

RECENZIJOS

Daniel Petit, Claire Le Feuvre, Henri Menantaud (éd.), **Langues baltiques, langues slaves**, Paris: CNRS Editions, 2011, 290 p.

This book is a collection of papers from the international conference held in Paris in April, 2006, organized by Daniel Petit (École Normale Supérieure) and Henri Menantaud (Inalco). In his short *Préface* (p. 3) D. Petit dedicates the book to the memory of two recently deceased Balticists Anatoli Nepokupnij (1932–2006) and Saulius Ambrazas (1957–2010).

The volume shows the diversity of approaches regarding the relationships between the Baltic and the Slavic languages and presents the contributions of thirteen scholars on different subjects in the area of Baltic and Slavic linguistics. One can roughly note that six or seven contributions are devoted to the theme of Balto-Slavic relations, in a broader sense, including also contrastive investigations; three or four contributions are devoted to Baltistics, and two to Slavistics, in a narrower sense.

The debate on the Balto-Slavic problem is notoriously very old. It probably began already with the first palaeocomparative reflections on the linguistic situation in Eastern Europe proposed by Æneas Sylvius de' Piccolomini (1405–1464) in his book *De Europa* (1458)

and by the so-called Philoglots (Conrad Gessner, Angelo Rocca, Hieronymus Megiser et al.) in the middle of the 16th century with their Illyrian Theory (cf. Dini 2010, 571–618). One must also mention the later linguistic ideas of Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro (1735–1809) on a Scytho-Illyrian language family, and the first “modern” attempt of an explanation in the work *Mithridates* by Johann Christoph Adelung (1732–1806). It is only after the acceptance of “scientific” linguistics that a methodologically founded comparative approach to the Balto-Slavic question was developed (cf. Dini 1997, 127–143; Petit 2004).

Among the papers devoted to Balto-Slavic matters Rainer Eckert's historiographical contribution “La commission balto-slave au sein du comité international des slavistes: son histoire, ses tâches actuelles” (p. 5–13) opens the collection and updates the information on the many and different tasks accomplished by the Balto-Slavic commission of the International Committee of Slavists from its foundation in 1963 until the present time.

Going on with the other papers devoted to Baltic-Slavic matters, one encounters Alexander Anikin's contribution “On the stratification of Baltic lexical elements in the Russian language” (p. 49–55). This is a presentation of the author's very important work “A

dictionary of Baltic lexical elements in Russian” (Anikin 2005, in Russian), in which a useful stratification of Baltic elements in Slavic languages is proposed. Generally speaking, the paper represents a rather skeptical point of view concerning the Baltic lexical substratum on Russian territory. Although the author maintains that a Baltic element is traceable in Russian hydronymy (the references omit Babik 2001), he observes that it could have reached the Russian language via Belorussian. In particular the author also affirms that “the attempts to reveal an extensive Galindian lexical stratum in Russian dialects around Moscow – made by Toporov [1980a; 1980b; 1981; 1983 etc.] – are yet to be regarded as a failure” (p. 53), but he does not say why.

The difficulty of distinguishing between etyma dating back to the Balto-Slavic period and etyma that were borrowed from Baltic into Slavic or vice versa is emphasized in Rick Derksen’s contribution “Reconstructing Balto-Slavic etyma” (p. 179–186). The assumptions that there was a Proto-Balto-Slavic stage, a Proto-Slavic stage (but not a Proto-Baltic one [!], cf. footnote 2 at p. 179) is not without problems. The author based his comparisons and reconstructions on the material gathered for the Baltic and Slavic etymological databases (created within the framework of the Indo-European Etymological Dictionary project, see: <http://www.ieed.nl>).

Another contribution dealing with etymological matter is “Le nom du millet et le problème de la satemisation incomplete en balto-slave” by Aleksandar

Loma (p. 223–234). On the new light shed by Tokharian data, the author offers an investigation of the Balto-Slavic-Tokharian isogloss for “panicum miliaceum” (cf. OPr. *prassan*, Sl. *proso*, Tok. B *proksa*) proposing some thoughts on the meaning of this word, taking into account the *centum* vs. *satem* phonetic shape of this form. Discussing this matter one should also consider Ivanov 2004, and for the *centum* vs. *satem* issue one could have also recalled Campanile 1965.

