As A. Holvoet points out in the preface (p. 9) the laryngeal theory has long ago abandoned the status of a revolutionary theory to become generally accepted as part of our picture of the Indo-European phonemic system. In addition, although controversy remains concerning their exact phonetic nature and their reflexes in some specific environments, there is general agreement concerning their number (three laryngeals, neither more nor less) and most of their reflexes in the daughter languages.

While this holds true for the mainstream of Indo-European studies, laryngeals often keep some of their mystery among non-specialists. Myths like the notion that laryngeals were lost “very early” and can, accordingly, be left aside in studies of, say, Baltic comparative linguistics are still widely held. This is a pity, as serious work in comparative linguistics is being done in this country and scholars currently working on these languages would benefit enormously from a more up to date knowledge of comparative Indo-European linguistics, where laryngeals play an important role.

Against this background, the publication of this monograph by Prof. W. Szmoczyński (S.), who has contributed a number of relevant studies to the reflexes of the laryngeals in Baltic and Slavic (2001, 248-252; 2003a; 2003b, 171-224), is specially welcome. Although its main focus is on Lithuanian, S. has very reasonably included material from the other Baltic languages and from Slavic as well, even in cases where it is absent from Lithuanian.

The book is based on a series of lectures held in the linguist’s summer-school at Salos in 2004. It offers a relatively complete introduction to the laryngeal theory (13-86), followed by a survey of its reflexes in Baltic (and Slavic) (87-217). The book is completed with a bibliography (219-226), a list of abbreviations (227-233), and a list of words...
(235-292). Being written in Lithuanian, in part it serves a pedagogical goal. It follows from this general purpose that this monograph is not intended to be a comprehensive treatment of the laryngeals in Balto-Slavic in the line of Beekes (1969) for Greek or Schrijver (1991) for Latin. This remains a major desideratum for the future. The coverage of data, although ample, is not exhaustive, but rather of an illustrative character. In addition, as it is for the most part S.’s practice (this has also been criticized in Fecht’s review of S.’s Hiatus laryngalny, 2006, 157), there is very little proper discussion of problematic cases or alternative views. As a result, generally accepted laryngeal developments and etymologies are not always clearly distinguished from controversial issues and hazardous etymologies. Fortunately, the former largely outnumber the latter, so the book can still be recommended as a reliable presentation of the laryngeals and their reflexes in Balto-Slavic.

The presentation of the laryngeal theory is adequate and up to modern standards. Practically all relevant phenomena that should have been included are conveniently presented and exemplified.

S. has probably made the correct choice in limiting himself to a presentation of the currently standard doctrine, simply passing in silence alternative views concerning the number of laryngeals and proposals concerning their reflexes in particular environments that have not met with general approval. Nevertheless, a critical discussion could have been of some use for non-specialists that may easily go astray in this area of research. In this respect, it would have been useful to extend the history of the laryngeal theory (72-83: from de Saussure’s Mémoire to Kuryłowicz’ seminal articles in the late twenties) down to the present day, and to offer some comments on the vast literature on the subject (simply sketched on p. 83). Thus, readers should have been informed that Mayrhofer’s presentation of the laryngeal theory (1986, 121-150; 2004, 17-39) can be regarded as representing the standard version of the theory, while the views of Lindeman (1997) or those of the Leiden School (e.g. Beekes 1988b; Schrijver 1991), beside much valuable discussion, include ideas that are not generally accepted.

S. correctly highlights the importance of the laryngeals for Indo-European root structure (13-17, 28-30), and root apophony (17, and passim). S.’s discussion of the Indo-European vocalism, however, is inadequate and rather confusing. On p. 13 only e a o are given as full vowels, e i a o e u a o u as diphthongs, while i y are classified with the sonants (i u being mere allophones). From pp. 17 and 20 one could get the impression that S. is prone to assume a one-vowel-system for primitive Indo-European and explain the long vowels, a and even o as due to the fall of the laryngeals. This is probably not what is meant, as S. later uncontroversially
assumes the existence of long vowels (p. 24: ē), of o and a (p. 31), but S.'s formulation is simply confusing. On p. 31, fn. 9, a list of words is given that had a-vocalism in Indo-European, so one could get the impression that in the end S. is assuming the standard vowel system for the parent language (a ē į ū ū), but on pp. 85-86 the “traditional” vowel system of Mayrhofer and Szemerényi (ā ē į ū ū) is contrasted with the “laryngeal theory” system of Beekes (ē), and S. finally opts for a system i u ē ū. Szemerényi’s version of the laryngeal theory was idiosyncratic (he accepted only one laryngeal), but Mayrhofer’s system is as fully laryngealist as that of Beekes. S.’s discussion could give the impression that a reduction of the inventory of Indo-European vowels goes hand in hand with the laryngeal theory, what is certainly false (although, of course, the occurrence of a ā į ū has diminished dramatically). A full discussion cannot be attempted here, but it is probably safe to say that the “traditional” system ā ē į ū ū remains the most generally accepted today (cf. M a y r h o f e r 1986, 168ff.; 2004, 10ff.).

