

## RECENZIJOS

V. Mažiulis, *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai (Deklinacija)*  
(Relations between Baltic and Other Indo-European Languages. Declension),  
Vilnius, 1970, 344 p.

The author, professor Vytautas Mažiulis, of Vilnius University, Lithuania, has in recent years along with his late colleague Jonas Kazlauskas made a name for himself within the field of Baltic and Indo-European linguistics, not least because of original points of view and courageous breaking with some traditional theories on Indo-European historic linguistics.

For long Baltic and Lithuanian studies seemed to be an exclusive matter for the foreigner. It will suffice to mention Bopp, Brugmann, Schleicher, Leskien, Specht and in more recent years Fraenkel and Stang. In the 19th century Lithuanian grammars were written in German. Around the turn of the century Lithuanians began to devote themselves to these studies as well, and it is worth noting that mostly due to their efforts (Baranauskas, Jaunius, Jablonskis, Būga) which mainly consisted in collecting and drawing material from the abundant dialects the studies of Lithuanian and Baltic began to take decisive form and to progress. Especially in the field of dialectology has their work up to this day been fruitful as is shown by Zinkevičius' „Lietuvių kalbos dialektologija“. But the Lithuanians never had their Endzelīns and the studies of Lithuanian and Baltic in relation to the other Indo-European languages have greatly suffered from that lack. Now at last there has appeared a work which aims at taking up that problem, and it must be said that the gap has been filled in a worthy manner.

The book which has the subtitle “Declension” is primarily divided into three parts on phonetics, declension and on Baltic and Indo-European relations.

The purpose of the work, in the author's own words, is “with the help of morphologic arguments explain some genetic relationships between the Baltic and other Indo-European languages“ and “to accent the fact that the progress of explaining the genetic relationships of these languages depends not so much on the interpretation of results already won by traditional Indo-Europeanistics as on a further investigation into the internal reconstruction of the Baltic (and other Indo-European) languages“. The author lays great stress on the difference between paradigmatic and unparadigmatic case forms but he fails or evades to give an adequate definition of the conception “paradigmatic”.

In a short review of this sort it will not be possible to mention all the questions which the author raises in his book nor will all the answers be weighed.

In the chapter on vocalism the author maintains (and that is a widely held opinion) that IE  $*\bar{a} \rightarrow$  archaic Prussian  $*\bar{o} \rightarrow$  Elbinger Prussian  $o/oa$  is being represented in Catecismic Prussian by  $\bar{a}/\bar{o}$ . After labial or guttural sounds (L/G) Cat. Pr.  $\bar{a}/\bar{o} \rightarrow \bar{u}$  which is never written in the form of a diphthong (digraph)  $ou$  ( $u^{\text{st}}$ ). On the other hand, IE  $*\bar{o} \rightarrow$  arch. Pr.  $*\bar{o} \rightarrow$  Elb. Pr.  $o/oa$ , is being represented in Cat. Pr. by  $\bar{o}$ . After L/G Cat. Pr.  $\bar{o} \rightarrow \bar{u}$  and is often written like a diphthong (di-

graph) *ou* (*u<sup>u</sup>*). Some remarks have to be made on this reconstruction. The IE *\*ā* and *\*ō* seem to be represented in Elb. Pr. by *o/oa*, where the author maintains that *oa* seems to stand for IE *\*ā* whereas *o* seems to stand for both IE *\*ā* and *\*ō*. The difference is really meagre and can hardly be relied on. It seems more probable that in Elb. Pr. the representatives of IE *\*ā* and *\*ō* have merged into a single sound *\*ā<sup>o</sup>* which would account for the occasional *oa* for *o*. In Cat. Pr. these sounds, however, seem to be differentiated. That they are identical in the earlier language but kept apart in the later can, of course, be because Elb. Pr. and Cat. Pr. are different dialects. But even the differentiation in Cat. Pr. should be considered very carefully because in Prussian only a very few words have an etymologically certain IE *\*ō* (cf. Stang: *Vergl. Gr. d. Balt. Sprachen*, p. 48).

