Kortlandt, Frederik 2007, *Italo-Celtic origins and prehistoric development of the Irish language*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Petit, Daniel 2010, *Untersuchungen zu den baltischen Sprachen*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Schmalstieg, William R. 1958, The thematic vowel in Baltic, *Lingua* 7, 428–432.

Stang, Christian S. 1957, *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Stang, Christian S. 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsö: Universitetsforlaget.

Vermeer, Willem R. 1998, Christian Stang's revolution in Slavic accentology, in Jan Ivar Bjørnflaten, Geir Kjetsaa, Terje Mathiassen, *A Centenary of Slavic Studies in Norway. The Olaf Broch Symposium. Papers, Oslo 12-14 September 1996*, Oslo: The Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, 240–254.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON

Baltistikos katedra
Vilniaus universitetas
Universiteto g. 5,
LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania
[*miguelvillanueva@yahoo.com*]

Daniel P e t i t, **Untersuchungen zu den baltischen Sprachen**, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010, ix + 324 p. (*Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages and Linguistics* 4)

As D. Petit (P.) points out (3) the Baltic languages are often "nur ein toter Winkel in der Ausbildung der Indogermanisten". This book, based on a series of lectures at the Indo-European Summer School in Berlin, 2006, is a most welcome attempt to bring Baltic historical linguistics to the attention of the general Indo-European reader. It consists of five autonomous chapters broadly divided into two parts: a presentation of a given topic followed by a discussion of a particular issue.

Chapter 1 offers an overview of Baltic dialectology: traits separating Baltic from the rest of Indo-European (pp. 6–11), differences between West Baltic and East Baltic (pp. 12–21), Old Prussian dialects (pp. 21–25), differences between Lithua-nian and Latvian (pp. 25–35), Lithua-nian dialectology (pp. 35–44), Latvian dialectology (pp. 44–48), including a list of ancient Lithuanian and Latvian texts (a couple of maps would also have been useful). Every section presents a similar structure: a short presentation of the basic facts is followed by a commented list of phonological, morphological and, specially, lexical isoglosses. P. also discusses areal and substrate approaches to the Baltic dialects and even to Baltic itself, which is seen as a "Zwischenzone" within Indo-European (pp. 48–51).

Chapter 2 presents a survey of the accentological and intonational system of the Baltic languages: Latvian intonations (pp. 55–60), Lithuanian intonations (pp. 60–64), correlation between Lithuanian accentual paradigms and Latvian intonations (pp. 64–71), Žemaitian intonations (pp. 71–75), Old Prussian (pp. 75–100). P. devotes considerable space to determine what the macron expressed in the

Enchiridion. Abel Will, however, states explicitly that *ā ē ī ō ū ij* express vowel length (PKP 2, 105). It follows that it provides only indirect information on stress position and intonations. P. then moves on to tackle a major point of disagreement in modern scholarship: the intonation of Indo-European long vowels in Balto-Slavic (p. 100–139). P. discusses possible instances of Indo-European long vowels in Baltic, most of which are dismissed as incorrect, unclear, or insufficiently grounded. P. concludes that the issue is still unsettled, but on the strength of *duktė̃* "daughter", *akmuõ* "stone" he provisionally favors Kortlandt's theory that Indo-European long vowels yield long vowels with circumflex intonation.

Chapter 3 studies the decay of the neuter gender in Baltic. As P. points out, the history of the neuter in Baltic has been more complex than a cursory "preserved in the Elbing Vocabulary, reduced in the Catechisms, preserved only in adjectives and pronouns in Lithuanian, lost without traces in Latvian". Of particular interest are the sections on the distribution of pronominal *-an* and *-a* in the Enchiridion (pp. 164–168), which P. convincingly attributes to German interference, on the pronominal neuter in Lithuanian (pp. 174–183), including discussion of forms like *(ta)taĩ*, *kàs*, or on adverbial relics of neuter adjectives in Latvian (pp. 185–191). P. expresses considerable skepticism on the view that borrowings like Finnish *silta* "bridge" preserve a direct reflex of a thematic nom.-acc. sg. n. ending **-a* (pp. 197f.). If P. is right (the issue clearly deserves a thorough study), we are only left with a thematic neuter adjective ending *-a* to be accounted for (against perfectly clear substantival **-an < *-om*, pronominal **-a < *-od*). In the last section (pp. 198–204) P. correctly criticizes the idea that forms like Lith. *gẽra* represent an Indo-European archaism and provides a syntactic motivation for the adoption of pronominal **-a* as the neuter adjective ending.

