The author writes in the foreword (p. 13) that the pronouns of the Lithuanian and Latvian languages and the Prussian texts are inventoried, the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships are investigated and on the basis of these the differential and integral features are explained.

The book consists of six chapters: 1. Baltų kalbų įvardžių semantinė struktūra (pp. 15–201); 2. Baltų kalbų įvardžių morfologinė sandara (pp. 202–230); 3. Baltų prokalbės įvardžių sistemos ir semantinės struktūros rekonstrukcija (pp. 231–284); 4. Baltų kalbų įvardžių leksikos ir semantinės struktūros evo- liucija (pp. 285–333); 5. Baltų kalbų įvardžių linksniavimo sistemos rekonstrukcija (pp. 334–423); 6. Baltų kalbų įvardžių linksniavimo sistemos raida (pp. 424–501). A section entitled Baigiamosios išvados (pp. 502–509) contains an impressive 35 conclusions. The equally impressive bibliography (in very small print) occupies pp. 510–529 and, I estimate (although I didn’t actually count), contains close to a thousand items. Following this is a list of abbreviations of the source material (pp. 530–534), a list of sources used (pp. 535–538), abbreviations of place names (pp. 539–541), abbreviations of languages and dialects (p. 542), abbreviations of terminology and a list of the conventional symbols (p. 542) also. The English language summary (pp. 543–559) concludes the book. The book is just too rich in content to describe in detail in a review. Suffice it to say that I know of no other equally thorough-going and careful description of the Baltic pronoun and I suspect that this will be the fundamental work for years to come. In the following I will comment on only a few of the important points which Rosinas makes, a full inventory requiring another book of equal depth and length.

Rosinas (p. 266) notes that in addition to the structural characteristics, the meaning of *tai* connects it with the locative. Its locative meaning is palpable in such a sentence as *Ne, tai ne tas veidas, kurį vyliausi pamatyti* ‘No, that is not that face which I hoped to see’. If one replaces *tai* with the adverb *čia* ‘here’ with locative meaning, the meaning of the sentence would not change. Rosinas refers to his 1981 article in which he first espoused this idea. I think that Rosinas’ idea is absolutely excellent and I regret only that I somehow had missed his idea previously. I can think of many English sentences similar in content in
which the adverb *there* and the pronoun *that* could be interchanged with little or no difference in meaning. I quote here a brief portion of Hamlet's famous soliloquy: 'To sleep: perchance to dream: ay, there's the rub: for in that sleep of death what dreams may come...'. With apologies to the great bard it seems to me that one could say *that's the rub* instead of *there's the rub* with no important change of meaning. I think then that Rosinas has thereby solved the problem of the origin of the pronoun *tai*. The usual explanation of the definite dat. sg. masc. *tā-ja* is that it derives from *tam-ja* but if one derives it instead from *tāi-* there would be no need to explain the loss of the nasal in the initial syllable.

According to Buck (1928, 82), in addition to the *o*-stem dat. sg. -οι, encountered in most Greek dialects one encounters -οι in Arcadian, Elean, Boeotian and in later inscriptions from Northern Greece. I propose rather that the dat. sg. endings -οι and -ο were originally morpheme alternants and that the contamination of the two endings led to the creation of -οι. The etymological primacy of dat. sg. -οι is supported by the existence of the dat. pl. -οις. Already in 1923 Būga (1961, 673) registered the Lithuanian Debeikiai dat. sg. *-o* stem forms *tam vyrai* 'to that man' and *duok pažai* 'give to the pig' suggesting that the Baltic dative singular might have been represented both by *-oi* and *-o*. Būga mentions also Greek Boeotian dialect forms similar to those mentioned above. One might note the possible Old Prussian dative singular nominal ending in the expression *en stesmu wirdai* 'in that word', with the ending used here in its locative meaning.

Following Greenberg's universals Rosinas writes (p. 335) that the singular with respect to the plural/dual is the unmarked member of the opposition, and the plural is the unmarked member with respect to the opposition of plural and dual. Evans and Levinson (2009, 23), who seem to be somewhat skeptical of language universals, write that in the language Nen basic verb stems are dual and non-duals are indicated by a suffix meaning 'either singular or three-or-more', the singular and the plural sharing an inflection. In Nen it would seem to me that the dual is the unmarked member with respect to the singular and plural.

Rosinas (p. 336) disputes Kazlauskas' (1968, 136) and Mažiulis' (1970, 81) view that Proto-Baltic had only a four-member declensional system, viz. nominative, genitive, dative and accusative and that the instrumental and locative were later 'non-paradigmatic' cases. According to Rosinas the internal reconstruction of the noun and pronoun singular inessive and adessive cases confirms the assumption that in the Baltic protolanguage before the creation of the postpositional locatives the dative singular and the locative singular of the e, i, (j)ą, u, c, (j)a, and partially (j)a stems had the same forms. However the same cannot be said for the locative plural in -su which was inherited from the Indo-European proto-language as a paradigmatic case and could not be a 'half
adverbial’ form, because it couldn’t become paradigmatic. In fact, I really never understood the difference between the so-called paradigmatic and non-paradigmatic cases, since in my view all of the cases have functions ranging from semantic to syntactic.

