

vienintelis paveldėtas 'maisto' pavadinimas. Šalia *maità* ir seno priesagos *-t-* vedinio *maistas* (*mìsti*, *maitinti*, *maiintis*) buvo dar ir *pėnas* (*penėti*, *penėtis*, *penauti*, *penėdinti*), plg. *Jisai duost peną visokiam kūnui. Penėjo jį pieneliu. Savim (krūtimi) nepenėjau [vaiko]* (LKŽ IX 779–780, 782–783; iš LKŽ pavyzdžių netgi atrodytų, kad bent jau senuosiuose raštuose *pėnas*, *penėti* reikšme 'maistas, maitinti' buvo įprastesni negu *maistas*, *maitinti* ar specifinę reikšmę gaunanti *maità*).

Be vykusiai patikslintų etimologijų ir tokių, kuriose dar nemaža fonologinės garsų adaptacijos ir semantinės žodžių raidos painiavos, be drąšių, tačiau platesnės profesionalios diskusijos reikalingų hipotezių, Liukkoneno knygoje „Suomių kalbos baltizmai“ įtikinamai, pakankamai paprastai, be sudėtingų reikšmės pasikeitimo postulavimų ar vien teoriškai galimų nepaliudytų konstruktyvų įrodoma, kad kai kurie iki šiol patikimo savo reikšmės paaiškinimo neturėję suomių kalbos žodžiai yra niekieno nepastebėti (arba beveik nepastebėti) baltizmai. Galima manyti, kad tokie yra: suom. *haastaa* 'kalbėti, kalbėtis, pasakoti; iškviesti, mesti iššūkį' (plg. lie. tarm. *žosti*, *žostu* 'sakyti'; *išžasti*, *išžandù* 'ištartį'), *haitta* 'trūkumas; trukdis; gedimas; žala, nuostolis' (plg. lie. *žaidà*), *keinu* 'sūpynės' (plg. lie. *geinys*, *geinė*)<sup>13</sup>, *kuohu* 'goža, bangų mūša' (plg. lie. *góža*), *lampi* 'tvenkinys' (plg. lie. *klampà*, *Klañpè*), tarm. *lojo* 'kelioninės rogės, šlajos' (plg. lie. *šlājos*), *lumme* 'vandens lelija, Nymphaea; lūgnė, Nuphar' (plg. lie. *lugmiai*), *sarana* 'durų ar lango vyris; sąnara; tech. lankstas' (plg. lie. *sānara*), *sampi* 'Baltijos eršketas, Acipenser sturio' (plg. lie. *stambi*), *tuore* 'šviežias, naujas' (plg. lie. *dorà*), *vaivero* 'viržinių klasės (Ericaceae) augalas, Chamaedaphne calyculata' (plg. lie. *vaivóras* 'Vaccinium uliginosum')<sup>14</sup>. Su nedidelėm išlygom labai tikėtina, kad ir *rāntā* 'dargana, dranga, šlapdriba' (plg.

<sup>13</sup> Apie šį žodį kitose finų kalbose žr. L. V a b a, Gibt es ein baltisches Fragment im estnischen Wortschatz der Waldimkerei? – *Linguistica Uralica*, XXVI 3, Tallinn, 1990, 173–179; R. E c k e r t, Baltisch-slawisch-finnougrische Entsprechungen im Wortschatz der Waldimkerei, – *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen*, LIV 1–2, Helsinki, 160.

<sup>14</sup> Plg. U.-M. K u l o n e n pastabą: „*vaivero* etimologų beveik nenagrinėtas, nes kaip mažas kuklus augalėlis jis kartu su kitais mažais, pavyzdžiui, *vaivaiskoivu* 'beržas keružis', savaime buvo įtrauktas į žodžio *vaiva* lizdą“ (min. veik., 250).

lie. *dreņgta*, *dreņgti*), *taaja* 'tankus, dažnas' (< bl. \**tankjā*, plg. lie. *tánki*, gen. sg. *tankiōs*) yra baltizmai. Kai kas gal pastebės ir daugiau.

Liukkoneno „Suomių kalbos baltizmai“ yra iš tų knygų, kurios kelia įvairių klausimų ir provokuoja diskusiją. Joje pateiktas įspūdingas visiškai naujų ir gana netikėtų etimologijų skaičius, ir galime turėti vilties, kad dabar apie 110–120 svyruojantį patikimų senųjų baltiškų suomių kalbos skolinių būrį papildys tie, kuriuos šios knygos autoriui pavyko neprieštaringai ir įtikinamai įrodyti.