Yet another thing is the structure of the vocalic system that the author is forced to set up for Old Prussian, a system where there are more back vowels than front vowels. As the author himself emphasizes, "Such a system is not known to exist in the world or ever to have existed". Therefore he is forced to postulate the former existence of an arch. Pr. *\*ē* which later vanished because of the lack of the relation *\*ō* : *\*ē* leaving the most dubious traces. The question arises, why then did not also *\*ō* vanish being even more spectacular standing alone than in relation to *\*ē*?

In the chapter on diphthongs the author, in my opinion, neatly makes use of a theory proposed by Kuryłowicz (BPTJ XV 1956, 125) and shows the double origin of Lithuanian *uo* : a) ← IE *\*ō*, b) ← by apophony. He also explains Lithuanian *ui* on apophonic premisses.

Moving on to the declension the author accentuates the need for relying more on internal reconstruction when investigating historical morphology. He stresses the conclusion arrived at in later years' works which, in contrast to the tradition of Brugmann,

supposes an Indo-European morphological system relatively simple, originally ergative in construction, with elaborate declination outcrystallizing quite late and not affecting all branches of Indo-European such as Hittite, Germanic and Greek.

The author then comments the separate endings. All of his solutions are interesting and some of them disputable. He considers the Slavonic-Lithuanian non. sg. neutr. *-o* more archaic than the Prussian *-an*. But as Slavonic also knows *-on* (*dvorō* ← *\*-on*) he considers *\*on* : *\*o* to be a complementary distribution baryton vs. non-baryton. Explanations relying on accentual relations are always slippery and a simpler solution must be either that of different sandhi forms or an attempt to differentiate neutr. nom. sg. from. masc. nom./acc. sg. which otherwise would have merged. If that be the solution then, of course, *\*-on* is the archaic ending.

In explaining the Prussian gen. sg. (*o*-stem) *-as* he dismisses the traditional view that Pr. *-as* ← IE *\*-oso* / *\*-osjo*. He maintains that the vowel was not apocoped as it was in the nom. sg. just in order to retain the difference between the two forms. This was possible primarily because sometimes the gen. sg. had an accentuated ending whereas the nom. sg. never had. In general the author supposes the model for gen. sg. (*o*-stems) in the Indo-European languages to be *\*-o/es* [(*i*)*o/e*], an all-embracing solution. He greatly stresses the point that the *o*-stems must be considered *o/e*-stems, and that the occurrence of *-e*-forms must not come as a surprise. Thus in gen. sg. the Germanic languages make use of both *-o*- and *-e*-, West-Germanic using *\*-os* but Gothic using *\*-es*. This coincides with the fact that gen. pl. in Gothic is *\*-ēm* whereas *\*-ōm* is used by the other Germanic languages.

The author then takes up the problem of dat. sg. and concludes that the traditional explanation Lith. *-ui* ← IE *\*-ōi* is impossible by inner Lithuanian reconstruction. He maintains that the dialectal *-uo* ← *\*-*

is the only original *o*-stem dat. sg. ending, that dialectal *-u* is borrowed from *u*-stems and that *-ui* is the *u*-stem ending *-u ÷ i* later affixed. This is an interesting theory and a lot more probable than *-ui* ← *\*-ōi*. The crux, however, seems to be, how can a *u*-stem influence an *o*-stem?<sup>1</sup> Are there other examples of this kind in Lithuanian? The influence ought to be the other way round. Another solution might be considered, namely that a) *-uo* ← *\*-ō* ← *\*-ō̄* b) *-u* ← *\*-ō̄* ← *\*-ō̄²* c) *-ui* ← *-u + i* in analogy to *a*-stems *-ai* (cf. Cons. stems dialectal *-ij*). In Lithuanian dialects, especially in Western Žemaitic, there still are examples of accentuated oxytone endings in unparadigmatic dat. sg., i. e. (as Mažiulis uses the term) adverbially and after prepositions in the (*i*)*ā*-, *ē*-, *i*- and cons. stems: cf. *bėgo be galvaĩ* (= *be galvōs*), *nu duobeĩ* (= *nuo duobēs*), *po rudeniē* (= *po ru-*

