nija išlaikoma; tuo tarpu dalyvių, tiesiogiai su
sijusių su pamatinėmis indikatyvės formomis, 
posistemėje balsių kaita yra eliminuojama (plg. 
p. 373); menkų jos reikėtų pasitaiko tik senuo-
siuose raštuose.

Balų kalbų faktai monografijoje yra patei-
kiami ir interpretuojami labai profesionaliai; 
apširikina, netgi korektūros klaidos išn retos.
Antai autorius K. Širvydo du žodynus traktuo-
ja kaip vieno žodyno skirtingus leidimus (plg. 
bibliografijoje p. 431). Nuosekliai žymima lat-
vie kalbos antrinių dvigarsių pagrindinio ir šalu-
tinio kūrišio krintančioji prieigai (pvz.: cēls, 
dzīls, akmēns, lesāls), tačiau viename kitame pa-
vyzdyje jos nėra (pvz.: per ‘peria’, p. 293 t., 391; 
min ‘mina’, p. 313; pin ‘pina’, tin ‘tina’, p. 313, 
391 t.; sum ‘sumia’, p. 326, 391; vem ‘vemia’, 
p. 319, 392), o žvgs atveju (p. 27 t., 392) prieiga-
ė pažymėta klaidingai. Apširkitė ir pateikiant 
veną kitą lietuvių kalbos žodži, pvz.: atstomi 
(= atstomi), p. 94 (štn, 151), 378; stipu (= stip-
rus), p. 386. Kiek daugiau korektūros klaidų ir 
nenuoseklumų aptikau bibliografijoje. Antai 
G. Akelaitienės darbų pavadinimuose turi bū-
ti ne morfologinės, o morfonologinės (kaitos), 
Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatikos anglis-
ka versija yra Lithuanian Grammar (be artiklio), 
p. 413: R. Venckutės straipsnio pavadinime ne-
apofinē taisytina į neapofonē (p. 435); Ste-
panovo vardas yra Jurijus (J.), p. 433; angl kal-
ba parašytų darbų bibliografijoje vietoj vyrau-
jančių didžiųjų raitų kartais pasakomos ma-
žiosios.

Apibendrinant tai, kas čia svarstyta, norisi 
pabrėžti, kad D. Peti'o tyrimas išryškino pa-
veldėtosios gramatinių apofonijos balų kalbo-
se likimą sąlygojančius veiksnius: 1) formalųjį 
(skniškas struktūra); 2) morfologinį (polinikį į 
binarines priešpriešas, morfemų produktyvu-
mas); 3) semantinį (tai nėra semantinės nepriklausomybė). Balų kalbų savitumą autorius suvo-
kia kaip jų gebėjimą indeuropetietiškasias bal-
sių kaitas ne tiek išlaikyti (užkonservuoti), kiek

25 Kitur šios formos prieigai pažymėta, pvz., 
min (p. 255, 390). Kalbamais atvejais prieigai 
žymė, pvz., E. Kaganės – S. Ragišės (KR) ir A. Re-
kėnos (RV) žodynai; ME ji nežymima.

integruoti į savo sistemą, kurioje jos gali tapti 
netgi produktyvios.

Danielio Peti'o knyga yra ir brandus, aka-
emiškas, ir drauge elegantiskas veikalas. Tei-
giniai pagrįsti, aiškūs, pateikti palyginti paprasta 
kalba. Žavi tai, kad autorius kruopščiai apžvel-
gia kitų mokslinkų nuomones, nesvarbu – pri-
taria joms ar ne.

Bonifacius Stundzia

Erdvėlas Jakulis, Lietuvių kalbos tekėti, 
teka tipo veiksmazodžiai, Vilnius, Vilniaus 
universiteto leidykla, 2004, 306. (Baltistica, 
XXXVIII (1–2) 2003).

Lithuanian has a large class of verbs charac-
terized by a simple thematic present and a second 
stem in –ė (e.g. tekėti, tėka, tekėjo “flow, run”).

As the author (J.) records in the introduction, 
there is some indeterminacy in the way their 
synchronous properties and their prehistory are 
treated in the secondary literature, partly due to 
the lack of an exhaustive treatment of the data. 
This monograph (based on a 2002 Vilnius 
University dissertation) is a welcome attempt to 
fill this gap.

