BALTIC LINGUISTICS
ISSN 2081-7533
4 (2013), 221–243

Вячеслав Вс. Иванов (отв. ред.), Петр М. Аркадьев (сост.), *Исследования по типологии славянских, балтийских и балканских языков (прежмущественно в свете языковых контактов)*. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя, 2013. / Vyacheslav Ivanov & Peter Arkadiev, eds., *Studies in the Typology of Slavic, Baltic and Balkan Languages (with primary reference to language contact)*. St Petersburg: Aletheia, 2013. 368 pp.[1]
ISBN 978-5-91419-778-7

Reviewed by Ilja Seržant, Konstanz & Vilnius

This book consists of an introduction and ten chapters written in Russian, each supplied with an English abstract, and is a collective volume authored by well-known specialists in the respective subfields. The main focus of the book is on various language contact situations as well as areal interpretations of particular phenomena against a wider typological background. The idea is to provide a broader overview of each phenomenon discussed, bringing in comparisons with the neighbouring languages. Two major linguistic areas are in the focus of the book: the Balkan and Eastern Circum-Baltic areas. The book is an important contribution to these fields as well as to areal typology and the theory of language contact in general, meeting all standards for a solid scientific work. Various aspects of contact phenomena, ranging from phonological or morphological features to syntactic and lexical ones, are covered, adhering primarily to a functionalist typological approach.

The first chapter "Word Order Typology in Slavic Languages" (**Типология порядка слов в славянских языках**) by Anton Zimmerling (А. В. Циммерлинг) is devoted to the typology of word order. Slavic languages typically lack strict word order constraints; they represent the so-called free-word-order type languages, in principle allowing any possible word placements, though these are pragmatically constrained. This, as the author writes, deprives intra-Slavic word order typology and comparison of a *comparandum*. Consequently, the focus of this contribution is on specific, grammaticalized word order restrictions

[1] The electronic version of the volume is available online at http://www.inslav.ru/izdaniya/arxiv/8-arxiv-publikaczij/1339-2013-01-28-11-17-15

and their distribution across Slavic languages. One of the few such restrictions that are found is the obligatory positional distinction between classifying and non-classifying adjectives in Polish (pp. 16–17). However, given that this distinction is a specific Polish innovation not found in any other Slavic language, the author selects another phenomenon to scrutinize, more suitable for cross-Slavic comparison. Namely, in a number of Slavic languages the most rigid constraints on word order are found in the clustering of clitics. Other word order phenomena, such as scrambling constraints, can also be meaningfully discussed only with regard to clitic clustering. A subtype here is *Clitic Climbing* (placement of a clitic into a clitic cluster belonging to a higher predication, e. g., a reflexive clitic of an infinitive into the clitic cluster of its matrix verb), which is not considered a subtype of scrambling at all, because the non-scrambled placement of the clitics is simply prohibited in most Slavic languages (p. 31–32) (an exception is the Late Old Novgorodian dialect of the 14th–15th centuries). At the same time, there is no clitic scrambling within the same clitic cluster (long-distance bounded scrambling, p. 23).

In several Slavic languages, there are clitics (argumental dative, accusative pronouns, (perfect and future) auxiliaries, negation, question marker (*li*), and some others) which cluster in sentence-second position according to their inherent, lexically specified ranks (p. 19), exceptions being almost all modern (but not old) East Slavic languages (apart from some Western Ukrainian subdialects). The description of how the second position is defined is given in more detail on pp. 66ff. As the author emphasizes, this is subject to language-specific constraints, though it may be restricted to the first word form or negation proclitic *ne*, the first phrase (XP), subordinating conjunction, etc.

In his paper Zimmerling presents an interesting and insightful overview and comparison of different subsystems of Wackernagel's law (requirement for the clitics to occur in the second position of a clause) with additional reference to extra-Slavic typology. Moreover a classification of various subsystems is put forward (pp. 49–56): standard w-systems (internally-ranked clitic cluster must come second, e. g., Serbo-Croatian), modified w-systems (the placement of the main verb must be adjacent to the internally-ranked clitic cluster, e. g., Bulgarian or Macedonian), degraded w-systems (e. g., Polish) with an optional clustering of different kinds of clitics into one cluster (some clitics

such as perfect auxiliary may occur after the verb irrespective of the verb's position in the sentence).