*deñs*). This ending cannot have been taken from the pronominal or adjectival paradigms for there the ending is *-āi*, cf. *tāi*, *baltāi*. Zinkevičius in his book „Lietuvių kalbos dialektologija“ 414 is of the opinion that there must be some relation between the ending *-āi* and the unparadigmatic use of the dative. The accentuated dative, though far less frequently, is also witnessed in masc. non-oxytone *o*-stems (and *i*-stems). Cf. *už staluō nebūvo sūolo*. I venture therefore to suggest that at a certain stage in certain Lithuanian dialects the IE *o*-stem ending *\*-ō̄* yielded primarily archaic Lith. *\*-ō̄* → *ù* → mod. Lith. *-u* when the dat. had ordinary dat. function and secondarily arch. Lith. *\*-ō̄* → *uō̄* → *uo* when the dat. was used unparadigmatically, i. e. adverbially or after prepositions. Later this difference of function was no longer acknowledged except in Western Žemaitic where it is still maintained, and, varying from dialect to dialect, either the ending *-u* was generalized or the *-uō̄* which lost its accent and became *-uo* as soon as it got into use as a normal dat. sg. ending.

The absence of special locative forms in Prussian is, according to the author, an archaic Indo-European feature. But an ancient and still valid argument against this point of view is that this may be due to German influence, cf. the influence of German on the dialect of the Klaipėda district, where also special locative endings are not to be found.

The author compares the Lithuanian instr. pl. *-ais* ← IE *\*-ois* with Gr. *-οις* which of course is quite possible. Further he compares it with Skt. *-aiḥ* which he considers a *vṛddhi* form. If this be true then it is the only example of *vṛddhi* operating in an ending<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Note of the Editor. It is not likely that such a *vṛddhi* in word-final position is a singular case [I would rather treat the Skt. loc. sg. (*sūn*)-*au*, (*mat*)-*ā* ← *\*-āi* to be *vṛddhi* cases too; see my „Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai“ 293].

<sup>1</sup> Note of the Editor. The questions of how and why the *u*-stem affected the *o*-stem in this case, i. e. why and in what way the *u*-stem flection dat. sg. *-u* (and *-ui*) found its way into the *o*-stem dat. sg. [its flection *-uō̄* (< *\*-ō̄* ← *\*-ō̄*) was completely identical with the *u*<sub>1</sub>-stem dat. sg. *-uō̄* (≦ *\*-au*), which had a “doublet” — the *u*<sub>2</sub>-stem flection *-u(-ui)*!”, have indeed been discussed in my book „Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai“, Vilnius, 1970, §§ 31, 65, 66, 154, 160, 162. The concise style of the book, as has been rightly noticed by the reviewer, might have made the understanding of the above mentioned cases of derivation difficult (mea culpa!)

<sup>2</sup> Note of the Editor. It is difficult to believe that one and the same Lithuanian subdialect (e. g. the Dusmenys — Pivašiūnai subdialect) should have preserved both the circumflex accent [dat. sg. *vil̄k-uo* (Dusmenys) is definitely derived from *-uō̄*], and the acute accent [if dat. sg. *vil̄k-u* (Pivašiūnai) were assumed to have originated from *\*-uo*]!