After a short introduction (pp. 8–11), the book 
is divided into two large chapters. The first one 
(pp. 12–83) is devoted to a synchronic description 
of the type. The second one focuses on diachrony 
on the following levels: comparison with Latvian 
(pp. 84–110), Old Prussian (pp. 110–116), Slavic 
(pp. 117–141) and, finally, Indo-European (pp. 
142–159), and presents his own theory on the 
origin of this class of verbs (p. 115, 155ff.). 
The conclusions (pp. 160–164), and English summary 
(pp. 165–189), the bibliography and abbreviations 
(pp. 190–197), six appendices giving in tabular 
form a list of forms on some topics treated in the 
book (pp. 199–245), and a list of words (pp. 246– 
306) complete the volume.

The first chapter is divided into three sections: 
semantics (pp. 12–25), derivational status and 
relationship with other types of verbs or parts of 
speech (pp. 25–43), and morphological structure 
(pp. 43–83). From a functional point of view
tekėti-type verbs are typically intransitive (or at least ineffective). Well represented semantic classes include verbs of sound, emanating both from animate and from inanimate subjects (by far the largest group), other verbs of emission (especially of light), verbs of motion, processes of change of structure and some other minor semantic classes. There is frequent overlap between the semantic spheres, many verbs being used in more than one meaning. As a general feature, J. characterizes them as duratives, usually with what he terms a “vibrative” connotation. They are not typically stative or iterative, although in some cases they may approach these types of meaning.

Morphologically the type tekėti, tēka is a large class of primary (i.e., not derived) verbs, the overwhelming majority of which is of a clear onomatopoeic nature. They are not denotative, nor are they productively derived from other types of verbs. There is a certain amount of variation with other types of present (e.g. smirda “stinks” beside smirdi, smirdziu, or smirsit); partly because these are close in meaning, but mostly explainable as an effect of the elimination of Old Lithuanian athematic presents or due to individual phonic processes of the dialects. In other cases we may be dealing with independent onomatopoeic coinages. Finally – and importantly – J. dismisses many of the examples found in the dictionaries as ghost forms and errors made by the lexicographers.

Verbs of the type tekėti, tēka are apophonically invariant, all type of root vocalism and groups of consonants being permitted. -e- functions as a dominant suffix that almost always carries the accent, irrespective of the intonation of the root. The morphophonemics of this type of verbs are characteristic of onomatopoeic formations. Most of this section is devoted to its manifestation in root vocalism, consonantism (both bound to variation of every sort), and accent, that often serve an iconic function. An interesting feature is the frequency of partial reduplication (dondēti, dūnda “thunder”), specially frequent among roots ending in a sonant. Although J. doesn’t state it overtly, I suppose this can be explained through a tendency in Lithuanian to avoid suffixal verbs to roots ending in a sonant, which is also to be made responsible for the expansion of -d- among causatives and other formations (pildyti, pildu “fill”, mėrdēti, mērdu “lie dying”, etc.), cf. Stang 1966, 325f. Very detailed tables through this chapter and in the appendices (pp. 200–216) make the results of this section of easy consultation.

I have little to comment on the first section, which is a very full study of the type tekėti, tēka as found in Lithuanian. Some of his conclusions, such as the durative value or the non-derived status of these verbs, are of some importance for a historical study. Readers should specially take due notice of the many corrections J. posits to the entries of the LKZ and other lexical sources. On the second section, devoted to a historical analysis of the type, I have more reservations.

The Latvian facts basically accord with the Lithuanian ones and there is an appreciable number of direct cognates between both languages, given in an appendix (pp. 217–224). The mixing of paradigms with other types of presents is still more marked in Latvian, so it is sometimes difficult to establish the original inflection of a given verb. On the other hand, J. seems to have based his study on Latvian cognates of Lithuanian verbs only, so one is left in doubt of whether Latvian has not a couple of verbs not attested in Lithuanian that may claim some antiquity. In any case, it is clear that the type tekėti, tēka was already present in common East Baltic in full force.

