

D a n i e l P e t i t: *Untersuchungen zu den baltischen Sprachen*. Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics. Vol. 4. Brill: Leiden, Boston.

1. The book contains four major diachronic studies encompassing such fields of Historical Linguistics as historical phonology (or more precisely historical accentology), historical morphology and historical morphosyntax. After an introduction to the historical splits of the Proto-Baltic language and to the dialectology of each Baltic language (Chapter I) the author presents a diachronic treatment of suprasegmental features of the Baltic languages such as accent and syllabic tonemes in Chapter II. Chapter III is devoted to the history of the morphosyntactic category of the neuter gender in Baltic. Chapter IV provides insights into the diachronic development of the so-called half-thematic inflexion in Baltic. Finally, Chapter V discusses the history of clitics in Baltic.

Ideally for an introduction, the subject matter is not treated dogmatically: the author does not confine himself to one particular concept, but rather discusses the most common hypotheses and carefully evaluates their benefits and short-comings. The book is well-written and can be strongly recommended as a balanced and very detailed treatment of the topics.

In the introduction, a representative list of common Baltic lexical innovations (pp. 8-11) is provided by the author. On pp. 12-20, the author discusses features that distinguish between East (Lithuanian and Latvian) and West Baltic (Old Prussian). This is followed by a short introduction into the literal tradition and the dialectal variation of West (pp. 21-25) and East Baltic (pp. 25-51).

On p. 5 he presents a slightly modified, but quite possible and interesting picture of the split of the Latvian dialects. While the traditional view presupposing a split into the three Latvian dialects can do without the assumption of subplits, the "Stammbaum" of the Baltic languages assumed by the author implies an additional stage in the historical development of the Latvian dialects: first, a split into High Latvian and Low Latvian, and only then, a further split of the latter into the Livonian and Middle Latvian dialect. Some new insights as, e.g., the etymological interpretation of Lith. *sveikas*, Latv. *svēiks* 'healthy' as a compound adjective IE. \*h<sub>1</sub>su-uej̥k- as 'well-powered' (p. 16) can already be found in this introductory chapter.

In the second chapter, the author presents a very valuable and detailed introduction to synchronic and diachronic Baltic tonology. He discusses and elaborates on the achievements and insights of more than 100 years [a century] of research. In general, the introduction can be read as a "fast lane" into the problems of the historical accentology of Baltic and Balto-Slavic. The presentation consists of two parts: the first part of which describes the synchronic and internal diachronic distribution of tonemes in all three Baltic languages. Here the author rejects (p. 96f) the view expressed by Smoczyński (2000: 150 fn. 225; 2005: 330-1) and argues, instead, that the macron in the Old Prussian "Enchiridion" does in fact render tone distinctions on diphthongs. The second part of the chapter (pp. 100-139) treats the rise of tonemes in the Baltic languages and consists of a discussion of the classical tradition (as represented in, e.g., Stang 1957; 1966, passim) and the tradition adhered to by the Leiden school (cf. Kortlandt 1975; 1977, passim; Derksen 1996, passim). The author carefully discusses both views providing a great number of insightful examples and evaluations of arguments put forward so far, and at the same time allows the reader enough space to build up his own view of the problem.

The author uses the traditional notion *intonation* for labelling (tonological) pitch distinctions on syllables.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that this notion is ill-advised as it generally refers to pitch distinctions dominating a sentence or a clause but not a syllable where more frequently the label *tone* is used.

Perhaps the only objection that can be put forward is that the author seems to assume a twofold treatment of the IE long vowels in Baltic which (if this is the case) would have to be motivated additionally. Thus, on the one hand, the author assumes that the loss of laryngeals had led to compensational lengthening, and that the length of a vowel has triggered the Proto-Baltic actute (“Stoßton”), cf. pp. 106-109: Ie. \*VHK > Balt.  $\check{V}$ K, IE. \*VRHK > VRĀK > Balt.  $\check{V}$ RK, IE. \*VRHK > VRĀK > Balt.  $\check{V}$ RK. At the same time, the author seems to be inclined to regard the original, non-laryngeal-lengths as represented by the circumflex (“Schleifton”) in Baltic.