Etimologiniai tyrinėjimai netektų savo patrauklumo ir intrigos, jeigu kiekviena nauja knyga vienu mostu nubrauktų beveik visus klausukus. Neįmintų mįslių visada buvo ir bus, tad lieka palinkėti, kad ši knyga sulauktų įdomių ir vaisingų diskusijų ir kad diskutuojančios pusės viena kitą išgirstų ir suprastų<sup>15</sup>.

Regina Venckutė

William R. Schmalstieg, *The Historical Morphology of the Baltic Verb*, Washington D.C. [2000], 446 (*Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph No. 37.*)

Reading a book or article by Prof. Schmalstieg is always a rewarding experience, and the present *Historical Morphology of the Baltic Verb* is not an exception to this rule. The title of the book suggests that we are dealing with a synthesis of the author's investigations into the historical morphology of the Baltic verb, part of which are undoubtedly well known to the readers of this journal. To a certain extent, this is actually the case, but the term 'synthesis' suggests a more or less systematic treatise, which would not be an accurate description of Prof. Schmalstieg's rather loosely structured book. The author intermingles echoes of his extensive reading with reflections of his own, and often no conclusion is offered, or it is not clear whether a conclusion is being offered or not. The reviewer is therefore often at a

<sup>15</sup> J. J a n h u n e n, *Etymologian menetelmistä [Apie etimologijos metodą]*, – *Tieteessä tapahtuu*, II, Helsinki, 2001, 49–50; O. N i k k i l ä, *Fragwürdige Lehnwortforschung*, – *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen*, LVI 1–3, Helsinki, 2001, 394–403.

loss, as it is not clear whether the author is endorsing or just quoting the views of his predecessors and colleagues. Of course, Schmalstieg's comments on the views he is citing are always incisive and useful, even if no definitive answer is proposed. Moreover, there can be no doubt that every reader will profit from the author's erudition. Not only the views of contemporary scholars, but also those of older generations of Indo-Europeanists are cited and commented upon. Moreover, Lithuanian and Latvian scholars writing in their native languages are also represented, and their works are thereby made more accessible to Western scholars. However, as the author's notes from his reading are selective and unsystematic, the reader cannot rely on them for a complete history of every question touched upon in the book. So, for instance, the identification of *\*vaid* in Latvian *navaid* < *\*nevaid* 'is not' as an old perfect related to Skr. *vindāti* 'finds' (*vidyate* 'is') is not a 'suggestion' of Fraenkel's (p. 72), as we find it already in Endzeliņ's *Lettische Grammatik* (1922, 557). Moreover, the bibliography does not seem to be accurate in all respects. It fails to list many publications cited in the text, e.g., Pedersen 1906 and Smoczyński 1986 cited on p. 359. Some works are referred to with different abbreviations (e.g., the 'Acad. Gram.' cited on p. 234 figures in the bibliography as 'Lith. Acad. Gram.') or inaccurately identified (does 'Ford 1970' cited on p. 234 refer to Ford 1970a or 1970b listed in the bibliography?). Nevertheless, the book would deserve recommendation as a useful overview for any student of Baltic linguistics even if it was not also an original work of scholarship. Though its loose structure does not exactly match the author's intention of providing "a possible scenario for the history of Baltic verbal morphology" announced in the Foreword, it may well serve as an introduction to Baltic verb morphology for those who have a basic knowledge of Indo-European linguistics and want to acquaint themselves with the main problems of Baltic verb morphology, considered against an Indo-European background.

The division of the book into sections is somewhat asymmetrical and its principles are not always clear. An opening chapter dealing with a number of selected issues of Indo-European verb morphology (here, a few basic assumptions are

formulated which will be used in the sections dealing with Baltic) is followed by two brief chapters respectively discussing the personal verbal endings and the rise and development of the category of transitivity in Indo-European. Section 4, which occupies 308 out of the 368 pages constituting the text part of the book, is entitled *Verb Classification*, but it deals also with problems not connected with individual conjugational types, such as the tense and mood affixes and the derivation and inflection of non-finite verb forms. However, a detailed table of contents enables the reader to find his way in the subject matter of the book, and the indexes added at the end also facilitate quick reference.