The author claims that Bulgarian and Macedonian clitics should not be defined as just *vA clitics* in contrast to *2P clitics* (second position clitics, cf. Franks & King 2000), because the Bulgarian and Macedonian clitics (with some exceptions) are first and foremost determined as obligatorily occurring in the second position, while it is the verb that is positionally dependent on the placement of the clitics and not vice versa. Differently from the Serbo-Croatian Wackernagel system, the Bulgarian and Macedonian ones represent modified w-systems by not only restricting the clitic cluster to sentence-second position but also in restricting the positioning of the verb: if there is a clitic cluster in the sentence, the main verb must be adjacent to that clitic cluster (pp. 51–54).

On pp. 21–22 the author argues that the sentence negation *ne* in Bulgarian should be regarded as not belonging to the syntactic position for the clustering clitics but rather constituting an extra position between the sentence initial XP and the clitic cluster just because the negation *ne* always precedes the (other) clitics. The same argumentation is given for the future auxiliary *šte* (which is said to be one of the clustering clitics on p. 43). The argument as it stands might be somewhat inconclusive, because one could equally and alternatively argue that it is the clitic template that requires the negation and the future auxiliary to occur first and second in the clitic cluster, respectively. In contrast to the future auxiliary, the perfect tense auxiliary based on the verb *to be*, does belong to the clitic cluster according to the author, even though it behaves the same way (except for the 3rd sg. form) as the future auxiliary as argued by the author in relation to example (8) on p. 21. It seems that assuming an extra position between the XP and the clitic cluster would make the latter appear in sentence-third and not, as originally stated on p. 21, sentence-second position. However, the author seems to assume that negation and future auxiliary fuse into one XP with the first XP (cf. the formula (iii) on p. 22)[2].

[2] Note that the author assumes that the question clitic *li* precedes the perfect auxiliary (clitic), though one may find counterexamples (from Franks 2007, ex. (11b)):

Ne si li mu gi pokazvala?
NEG AUX.2SG Q him.DAT them.ACC shown
'Haven't you shown them to him?

The second chapter of the book "Language Contact as the Trigger for Restructuring of the Categories of Gender and Declension in Molise Slavic" (Языковой контакт как причина перестройки категорий рода и склонения в молизско-славянском языке), by Walter Breu, discusses the restructuring of gender and inflectional classes in the Molise Slavic minority language spoken in three villages in Southern Italy since the 15th–16th centuries. One of the properties of the Molise Slavic gender system is that the neuter gender has been lost as a lexical property specifying a particular noun for gender. All nouns are either masculine or feminine in this language. However, there are several traces of the neuter gender in Molise Slavic which encompass not only personal pronouns such as *ovo* 'this', *to* 'this/that', *ono* 'that' (p. 86) but also substantivized adjectives which assume the former neuter form in the nominative/accusative, and default agreement forms of predicatively used participles (in the perfect tense) in a context with no nominative subject (p. 90). The author assumes that the neuter agreement between the pronoun and the substantivized adjective is a place where the Italian influence might be seen, because this source for new third gender nouns is productive in Italian, while it is not productive in Serbo-Croatian. In general, the former neuter gender in Molise Slavic has acquired the new function of marking lack of individuation, of marking 'the category of non-individuatedness' as the author puts it (p. 110). Furthermore, the former neuter gender is still an agreement parameter, and substantivized adjectives if preceded by a pronoun or an article require it to have the former neuter form. However, Molise Slavic has lost gender distinctions in the plural domain altogether (pp. 91ff)[3].

The main body of the former neuter-gender nouns have acquired masculine gender in all dialects of Molise Slavic, subsequently losing the older neuter ending *-o* and thus adapting to the endingless masculine (p. 96). A small subgroup, though, has been subject to internally-motivated variation: Several former neuter gender nouns with the ending *-o* have been transferred to the feminines in the Acquaviva dialect regardless of

[3] On pp. 93–94 the author states that the flectional form of the noun with numerals 2, 3, 4 is the genitive singular with masculine nouns and nominative/accusative plural with feminine nouns in Molise-Slavic, Croatian and Russian. However, this is not entirely correct for Russian, cf. the author's own work in Breu (1994).

the gender of their Italian counterpart. This change is, rather, motivated internally by a sound change (similar to East Slavic *akan'e*), where the word final *-o* became *-ă* (a whispered *a*), while in the Montemitro dialect, which does not have *akan'e* and retains the final *-o*, the same nouns have been assigned to the masculine gender (pp. 94). Only the noun *doba* with original word final *-a* is an exception. This noun has acquired feminine gender in all dialects, not only in Italy but also in some dialects of the Molise Slavic original homeland in the Balkans.

