RECENZIJOS

Albertas R o s i n a s, **Baltų kalbų įvardžių semantinė ir morfologinė struktūra. Sinchronija ir diachronija**, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2009, 559[1] p.

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 evoliucija (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. *tá-jam* is that it derives from **tam-jam,* but if one derives it instead from **tái-* 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. -ῳ, 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 -ω were originally morpheme alternants and that the contamination of the two endings led to the creation of -ῳ. 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 výrai* 'to that man' and *duok par̃šai* 'give to the pig' suggesting that the Baltic dative singular might have been represented both by **-oi* and **-ōi.* Būga mentions also Greek Boeotian dialect forms similar to those mentioned above. One might note the possible Old Prussian dative singular nominal end-

ing 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 $\bar{e}$, *i*, *(i)ā*, *u*, *c*, *(i)a₂*, and partially *(i)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 **tasmōi* 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 fléchie 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-į̃ jósim in karùžę ... mėlyn-às-į̃ 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 *-į̃* to the nom. sg. forms *pirm-às-* 'first' and *mėlyn-às-* 'blue' (with stress as in the definite nom. sg. *pirm-às-is, mėlyn-às-is*). 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 etymo-logical **tam-āi* < **tom-ōi* which, as in the Lithuanian masc. dat. sg. *tam-ui*, 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 + i̯amu* (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 **-´ō/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, $(i̯)ā$, u, c, $(i̯)a_2$ and partially the $(i̯)a$ 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-õjos* 'variegated' for standard Lith. *marg-õsios* (Z i n k e v i č i u s 1966, 282). The Lith. dialect fem. gen. sg. (*marg*)-*õ-jos* corresponds phonologically and morphologically exactly to the Sanskrit fem. gen.(-abl.) sg. (*priy*)-*ā́-yāḥ* 'dear'. Likewise the Lith. dialect fem. dat. sg. (*marg*)-*õjai* also corresponds phonologically and morphologically exactly to the Sanskrit fem. dat. sg. (*priy*)-*yā́yai.* 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 -*y*-.

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 *-oisu* 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 *−ái* 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 ...σώματος εὐμορφίᾳ '...exalté... par la beauté physique, exalted by the beauty of the body' (H u m b e r t 1954, 291), Gothic *wopida Iesus stibnái mikilái* 'Jesus cried with a loud voice' (W r i g h t 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 Palomé 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.

REFERENCES

Buck, Carl Darling 1928, *Introduction to the study of the Greek dialects: grammar, selected inscriptions, glossary. Revised edition*, Boston, etc.: Ginn and Company.

Būga, Kazimieras 1961 (rev.), Mémoires de la société de linguistique de Paris 22, 1922, in *Rinktiniai raštai 3,* Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 673 (Original in *Tauta ir žodis* 1, 1923, 417–418).

Düntzer, Heinrich 1868, Die ursprünglichen casus im griechischen und lateinischen, *KZ* 17, 33–53.

Evans, Nicholas, Stephen Levinson 2009, The Myth of Language Universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science (To be published in *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*).

Haudry, Jean 1982, *Préhistoire de la flexion nominale indo-européenne*, Lyon: Institut d'études indo-européennes de l'Université Jean Moulin.

Hirt, Hermann 1927, *Indogermanische Grammatik 3*: *Das Nomen*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Humbert, Jean 1954, *Syntaxe grecque* (2nd ed.), Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.

Kazlauskas, Jonas 1968, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1958, On earlier stages of the Indo-European nominal inflection, *Language* 34, 179–202.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1970, *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai,* Vilnius: Mintis.

Rosinas, Albertas 1981, Kelios pastabos parodomųjų ir nežymimųjų įvardžių evoliucijos klausimu, *Baltistica* 17(1), 16–27.

Rosinas, Albertas 1995, *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai: morfologijos raida*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

Wright, Joseph 1954, *Grammar of the Gothic language*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas 1966, *Lietuvių dialektologija*, Vilnius: Mintis.

William R. SCHMALSTIEG

814 Cornwall Road
State College, Pa. 16803
USA
[*emily@leanonemily.com*]

Zigmas Zinkevičius, **Lietuvių asmenvardžiai**, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla, 2008, 840 p.

Zigmas Zinkevičius (toliau – ZZ) labai daug nusipelnė lietuvių onomastikai. Čia minėtina istorinių šaltinių, daugiausia rytinės Lietuvos dalies, antroponimų analizė (ZZ 1977; 1997 [2003, 106–124] ir kt.) bei jo aprašytas onimų, fiksuotų dokumentuose, slavinimas, kurio rezultatus, anot tyrėjo, šiandien matome lietuvių pavardėse. ZZ darbai įdomūs ir dėl minčių apie krikščioniškos kilmės asmenvardžių paplitimo laiką: lietuviai šios kilmės vardus pažinę iš rytų slavų dar iki oficialaus krikšto (ZZ 1980 [2003, 45–52]; 1981 [2003, 66–75]; 2005; S i n k e v i č i ū t ė 2006). Šiomis įžvalgomis ZZ disponuoja ir aptariamojoje knygoje.

Tačiau naujasis ZZ veikalas nėra jo ankstesnių minčių kartojimas. Naudodamasis vardyno paveldu autorius siekia atkurti senuosius lietuvių asmenvardžius (atstato iš pavardžių, istorinių antroponimų) ir kelia daug naujų idėjų dėl jų raidos. Šios knygos objektas yra lietuvių kalbos dvikamieniai vardai, jų trumpiniai, pravardės ir krikščioniškos kilmės asmenvardžiai. ZZ valo tirštas istorijos apnašas nuo senųjų dvikamienių vardų ir jų trumpinių: pagrindęs šių asmenvardžių kilmę, sudaro gerokai didesnius nei įprastai numanomus dvikamienių vardų ir trumpinių sąvadus, praplečia kamienų inventorius (p. 67–340). Toliau ZZ sistemiškai analizuoja ir krikščioniškos kilmės lietuvių vardus (ir šios kilmės pavardes), kuriuos grupuoja (hebrajiški, graikiški, lotyniški, germaniški, slaviški ir kt.), aptaria „vakarietiškus“ ir „rytietiškus“ krikščioniškų vardų variantus bei jų trumpinius lietuvių pavardėse (p. 341–486). Pravardinius asmenvardžius jis skirsto į grupes, nusako pravardžių davimo motyvus, siedamas šios kilmės asmenvardžius su apeliatyvais (p. 487–608). Dėl to šią ZZ knygą galima naudoti ir kaip lietuvių asmenvardžių žodyną, kuriame aiškiai pateikta daugelio mūsų asmenvardžių (ir pavardžių) kilmė; labai pravarčios rodyklės (p. 650–839).