As far as the evaluation of Prof. Schmalstieg's own contribution (as opposed to the *status quaestionis* to which the discussion of many issues is confined) is concerned, it should be said at the start that the author operates with a few assumptions with regard to internal IE developments which are not elaborately argued in this book because they belong at least partly to the domain of phonology, but are repeatedly invoked to explain various processes in verb morphology. The most important of these is the assumption of internal IE monophthongisations. I will not enter on a discussion of this assumption here as it does not belong to the domain covered by the book (the reader is referred to Prof. Schmalstieg's 1980 book *Indo-European Linguistics: A New Synthesis*). I would only like to point out that the use made of it is sometimes puzzling. If the author operates, for the root 'give', with sandhi variants *\*dō-* (pre-consonantal and word-final) and *\*dow-* (prevocalic) (the former underlying Skr. *ádāt* and the expanded Greek form *ἔδωκε* whereas the latter is assumed to underly the originally thematic aorist Lith. *dāvė*, cf. pp. 79–80, as well as pp. 191–193 on other difficult alternations of this type), then the monophthongisation is invoked to explain a feature observed in several branches of Indo-European, which justifies the notion of an 'internal IE monophthongisation'. The viability of this type of explanation as an alternative to the now widely accepted explanation of this intervocalic *-w-* as a trace of the specific colouring of *h<sub>3</sub>* (as far as I can see, Schmalstieg's reconstruction is not compatible with the laryngealist reconstruction of this root) is quite another question. On the other hand,

when the author (p. 135) assumes an ‘internal IE monophthongisation’ in the infinitive suffix of causative-iterative verbs Lith. *-yti*, Latv. *-īt*, allegedly from *-ey-tey* (corresponding to a putative present in *-ey-/-i-* which is not directly attested but may be inferred from the thematised variety *-ye/o-* evidently underlying such Eastern High Lithuanian presents as *gimdžia, guldžia*, cf. Stang 1966, 328), then the question arises how one can use the notion of an ‘internal IE process’ to describe a feature observed only in Baltic or, at best, in Balto-Slavonic. In the case of the infinitive (and originally also preterite) stem of the type *mīni minėti*, OChSl *мѣнѣти мѣнѣти*, where monophthongisation *\*oy- > -ē-* is assumed (p. 19), the notion of an internal IE process is justified by the proposed identification of *\*min-ē-* (the original preterite stem, now Lith. *minėjo* with hypercharacterisation of the preterite stem) with Greek ἐμάνη, but is there a counterpart for Lith. *(man)yti* outside Balto-Slavonic?

Apart from such phonological prerequisites as the above-mentioned ‘internal IE monophthongisations’, the reader acquainted with Prof. Schmalstieg’s earlier work will recognise a number of hypotheses concerning the morphosyntax of the protolanguage, presented and elaborately argued in earlier publications. I have in mind, first of all, the author’s view of the IE verb as being associated with a partly ergative syntax. Schmalstieg’s reconstruction of the syntactic properties of IE verb forms are reminiscent of the Georgian system, with nominative case marking in the (active intransitive) present and ergative case marking in the (middle) preterite characterised by the marker *\*-to*. This reconstruction should be considered in connection with Prof. Schmalstieg’s view of the accusative as an original dative (recently argued in Schmalstieg 2000). The oldest tense/aspect/voice opposition would thus have been that between *\*māter pek<sup>w</sup>et ovi-m* ‘mother cooks away at the sheep’ (an intransitive pattern which could be optionally expanded with a dative expressing the ‘affectedness’ of the object) vs. *\*ovi pek<sup>w</sup>-tō mātré/ós* ‘(the/a) sheep (was) cooked by mother’ (p. 67). Prof. Schmalstieg’s reconstruction is quite impressive as a coherent theoretical concept, especially with regard to the ingenious way in which it establishes a common source for a number of verbal categories as well as for certain

features of nominal inflection which Indo-Europeanists have long suspected to be mutually related. I think this model is quite convincing in itself, though elsewhere I have expressed my scepticism with regard to the possibility of discovering direct traces of the IE ergative construction in Lithuanian passive constructions with the agentive genitive (p. 66). Traces of an ancient ‘pre-nominative’ case marking pattern can probably be found only in morphology.

In the book we find a series of useful overviews of the discussions concerning several intricate questions of Baltic historical morphology. The author does not always offer an explanation of his own. I will briefly mention a few traditional problems of Baltic comparative grammar on which no consensus has been reached among scholars: the 3rd person present of the substantive verb, the coincidence of singular and plural 3rd person verb forms, and the 1st person singular ending of the Lithuanian-Latvian conditional.

No definitive view is offered on the origin of Lith. *yrà*, Latv. *ir* ‘is’; an account of the question is given partly on the basis of an article by Ju. Stepanov. If one compares the different explanations offered until now, it seems that the oldest of them, the one assuming an original noun meaning ‘existence’, is the least probable. The Armenian counterpart *ir* ‘thing, reality’, proposed by Gauthiot, is apparently doubtful (cf. Stang 1966, 414), but I also think Schmalstieg correctly criticises the notion of a noun turning into a copula in view of the lack of parallels (p. 73). As the author points out, the parallel of *reikia* (from a noun meaning ‘necessity’), Greek *χρή* and similar expressions is not convincing: the original noun is not retained alongside the predicative form. I would like to add that such words as *reikia, χρή* or Latvian *vajag* were originally combined with a zero form of the verb ‘be’ before being reanalysed as verbal forms. The transition from noun to verb was formally accomplished when the zero copula was reanalysed as a zero ending for the present indicative and explicit inflectional endings were added for other tenses and moods, cf. Greek *χρῆναι*, Lith. *reikėjo* and Latv. *vajadzēja*. The complete isolation of the form *yrà, ir*, however, and more specifically its restriction to the present tense, seem to support Stang’s notion that it was originally a deictic particle with the meaning of