As far as the basic reflexes of the laryngeals in the daughter languages are concerned, S. treats virtually all relevant phenomena: the change of *e to *a, *o in the neighborhood of *h₂, *h₁ respectively (pp. 20–26), while *o (31-35, 42-46) and *ē (24) (and a forteriore *ō) are not colored by an adjacent laryngeal (for *ē this is often called “Eichner’s Law”, cf. Eichner 1973, 72), compensatory lengthening *-EHT-*-ĒT- (37-52), reflexes of *-RH-* (52 57), *-THT- (61-66), *-TH # (66-67), the “triple representation of schwa” in Greek (58-61 for initial position, and passim), laryngeal metathesis *-HU-*-UH- (50-52), irregular lengthening in compounds (45-46, 49-50) as well as in augmented and reduplicated forms (41-42) in Indo-Iranian, aspiration of a voiceless stop by *h₂ in Old Indic (35-37).

Hittite data are introduced on every pertinent occasion, but usually in a separate section (23-24, 34-35, 40). This procedure may give the wrong impression of a particular position of Anatolian with respect to the rest of the family. Different variants of the Indo-Hittite hypothesis continue to be discussed, but the development of laryngeals as such does not anymore play a role in the modern debate – in spite of the importance of the preservation of *h₂ in most positions.

S. (24) states that *h₂ is preserved in initial position in Hittite (while it is lost in other positions). Whether word-initial *h₂ was lost or preserved is a major subject of controversy of Anatolian historical phonology (cf. K l o e k h o r s t 2006, 85ff. for a brief survey of the main positions). In my view, the issue cannot be said to be definitively settled yet.

S. draws most examples from the classical languages and Old Indic. This is perfectly reasonable as a pedagogical procedure, but as a result readers are left uninformed about the development of laryngeals in languages like Celtic, Armenian, or Tocharian. For an introduction this is
not a great loss, but in some specific environments the testimony of less favored languages may be important. Thus, concerning the evolution of *-UH(-) and the metathesis *-HU- > *-UH- (46-52), it should have been mentioned that in Tocharian (like in Greek, but differently from the other languages), a final sequence *-UH is solved with vocalization of the laryngeal, but only in the case of *h₂ and *h₃. In addition, the laryngeal is also vocalized in internal position *-UH-: *-Uh₁(-) > *-Ū(-), but *-Uh₂/₃(-) > *-U̯A(-)/*-U̯A(-) > Proto-Toch. *-(U)U̯Ā(-) (e.g. nom-acc. n. *tri-h₂ > Pre-Toch. *triya > Proto-Toch. *tūryā > TA trī, TB tūrya, cf. Gk. τυχά vs. Ved. trī, cf. Hackstein 1995, 17-19; Pinault 1997, both with references).

S. (61) follows Rix (1976:70) in assuming that the double representation of *i- in Greek is conditioned by a preceding laryngeal. *Hj- would give ζ-, while *i- would give /h-/. Nowadays Schindler’s unpublished defense of the opposite view can be said to be generally accepted: *i- > ζ-, *Hj- > /h/ (e.g. Myc. u-ta° / hut₃ā/ “fight”, Gk. ὑλός, το-μινή “battle” < *Hjūd°, with initial laryngeal confirmed by the irregular length in compounds in Indo-Iranian: Ved. amitrā-yūdh-, viśā-yūdh-, Av. aspā-iiaodā-< Irl. °a-Hiža/jud°-, cf. Mayrhofer 2005, 37, with references).