The earliest form of Proto-Indo-European may, however, have had a reduced case system, as has long been proposed in the literature. For example, Düntzer (1868, 53) wrote: ‘Ein besonderer dativ neben dem locativ und ein instrumentalis waren den indogermanischen sprachen vor ihrer trennung fremd, und ein bedürfnis dazu hat sich nie im griechischen und lateinischen gezeigt’. Lehmann (1958, 182) wrote: ‘The cases expressing adverbial relationships (instrumental, dative, ablative, locative and the genitive in some uses) are late...’ He writes further (1958, 202) that the original cases must have been nominative, accusative, genitive and vocative. I subscribe to Lehmann’s view but in place of the term accusative I would use the term adverbial to describe a case which functioned with meanings which we have become accustomed to calling dative, instrumental, locative and accusative. Since I subscribe to the ‘uniformitarian hypothesis’ I assume that the development within Indo-European was similar to the developments observed today in the history of Lithuanian and Latvian where new cases have been created by the addition of etymological postpositions. Rather than assuming deletions performed on morphemic monsters I assume accretions of postpositions, represented by the vowels *-i(-) and *-u(-), the consonants *-s(-), *-m(-), and in Indo-Iranian (and perhaps Italo-Celtic) *-bh(-). The original meanings of these minimorphemes are difficult and quite probably impossible to recover. It is hard, however, for me to imagine how a case system could come to exist other than through the addition of postpositions to nouns, unless perhaps it was given to human beings directly by God. On the other hand I think that Rosinas (p. 337) is right to question the validity of the Old Prussian evidence for the reconstruction of a Proto-Baltic declensional system. For the most part I consider it a mistake to rely heavily on the Old Prussian evidence for any reconstruction of Proto-Baltic. East Baltic may help with the reconstruction of West Baltic, but I suspect that the reverse is rarely true.

Rosinas (p. 337) shows correctly that the intervocalic sequence -sm- is very stable in Latvian and Lithuanian, cf. Lith. asmuo ‘person’, Latv. asmens ‘blade’, Old Lith. esmi, Latv. esmu ‘I am’, etc. He therefore concludes, completely correctly in my opinion, that to reconstruct a Baltic *tasmői cannot be motivated, because the origin of Sanskrit tasmāi is not clear and Old Prussian stesmu /stasmu/ is most likely an innovation developed within Old Prussian. Although I agree with Rosinas on this point I believe that similar conditions led to the creation of these forms and I should like to offer my own explanation of the similarities.

I rely here on Hirt’s suggestion (1927, 28): ‘Man darf voraussetzen, dass es zusammengesetzte Pronomina auch
schon im Idg. gegeben hat...’ I propose then that the masc. dat. sg. Lith. tamui < *tom-ōi represents such a fossilized definite form, possibly retained in order to help to keep it separate from the indefinite acc. sg. *taN, cf. Sanskrit tam. Rosinas (p. 418) writes that the introduction of the definite form (i.e., supplied with a postpositive article) into the paradigm of the simple forms is a common phenomenon, characteristic of many Lithuanian dialects. Correspondingly I suggest that such may have happened throughout the history of the Indo-European languages.

Here I should like to digress a bit further and consider the concept hypostase introduced by Haudry. According to the latter (1982, 41): ‘On nomme hypostase le fait de traiter une forme flechie ou adverbialisée comme une base de flexion ou de dérivation’. Examples abound in Lithuanian dialects. Zinkevičius (1966, 283) gives some examples in which the indefinite adjective nominative case serves as a stem to which other case endings are added, e.g., šį̃ pirm-às-į jósim in karùžę ... mėlyn-às-į pas jáuną mergùžę ... ‘We shall ride this first one into war ... the blue one to the young girl’. Note the addition of the definite acc. sg. ending -j to the nom. sg. forms pirm-às- ‘first’ and mėlyn-às- ‘blue’ (with stress as in the definite nom. sg. pirm-às-ís, mėlyn-às-ís). I propose then that the Sanskrit dat. sg. masc. tasmai is remodeled from *tamai on the basis of the reconstructed nom. sg. masc. *tas = Lith. tas. The form tasmai then derives from etymological *tam-āi < *tom-āi which, as in the Lithuanian masc. dat. sg. tam-ūi, is a result of the contamination of *tom-oi with *tom-ō, reconstructed by Rosinas (1995, 90) as *tam’ō/’i/’ei. Rosinas explains Old Prussian stasmu as deriving from *stas + jamu (p. 419). I agree with Rosinas’ general idea of the generalization of the nom. sg. masc. simple form as the stem, but I suggest that the Proto-Baltic (and Slavic and Indo-Iranian?) *tam’ō/’i/’ei was already a definite pronoun with the initial element *tam- and the second element *-’ā/’i/’ei. The Old Prussian masc.-neut. dat. sg. pronoun stesmu (also stasma once in the First Catechism) has the enigmatic sequence -sm- from the nom. sg. masc. stas. The assumption of separate hypostasis in Indo-Iranian and Old Prussian removes the necessity of positing a formant *-’s m- in the pronoun. I suspect then that the same morphological change took place independently in Indo-Iranian and Old Prussian, although the process was similar in both cases.