Kazimieras Garšva’s contribution “Le domaine orientale des langues baltiques et son développement” (p. 187–198) touches the very intriguing (and also very debated) question of the Eastern Balticisms, i.e. the remnants (mostly toponyms) of the Baltic languages in those territories whose Slavicisation is a relatively late phenomenon. The author pays attention particularly to the Balticisms (Lithuanianisms) in the territory of contemporary Belorussia, of the region of Novgorod, and of that between Moscow and Kursk.

Andrij Danylenko’s large, detailed and interesting contribution “Linguistic and cultural border crossing in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or, can the Grand Duchy of Lithuania be defined as a Sprachareal?” (p. 147–177) offers a panorama and a critical review of the investigations devoted to the linguistic situation in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In particular the author’s main goal is to illustrate “the socio-linguistic and linguistic factors that indicate an exceptional density of areal relationship in the

Polish-Lithuanian-Ruthenian ethno-linguistic area” (p. 149–150) and “to probe the density of areal relationship in this area and ascertain the structural affinities” (p. 150). Danylenko emphasizes the complex nature of *ruski* and its difference in the course of time, and presents a well argued diachronically and functionally complex system of relationships among the core languages (Lithuanian, Polish, Ruthenian) of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania during a three hundred-year period of time. Beyond that Danylenko appropriately points out that intensive language contact could involve factors of time and different levels of bilingualism; similarly extensive asymmetrical bilingualism functionally tends to transform into diglossia (native language for oral and non-native language for written discourse). As a matter of fact, this contribution contains many important issues and will be a reference work for further discussion and research on this field. (One could perhaps mention – however just for bibliographical completeness – also the schematic and programmatic contribution on the same subject Ivanov, Dini 2001).

A couple of contributions deal specifically with issues of Baltic or of Slavic.

Unfortunately the late Saulius Ambrazas left unfinished a huge investigation on different forms of morphological derivation in Lithuanian and Baltic. After having devoted two monographs to nominal derivatives (Ambrazas 1993; 2000), he prepared a third one on adjectival derivatives which could not be finished by the author himself (Ambrazas

2011). His contribution “Some old Indo-European features of the formation of Baltic adjectives” (p. 15–48) is also a part of this larger study (cf. Ambrazas 2011, 106–123). The author investigates Baltic deverbal adjectives formed with the suffixes **-no-*, **-ro-*, **-lo-*, **-to-* and **-uo-* and comes to the conclusion that there was a rather archaic tendency to create substantival attributive adjectives from deverbal adjectives of action and result, and that in the Baltic languages these two derivational categories have remained close to each other.

Olivier Azam’s contribution “L’emploi des formes «enclitiques», «toniques» et «accentuées» des pronoms personnels et réfléchi compléments en russe littéraire classique et en vieux russe littéraire (slavon russe), étude contrastive en contexte identique (les traductions de l’Evangile)” (87–145), is a large and well documented philological investigation on a very specific matter as announced in the title.

The contribution of Claire Le Feuivre “L’allongement des prépositions en composition (préfixes) en baltique et en slave” (p. 199–222) and that of Daniel Petit “Préverbatation et préfixation en baltique” (p. 235–271) are closely related. I find very interesting both these investigations which together offer a very detailed chapter of comparative historical morphology of the Baltic and Slavic languages (with comparison with Germanic) focused on the relation between preverbatation and prefixation.

In his contribution “Aspect and actionality in Lithuanian on a typological background” (p. 57–86) P. M. Ark-

diev is right to abandon obsolete explanations, and to distinguish between actionality (with reference to the inherent semantics of the verb) and aspectual viewpoint (that is the point of view of the speaker, his way of looking at the event). About 220 Lithuanian simple and derivational (mostly prefixed) verbal lexemes are considered. Typologically Lithuanian shares many of the so-called cross-linguistic actional classes established by Tatevosov (2002) only partly coinciding with those established by Vendler (1967). Lithuanian represents a typologically quite rare (and still underinvestigated) system in which actionality plays a central role and the grammaticalization of the aspect still is at an incipient stage. Also the telic value which the prefixes may have in Lithuanian has been well emphasized. Lithuanian occupies a very specific place in the frame of the “standard average European” but also in comparison with the Slavic languages. I find this investigation, which deals, indeed, with a subject very well investigated by the school of Pisa (Piermarco Bertinetto) very useful. Interestingly enough, Silvia Piccini in her PhD dissertation, “Preverbatation, actional categories and argumental realization in Lithuanian with IE comparisons” (in Italian; see Piccini 2009), also came almost to the same results.