French *voici* (or, one might add, Polish *oto*). Stang's explanation of *yra* as a particle based on the demonstrative stem *\*i-* and comparable to *aure* 'siehe da' is still the most plausible one offered until now. However, the hypothesis of a purely verbal origin of *yra* should not be discarded: structurally it is preferable to any explanation of *yra* as a nominal form, and the phonetic difficulties (stress) are negligible in view of the special treatment we are entitled to expect in such an isolated form. It is therefore puzzling that the author does not even mention Smoczyński's explanation (e.g., Smoczyński 1988, reprinted 2001, 26) of *yra* as an infixed present *\*i-n-ra* 'arises, comes into being' from a Common Baltic *\*irtey* 'move'. The assumption that a form of a verb that otherwise completely disappeared in Baltic was introduced into the paradigm of the verb 'be', thereby escaping the fate of the other forms, would explain its isolation.

With regard to the original structure of the Lithuanian-Latvian conditional (also referred to as subjunctive or optative), the discussion has not advanced beyond Stang's brilliant reconstruction proposed in 1957 and repeated in Stang (1966). A recent article by Smoczyński (1999) deals only with the form underlying the original auxiliary *-biaul/-beil/-bi-* (preterite or optative). The deviant 1st person singular, on the contrary, has been the object of a considerable number of publications. Several scholars have rejected the explanation of *\*-čiau* as a phonetic reduction of *-tumbiau* (still the most probable explanation in spite of the difficulties), and proposed a nominal origin for this suffix, e.g., a verbal abstract in *\*-tyā* (*jeigu žinočiau, sakyčiau* would thus go back to a construction meaning 'if there was a knowing, there would be a saying'). Schmalstieg characterises Mathiasen's (1994) explanation of *-čia* as "... the infinitive ending *\*-ti* plus the element *\*-jā* which would perhaps be some case form of the pronoun stem *\*yo/e* ... and which might also be present in the Latvian debitive in *jā-* and further in the Latvian conjunction *jā* 'if'" (which should be corrected to *ja* – A. H.) as the best yet offered. I think, however, that only the first part of Mathiasen's explanation, i.e., the interpretation of *-tyā* as the infinitive followed by some auxiliary element, deserves serious consideration. The comparison with the Latvian debitive is evi-

dently false and that with the Latvian conjunction *ja* does not inspire confidence.

It seems that the traditional view according to which the 3rd person plural forms coinciding with the singular must have replaced earlier forms with the ending *\*-ont* is not fashionable any more. The author seems to set most store by Kazlauskas' arguments. Kazlauskas (1968, 301–302) criticised the traditional view of the loss of the old 3 person plural forms through generalisation of the model τὰ ζῶα τρέχει as being Graeco- or Sanskritocentric, which is no doubt true. Kazlauskas, whom the author quotes (approvingly, as it seems) on p. 53, draws attention (1968, 302–304) to the unmarked status of the 3rd person (emphasised by Benveniste, who characterised the 3rd person as 'non-person'). I am not sure that unmarked with regard to person must mean unmarked with regard to number. Third person forms rely for their reference on a subject, and subject-verb agreement with regard to number is otherwise quite common. Even English, which has few agreement features and (with the exception of archaic and dialectal varieties) no opposition of number in the 1st and 2nd person, has one in the 3rd person (*goes* : *go*). Kazlauskas' notion that the 3rd person could have "denoted action without reference to person" is rather vague, and his observation that in East Lithuanian the 3rd person is sometimes used where other dialects would use the infinitive, is not correct. Far from being relics, such constructions as *nėra kada važiuoja, nebuvo kada daro* etc. must be innovations, in which the 3rd person took the place of a participle or (as shown by constructions with dative subjects such as *nėra kam važiuoja*) an infinitive, as argued in Holvoet (1999). The question is left open in the section on verbal endings (pp. 51–53), but taken up again in the section on participles (pp. 326nn). The Lithuanian nominative plural masculine participial forms of the type *sūką* cannot any longer be explained as ancient neuter forms, because Schmidt's explanation is connected with other assumptions of his concerning the origin of plural endings (specifically *-ai*) from original neuter endings, which are no longer accepted now. The difficulties in explaining the forms in *-ą* as paradigmatic forms of the participle lend a certain probability to Endzelin's one-time assumption, later taken up by Cowgill, according to which the

nominative plural masculine (and occasionally also common-gender) form of the participle is the original 3rd person plural form. The parallel of Baltic Fennic, with its 3rd person ending *-vat* coinciding with the nominative plural ending of the participle cannot be a pure coincidence, as pointed out by Cowgill. The exact nature of the connection remains a mystery, but it may apparently be taken as evidence that the 3rd plural ending *-ont* was inherited by Baltic and subsequently abandoned for some reason. Endzelin's original explanation invoking the influence of the oblique mood is, of course, improbable.