Evolution of *-RH-. S. (53ff.) seems to assume that -Rŋ/ā/ω- is the only reflex of *-TRHT- in Greek. However, it is now generally held that *-RH- had a double reflex in Greek depending on the accent: unaccented *-TRHT- gives -Rŋ/ā/ω-, while (secondarily) accepted *-TRHT- gives -eRŋ-, -aRŋ-, oRŋ- (e.g. Rix 1976, 73; Mayrhofer 1986, 129). A similar process perhaps took place in Latin: unaccented *-RH- > -Rā-, but accentuated *-RH- > -aRa- (e.g. palma < *palama < *ph₃-mah-, Gk. πάλαἱμη, OIr. lám, OHG folma, cf. Meiser 1998, 108ff., but also Schrijver 1991, 193-197 for criticism of this view). Finally, it seems that in initial position the laryngeal of a sequence *RHT- was vocalized at least in some languages (Lat. macer “lean, meager”, Gk. μακρός, OHG magar “long” < *mh₂-rō-, cf. Gk. μήκος “length” < *meh₂-es-, cf. BEEKES 1988a; Schrijver 1991, 161-172; Meiser 1998, 107).

Some relevant phenomena concerning the reflexes of laryngeals are not mentioned by S. An introduction is of course not the place for a discussion of all reflexes of laryngeals in the daughter languages, but I believe at least a brief mention should have been made of phenomena like the Germanic Verschärfung (cf. Jasanoff 1978), or the gemination of *-ERHE- > *-ERRE- in Anatolian (cf. Melchert 1994, 79-81; Kimball 1999, 410-420), and, probably, in Germanic (cf. Lühr 1976).

Further refinements in the laryngeal theory have allowed to specify the contexts where the laryngeals seem to have fallen (or were not vocalized) already in the parent language, thus causing what apparently surface as “irregular” reflexes.
in the daughter languages. Again, most relevant phenomena are conveniently treated by S.: loss of *⁻H in pause (69-70), loss in the second member of compounds (70-71, “νεογνό̋-rule”), as well as in reduplicated formations (71-72), loss in the first member of compounds with final accentuation (71), loss in a sequence -T/RH₃ (68-69, “Pinault’s Law”), loss in *HRoT- and *⁻oRHT- (67-68, “Saussure’s Law” or “Saussure-Hirt’s Law”), part of Stang’s Law (72, ḫ₁-stem acc. sg. *⁻ah₂-m > *⁻ūm), as well as some other, less clear cases of lack of vocalization of a laryngeal (65).

Laryngeals probably also participated in Szemerényi’s Law (*⁻ERH > *⁻ĒR like *⁻ERs > *⁻ĒR in *ph₂-tér-s > *ph₂tēr). This would explain the length of the nom.-acc. of hysterokinetic and amphikinetic collectives: *uéd-ør-h₂ > *uédôr (Hitt. ṣidâr, Gk. ὑδωρ), *h₁néh₂-mon-h₂ > *h₁néh₂mōn (Av. nāmqn), cf. Nussbaum (1986, 129ff.).

The consonantal clusters where a laryngeal was lost are not yet absolutely clear, but serious work is currently being done in this direction. S. mentions Ved. 1 pl. da-dh-mâsi, 2 pl. dha-t-tâ (dhā- “to put”), and the gen. sg. of the word for “blood” Ved. āsṇâḥ, Hitt. ḫnān < *h₁sh₂-n-ēs. Cf. Hackstein (2002) for a general rule *TH.TT > *T.TT, or Jasánoff (2003, 77, 134f.) for a rule *⁻Th₂T/s > *⁻TT/s- in non-initial syllables. In the last years a “Wetter-Regel” (-VTHR- > -VTR-), due to J. Schindler but not published by him, seems to be gaining general acceptance:

\[ *h₂yeh₂d'r̥om > *h₂yed'r̥om > \text{ON} \text{veđr}, \]
\[ \text{OCS} \text{vedro “clear weather”,} *mēh₁trom > \text{Gk. miťqov (cf. Peters 1999, with references, and already Lubotsky 1981, with a different formulation).} \]


Concerning the basic reflexes of laryngeals in Balto-Slavic (which for the most part are uncontroversial), S’s presentation is lucid and fully reliable. There are, however, a number of general issues on which I would like to comment.