Chapter 4 begins with a survey of the Lithuanian and Latvian verb (pp. 206–221). P. properly stresses the fact that the principles governing the structure of the Baltic verb (autonomy of the infinitive stem, pivotal position of the third person, predictability of the preterit stem) are specifically Baltic. This is important, as it is not unusual to come across incorrect use of Baltic forms that are entirely predictable within the system. There is at present considerable debate concerning even some of the basics of the organization of the Old Prussian verbal system. P. (pp. 222–241) critically surveys the different approaches and concludes that it can be derived without great difficulty from a "Lithuanian-model" of the Baltic verbal system. Finally, P. briefly discusses the Indo-European origins of the Baltic "semithematic classes": *ā*-presents, *i*-presents, *ē*- and *ā*-preterit (pp. 244–260).

Chapter 5 studies the position of clitics in Baltic. After establishing criteria for the identification of clitics in ancient texts, P. surveys the evidence of Old Prussian (pp. 264–271) and East Baltic, mostly Lithuanian (pp. 271–281). The evidence of the three languages permits a relatively straightforward recon-

struction of Baltic clitics, most of them of clear Indo-European pedigree (pp. 281–285). P. then goes on to establish the rules for the position of clitics in Baltic (pp. 285–307). In Baltic, as in Slavic, the position of enclitics has become strongly verb-oriented, thus restricting the application of Wackernagel's law. The main question concerning the position of proclitics is the scope of tmesis in Baltic. As a remarkable archaism, the Latvian *dainas* still preserve examples of sentence-initial preverbs with sentence-final verbs. Otherwise preverbs are not separable from the verb, but there are many instances of clitics being inserted between preverbs or prepositions and the head (Lith. *sùka-si* vs. *pa-sì-suka*; OLith. *ing*, *nuog* < *in-gi*, *nuo-gi*; OPr. *ergi*, *surgi*; etc.).

P.'s book is very well written and has obviously achieved its goal. Although it has been primarily conceived for Indo-Europeanists, it will no doubt be read with profit by Balticists as well. In spite of its unmistakable pedagogical bias, P. does fortunately not shy away from presenting his well-informed views on a number of issues.[1] There are, however,

some aspects of P.'s approach I find problematic.

Probably my main concern is the issue of Balto-Slavic. It is not discussed in the chapter devoted to Baltic dialectology, where he simply refers to P e t i t 2004. This article, however, is concerned with the *historia quaestionis* and does not include any type of factual analysis. P. views Balto-Slavic, at best, as "un groupe de dialectes perméables à la diffusion d'isoglosses" (2004, 35). He further observes that "actuellement, peu de savants défendent encore l'idée d'une langue balto-slave unique; elle supposerait une unité politique et culturelle qui aurait certainement laissé plus de traces dans les deux familles de langues qui en procèdent". The first part of this statement is hardly accurate. Balto-Slavic unity is now widely accepted, at least among Indo-Europeanists. The second part is irrelevant. One should not adduce extra-linguistic arguments when deciding on linguistic matters. P.'s position is particu-

---

[1] Sometimes one may wonder whether P. has not gone too far. For instance, he criticizes all theories on the origin of the Baltic preterit suffixes *-ā-, *-ē- because "entweder beruhen sie auf schwach begründeten indogermanistischen Ansätzen oder sie setzen wenig überzeugende analogische Prozesse voraus" (p. 251). These words apply perfectly well to his own scenario (pp. 252–254), which starts with an

over simplistic identification *ē*-preterit ≈ sigmatic aorist, *ā*-preterit ≈ thematic aorist, continues with questionable (pre-) Baltic reconstructions (the Baltic sigmatic aorist had a thematic 2nd and 3rd singular *$u̯ed^h$-e-s*, *$u̯ed^h$-e-t*, as in Slavic; the thematic aorist generalized *-a-* as the thematic vowel), and ends up positing an impressive amount of analogical remodeling (2 sg. *$u̯ed^h$-e-s*, 3 sg. *$u̯ed^h$-e-t* → *$u̯ed^h$-ē-s*, *$u̯ed^h$-ē-t* on analogy with the imperfect of the verb "to be" 2 sg. *$ēs$, 3 sg. *$ēst$ < *e-$h_1$es-s*, *e-$h_1$es-t*; thematic aorist *sed-a-t* → *sed-ā-t* on analogy with the recently created *ē*-preterit).