An important point Breu makes is that one only rarely finds gender re-assignment adjustments due to the Italian counterpart, and the distribution between masculine and feminine nouns remained *mutatis mutandis* as it was inherited (p. 99). The author argues convincingly that the main reason for this conservatism is morphological pressure. Even though there is no strict correlation between lexical genders and morphological noun types, this correlation is strong enough to resist the Italian influence: in modern Slavic and in Molise Slavic the feminine nouns are overwhelmingly *a*-stems, while the masculine nouns are mainly *o*-stems. The strength of this morphological factor is supported by the loss of the *i*-stems in Molise Slavic, which were all feminines and, hence, did not adhere to the aforementioned correlation (pp. 101–103). While the loss of *i*-stems was not conditioned by language contact itself, the new gender assignment to the former *i*-stem nouns has indeed been heavily determined by their Italian correlates: those former *i*-nouns that had a masculine Italian correlate acquired masculine gender, while those which had a feminine Italian correlate were transformed according to the aforementioned morphological correlation between stem and gender into feminine *a*-stems (p. 101–102). Note that the *i*-stems after having lost their final *-i* became morphologically masculine but were etymologically feminines. This sort of ambiguity has been dissolved by language contact. One of the interesting conclusions that the author makes is that the major triggering mechanisms of gender restructuring are internally motivated, but, at the same time, in cases of ambiguity the contact language seems to play an important role.

The next chapter of the book "Some Isoglosses on the Dialectal Map of Albanian. On the Rise and Spread of Albanian Balkanisms" (Некоторые изоглоссы на албанской диалектной карте (к вопросу о

возникновении и распространении балканизмов албанского языка)) is by Alexander Rusakov (А. Ю. Русаков). Here, the focus shifts to a non-Slavic language. The main idea of this paper is to present an overview of the history of Albanian and its dialectal splits in the broader context of the Balkan Sprachbund, taking into account historical factors that led to various shifts in the sociolinguistic situation and contact languages. This overview is innovative in not drawing borderlines between inter-language and inter-dialectal convergence effects; it combines results from dialectology and (Balkan) areal typology. The author gives a brief introduction to the theory of language contact and to Albanian studies (pp. 113–125) with a number of important references.

Four major historical periods of Albanian are established: (i) Albanian-Eastern Romance contacts (from the beginning of the first millennium A. D. to the 7th–8th centuries A. D.) leading to the split of Albanian into the two major dialects Tosk and Gheg; (ii) the Gheg-Tosk Dialect split (8th–10th centuries A. D.); (iii) Tosk-Gheg contacts (first half of the second millennium), when a number of balkanisms were transferred via Tosk into Gheg from Greek, Aromanian, Bulgarian-Macedonian; finally, (iv) the Ottoman period (since the 15th c.) with new dialectal splits due to various contact sources.

On p. 126–132 the author discusses the earliest Balkanisms in Albanian. One of the most salient properties that is found in all varieties of Albanian and hence must be of Proto-Albanian origin is the postposed / enclitic definite article inflecting for case. Since this article does not occur in the Romance or Slavic languages outside the Balkans, the author reasonably assumes that Albanian might have been the source for this feature in the Balkans. In this context, though, one may consider the definite and indefinite adjectives in Slavic that encode definiteness along the same pattern: a postposed clitic pronoun is fused with the adjective being marked for case, number and gender, yielding definite and indefinite inflection quite parallel to the definite and indefinite inflection of Albanian. Recall that this feature must be very old in Slavic (well attested, e. g., in Old Bulgarian / Old Church Slavic), and its emergence has to be dated to Proto-Slavic or, even earlier, to Proto-Balto-Slavic, since the Baltic languages attest the same strategy involving etymologically the same pronoun. This means that this feature existed in the South Slavic dialects before these arrived in