S’s treatment of *⁻THT- is probably the only one I find utterly unsatisfactory. S. assumes that the laryngeal was unconditionally lost without vocalization. His only example is the word for “daughter”: Lith. duktē, OCS doštī < Balto-Slavic *dukter- < PIE *dugh₂-ter-. Starting from such an assumption, S. proposes alternative explanations for some words traditionally supposed to show vocalization of the laryngeal, e.g. Lith. stātas, denom. statyti < *sth₂-tṑ- (108, 187f.) instead of traditional *sth₂-tṑ- (cf. Ved. sthitū-, Gk. στῆτος, Lat. status).
But it is well-known that in the word for “daughter” we have cases of non-vocalization of the laryngeal in languages where a laryngeal between stops is otherwise vocalized (Arm. *dovstr-, Os. *futir-, Gaul. *duxtīr), beside cases of vocalization (Ved. *duhitār-, Gk. ἰδόμη, TB *tkäcer, perhaps Lyc. *kbtra). This fact has been convincingly attributed to an Indo-European regular loss of the laryngeal in some specific clusters, probably nom. sg. *dugh-trēr vs. gen. sg. *dugh-trēs > *dughtrēs (cf. Ringe 2006, 137f., with references). It follows that Lith. *duktė, OCS *dšt, Go. *dauhtar fail as evidence for the reflexes of *-THT- in Balto-Slavic and Germanic. On the other hand, loss in medial position would not entail automatically loss in other positions. Germanic is particularly illustrative, as laryngeals were vocalized in initial position (e.g. ON *fāðr, OE *fæder < *ph₂ter-), but lost in medial and final position (cf. Ringe 2006, 79ff., 137ff.).

From this point of view, S’s *sth₂-ėtō-, for which no internal or external support is offered, loses all its attractiveness. Darden (1990) has proposed that *RHT- yielded *RaT- in Balto-Slavic (e.g. Lith. mātas “measure”, denom. matioto, if from *meh₁ “to measure”). I find most of his examples questionable, but it is clear that the issue of the vocalization of laryngeals in Balto-Slavic awaits a full and unprejudiced study.

S. (165ff.) assumes a laryngeal metathesis *-EHUT- > *-EUHT- > *-ĒUT- in order to explain the acute intonation of cases like Lith. acc. sg. *piemenį “shepherd” < *pāmen- < *paHmen- < *po. h₂i.men- (: Gk. ποιήμα; I would rather reconstruct *poḤmen-, but this is irrelevant for the present question). A further example can now be added: Lith. āuksas (via *HauHsa-?), Lat. aurum < *h₂e-h₂us-o-, cf. Driessen (2003). I personally see no other way of handling cases like *piemenį, but S. himself gives some examples where no metathesis seems to have taken place, e.g. Lith. dienį “pregnant (cow)” < *dēhi-nō (: Ved. dhenu “giving milk; cow”). The conditions under which a sequence *-EHUT- underwent metathesis thus remain to be worked out. It should be noted that Leiden School authors derive the acute directly from *-EHUT-, thus implying a Balto-Slavic syllabification *paḤmen-.

Apart from the important contrast between acute and circumflex in sequences involving a sonant followed or not by a laryngeal (probably the major contribution of Baltic and Slavic to the laryngeal theory in general terms), suprasegmental phonology is not treated in this book. A chapter on “Laryngeals and Balto-Slavic Accentology” would have been of some interest (for instance, Hirt’s Law is usually traced back to a stage when laryngeals were still preserved as a segmental phoneme).

Virtually every Baltic or Slavic word is derived from an Indo-European prototype. For practical purposes this is a legitimate procedure, but it may be misleading. In part it gives a wrong impression of Indo-European morphology and its transformation in Baltic and Slavic. I
think it would have been useful to distinguish systematically between a reconstruction (a real Indo-European word is reconstructed from which a given Lithuanian word is derived) and a transposition (a rewriting in Indo-European terms of a given word or form that is probably to be regarded as a post-Indo-European coinage). To give a clear example, on p. 171 the preterit Lith. būvo “was” < *bhuH- seems to be derived from a “pide. *bHuh2H-eh2H-”. Whether a “*bHuh2H-eh2H-” existed in Indo-European is more than doubtful, but būvo is known to be a very recent innovation vis-à-vis OLith. biti, bit, Latv. bija, OPr. bēi, bei, be (a matter on which S. himself has contributed a relevant paper [S. 2004]).

