
Be vykusių patikslintų etimologijų ir tokius, kuriose dar nemaža fonologinės garšų adaptacijos ir semantinės žodžių raidos painiavos, be drąsių, tačiau platesnės profesionalios diskusijos reikalingų hipotezių, Liukkonen knygoje „Suomų kalbos baltizmai“ įtikinamai, pakankamai paprastai, be sudėtingų reikšmės pasikeitimo postulavimų ar vieš teoriškai galimų nepaliudytų konstrukcijų įrodoma, kad kai kurie iki šiol patikimų savo reikšmės paaiškinimo neturėjo suomų kalbos žodžių yra niekieno nepatebėti (arba beveik nepatebėti) baltizmai. Galima manyt, kad tokie yra: suom. haastaa ‘kalbėti, kalbėtis, pasakoti; iškasti, mesti išiškį’ (plg. lie. tarm. žōstī, žōstū ‘sakyti’; išiškū, išiškū ‘ištarti’), haatta ‘trūkumas; trukdis; gedimas; žala, nuostolis’ (plg. lie. zaistāda, keinu ‘sūpynės’ (plg. lie. geinys, geinite)13, kuohu ‘goža, bangų mūša’ (plg. lie. goža), lampi ‘tvenkinys’ (plg. lie. klampā, Klampē), tarm. lojo ‘kelionės rogės, šlajos’ (plg. lie. šlajos), lumme ‘vandens lelijai, Nymphæa; liūną, Nuphar’ (plg. lie. luguai), sarana ‘dūrų ar lango vyris; šančia; tech. lankstas’ (plg. lie. sānara), sampi ‘Baltijos erškačas, Acepenser sturio’ (plg. lie. stambīl), tuore ‘šviežas, naujas’ (plg. lie. dorā), vaivero ‘viržinio klasės (Ericaceae) augalas, Chamaedaphne calyculata’ (plg. lie. vaivorās ‘Vaccinium uliginosum’14). Šiu nedidelėm išlygom labai tikėtina, kad ir rāntā ‘dargana, dranga, šlapdrība’ (plg. lie. drenūga, drenūgī).


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. vindati 'finds' (vidyate 'is') is not a 'suggestion' of Fraenkel's (p. 72), as we find it already in Endzelin'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 monophtonisations. 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- (preconsonantal and word-final) and *dow- (prevocalic) (the former underlying Skr. ādāt and the expanded Greek form ἔδωκε whereas the latter is assumed to underly the originally thematic aorist Lith. dāvē, cf. pp. 79–80, as well as pp. 191–193 on other difficult alternations of this type), then the monophtonisation is invoked to explain a feature observed in several branches of Indo-European, which justifies the notion of an 'internal IE monophtonisation'. 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 h₁ (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,
features of nominal inflection which Indo-

when the author (p. 135) assumes an 'internal
IE monophthongisation' in the infinitive suffix
of causative-iterative verbs Lith. -yti, Latv. -it,
legedly from -ey-ey (corresponding to a putative
present in -ey/-i- which is not directly attested
but may be inferred from the thematised vari-
ety -ye/o- evidently underlying such Eastern High
Lithuanian presents as gimëþia, guldëþia, cf. S t a n g
1966, 328), then the question arises how one can
use the notion of an 'internal IE process' to de-
scribe 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 mini
minëîi, OChSminëîa minëîi, where monophthong-
isation *oy- > é- is assumed (p. 19), the notion
of an internal IE process is justified by the pro-
posed identification of *min-ë- (the original pre-
iter stem, now Lith. minëjo with hypercharac-
tisation of the preter stem) with Greek ekávó
, but is there a counterpart for Lith. (man)yi
outside Balto-Slavonic?