Chapter III treats the loss of the neuter gender in all three Baltic languages. The author first presents the Old Prussian data where the neuter gender is still (to some extent) a grammatical category being one of the agreement features, whereas in Lithuanian it is only the morphology of the neuter that has been preserved, functionally confined to non-agreeing or default predicative contexts; finally, Latvian has lost also the morphology. The author provides an interesting attempt to account for how the masculine gender may have come to overtake the functions originally pertinent to the neuter gender (pp. 193ff.). The discussion is mainly devoted to the historical morphology and less to the morphosyntax of the neuter gender in Baltic encompassing critical elaborations of different approaches to the problem.

The first part of Chapter IV (pp. 205-240) represents a detailed and, indeed, very useful introduction to the verbal system of Latvian, Lithuanian and Old Prussian. The second part discusses possible historical explanations of the *present* vs. *preterite* morphology involved. As correctly stated by the author, the Baltic verbal system has changed considerably from its Proto-Indo-European ancestor and exhibits a great deal of innovations. As elsewhere in the book, the author provides a very valuable discussion of possible explanations. The fact that one might not agree with some particular suggestion does not undermine the overall value of the discussion. Thus, while not going into a detailed discussion of the explanations suggested by the author or by previous research (cf. pp. 249-254), it might be important to state that the Baltic preterite in \*-ē- and both present as well as preterite stem formations in \*-ā- do not necessarily have to have a uniform historical background, or even more, they need not be homogeneous in their origin at all. In Baltic we are obviously dealing with a reduction of the tense/aspect/(mood) formations originally available in the Indo-European proto-language. Hence, it is not entirely correct, e.g., to assume that the Baltic preterite should be traced back to a sort of Indo-European aorist. It can equally represent in some cases an internal derivation on the bases of the present stem, in other cases it might theoretically go back to the Indo-European perfect and, finally, in some others to the Indo-European imperfect or aorist. The Baltic preterite is not marked for aspect, it is only a tense form and, hence, must also historically be treated as such.

Chapter V contains a discussion of the clitics in Baltic. Beside the data from Latvian and Lithuanian, the author tries to integrate Old Prussian for the first time. The chapter is divided into two parts of which the first part represents a well documented historical treatment of several Baltic enclitics (pp. 262-284). The main question addressed here is how Wackernagel’s law was first relaxed and then completely abandoned in Baltic. The second half of the chapter (pp. 285-308) discusses different kinds of (original) procliticization in Baltic and their original syntactic properties. Thus, the author correctly suggests that the original unboundedness of the proclitics (traces of which can still be found in, e.g., Latvian folk songs) has first been subject to several restrictions before it was abandoned completely.

## **2. Addenda et corrigenda**

### **2.1 Addenda**

p. 7 ... ”Im Bereich der Syntax ...” rather *morphosyntax*.

p. 11: the meaning “forest, wood” instead of the original ‘mountain’ of the root ie. \*g<sup>h</sup><sub>1</sub>rH- (cf. Ved. *giriḥ* ‘mountain’, OCS, idem) in Lith. *girià*, Latv. *dziņa* is not exclusively Baltic, cf. also Slavic Bulgarian *zopa* “forest, wood”.

p. 12: The sound law that predicts that only the stressed \*ei has changed into *ie* in Baltic was first discovered by Hirt (1892: 37).

p. 14: A possible explanation for East Baltic Lith. *vienas* and Latv. *viēns* ‘one’ might be: \*ōino- (long \*ō due to the acute toneme) > \*uoino- > \*uaina- > \*uiena- > Lith. *vienas*.