Prof. Schmalstieg's book furthermore contains a number of interesting ideas concerning morphonologic processes determined by phonetic changes.

An example of this is the treatment of reflexive forms. The shortening of word-final *-uo* in the 1st person singular as opposed to its retention before the reflexive marker (*suku : sukuosi*), and the similar alternation in the 2nd sg., led to a remodelling of the underlying shape of the reflexive marker *-si* as it is reflected on the juncture of ending and reflexive marker. For this underlying shape the author introduces the notation *-Asi*, where *A* represents an indeterminate non-high vowel. The 1 pl. form *sukamēs* thus assumes an underlying form *suka-me-As(i) > sukamēs* (p. 47). Thus there is no need to derive the 1 and 2 pl. endings *-me* and *-te* from *-mē* and *-tē* (p. 49–50). This rule did not operate in the 3rd person because the regular form *suka-Asi > \*sukāsi* would have coalesced with the preterite. This morphological analysis seems to be basically correct, and the explanation for the special treatment of the 3rd person seems plausible enough. In standard Latvian and part of the Latvian dialects, the rule works even in the 3rd person and we have *duod : duodas* but *rada : radās*. Forms with *-a-* such as *gadas* seem to reflect the factor mentioned by Schmalstieg, viz. the opposition of present and preterite. What is harder to account for is the generalisation of the long vowel of *nākās*, which is much more frequent than the generalised short vowel (Endzelin 1951, 905–906). Endzelin suggests that the long vocalic segment as such was generalised. Of course, Schmalstieg's rule should be formulated somewhat differently for Latvian in view of such forms as *metam : metamies*.

Here Schmalstieg assumes influence of the 2nd sg., where *sit* from an older *siti* is opposed to *sities* (p. 50), but perhaps the infinitive (*sist : sisties*) would have provided a better model for the treatment of affixes ending in a consonant, cf. also other nominal forms such as the indeclinable participle *ceļam : ceļamies*. At any rate it is important to note the author's main point, viz. that the evidence of the reflexive forms should be used cautiously because they do not always retain the original ending but may result from secondary generalisations.

In earlier publications Prof. Schmalstieg proposed that the generalisation of the *-o-* grade of the thematic vowel in the Baltic verb must have something to do with the Common Baltic loss of *y* before *e*. A form like *\*leid-y-e* would have yielded *\*leide*, and the restitution of the basic stem shape *\*leid-y-* required the introduction of *-a-* instead of the original *-e-*, with subsequent generalisation of *-a-* in pure thematic stems (*ved-a*). This view is once more expounded here (p. 46). There can be no doubt that Schmalstieg is right in establishing a connection between the generalisation of the *-o-* grade and the loss of *y*. However, in the literature one also finds expressed the view that the generalisation of the thematic vowel *-o-*, Baltic *-a-*, was a result of the rise of the correlation of palatalisation (e.g., Smoczyński 2001, 26). One wonders whether these two formulations amount to the same or not. In Kuryłowicz's formulation (e.g., 1956, 235–237), the Common Baltic correlation of palatalisation consisted in a functional identification of *Cy* and *C'*, leading to the rise of an opposition *C : C'* before back vowels whereas before front vowels only the unmarked member, viz. *C*, could occur. Such a state of affairs is observed, e.g., in Bulgarian, where an opposition between hard and soft consonants occurs before back vowels whereas the hard variety occurs before front vowels and *y* is automatically deleted before *e* (even in recent loanwords, cf. *obekt* 'object'). Now the loss of *y* before *e* suggests that the sequence *Ce*, though not characterised by phonetic palatalisation, is interpreted as a realisation of an underlying sequence *C'e*. In that case *\*leid-e* would still be susceptible, phonologically, of an interpretation *\*l'eid'-e*, and this form would not diverge from, say, the 1st person plural form *\*leid'ame*. Therefore it would perhaps

be more accurate to say that *\*vede* was replaced with *\*veda* because *\*vede* would be interpreted as *\*v'ed'e* and would therefore not be opposed structurally to the *-ye/o-*stem form *\*l'eid'e*. This *-a-* could then have been transferred to the *-ye/o-*stems: *\*leid'a* instead of *\*leide* under the influence of *veda*.