the Balkans. Interestingly enough, there is also a phonetic correspondence — something that often enhances grammatical replication: the postclitic pronoun used in the Slavic definite adjectival flection is also *i-* (plus case/gender/number endings), historically from the Proto-Indo-European pronoun nom. sg. m. *$*h_1is$* 'this' (cf. Latin *is,* Lithuanian *jis*). Problematic here, however, is the fact that South Slavic languages have used an etymologically different pronoun *to* (generalized oblique stem of the Proto-Indo-European pronoun nom. sg. m. **so(s),* acc. sg. m. **tom* 'this') to create their definite articles. Thus, the definite adjectival flection and the grammaticalization of the definite postclitic article *to* for nouns in South Slavic might reveal themselves as being two different, unrelated phenomena.

The author works with micro-zones within the Balkan area, primarily the one encompassing Albanian and Eastern Romance languages. There are a number of specific, typologically rare phenomena that make this micro-zone remarkable, such as the noun-phrase architecture: the possessum agreement on the possessor phrase making the possessor-possessum construction pattern with the noun-adjective construction (with some formal but not substantial differences between Albanian and Rumanian), the definiteness marker coming always right after the first word of the NP irrespective of whether it is a noun or an adjective (with parallels in Bulgarian and Macedonian) (pp. 127–129). Furthermore, there are several phonetic and morphonological features (p. 130), presence of the *genus alternans* (singular — masculine, plural — feminine), various lexical parallels (p. 131).

In turn, several other features found in the whole dialectal continuum of Albanian are common rather to Standard Average European and not specifically to the Balkan Sprachbund, e. g., the possessive perfect (p. 135), rise of the indefinite article on the bases of the numeral *një* 'one' (p. 136). Finally some features that are atypical for both Balkan and SAE are discussed (e. g., the Albanian synthetic optative mood, p. 138).

On pp. 144ff the author discusses the distribution of dialectal isoglosses dividing Albanian into major dialects Tosk (roughly South Albanian) and Gheg (North Albanian) in a larger extra-genetic, areal context. Thus, the presence of a reflexive possessive pronoun in Gheg *vs*. its absence in Tosk is not only characteristic of the split between the dialects, but — if taken more broadly — can be regarded as an

isogloss that divides the Balkan languages: the absence of a reflexive possessive pronoun is typical for Greek, Aromanian, East South Slavic dialects (South Macedonian, West Bulgarian and the East Bulgarian Moesian and Rup dialects), while its presence is characteristic of East South Slavic. The author assumes that it is Greek and/or Aromanian that have led to the loss of the reflexive possessive pronoun in Tosk (but not in Gheg). A more complicated situation is found with the grammaticalization of the future tense from a volitive modal verb in combination with a finite form of the lexical verb, which is a typical Balkan feature. While this feature originates in Tosk, it has penetrated into most of the Gheg subdialects leaving only the most northern ones unaffected (p. 152ff).[4]

Concluding, the author draws an important conclusion: new phenomena often do not eliminate the old options, leading rather to a new distribution between the new phenomenon and the old one as is the case with various infinitive periphrases in Albanian (p. 152).

The fourth chapter "The particles *bylo* and *byvalo*: Russian 'Secondary Modifiers' in a Typological and Diachronic Perspective") (Частицы *было* и *бывало:* русские «вторичные модификаторы» в свете типологии и диахронии) by Dmitry Sitchinava (Д. В. Сичинава) is devoted to the function, distribution and syntactic properties of two Russian particles that emerged from the simple and the iterative/habitual forms of the existential verb *byt'* 'be' : *bylo* lit. 'it was' and *byvalo* lit. 'it used to be'. The paper is very informative, containing a number of parallels not only from Ukrainian or Belarusian but also from a wider typological perspective. It furthermore touches upon the grammaticalization of these particles. However, at times the text is too dense: argumentation is not always retrievable from the paper and the reader is referred to the author's previous research. Thus, the author distinguishes between two different degrees of grammaticalization of a deverbal particle: serialization and morphological marker. However, one may wish that the paper were more explicit with regard to the formal properties that distinguish between these two options.

[4] This must have happened very early, as the author argues on the bases of von Harff's glossary, cf. Maynard (2009) who argues that the quote given by von Harff may also be understood literally as *to want*.