p. 15: The unexpected onset *d-* instead of *n-* in Lith. *devyni* and Latv. *deviņi* ‘nine’ has other parallels, cf. the word for ‘sky’: Lith. *debėsis* ‘cloud’, Latv. *debess* ‘sky’ and OCS *nebo*, pl. *nebesa* ‘sky’.

p. 17: With the IE. root \*kelH- of Lith. *kálnas*, Latv. *kâlns* ‘mountain’ the author refers to LIV<sup>2</sup>:349, which is entirely correct but might be defined more precisely as \*kelh<sub>3</sub>- following Rix (1995: 403), Vine (2006: 510 and fn. 38) on the bases of Gr. κολωνός ‘hill’, κλωμαξ ‘amas de pierres’, κλωμακίεσσα ‘rocheux’ (?) (Il. 2. 729). Cf. also Seržant (2008b).

p. 27: On the origin of the Latvian debitive mood Holvoet (2001) might be quoted.

p.29: Latvian *duõmât* is probably borrowed from Old Russian *доумати* [dũmãti] with Old Russian to Latgalian \*ũ and then to Middle Latvian *-uo-* (cf. Seržant 2006). Generally the author sometimes adduces a Modern Russian form exemplifying a borrowing from the Old Russian period. Instead, it is advised to indicate the Old Russian correlate which can also enhance the understanding of the meaning of the Latvian counterpart: Latv. *strādât* (p. 31) ‘to work’ from Old Russian *stradati* ‘to work, to suffer’ instead Russian *stradat’* (only) ‘to suffer’.

p. 30: Latv. *naũda* ‘money’ should rather be compared with Lith. *pinigã* (idem) than with Lith. *pinigas* ‘coin’.

Generally, the German translation of the Livonian dialect of Latvian (*lĩbiskais dialects*) should rather be *Livonisch* and *Livisch* should be used for the Fennic language spoken in Latvia (Latv. *lĩbiešu*), cf., inter alia, Endzelin (1923).

## ch.2

p. 110: Lith. *dẽlẽ*, acc.sg. *dẽlę* ‘leech’ goes back to IE. \*d<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>- ‘suck’ extended with the suffix \*-lo- as correctly pointed out by the author. However, this form might not illustrate a change from an expected Proto-Baltic acute-toneme to a Lithuanian circumflex-toneme due to the change in accentual paradigm but rather constitute an instance of *métatonie douce* that is often found with *-ẽ* stems, cf., inter alia, Derksen (1996: 55-65).

pp. 110-1: Similarly, the circumflex-toneme found in Latvian *gũovs* might also be regarded as expected due to its secondary change to the \*(i)jõ-declension. Thus, Derksen (1996: 41-54) provides a number of instances with *métatonie douce* triggered by the change to the \*(i)jõ-declension.

p. 111ff: Concerning the Baltic realization of non-laryngalic Indo-European long vowels:

- the negated form of the copula does not contribute much evidence for uncovering the tonological [/tonal] shape of the Indo-European contractions in Baltic, as also pointed out by the author. Thus, contractions such as Latvian *nẽsmu* < *ne-esmu* or *nẽsi* < *ne-esi* can hardly be analyzed as petrified formations that may have preserved the original toneme. Even the opposite is true, Lithuanian proves that the negated copula was never lexicalized - a consequence that one would expect if the contraction were of Indo-European origin, cf. Lith. *nebẽra* ‘not anymore’ from \*ne-be-ya.

- (pp.114-117) the ending Lith. *-uõ* (as in *akmuõ* ‘stone’) also does not seem to be unequivocal. We might be dealing here with a contamination of the Hoffmann suffix \*-Hon- (\*h<sub>2</sub>?) and a thematic \*-o- (Hoffmann 1955: 36).