In connection with the Common Baltic treatment of *\*ye* and its morphological consequences the question arises what the treatment of *\*yē-* could have been, and whether part of the *yā* sequences could not represent an original *yē*. Consider, for instance, stative forms containing the suffix *-ē*. If we assume that the sequence *-yē-* was prohibited in Common Baltic, then we could regard *\*biy-ā-* as substitute for *\*biy-ē-*, which would provide an exact counterpart to Slav. *bojati se* (the difference consisting in the generalisation of different grades of vocalisation, *o* and zero, originally co-existing within an old perfect formation). The comparison with Slavonic is interesting but not conclusive, a formation *\*biy-ā-tey* being equally plausible. We would certainly go too far if we assumed (as the author tentatively suggests on p. 116) a substitution of *-w-* for *-y-* in a putative *\*sta-y-ē-tey* (with subsequent substitution of *-ā-* for *-a-* under the influence of *stā-tey*). As the explanation of *stóvi stovéti* as an original perfect (OInd. *tasthau*) is perfectly satisfactory, there is no reason to abandon it for an explanation that establishes a correspondence with Slav. *stojati* but is otherwise highly speculative. Of course, the matter deserves further consideration because, as the author points out, formations like *klojéti*, *žiojéti* are undoubtedly recent. The loss of *y* before front vowels is historically attested for postconsonantal position (where it can be established on the basis of such pairs as *katé : kačīų*), but the treatment in word-initial and intervocalic position is not clear. As pointed out by Kuryłowicz, the opposition between hard consonants and soft consonants arising from *Cy* clusters was neutralised before front vowels, where only the unmarked member, viz. the nonpalatalised consonant, could occur; this is reflected in a form like *katé* (with assimilatory palatalisation of later date) as against *kačīų* (with palatalisation of Common Baltic date). But how was *y* treated if it was not part of a *Cy* cluster? The parallel of Bulgarian (as mentioned above, the pattern of palatalisation observed in this language corresponds to that re-

constructed by Kuryłowicz for Common Baltic) would lead us to expect generalised loss of *y* before *e* (cf. Bulg. *ezik* < *\*językō*) but this seems to be contradicted by such forms like Lith. *jėga*, Latv. *jēga* (in the pronoun *jis, ji* the initial *y* was, of course, restored by analogy), and indeed there is a priori no reason to assume that word-initial or intervocalic *y* should have been treated in the same way as in *Cy* clusters.

A phonetical rather than morphological explanation is invoked to explain the lengthened vowel in such Lithuanian formations as *rykteleiti* 'shout out strongly' alongside *rikteleiti* 'shout a little bit'. According to Schmalstieg, an 'iconic lengthening' could be involved here (p. 124nn). Judging from the examples cited on p. 124, most instances involve the long vowels *y* and *ū*, so that in dealing with this type one should, first of all, take into account the peculiar role played by the lengthened zero grade in the apophonic system of Lithuanian, particularly as manifested in the verbal system. As Kuryłowicz (1956, 294nn.) has shown, lengthening (especially of *i, u*) has taken the place of ancient apophonic alternations in Baltic, and before assuming iconic or expressive lengthening one should carefully examine whether the possibilities of a morphological explanation have really been exhausted. Of course, in quite recent formations such as those in *-teleiti* the availability of a lengthened zero grade alongside the normal zero grade could have been exploited for purposes of expressiveness, but this seems hardly believable for such formations as *brydoti* (p. 126).

Some of Prof. Schmalstieg's most important contributions to Baltic scholarship, and, from the methodological point of view, probably the most important ones, belong to the domain of Old Prussian. In Prussian scholarship, prof. Schmalstieg's views are characterised by a sound measure of scepticism and common sense. They provide a useful contrast to the tendency, unfortunately too widespread in Prussian and Indo-European studies, to treat the clumsy Old Prussian translations on an equal footing with Homer and the Vedas and to search this language for archaisms of Indo-European date that find no confirmation in the evidence of Lithuanian and Latvian. As the author pointedly observes on p. 259 (in connection with a preceding quotation from Bezzenger), "Will may have been the best teacher [sc. of Prussian],

but that still doesn't mean that he was very good". The views we find criticised in the book may be irreproachable from the point of view of comparative grammar: the point is that they often bear no relation to the Old Prussian facts. When the author criticises the notion that the orthographical variation between *turi* and *turei* could reflect an IE ablaut and suggests that this difference is "purely orthographic whimsy reflecting no phonological difference" (p. 113), I think this is simply the voice of common sense.