The section on Old Prussian is more challenging, as J. denies the existence of the type tekėti, tēka in this language. He finds four “root verbs” with possible cognates in East Baltic tekėti-type verbs. Of these, however, three are clearly untenable: OPruś. grūmons “gesungen”, uasey gūbars “ausgeführt” and etuērpt “vergehen” have closer cognates, both morphologically and semantically, in other classes of verbs (cf. Latv. gremt, gremju, grūmu “nurmseln, im Affekt reden”; Lith. gūbt-, -ia “cover; plunder”, gūbius, gūbias “take up” in Daugšia; Lith. vėpti, -ia, Latv. vērti, -ja “spin”) than in the tekėti-types Lith. grumēti, grūmu “lock, throng”, gēbēti, gēba “have a habit, like; be able, can” and vērtēti, vīrpa “tremble, shake”. His best example, stēnums į, stīmens
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II 736, stūnas III 41, 127, to "gelitten" shows a vocalism *stēn-* that hampers a direct equation with Lith. stenėti, stêna and Latv. stenēt-, -u "moan, groan".

On the other hand, J. dismisses all potential examples of tekēti-type verbs in Old Prussian on several grounds, sometimes without any argumentation at all. He prefers to posit instead, following Kaukienė (2004, 200–204), a (very doubtful, in my opinion) class of Old Prussian verbs with intransitive *-ē- and present and preterit *-ā- or *-e- (their distribution is not specified). It doesn’t become clear from J.’s treatment why this interpretation is to be preferred to the traditional one, taking at face comparative value examples like OPřuss. *wîrst kabîluns “wird hangen” = Lith. kabėti, kâba “hang (int.)”, peldîluns “erworben” = Lith. peldėti, pėlda “save, spare”, skelûlûns “schuldig”, verbal noun skelûlûnûns “Pflicht” = skelėti, skēta “owe”, etc. I miss a comment on gîvît, gîva- “live”, that has been often taken to be a further example of the tekēti-type in Old Prussian. While it must be recognized that the Old Prussian data are multiply ambiguous and liable to different interpretations, I find J.’s treatment somewhat aprioristic.

After denying the existence of the type tekēti, tekâ in Old Prussian, J. goes on to assume that the type as a whole is an East Baltic innovation and reconstructs a Baltic paradigm *tekštī, *teksta, *tekē. In East Baltic the preterit tekē was enlarged by *-jā to give *tekējā. Latter, the infinitive *tekšī was reshaped as *tekēti after the preterit *tekējā.

There are several flaws in this scenario. First, it goes without saying that even if J. had succeeded in proving that the type tekēti, tekâ is missing in Old Prussian (what he certainly has not), this wouldn’t prove automatically that the type was not present in Common Baltic and must be an East Baltic innovation. A West Baltic loss seems in principle equally possible. Second, J. simply takes the pivotal preterit *tekē for granted, without further commentary. But *tekē needs to be justified because it is by no means self-evident that the preterit of a paradigm *tekštī, *teksta should have been *tekē rather than *tekâ (the preference of the *-ē-preterit for intrasitivity is a common place in Baltic studies).

As shown by S. C. H. M. (1966; 1967–1968), the preterit of simple thematic presents without a second stem is largely regulated by root vocalism and stem structure: alternating verbs of CeRC-roots and not alternating verbs with a root vowel other than e and a have *-ā-preterits (e.g. kîpē, kēpa : kîpo “cut”, rîštī, riša : rišo “bind”, dirbī, dirba : dirbo “work”, augi, auga : augo “grow”). CeC-verbs, however, can be *-ē-preterits in Lithuanian (maiūti, maiūta, maiūtē “grind”), but this is known to be an innovation (dialect Lith. maiū, Latv. maiā). CeC-verbs, finally, have regularly the *-ē-preterit (vēsti, vēda, vēdē “lead”). Since all types of root structure and vocalism are permitted in the type tekēti, tekâ, one is only left with the possibility that the type originated in a handful of CeC-verbs such as tekēti, stēnėti “moan, groan”, derēti “be fit; bargain”, or terēti “thicken”. But even for these a preterit *tekē will not find support in the *-ē-preterit of verbs like vēsti, mēsī “throw”, dégī “burn” or nēštī “carry, bear” because this class is composed of characteristically transitive, effective verbs, functionally very far from the tekēti-type, and even here Endzelin (1910) was able to show that originally kēpī and dégī had an intransitive *-ā-preterit beside the transitive *-ē-preterit (dialect Latv. x. cēpē - dâda : intr. -cēpa, daga *-degā). Old Lithuanian intransitive athematic presents without a second stem had *-ā-preterits as well (bēgtī, bēgūnī: bēgo “run”, lktī, līkēni : liko “leave; be left”). At best, one could find a parallel for the putative *tekē in the synchronically irregular gimi, gimsta (OLith. gēma) : gîmē “be born”, mirīti, miršā : mirē “die”, (pri- si-)*mēhī, -mēna : -mēnē “remember”, but these verbs are not durative and show a different morphological structure. In any case, they pose a problem by themselves and could not be used to support the putative *tekē. All in all, everything suggests that if Baltic had had a paradigm *tekštī, *teksta rather than *tekēti, *teksta, its preterit should have been *tekē and not *tekâ.