Apart from such phonological prerequisites
as the above-mentioned 'internal IE monophon-
thongisations', the reader acquainted with Prof.
Schmalstieg's earlier work will recognise a num-
ber 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. Schmal-
stieg's reconstruction of the syntactic properties
of IE verb forms are reminiscent of the Georgian
system, with nominative case marking in the (ac-
tive intransitive) present and ergative case mark-
ing in the (middle) preterite characterised by the
marker *-to. This reconstruction should be con-
sidered in connection with Prof. Schmalstieg's
view of the accusative as an original dative (re-
cently argued in Schmalstieg 2000). The oldest
tense/aspect/voice opposition would thus have
been that between *mëter pek*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*-tò mëtrëós '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-

In the book we find a series of useful over-
views of the discussions concerning several
intricate questions of Baltic historical morphology.
The author does not always offer an explana-
tion of his own. I will briefly mention a few tradi-
tional 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. yrâ, 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 expan-

doned until now, it seems that the oldest of
them, the one assuming an original noun mean-

existentialism, is the least probable. The Arme-

ian counterpart ir 'thing, reality', proposed by
Gauthiot, is apparently doubtful (cf. S t a n g
1966, 414), but I also think Schmalstieg correctly
opines 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 χωή
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, χωή

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
χωή, Lith. reikëjo and Latv. vajadzēja. The com-
plete isolation of the form yrâ, 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
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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 yrà should not be discarded: structurally it is preferable to any explanation of yrà 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 *îrey ‘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 -biau/-bei/-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 *-tyà (jeigu žinočiau, sakęčiau would thus go back to a construction meaning ‘if there was a knowing, there would be a saying’). Schmalstieg characterises Mathiassen’s (1994) explanation of -cia as ‘... the infinitive ending *-ti plus the element *-jà which would perhaps be some case form of the pronoun stem *yole ... and which might also be present in the Latvian debitive in jà- and further in the Latvian conjunction jà ‘if’’ (which should be corrected to ja – A. H.) as the best yet offered. I think, however, that only the first part of Mathiassen’s explanation, i.e., the interpretation of *tyà as the infinitive followed by some auxiliary element, deserves serious consideration. The comparison with the Latvian debitive is evidently 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 tà. ζoa. τέχει as being Graeco- or Sanskritocentric, which is no doubt true. Kazlauskas, whom the author quotes (approximately, 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 nèra kada važiuoja, nebuvò kada dario 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 nèra 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 stàko 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 -q 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
nominate 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. Endzelín’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 re-modeling 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 sua-ke-Asi > 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 that the generalised short vowel (Endzelín 1951, 905-906). Endzelín 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 asmetam : metamēs.

Here Schmalstieg assumes influence of the 2nd sg., where sit from an older siti is opposed to sities (p. 50), but perhaps the infinitive (sisti : sities) would have provide a better model for the treatment of affixes ending in a consonant, cf. also other nominal forms such as the indeclinable participle cēlam : cēlamēs. 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 Kurjłowicz’ 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’ēd-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/lo-stem form *feid'e. This -a- could then have been transferred to the -ye/lo-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 a substitute for *biyi-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-īt 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-tē (with subsequent substitution of -ā- for -a- under the influence of stā-tē). As the explanation of stōvī stovēti as an original perfect (Ofnd. tasīhau) is perfectly satisfactory, there is no reason to abandon it for an explanation that establishes a correspondence with Slav. stojāti but is otherwise highly speculative. Of course, the matter deserves further consideration because, as the author points out, formations like klojēti, žiojēti 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 katē : kačiū), 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 katē (with assimilatory palatalisation of later date) as against kačiū (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 < *żejksi) but this seems to be contradicted by such forms like Lith. jēga, Latv. jēga (in the pronoun iūs, iī the initial y was, of course, restored by analogy), and indeed there is a priori no reason to assume that word-initial or intervocalic 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 ryktelei 'shout out strongly' alongside riktelei '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 ā, 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 -telēti 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 brydovī (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 Bezzmenberger), "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. leist (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 ateity) 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-attes-
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Iš bendresnio pobūdžio lietuvių dialektologijai skirtų pirmąjame tome publikuojamų straipsnių ypač norėtū išsiskirti straipsnių „Kada gi žemaičių tarmė atsiskyrė nuo aukštutinių?“ (I 204–210), kuriame suabejojama kadaise pareikšta profesoriaus Antano Salii nuomonė, kad šis atskrypinimas įvykęs XV amžiuje viduryje (ne ankstiau). Girdenis šią datą linkės nukelti dar ir prieš XII amžių.


Labai būtina ir bendrinės kalbos normos kodifikaciją pažvelgta drauge su Alono Pupkio parašytame straipsnyje „Bendrinės kalbos normos ir jų kodifikacija“ (I 183–189).