When reconstructing the morphology of the Old Prussian verb, it is probably safer to operate with forms that have counterparts in Lithuanian and Latvian even if the solution thus arrived at is less sophisticated and elegant than those assuming the retention of archaic IE categories in Old Prussian. Therefore I welcome prof. Schmalstieg's view that the Old Prussian optatives in *-sei*, *-sai* are simply future indicatives rather than optatives derived from a future or aorist stem (p. 262). As to the forms in *-lai*, he suggests (p. 257) that they are connected with Latvian *lai*, Lith. dial. *lai*, a view that had already been advanced by Bielenstein. Stang rejected this connection on the grounds that *lai* goes back to the imperative of the verb *laist*, Lith. *leisti* (1966, 442), but, as Schmalstieg points out, why shouldn't Prussian have had a verb corresponding to Latv. *laist*? In this connection it is interesting to note the expansion of combinations with *lai* at the cost of original conditional (optative) in Latvian. This language has considerably restricted the use of the conditional in *-tu* when compared to Lithuanian. In volitional complement clauses and in final adverbial clauses, for example, Latvian has introduced a construction that is basically used to form hortative main clauses. The hortative construction *lai viņš atnāk* 'let him come' has spread to complement clauses (*es gribu, lai viņš atnāk* 'I want him to come' = Lith. *aš noriu, kad jis ateitų*) and to final adverbial clauses (*es pasaukšu sulaini, lai tevi izvada laukā* 'I'll call the servant to show you out', a sentence which one might also translate as 'I'll call the servant, let him show you out'). In a similar way, the Old Prussian form, differing from the Latvian ones by the affixation of *lai*, could have partly or completely ousted an original conditional (optative) corresponding to that of Lithuanian and Latvian. One explanation for the non-attest-

ation of the optative in *-tum-* in Old Prussian could have been the German authors' failure to elicit these forms from their Prussian informants. Another explanation could be that either the new optatives in *-lai* had spread from optative to conditional (*irrealis*) uses, thereby completely ousting the forms in *-tum-*, or the German authors erroneously used optative forms instead of conditional ones. The assumption that they used the Old Prussian mood forms correctly (thus enabling us even to distinguish an 'optative' from a 'conditional', as Stang did) is not warranted: suffice it to look at the often erratic way in which Glück used the Latvian mood forms in his Bible translation (a result of his inability to decide whether it was the conditional or the oblique mood that should be identified with the German subjunctive).

The above notes give but a very incomplete idea of the richness of Prof. Schmalstieg's *Historical Morphology of the Baltic Verb*. Many aspects of it are left untouched in this brief review because, on the one hand (as mentioned above), there is not always a clear-cut line of division between the views cited and the views endorsed by the author, and, on the other, the author's own views were in many cases published earlier. One of the qualities of the book is that it conveniently summarises the results reached in many of the author's earlier publications, scattered over various periodicals. There is no need to emphasise that *The Historical Morphology of the Baltic Verb* is an indispensable book for every Baltic scholar.

## REFERENCES

- Endzeliņ J., 1922, *Lettische Grammatik*, Riga.
- Endzeliņ J., 1951, *Latviešu valodas gramatika*, Riga.
- Holvoet A., 1999, Infinitival Relative Clauses in Baltic and Slavonic, – *Baltistica*, XXXIV(1), 37–53.
- Kazlauskas J., 1968, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius.
- Kuryłowicz J., 1956, *L'apophonie en indo-européen*, Wrocław.
- Schmalstieg W. R., 2000, Dative or Accusative, A Latvian Parallel to Proto-Indo-Eu-

ropean, –Range J. D., ed., *Aspekte baltistischer Forschung*, Essen.

Smoczyński W., 1988/2001, *Języki bałtyckie: litewski, łotewski, staropruski*, – Bednarczuk L., ed., *Języki indoeuropejskie, II*, Warszawa. Here cited after: Smoczyński W., *Język litewski w perspektywie porównawczej*, Kraków, 9–95.

Smoczyński W., 1999, *Geneza starolitewskiego conditionalis na -biau, -bei, -bi-*, – *Acta Baltico-Slavica*, XXIV, 13–18.

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

*Axel Holvoet*

Aleksas Girdenis, *Kalbotyros darbai*, I: 1962–1974, Vilnius, Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2000, 420; II: 1975–1987, 2000, 416; III: 1988–2000, 2001, 476.