Among the contrastive studies presented in the book are the following. Lea Sawicki’s contribution “TO and TAI as markers of division” (p. 273–279) is a synchronic contrastive enquiry on the two lexemes mentioned in the title (Pol-

ish *to* and Lithuanian *tai*) which share many features and encompass a wide range of context-specific functions. With a large number of examples the author analyzes their different functions but especially as non verbal copulae, that is, as a marker of nexus or signal of connection, on various levels of syntactic and textual segments.

To the same group may be added Henri Menantaud’s contribution “Forme adnumérale et indéfinitude en letton et en polonais” (p. 281–288). The author draws attention to a comparison between Latvian and Polish in the domain of numerals and precisely to sentences like (A) Polish *dwaj panowie spali* “two lords slept” ~ (B) *dwóch panów spało* “id.” and (A) Latvian *Man ir desmit lati* “I have ten lats” ~ (B) *Man ir desmit latu* “id.”. According to the type (B) the author claims that it is possible (p. 283) “formuler l’hypothèse qu’il pouvait exister également en letton une tendance à exprimer l’indéfinitude”. This may be interesting (although only 3 examples are given for Latvian) from a synchronic-contrastive point of view, but it is doubtful from a Baltic-internal perspective since in Lithuanian only the type (B) is admitted and also in Old Latvian (cf. Cerri forthcoming) the type (B) seems to be more ancient than (A).

In conclusion I want to express my thanks to the three editors of this volume for having delivered a new important contribution to the community of scholars interested in Baltic and Slavic languages.

REFERENCES

- Ambrasas, Saulius 2011, *Būdvardžių darybos raida*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Babik, Zbigniew 2001, Najstarsza warstwa nazewnicza na ziemiach polskich : w granicach wczesnośredniowiecznej słowiańszczyzny, Kraków : TAIWPN Universitas.
- Campanile, Enrico 1965, Sull'isoglossa satem, *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 5, 37–55.
- Cerri, Adriano (forthcoming), Variabilità morfosintattica dei numerali in lettone antico, *Res Balticae* 12: *Baltica Pisana in memoria di Nikolai Mikhailov*, Livorno: Books & Company.
- Dini, Pietro Umberto 1997, *Le lingue baltiche*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Dini, Pietro Umberto 2010, *Aliletoescvr: linguistica batica delle origini. Teorie e contesti linguistici nel Cinquecento*, Livorno: Books & Company.
- Ivanov, Vyacheslav 2004, Prussica 1–3, in Philip Baldi, Pietro Umberto Dini (eds.), *Studies in Baltic and Indo-European linguistics*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 91–101.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav Vsevolodovič, Pietro Umberto Dini 2001, Languages, Writings, Linguistic ideas, Religions, Cultures in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and neighbouring areas in XIV–XVII c. A. D., *Res Balticae* 7, 199–203.
- Petit, Daniel 2004, Les langues baltiques et la question balto-slave, *Histoire-Épistémologie-Langage* 26(2), 7–41.
- Piccini, Silvia 2009, *Preverbazione, categorie azionali e realizzazione argomentale in lituano con confronti indoeuropei*, Tesi di dottorato in Linguistica, Università di Pisa.
- Tatevosov, Sergej 2002, The parameter of actionality, *Linguistic Typology* 6(3), 317–401.
- Toporov 1980a – Владимир Николаевич Топоров, Γαλίνδαι – Galindite – голяди (Balt. *Galind-) в этнолингвистической и ареальной перспективе, in С. Цимерманис (ред.), *Этнографические и лингвистические аспекты этнической истории балтских народов*, Рига: Зинатне, 124–136.
- Toporov 1980b – Владимир Николаевич Топоров, Балтийский элемент к северу от Карпат: этнонимическая основа *Galind- как знак балтийской периферии, *Slavia Occidentalis* 29, 247–252.
- Toporov 1981 – Владимир Николаевич Топоров, Голядский фон ранней Москвы: О балтийском элементе в Подмоскowie, in Regina Volkaitė-Kulikauskienė (red.), *Проблемы этногенеза и этнической истории балтов*, Тезисы докладов, Вильнюс, АН Литовской ССР, Институт истории, 112–117.
- Toporov 1983 – Владимир Николаевич Топоров, Галинды в западной Европе, *Балто-славянские исследования 1982*, 129–139.
- Vendler, Zeno 1967, *Linguistics in philosophy*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Pietro U. DINI

Dipartimento di Linguistica
Via S. Maria 36
I-56126 Pisa
Italy
[pud@ling.unipi.it]