## ch.3

p. 169: the Slavic borrowings Lith. *muilas* ‘soap’, *muitas* ‘custom’ may indeed represent the Late Common Slavic pronunciation of these lexemes, thus Late Common Slavic \*[muilo], \*[muito] as is suggested not only by the rendering of these lexemes in Baltic, but also by their spelling in Old Russian and Old Church Slavonic texts: *мѣсто*, *мѣло* with the ligature *-ѣ-* consisting of *-ѣ-* originally pronounced as [u] and *-ѣ-* as [i], cf. Seržant 2006.

p. 170 fn. 21: Old Lith. *peklà* ‘hell’, Old Lith. *prova* ‘right (n.)’ needs not necessarily be a late borrowing from Polish *piekło*, *prawo*. The high degree of entrenchment of these borrowings in the Latvian Standard language and dialects *pekle* ‘hell’, *prāva* ‘lawsuit’ as well as the preservation of the original length (not *\*\*prava*) might instead indicate an earlier layer of borrowings and a different Slavic source language.

p. 172: The author claims that the old adjective neuter forms agree with nouns in subject position. The question arises along which features (e.g., case, gender, number or person) this agreement is supposed to go.

p. 181: Tocharian A *kus*, B *kuse* ‘who’ is not only uninflected for gender, but also for number.

p. 192: Latvian *cits kas* ‘something’ is rather marked as opposed to neutral *kas cits*.

#### **ch. 4**

Concerning the introduction of the *\*-ā-* present suffix with verbs in Lith. *-yti*, Latv. *-īt*, cf., inter alia, Ostrowski (2001). Similarly, the discussion of the *-i/-ī-* presents in Baltic and Slavic might also include such an important treatment of this question as Rasmussen's (1993).<sup>2</sup>

#### **ch.5**

p. 282: One might reconstruct rather *\*na* and *\*pi* as the Proto-Baltic postpositions of the corresponding local cases (such as adessive or illative) instead of their long allo-forms *\*-nā*, *\*-pie* as does the author. The main evidence for that are the shortened forms in *-p* and *-n* in both Lithuanian dialects and Old Latvian. It seems less probable to assume here that the long vowel *\*-ā* or the diphthong *\*-ie* was shortened up here as neither Latvian nor Lithuanian dialects attest complete loss of originally long vowels or diphthongs (Seržant 2004: 51).

p. 286: An etymological split of Lithuanian *gi* ‘but’ along the lines of Fraenkel (1962: I, 126) does not seem to be probable. An argument in favour of such an analysis is the twofold behaviour of this particle in respect to stress: the stressed form occurs as a conjunction, the unstressed form as an enclitic particle. However, such a behaviour concomitant with a slight difference in meaning is found with many particles across languages. Thus, the German particle *doch* would exactly correspond to Lithuanian *gi* in both syntax and meaning: it can occur in the sentence initial position as a conjunction (stressed) and in an enclitic position with the stress on the preceding word. The example adduced by the author seems to favour the equation with the German particle/conjunction *doch*.

## **2.2 Corrigenda**

### **ch. 1**

p. 14: OCS dat.sg. †*tomъ* is a misprint for *tomu* (τομου), cf. Old Lithuanian and dial. *tamui*.

p. 137: *anerkannt* pro *anerkennt*

### **ch. 2**

p. 54: The statement that every long vowel or a diphthong bears a toneme (*Intonation*) is not entirely correct. It holds for Latvian or certain varieties of Low Lithuanian but not for Standard Lithuanian - as the author notes himself later on - where, indeed, stress and tone are not independent phenomena. Assumedly, this statement holds true for Proto-Baltic and, hence, is still a good argument against the view presented in Kuryłowicz (1956: 163f).

---

<sup>2</sup> Other recent suggestions may be found in Ostrowski (2006), see the discussion in Seržant (2008a).

p. 124: Lith. *kovà* ‘quarrel’ probably shows regular \*ā (the IE root is \*keh<sub>2</sub>u-, cf. LIV<sup>2</sup>: 345, cf. Toch. B Subj. I *kowäm̃* < \*kāũ- < \*keh<sub>2</sub>u-) and not a secondary lengthened Proto-Baltic \*a from IE. \*o.