Bene pirmas atvejis ne tik lietuvių, bet apskritai baltų kalbotyros istorijoje, kai mokslininkui dar esant gyvam taip rūpestingai išleidžiami jo atskiromis knygomis neskelbti darbai. „Į šį trijų tomų leidinį dedami beveik visi kalbotyros darbai, parašyti maždaug per keturiasdešimt mokslinės veiklos metų (ji prasidėjo 1959 m. pavasarį pranešimu Vilniaus universiteto studentų mokslinėje konferencijoje). Nespausdinami tikrai rašiniai, skirti labai siauriems kalbos praktikos dalykams – atsakymai į klausimus ir pan., tezės ar santraukos tų mokslinių pranešimų, iš kurių vėliau išaugo didesnės publikacijos, daugelis enciklopedinių straipsnių“, – taip pats autorius aptaria savo „Kalbotyros darbų“ pobūdį (I 11).

Pirmoji „Kalbotyros darbuose“ skelbiama publikacija „Balsių asimiliacijos reiškiniai Tirkšlių tarmėje“ (I 16–28) yra tos 1959 m. prasidėjusios mokslinės veiklos pradžia, nes straipsnis „Kalbotyros“ redakcijai buvo įteiktas 1959 m., kai jo autorius buvo bene II kurso Vilniaus universiteto studentas ir straipsnį parengti „ypač daug padėjo akademikas (tada – docentas) Zigmas Zinkevičius – už tai jam nors ir pavėluota, bet pati nuoširdžiausia padėka“ (I 16).

Šis straipsnis, be abejonės, buvo 1967 m. Girdenio apgintos disertacijos „Mažeikių tarmės fonologinė sistema“ (vad. Jonas Kazlauskas) tam tikra užuomazga. Su disertacija yra susijusi ir labai

vertinga publikacija „Mažeikių tarmės priegaidžių fonetinės ypatybės“ (I 76–88). Jos santrauka buvo paskelbta ir 1967 m. Prahoje įvykusio tarptautinio fonetikos kongreso tezėse. Du kiek sutrumpinti disertacijos skyriai „Mažeikių tarmės prozodija“ (I 89–119) ir „Mažeikių tarmės vokalizmas“ (I 120–160) „Kalbotyros darbuose“ skelbiami pirmą kartą. Gimtajai autoriaus tarmei taip pat skirti straipsniai: „i-kamieniai Tirkšlių tarmės daiktavardžiai ir jų raida“ (I 29–38), „Mažeikių (šiaurės vidurio dounininkų) tarmės pokirtinių skiemenų priegaidės“ (I 56–75), „Mažeikių tarmės fonologinės sistemos apžvalga“ (I 211–222). Labai svarbu, kad Girdenis, leisdamas savo „Kalbotyros darbus“, vienur kitur patikslina ar koreguoja savo ankstesnius teiginius. Pavyzdžiui, pastarajame straipsnyje jis atsisako ankstesnės priebalsių interpretacijos<sup>1</sup>.

Iš bendresnio pobūdžio lietuvių dialektologijai skirtų pirmajame tome publikuojamų straipsnių ypač norėtusi išskirti straipsnį „Kada gi žemaičių tarmė atsiskyrė nuo aukštaičių?“ (I 204–210), kuriame suabejojama kadaise pareikšta profesoriaus Antano Salio nuomone, kad šis atsiskyrimas įvykęs XV amžiaus viduryje (ne anksčiau). Girdenis šią datą linkęs nukelti dar į prieš XII amžių.

Istorinei akcentologijai labai svarbus straipsnis „Lietuvių kalbos vardažodžio priesagų kirčio susiformavimas“ (I 258–265). Autoriaus nuomone, pralietuvių, o galbūt ir prabaltų priesagų vėdiniai išlaikydavo pamatinių žodžių kirčiavimo paradigmą. Vėliau lietuvių kalboje ši situacija pakito dėl Sosiūro-Fortunatovo dėsnio veikimo. Šio dėsnio rezultatai buvo apibendrinti įvairaus tipo šaknų ir priesagų vėdiniam. Tačiau tarmėse išliko ir tam tikrų senojo kirčiavimo pėdsakų.

Aktualias lietuvių kalbos problemas Girdenis nagrinėja straipsniuose „Priegaidės S. Stanevičiaus raštuose“ (I 171–173), „Baltiškųjų \*tj, \*dj refleksai 1759 m. „Žyvate“ (I 237–257).

Labai bliviai į bendrinės kalbos normų kodifikaciją pažvelgta drauge su Aldonu Pupkiu parašytame straipsnyje „Bendrinės kalbos normos ir jų kodifikacija“ (I 183–189).

<sup>1</sup> „2000 m. pastaba. Priebalsių interpretacija, teikiama šiame straipsnyje, nekorektiška. Afrikatos, be abejo, yra savarankiškos fonemos, o minkštumas–kietumas – atskirų priebalsinių fonemų diferenciniai požymiai (ne supersegmentiniai elementai). Bet tuo įsitikinta tik gerokai vėliau“ (I 211).