Rosinas writes (p. 336) that before the creation of the postpositional locatives in the (ē, i, (j)ā, u, c, (j)a; and partially the (j)a stems) the dative and the locative singular cases were the same, but this could not be said for the locative plurals in –su which are inherited from the Indo-European proto-language. But as can be seen from the previous example and from the example in the following paragraph similar morphological changes can occur independently in related languages.
Another example of similar independent development is supplied by the Lithuanian dialect *-ā stem definite fem. gen. sg. marg-ōjos ‘variegated’ for standard Lith. marg-ōsios (Zinkevičius 1966, 282). The Lith. dialect fem. gen. sg. (marg)-ō-jos corresponds phonologically and morphologically exactly to the Sanskrit fem. gen.(-abl.) sg. (priy)-ā-yaḥ ‘dear’. Likewise the Lith. dialect fem. dat. sg. (marg)-ōjai also corresponds phonologically and morphologically exactly to the Sanskrit fem. dat. sg. (priy)-yāyai. Concerning this Lithuanian dialect Zinkevičius (1966, 282) writes that from the paradigms given one sees an evident tendency to align the other cases to the more commonly used nominative singular, thereby replacing the initial element of the forms of the other cases with the vowel o which along with the j tends to form a special suffix oj. This seems to correspond to the notion of hypostasis as proposed by Haudry. I doubt that the exact phonological and morphological correspondence shown by the Lithuanian dialect and Sanskrit *-ā stem genitive and dative singular forms stretches back to Indo-European times. On the other hand I propose that the morphological procedure may have been the same both in the Lithuanian dialect and ancient Indo-Iranian. The Sanskrit forms may result then from the hypostasis of the fem. nom. sg. stem -ā-plus -yr.

In fact Rosinas (p 428) quotes with apparent approval H. Lüdtke’s (1980, 233) statement that tomorrow’s morphology begins with today’s syntax. (Since the bibliography [p. 519] lists two items for H. Lüdtke, viz. a 1980a book and a 1980b book, we can’t be immediately certain in which book to look.) But as a perfectly reasonable example of morphological segmentation Rosinas gives the noun vyras which contains three morphs, viz. vyr-, -a- and -s. It seems to me that the final -a- and -s both are etymologically independent morphemes, the -a- possibly being a definite pronoun and the final -s being a marker of agent. In other words an original syntactic sequence has become a morphological construction.

I would mention also that Rosinas himself (p. 337) inveighs against the Sanskritization and Slavicization of Baltic. I would again agree with Rosinas on this view, but isn’t the assumption that the Lithuanian locative plural *-ōsu agreeing with Sanskrit -eṣu and Slavic -ěxъ a kind of Sanskritization or Slavicization of Baltic?

In sum then I concur with the ancient view espoused by Düntzer, Lehmann, Kazlauskas, Mažiulis and a host of others that the Proto-Indo-European case system did not have the number of cases attested in the satem languages.

Rosinas (p. 460) argues that the eastern dūnininkai and aukštaitish dialect *-ā stem instrumental singular form in -āi was taken from the dative singular form. In the žemaitish dialects under discussion after the morphological shortening the dative and instrumental plural forms became -ums being distinguished only by their intonation. There-
fore by analogy with the plural forms the new instrumental form was created. To me such transfers as Rosinas suggests are quite credible. On the other hand, nothing is certain in historical linguistics and in both Greek and Gothic the instrumental functions are expressed by the dative case, e.g., Gk. ἐπαιρόμενος... ὁμιματος εὐμορφία... exalté... par la beauté physique, exalted by the beauty of the body (Humbert 1954, 291), Gothic wopida Iesus stibnái mikilái 'Jesus cried with a loud voice' (Wright 1954, 186). Since the existence of a language is more or less a matter of chance, one might do a thought experiment and assume that only the Lithuanian dialects mentioned by Rosinas and Greek and Gothic remained. One might then hypothesize that the *-ā stem dative and instrumental singular were the same in Indo-European.

I note here a few trivial items. The Sanskrit sentence yuyam me guravaḥ (p. 245) is translated as 'jūs man mokytojas'. I wonder why the Skt. nom. pl. guravaḥ is translated by the Lith. nom. sg. mokytojas. On p. 335 one finds daiktardžių for daiktavardžių, on p. 522 Polomé for Polomé (a mistake which has led to an incorrect alphabetization). On p. 17 it seems odd to see the name Isačenko spelled also Isačenka (in order to reflect pronunciation?) in the same paragraph.

In conclusion, I can only emphasize what I wrote in the beginning of this review. Rosinas’ book is an incredible achievement certainly giving more detail and analysis about the Baltic pronoun than any other book so far produced. He is indeed to be congratulated on this authoritative book.
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