Both particles are claimed to have a common semantic core in that both are related to remote or discontinuous past (Plungian & van der Auwera 2006). At the same time, there are considerable differences both in the semantics of these particles and their formal properties, such as the tendency to occur verb-adjacently with *bylo* and much less so with *byvalo*. The former is mostly used postpositionally but with some psych verbs like *podumat'* 'to think a bit', *ispugat'sja* 'to be frightened' it is more frequently preposed. The author convincingly shows that after the attainment of a certain degree of grammaticalization, the reverse process of degrammaticalization took place: these particles have become again more independent from the main verb in the modern language.

The fifth chapter "Interpretive Deontics in Slavic and Baltic: Sources and Paths of Development" (Интерпретативные деонтические выражения в славянских и балтийских языках: Источники и пути развития) is jointly written by Axel Holvoet and Jelena Konickaja. It discusses and introduces a new gram in the domain of modality, namely *interpretive deontics*. Interpretive deontics are "deontic expressions (imperatives, hortative particles, infinitives, deontic modal verbs etc.) used interpretively (in the sense of Sperber and Wilson 1986), i. e., with reference to speech acts (usually imputed to imaginary interlocutors) expressing directives addressed to the speaker or some third person". (p. 195). Interpretive deontics are used in order to express other people's expectations — reasonable or unreasonable, expectations that can be satisfied and those which cannot.

According to the authors, the interpretative use has several subtypes (pp. 202ff): (i) request for permission, (ii) deontic request, (iii) rhetorical deontic request/question, (iv) negative evaluation of other people's expectations, and (v) epistemic assessments. This order — as the authors claim — represents a frequent developmental path. Thus, Polish hortative *niech* and Old Lithuanian *te-* allow only the first (i) interpretive use but not the others, namely (ii) to (v). While the first type (i) is similar to a permissive causative in that the hearer is supposed to just permit the speaker to carry out the event, in (ii) there is more control on the part of the hearer (or a third party) transmitted from the speaker — the speaker expects to be given instructions. The assumption of the speaker that there is no reasonable outcome/instruction in a particular situation gives rise to the rhetorical request/

question, as in subtypes (iii) and (iv) (p. 207). Subtype (v) represents a shift from the evidential into epistemic modality.

Various subtypes of this gram may be expressed differently across languages and within the same language. The following encoding strategies are discussed in the paper: hortative particles (Latvian, Slovenian), imperatives (Russian, Lithuanian), independent infinitive constructions (Russian), lexical markers such as *have to* (Polish). All these markers, of course, have other readings primarily pertaining to deontic modality (necessity or obligation), but also develop interpretive uses. Different markers tend to enter the deontic interpretive domain along different subtypes and encode different sets of meanings within this domain (p. 216).

Two languages attest all five subtypes with their hortative markers: Latvian (marker *lai*) and Slovenian (marker *naj*). Unlike Latvian, Slovenian attests additional readings, one of which (vi) is used to render other people's expectations about the subject of the sentence, cf. the following example (from p. 210):

(1) *Politik-i* ***naj*** *bi* *uresničeva-l-i* (Slovene)
politician-NOM.PL HORT IRR implement-PART-PL.M
želje *ljudstv-a*
wish people-GEN
'Politicians should implement the wishes of the people.'

This use cannot be rendered by the functionally close Latvian *lai*, as the authors correctly note. The diachronic explanation offered for this reading is that it developed from subtype (iv): *negative evaluation of other people's expectations* (as in (2)) to *neutral evaluation of other people's expectations* (as in (1)).

(2) *Es* ***lai*** *te* *dzīvoju* *trīs* (Latvian)
1SG.NOM HORT here live.PRS.1SG three.ACC
dien-as *kopā* *ar* *žurk-ām* *un* *spok-iem?*
days-ACC.PL together with rat-DAT.PL and ghosts-DAT.PL
'I should live here for three days with rats and ghosts?!' (p. 204).