larly damaging in chapter 2, as the intonation of inherited long vowels is clearly a topic in which Baltic and Slavic should be discussed together. In disregarding the Slavic evidence P. misses the best argument for Kortlandt's theory in inlaut (the circumflex intonation of SCr. inf. *dònijeti* "bring", aor. 1 sg. *dònijeh*, continuing an old sigmatic aorist *$*h_1nḗk̂-s-t$*), as well as powerful counterevidence (e.g. SCr. *brème*, Ru. *berémja* < Sl. **bérmę* a "load, burden" < *$*bhḗr-men-$*, cf. Ved. loc. sg. *bhárman* "bei der Darbringung" RV 8.2.8). This is not the only case in which P.'s attitude has given rise to an error of judgment. For instance, he rejects Jasanoff's account of the type *budéti*, *bùdi* "be awake" (*i*-inflection resegmented from 3 pl. mid. *$*bhudh-ṇtoi > *bhudh-intai →$* **bud-i-nti*; J a s a n o f f 2003, 158ff.) because it is impossible to prove the preservation of the 3rd plural or the middle in Baltic (p. 259). Jasanoff, however, is proposing an early Balto–Slavic development (cf. OCS *bъděti*, *bъdi-*), not an exclusively Baltic one.

Although P. pays much attention to intonations, he curiously tends to disregard the broader accentological context (this has also been criticized by L a r s s o n 2008, 147). Thus, when surveying the development of laryngeals in Baltic P. properly observes that the sequence -EHRT- yields a diphthong with acute intonation, exactly like -ERHT-. He fails to mention that -EHRT- triggers Hirt's law, whereas -ERHT- does not, cf. Lith. *díeveris* 1, Latv. *dièveris*, Sl. **děˇverъ* a "brother-in-law" < *$*deh_2i-u̯ér-$* (cf. Gk. δᾱήρ, Ved. *devár-*) vs. Lith. *jáunas* 3, Latv. *jaûns*,

Sl. **jûnъ* c "young" < *$*h_2i̯eu-h_3n-ó-$* (cf. Ved. *yúvan-*, Lat. *iuuenis* < *$*h_2i̯u-h_3on-$*). Hirt's law is in fact not mentioned, and so the reader is left without an explanation of the intonational contrast between zero grade *ir̃t* "row", *bur̃t* "conjure" and full grade *ceↃt* "lift", *dzer̂t* "drink" in the Latvian infinitive. Similarly, P. observes that it is unclear whether Lith. *žvėrìs* 3, Latv. *zvêrs*, Sl. **zvěˇrъ* c "wild animal" go back to *$*ĝhu̯ēr-$* or *$*ĝhu̯eh_1r-$*. As it has been frequently observed (e.g. L a r s s o n 2008, 148), mobility decidedly points to *$*ĝhu̯ēr-$*, as one would expect *$*ĝhu̯eh_1r-$* to yield an immobile paradigm according to Hirt's law.[2] P.'s lack of attention to accentology also affects his treatment of individual items. Thus, he equates Lith. *úostas*, Latv. *uõsts* "port, harbor; mouth of a river" with OPr. *austo* Elb., acc. sg. *āustin* Ench. (!), OCS nom.-acc. pl. n. *usta* "mouth" (pp. 150, 185). As D e r k - s e n (2001) has shown, this etymology creates extraordinary problems from an accentological point of view. The point, I believe, is important. While Indo-Europeanists not specializing in Balto-Slavic will normally know that the acute of Lith. *tìltas* "bridge" points to a laryngeal, it is my impression that the importance of accentology for Balto-Slavic historical morphology and etymology is less well understood.

P.'s command of Indo-European linguistics is, in general terms, as complete

---

[2] To be sure, the issue has been recently complicated by K a p o v i ć (2009, 240), who claims that there is evidence pointing to Sl. **zvěˇrъ* a.