Founded on weak basis as it is, J.’s theory should probably be rejected. Scholars with a different conception of the Old Prussian verb or the Baltic preterit will perhaps find J.’s scenario more credible than I do, but it is important to emphasize that it has not been adequately argued
for in this book. I find it easier to start with a Common Baltic type *tekėti, *teka, *tekėti (vel sim.), simply preserved (and certainly enlarged in its lexical composition) in Lithuanian, Latvian, and (probably) Old Prussian.

J.'s treatment of the Slavic and Indo-European comparanda is to some degree vitiated by his erroneous views on the internal history of these verbs in Baltic. He also seems to be much less familiar with the languages he is going to use, the principles of modern Indo-European linguistics, and the secondary literature (it is practically restricted to a couple of etymological dictionaries). As a result, the next two sections are much weaker and contribute but little to a historical elucidation of the type.

In the section devoted to Slavic J. studies about 80 verbs he has found equated with Lithuanian tekėti-type verbs in the etymological dictionaries, classified according to the type of verb in Slavic. J. rightly dismisses most possible equations as very doubtful or only etymologically related (i.e., not entailing a common prototype for the Baltic and Slavic verbs under consideration). He finds that the best direct equations are with "root verbs" (e.g., OCS snetati, sntj̆o = Lith. štenėti, stėna "moan, groan", tešti, teko = Lith. tekėti, tėka "run, flow", mošti, mogo "be able, can" = Lith. magėti, mąga "want, like", pasi, pso "protect" = Lith. pūsėti, pūsu "honor, respect"), thus supporting his theory of a Baltic paradigm *tekėti, *teka. While there is certainly some truth in it, this is not all the story.

It is well known that some tekėti-type verbs show clear cognates in Leskien's Class IV B. Verbs like Lith. kūpėti, kūpa = OCS kypėti, kypis- "boil", Lith. svitėti, svita = OCS svistes, svistes- "shine", Lith. smirdėti, smirda = OCS smirdėti, smirdėti- "stink", Lith. gromėti, grūma = OCS gromėti, gromi- "thunder" or Lith. bezėti, bezė = Russ. bezeti, bez逸, SCl. bežjeti "pedest" are not only derived from the same root, but look very much like exact word equations. To observe, with J., that a direct equation is not possible because Baltic and Slavic diverge in the present stem is a simple statement of the observable facts, not a historical explanation. Given their close formal and functional agreement, a common origin seems almost certain. I see no reason why the original paradigm could not have been that of Baltic, at least in some verbs (a Baltic replacement of an earlier *i-present is of course also possible in other).

On the other hand, reasonable arguments have been offered to assume that a pattern of conjugation like that of Lith. tekėti, tėka was present in the prehistory of Slavic (a point, once again, not addressed by J.). Vaillant (1966, 400) for instance, argues that the transfer of verbs like OCS tekėti, leti- "fly" < *lek-te- (: Lith. běkti, tekėti "fly") to Class IV B implies the earlier presence of a Class like that of Lith. tekėti, tėka in Slavic. The same perhaps holds for OCS blosći, blosći- se = Lith. bliskėti, blisča "shine, glitter" and other verbs in Slavic -stati and Lith. -skėti, -skėti, -zgėti, probably originated in some *-skelo-presents.