This example illustrates another unfortunate aspect of S.’s book. Controversial reconstructions are frequently given without further justification. This root is reconstructed as *bHyeH2H-, as in the LIV (s.v.), a view supported only by Rix’ interpretation of OLat. subj. 2 sg. fuās as an inherited aorist injunctive *bHuh2H-s, and of the Latin imperfect in -bā- (Lat. 2 sg. amā-bā-s, Os. 3 pl. fufans) as derived from a Proto-Italic pluperfect *fuβ(y)ā- (e.g. Rix 2003). Rix’ views have been seriously criticized (e.g. Jasanoﬀ 2003,112f.32). Ved. ābhūt, Gk. ēphv show unexpected zero grade in the singular of the root aorist, an idiosyncrasy that has often been projected back into the parent language: *bHuH- would display no ablaut, and the nature of the laryngeal would not be recoverable. For Italic an analysis *bHuH-eh2H- (whatever the origin of *-eh2H- might be) remains in any case possible.

It is obvious from this and other publications that S. doesn’t accept Winter’s Law, which in fact is never mentioned. This influences the way he handles part of the evidence, e.g. áugti “grow” < *h2eug- (93), ožys, ožio “goat” (94f.), bēgti “run”, ésti “eat, fressen” (120f.), mēžti “milk” (181), etc. The acute long vowel of bēgti and ésti could be explained from an inherited Narten present, as per S., but his account of ožys (< *ažH-iūH-, derivative of *ažH-a- < *h2eγH-ó-) is not clear to me, and áugti, mēžti are just said to have a “secondary acute”, which is not actually explained. S. is of course free to dismiss this controversial law, but I believe a discussion would have been in order. Simply passing in silence a theory that is being intensively discussed today is not the best way to contribute to the scholarly debate – and it simply misinforms non-specialists. In this respect, Kortlandt’s alternative views concerning vowel length and intonation (the acute would be due to a laryngeal or to Winter’s Law, while old long vowels would have circumflex intonation in Balto-Slavic, e.g. Kortlandt 1985) would also have merited a separate discussion.

Most reflexes of the laryngeals in Balto-Slavic are illustrated with a large number of for the most part well chosen examples. However, it must also be said that a good number of S.’s actual reconstructions are questionable. For lack of space I will refrain from a discussion of the many items on which I
would disagree with S., but readers are well advised to use S.’s rich collection of data with caution.

In a review it is almost unavoidable not to highlight the most problematic aspects of a book. For this reason, it is important to emphasize that S.’s presentation of the laryngeal theory and its application to the Baltic languages is, in general terms, fairly complete and reliable. It fills a pressing need in the literature, especially in Lithuania and in Baltic (and Slavic) studies in general. It is only to be hoped that it will help advancing the acceptance of the laryngeal theory as part of the “new look” of the Indo-European phonemic and morphological system, against which serious work on Baltic comparative linguistics must necessarily be done.
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Monografija parašyta 2004 m. rudenį apgintos daktaro disertacijos pagrindu, bet, kaip teigiama *Pratarmėje*, nuo pastarosios „jau gerokai skiriasi“ (p. 10). Tai liudija, kad darbo autorė yra jauna mokslininkė, kad tai pirmasis didelis jos darbas, per dvejus metus po disertacijos apgynimo brandinamas, išplėstas ir pateiktas skaitojojui nemažos apimties monografijos forma. Taigi vikas, kas ir kaip knygoje pasakytas apie lietuvių senųjų dvikamienių asmenvardžių trumpinius ir jų kilmės pavarde, jau tapo neatsiejama lietuvių antroponimijos tyrimo kontekste dalimi, kurią kaip naujausią reikia analizuoti ir vertinti.

Tai bus pamėginta padaryti šioje recenzijoje. Iš karto pasakyta, kad monografijos autorės ir recenzentės požiūris į daugelį tyrimo išdėstytų dalykų gerokai skiriasi. Todėl atrodo svarbu konstatuoti, kad recenzija rašyta laikantis nuostatos, pagal kurią į monografijoje pateiktą tirto asmenvardžių vertinimą žiūrėt galbūt ją mokslininkės teisę turėtų savo nuomone ir ją pateikti. Tokią pat teisę turi ir