### ch. 3

p. 169: sl. †\*vyno pro sl. \*vīno

p. 171: †*Reflekte* pro *Reflexe*

p. 180ff: Instead of German *lebhaft* vs. *lemblos*, a more common term for the grammatical distinction between ‘animate’ vs. ‘inanimate’ would be *belebt* vs. *unbelebt*.

p. 185: The author speaks about an ending of the acc. neutr. sg. It is not obvious from the context why he distinguishes between nominative and accusative with neuters.

### ch. 4

p. 222: Ostrowski (1998) is missing from the references.

### ch.5

p. 275 fn. 26: Missing references to Stang (1966: 229-232) and Kazlauskas (1968) who provided the core of the historical analysis of the local cases in East Baltic.

## References

- Derksen, R. 1996: *Metatony in Baltic*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European. Amsterdam. Rodopi.
- Endzelin, J. 1923: *Lettische Grammatik von Dr. J. Endzelin*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Hirt, H. 1892: Vom schleifenden und gestossenen Ton in den indogermanischen Sprachen, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 1, 1-42 and 195-231.
- Holvoet, A. 2001: *Studies in the Latvian Verb*. Kraków. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Kazlauskas, I. 1968: *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius 1968.
- Kortlandt, F. 1975: *Slavic Accentuation, a Study in Relative Chronology*. Leiden, The Peter de Ridder press.
- Kortlandt, F. 1977: Historical laws of Baltic accentuation, *Baltistica* 21(2), 112-124.
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1956: Die Doppeltvertretung von idg. *ei, oi* im Litauischen. In: H. Kronasser (ed.), *Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer*. Wiesbaden. Harrassowitz, 227-236.
- LIV<sup>2</sup>: H. Rix (ed.), *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden, Reichert. 2001.
- Ostrowski, N. 2001: Angeblich primäre Jotpräsentien im Litauischen, *Historische Sprachforschung* 114(1), 177-190.
- Ostrowski, N. 2006: *Studia z historii czasownika litewskiego. Iteratiwa. Denominatiwa. Poznan*.
- Rasmussen 1993: Jens Elmegård, The Slavic *i*-Verbs with an Excursus on the Indo-European *Ē*-Verbs. In: Indo-European and Finno-Ugric. Papers in Honor of Oswald Szemerényj III. Ed. by B. Brogyanyi and R. Lipp. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. 475-88.
- Seržant, I. 2004: *K voprosy ob obrazovanii adessiva* [On the question about the development of adessive], *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 50 [2004], 49-57.
- Seržant, I. 2006: *Vermittlungsrolle des Hochlettischen bei den altrussischen und litauischen Entlehnungen im Lettischen*, *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 55, 89-105.
- Seržant, I. 2008a: *Die idg. Wurzeln \*kelh1- „etw. bewegen“ und \*kelh3- „sich erheben“*, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 113, 59-75.
- Seržant, I. 2008b: Review: N. Ostrowski, N o r b e r t O s t r o w s k i, *Studia z historii czasownika litewskiego. Iteratiwa. Denominatiwa*. *Historische Sprachforschung* 121, 308-320.
- Smoczyński, W. 2000: *Das deutsche Lehnwort im Altpreußischen*. Kraków. Universitas.
- Smoczyński, W. 2005: *Lexikon der altpreußischen Verben*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft. Innsbruck.
- Stang, Chr. 1957: *Slavonic Accentuation*. Skrifter utgitt av det norske Vitenskapsakademi i Oslo, I, historisk-filosofisk klasse 3.
- Stang, Chr. S. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.

Ilja A. Seržant  
Institute of Linguistic, Literary and Aesthetic Studies  
Postbox 7805  
Bergen N-5020  
Norway