There is probably even direct evidence showing that at least one verb preserved this type of inflection into historical times. Köhn (1977, 104–107) observes that a paradigm *kvstėti, *kvste- "bloom" is surprisingly well attested in the Slavic languages (ORuss. cvsteti, cvstu, dial. Pol. kścić, kstę, Upper Sorbian kććē, kćē, OCz. kvietti, kru, Sloven. cveteti, cvetēm), beside the familiar *kvsteti, *kvstet- (OCS cvstēti, cvstēt, ORuss. cvstati, cvstati, OPol. kwiść, kweć, etc.) and *kvsteti, *kvstet- (SCz. cvstieti, cvstitēm, etc.), which bear all the appearance of morphological renewals of an anomalous verb. Slavic *kvsteti, *kvstet- makes a perfect equation with Latv. kvūtēti, kvūtu "glänzen, flimmern" and virtually solves the question.

There is thus every reason to believe that the type tekėti, tėka is not only common Baltic, but Balto-Slavic in date. It is almost certainly not Indo-European, but a review is not the place to explore the way it came into existence or the verbs that may have followed this conjunction in Balto-Slavic. I will content myself with a couple of observations.

First, Slavic *kvsteti, *kvstet- beside *kvsteti, *kvstet- and *kvsteti, *kvsteti- shows that the replacement of the thematic present by an *i-present was not the only way of handling these verbs in Slavic. Elimination of the second stem was another possibility. I would add — also in Baltic. From this point of view, neither can we take OCS tešti, teko or moštēti, mogo to show that the second stem of Lith. tekėti, tėka and magėti, mąga is an innovation, nor can we assume that Lith. pérstē, pérstia (Latv. pīst,
petu) “opedere” or bēgti, bēga (OLith. begmi) “run” were not pared with a second stem in *-ē-
in earlier stages of the language (cf. Slavic prēdēti, 
prēdi- and bēzāti, bēzi-). Second, J. is doubtless
right in emphasizing that the oldest layer of 
tekēti-type verbs lies in “root verbs”. An original
athematic present is still traceable for OCS molši
in the irregular 2 sg. *molš (cf. Vaillant 1966, 
165), it is assured on comparative grounds for 
tekētiešti or pōsetiipasti (cf. Ved. tak-ti, Hitt. 
pakhs-“”), and it is possible in other cases. One 
could speculate on the tekēti-type as a whole as
an offshoot of the gradual thematization of a class
of Balto-Slavic athematic presents pared with a
second stem in *-ē- (a type still directly attested
in Old and dialectal Lithuanian), but that would
not account for all examples, including potentially
ancient verbs. There is still much to do in this area
of the Baltic and Slavic verb, but it is clear that
the second stem in *-ē- (as well as that in *-d-)
played a major role in it.

I will not comment extensively on the chapter
on Indo-European. It aims to establish the nucleus
of Indo-European roots from which tekēti-type
verbs are built, their morphological structure and
their semantics (a list of forms supporting the
reconstruction of every root is given in an
appendix, pp. 225–245). Such an approach,
however, is not likely to give any serious results:
the Indo-European verbal system didn’t merely
consist of roots, but had a rather complex
morphology. A list of forms exemplifying the
derivatives of a root will not yield per se the correct
prehistory of a given verb. In addition, J. has
obviously not exerted any independent control on
the data he quotes, which apparently have been
copied down from Pokorny’s and a few other
eythological dictionaries. Errors and dubious
assessments are very frequent. In a word, this
section is an unreliable collection of data that have
simply not been studied in any meaningful way.

The serious shortcomings of the historical side
of this investigation renders it practically useless.
Nevertheless, the first part remains a valuable
contribution to the study of the Lithuanian and
(partially) Baltic verb, that no doubt will serve as
a solid basis for future research in this area.
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Jay H. Jasanoff, Hittite and the Indo-Eu-
ropean verb, Oxford, Oxford University Press,
2003, XIV + 270.

In 1979 Jasanoff (J.) advanced a new theory
on one of the most vexing problems of Indo-Euro-
pean linguistics: the Hittite (Anatolian) hhi-conju-
gation. This book incorporates J’s findings
during the next two decades. Starting from the
Hittite hhi-conjugation, it encompasses under a
single coherent framework a large number of ap-
parently independent formations in most Indo-Eu-
ropean languages.

The first two chapters are of a preliminary
character. Chapter 1 (pp. 1–30) introduces the
basic facts and the problem of the hhi-conju-
gation: how do we account for a class of active verbs
fully equivalent in function to those of the mi-conju-
gation, but displaying root ablaut and endings
that essentially match those of the perfect? J. re-
views critically most of the theories proposed to
solve this riddle and rejects any possible direct
derivation from the perfect or any other familiar