While the diachronic development suggested by Holvoet and Konickaja is possible, it seems that the relationship between hortative and neutral

expectations may also be straightforward with no intermediate stage in (iv). In this context one may compare the use of the Russian hortative particle *pust'* in (3) fully parallel to Slovenian (1), while the Russian *pust'* does not attest the intermediate stages (i)–(v):

(3) *Vsem prostym ljudjam nužen mir, sem'ja, dostatok — vojna nikomu ne nužna,* (Russian)
'All simple people need peace, family, prosperity — no one needs war,'
a vot politik-i ***pust'*** *by sam-i bra-l-i*
but PRT politician-NOM.PL HORT IRR self-NOM.PL take-PST-PL
v ruk-i oruži-e
in hand-ACC.PL weapon-ACC.SG
'… and politicians should take themselves arms in their hands.'[5]

On pp. 212ff. the authors discuss the subject marking of interpretively used imperatives. Here one may add that the 'Russian interpretive imperative' admits both nominative and dative marking of the logical subject. Thus, the following example (4) from Lithuanian on p. 213 yields a grammatical sentence in Russian if translated literally, I adduce an example from RNC in (5) below:

(4) *Vis-i ils-i-si, o* ***man*** (Lithuanian)
all-NOM.PL.M rest-PRS.3-RFL but 1SG.DAT
dirb-k
work-IMP.2SG
'Everyone is resting, and I have to work.'

(5) *A to on ešče slomajetsja tam,* (Russian)
PRT PRT 3-SG.M.NOM else break.FUT.3SG PRT
a ***mne*** ***otveča-j***
but 1SG.DAT be.responsible-IMP.2SG
'What if it would break, then I would have to be responsible (for this).' (N. Ruban, 2003, RNC)

As the authors suggest, the dative may be here in analogy to other deontic expression, e. g., to the infinitive such as in (6):

[5] http://immortalchess.net/forum/showthread.php?t=5217&page=973

(6) *Vis-i* *ils-i-si,* *o* ***man*** (Lithuanian)
all-NOM.PL.M rest-PRS.3-RFL but 1SG.DAT
dirb-ti
work-INF
'Everyone is resting, and I have to work.'

The sixth paper of the volume "The Role of Modification of Verb Stems in Assessing Areal Differentiation of Baltic Languages (in Comparison with Some Slavic Micro-Languages) (Значимость способов модификации глагольных основ для оценки ареальной дифференциации балтийских языков (по сравнению с рядом славянских микроязыков)) is written by Björn Wiemer. His paper deals with how verbal particles and prefixes are distributed in Baltic and some Slavic languages, comparing them to West Slavic micro-languages spoken in Germany and Austria. While prefixation is an older strategy in both Baltic and Slavic, verbal particles seem to have appeared relatively recently in these languages, and are, hence, likely to be an areal phenomenon in both areas under discussion, as has been suggested in previous research. The paper discusses frequencies and tendencies of both types of strategies in Baltic and Russian, on the one hand, and West Slavic micro-languages, on the other hand. Furthermore, Wiemer surveys the relevance of these two strategies for the grammatical domain of aspectuality, which is discussed with particular emphasis on Baltic. The comparison reveals that Western Slavic languages have many more borrowings and calques from their contact languages (which are different varieties of German), while Baltic mainly relies upon the inherited lexicon in creating verbal particles. Furthermore, the author's study confirms the main claim in Wälchli (2001) where it is shown that there is a tendency for the number and frequency of the verbal particles to increase from South to North: while Estonian sticks mainly to verbal particles, South Lithuanian and Polish have very few verbal particles. Latvian combines both strategies: the inherited prefixes and verbal particles. It may be added that one of the differences between Russian and Latvian pertains — besides the token and type frequency — also to various lexical restrictions. Thus, while basically all Latvian verbal particles mentioned on pp. 236-7 do have a semantic and syntactic correlate in Russian, these correlates in Russian are much more semantically constrained and restricted in regard to the verbs they may co-occur with than in Latvian.

Maria Zavjalova's (М. В. Завьялова) paper "Slavic Loans in Modern Lithuanian. Mechanisms of Adaptation" (Механизмы адаптации славянских заимствований в литовском языке (на современном этапе)) discusses various subsets of copying from Russian into Lithuanian on the basis of the database of language errors of the State Commission of the Lithuanian language (www.vlkk.lt). The overview is supplied with a number of examples. Thus, it shows various 'misuses' of prepositional phrases that are — as the author claims — attributable to the respective Russian structures. The prepositional phrases are mostly and genuinely used with purely locational semantics in Lithuanian, while the encoding of other, more abstract semantic roles is typically carried out by cases. Russian, in turn, is much more innovative in this respect in employing periphrases based on various prepositions in non-locational contexts. Moreover, the author correctly points out that also those domains are affected by borrowing for which Lithuanian does not have a productive means of encoding, which provides a suitable environment for the Russian borrowing to be used (as e.g. with the prefix *da-* from Slavic *do-,* pp. 257–8).