I shall not mention more details. As can be seen, this is an original work and therefore open to criticism. A great handicap, it must be said, is the author's style of writing. In his extreme carefulness putting forth his arguments he is led to repetitions and citations of arguments already passed, which makes the book a heavy reading indeed. Nonetheless, it is most valuable. For, in the often cited words of Chr. Stang (Vergl. Gramm.), "Die Wissenschaft ist ein Dialog

und niemand von uns kann den Anspruch erheben auf allen punkten zu einem bleibenden Ergebnis zu gelangen. Aber was man vorlegt wird ja kritisiert, andere melden vielleicht Widerspruch an. Mit Hilfe dieser unorganisierten Teamworks schreitet die Wissenschaft fort". The work is certainly most valuable and it is certainly one of the most interesting works on Baltic and Indo-European linguistics to appear in later years.

Jörundur Hilmarsson

**Leksikos tyrinėjimai** (Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai, XIII), Vilnius, 1972, 227 p.

Tai trečiasis LKK tomas, skirtas leksikos tyrinėjimams<sup>1</sup>. Kaip ir ankstyvesniuose, šiame tome skelbiami vertingi darbai, praturtinantys lietuvių leksikologiją. Betgi čia daug svarbių duomenų sau ras ir fonetikos, morfologijos, dialektologijos bei kitų lietuvių kalbos mokslo sričių specialistai. Recenzijoje ir norima leidinių aptarti platesniu aspektu, pažvelgti į straipsnius ne vien leksikologijos požiūriu.

Tomas pradedamas S. Karaliūno straipsniu „Semantika ir etimologija“, kuriame svarstomi aktualūs teoriniai šių dienų semantikos klausimai ir pateikiamos žodžio *džiaūgtis* bei latvių *džaubt*, *gaūbt*<sup>2</sup> etimologijos. Gaila, kad labai įdomias ir vertingas autoriaus mintis skaitytojui nelengva suprasti: trukdo įmantri modernistinė šių dienų lingvistikos terminologija, autoriaus automatiškai ir be jokių išlygų ar paaiškinimų perkelta iš užsieninių veikalų. Ne kiekvienam pavyks suvokti, pavyzdžiui, kuo skiriasi *sematema* (p. 5) nuo *sememos* (p. 7), ką reiškia *žmogaus*

*ženklinės elgsenos komponentai* (p. 5), kas yra tos *fonotaktinės taisyklės* (p. 6), ką reiškia pasakymas *raiškos plano segmentai nemanifestuoja... gretimų patyrimo ir mąstymo sričių turinio segmentų* (p. 7) ir pan. Autorius turėjo retesnius, bent jau pirmą kartą lietuvių lingvistikoje pavartojamus terminus ar išsireiškimus paaiškinti, juoba kad ir užsienio lingvistai anaipol ne visi juos vienodai supranta. Be to, neretai tą patį galima buvo pasakyti daug paprasčiau, suprantamiau.

Teorinėms bei praktinėms tarmės žodyno sudarymo problemoms skirtas V. Vitkausko straipsnis „Šnektų grupės žodyno sudarymo principai“. Jame ne tik aptariamos ir įvertinamos kitų asmenų mintys kalbamu klausimu, bet taip pat panaudota didelė paties autoriaus patirtis, kurią jis įgijo sudarydamas savo gimtojo krašto (kilęs iš Kuršėnų) tarmės žodyną. Tai bus pirmasis lituanistikoje sritis žodynas, kurio pasirodymo nekantriai laukiame.

Straipsnyje keliamos mintys labai pravers būsimiems lietuvių kalbos sritinių žodynų sudarytojams. Juk į šį darbą mūsų dialektologai ligi šiol nedaug dėmesio tekreipė. V. Vitkauskas laikytinas šio darbo pionierium Lietuvoje.

Net du straipsniai skirti Gervėčių šnektos leksikai: A. Vidugirio „Iš Gervėčių tarmės

<sup>1</sup> Leksikai dar skirti: Lietuvių kalbos leksikos raida (LKK VIII), Vilnius, 1966, 240 p.; Iš lietuvių leksikologijos ir leksikografijos (LKK XII), Vilnius, 1970, 207 p. Juos mūsų leidinyje recenzavo V. Urbutis, žr. *Baltistica* III (1967) 233–236 ir VIII (1972) 202–207.