and up-to-date as that of Baltic. There are cases, however, in which I miss some important evidence or references. For instance, P. (pp. 101f.) correctly observes that the apparent agreement between Lith. nom. sg. *algà*, gen. sg. *algõs* and Gk. ἀλφή, ἀλφῆς needs not be explained through contrastive intonations in the parent language. He curiously fails to mention the Germanic *Auslautgesetze* and the disyllabic scansion of some long vowels in the R̥gveda and the Gāθās. Although much more controversial, the idea that the divergent treatment of some final-syllable vowels in Slavic reflect earlier intonations should also have been mentioned. When discussing the words for "heart" and "fire" (pp. 145, 149) P. seems to assume that **-r* was regularly lost in final position in Baltic. Although this is not stated explicitly, this view probably depends on the notion that *duktė̃* "daughter", *mótė* "mother" and (indirectly) *vanduõ* "water" must be *lautgesetztlich* from **dʰugh₂tḗr*, **méh₂tēr*, **u̯édōr*. It is well-known that the nominative singular of amphikinetic *n*-stems is to be reconstructed as **-ō* (< pre-PIE **-ōn*) and contrasts with hysterokinetic **-ḗn*, cf. Lat. *homō* "human" vs. *liēn* "spleen". Since the absence of the final resonant in the nominative singular of animated *r*- and *n*-stems also occurs in Indo-Iranian (Ved. *pitā́* "father", *svásā* "daughter", *rā́jā* "king", *ātmā́* "soul"), the possibility should at least be seriously considered that the lack of *-r* in *duktė̃* etc. is due to analogy with that of *n*-stems like *akmuõ*, *piemuõ*. In his discussion of Indo-European long vowels in Baltic P. classifies the evidence according to the different types of lengthened grade reconstructed for the parent language (*vr̥ddhi*, Stang's law, Narten presents, etc.). I miss a reference to Schindler's concept of "Narten roots" (S c h i n d l e r 1994) or, to put it in less strong terms, the "Narten derivational system". To give an example, the idea that nouns of the type Gk. κώμη "village, district", λώπη "mantle, husk" (< **kṓm-eh₂-*, **lṓp-eh₂-*) are derivationally related to original Narten presents (Katz *apud* V i n e 1998, 697[44]) provides a rationale for the lengthened grade of Lith. *núoma* 1 "lease, rent" or Latv. *ruõta* "adornment, toy", which are thus to be added to the list of counterexamples against Kortlandt's theory (cf. V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n fthc., §§ 6.2–3). P.'s discussion of the present type Lith. *mataũ*, *mataĩ*, *mãto* etc. "see" also misses some important references. As shown by C o w g i l l (1959), all Germanic facts can be derived from **-ā́i̯e/o-*. The Baltic present stem suffix **-ã̃-* (beside **-ā́i̯e/o-* < **-ah₂i̯e/o-*) thus stays isolated in the northern Indo-European area. P. derives Bl. **-ã̃-* from athematic **-ā-mi*. This is directly contradicted by the *ḫḫi*-conjugation of the factitive type *newaḫḫ-* "make new" in Old Hittite, cf. J a s a n o f f 2003, 139ff. R a u (2009) has recently argued that the athematic inflection of Greek contract verbs is best understood if one starts from a *h₂e*-conjugation present **neu̯ah₂-h₂e(i)*, *-th₂e(i)*, *-e(i)*.

These critical notes are not intended to diminish the highly positive evaluation that P.'s monograph deserves. Points of disagreement are only to be expected in a book that not only presents a very ac-

curate picture to non-specialists, but also offers personal views on hotly debated issues. It is only to be hoped that P.'s book will scatter a greater interest on Baltic among Indo-Europeanists and, I would add, on Indo-European among Balticists.

REFERENCES

Cowgill, Warren 1959, The inflection of the Germanic ō-presents, *Language* 35, 1–15.

Derksen, Rick 2001, Lith. *úostas*, Latv. *uõsta* "port, harbour", *Baltistica* 36(1), 37–42.

Jasanoff, Jay H. 2003, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kapović, Mate 2009, Rising mobility in Slavic *i*-stems, in Rosemarie Lühr, Sabine Ziegler, *Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Krakau, 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 236–243.

Larsson, Jenny Helena (rev.) 2008, Daniel Petit, Apophonie et catégories grammaticales dans les langues baltiques, 2004, *Kratylos* 53, 147–156.

Petit, Daniel 2004, Les langues baltiques et la question balto-slave, *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 26(2), 7–41.

PKP – Vytautas Mažiulis, *Prūsų kalbos paminklai* 2, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1981.

Rau, Jeremy 2009, Myc. *te-re-ja* and the athematic inflection of the Greek contract verbs, in Kazukiko Yoshida, Brent Vine, *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*, Bremen: Hempen, 181–188.

Schindler, Jochem 1994, Alte und neue Fragen zum indogermanischen Nomen (Erweitertes Handout), in Jens Elmegård Rasmussen, *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 25. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 397–400.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel (fthc.), On the origin of the Greek type νωμάω.

Vine, Brent 1998, The etymology of Greek κώμη and related problems, in Jay H. Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, Lisi Olivier, *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 685–702.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON

Baltistikos katedra
Vilniaus universitetas
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania
[*miguelvillanueva@yahoo.com*]

Thomas O l a n d e r, **Balto-Slavic accentual mobility**, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009, 274 p. (= *Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs* 199)

2006 m. Kopenhagos universitete apgintos daktaro disertacijos pagrindu parengtoje danų kalbininko Th. Olanderio (toliau – O.) monografijoje nagrinėjama, ko gero, painiausia ir problemiškiausia istorinės baltų-slavų – o gal ir apskritai indoeuropiečių – kalbotyros problema: baltų bei slavų kalbų kirčiavimo sistemų kilmė. Pagrindinį dėmesį skirdamas centriniam šios problemos aspektui – mobiliosios