The following two papers of the volume deal with two areal phonological features of Baltic that are constrained on the suprasegmental level. The paper "Northwestern-Indo-European and Uralic Laryngealized Tones: Synchronic and Diachronic Linguistics and Genetics" (Северозападно-индоевропейские и уральские тоны с ларингализацией: синхронная и диахроническая лингвистика и генетика) by Vyacheslav V. Ivanov (Вяч.Вс. Иванов) is devoted to the rise of the glottalized or laryngealized tone (traditionally referred to as *broken tone*) in Baltic as well as to its areal and typological distribution. The paper furthermore assesses an interdisciplinary approach to the rise of the glottalized tone that combines both (diachronic) linguistics and (human) genetics.

The paper "Gemination of Voiceless Obstruents in Latvian: Traces of the Finnic Influence" (Геминация согласных в латышском языке: следы прибалтийско-финского влияния) by Anna Daugavet (А. Д. Даугавет) represents an important contribution to the areal phonology of Baltic, which has been seriously neglected in areal research in the last decades. It discusses the phenomenon of consonant gemination after a short open syllable and not before a syllable with a long vowel. Notably, gemination is understood here exclusively as

consonant doubling (on the phonetic level) across two adjacent syllables and not just consonant lengthening. The gemination furthermore affects only voiceless consonants. It is convincingly argued that Latvian has copied the phenomenon of gemination from Finnic, because it is clearly an internal Latvian innovation, while the closely related Lithuanian does not attest it at all. Interestingly, as the author shows, not only the very phenomenon of gemination but also the respective rules and restrictions have been copied into Latvian. These rules encompass such suprasegmental parameters as stress or the length of the affected and the following syllable.

The final paper "On the Typological peculiarities of the Lithuanian verbal system" (О типологическом своеобразии литовской глагольной системы) by Peter Arkadiev (П. М. Аркадьев) is devoted to several features of the verbal system of Lithuanian which are unknown to its geographic neighbours and genetically related languages. The author discusses such features as nasal infixes in the formation of the present tense; the position of the reflexive/middle marker which is always inserted between the prefix and the root of the verb; the ban on lexical prefix stacking (with few and well-defined exceptions); such grammatical categories as morphologically marked habitual past, avertive, continuative (semantically comparable to English *still* and formed by means of the verbal prefix *be-*) and restrictive (semantically comparable to English *only* and expressed by the verbal prefix *te-*) and some syntactic phenomena involving non-finite verbal forms (see below).

As regards the nasal infixes, this morphological strategy of encoding a semantic category (crudely speaking, low agentivity of the verb's subject) — as the author correctly notices — is indeed quite unique. One may add that its uniqueness may be regarded as a part of a more general feature of Lithuanian, namely, its phonetics that is surprisingly stable in diachronic terms. Thus, the tautosyllabic nasals were lost in both Latvian and East Slavic (cf. such inchoatives as Russian *sest'* 'to sit', historically Proto-East-Slavic **sēd-* vs. *sjadu* 'I am going to sit down', historically Proto-East-Slavic **se-n-d-*).

The category *avertive* (encoding an event that was imminent but did not took place, cf. Kuteva 1998) is quite unique in the Baltic context (cf. p. 330). The only parallel the author finds is the Estonian proximative construction ('there are prerequisites for a situation encoded by the

verb to take place') which is just a less grammaticalized form of progressive. The Estonian example (5) on p. 331, similarly to the English progressive *He is dying*, has the meaning of 'He is about to die'. The parallelism between the Lithuanian avertive and Estonian proximative is corroborated by the fact that both exhibit a tendency to develop into a progressive (p. 331). While the Estonian construction is indeed reminiscent of the grammaticalization of progressives[6], the Lithuanian avertive might undergo somewhat different development: the proximative uses of progressives are typically compatible with achievements or accomplishments only, while the Lithuanian avertive does not seem to have any restrictions as to the actionality of the verb to yield the avertive meaning, and such activity verbs as *to work* pattern here with achievements and accomplishments. This is, however, not typical for progressives and the Lithuanian avertive might be a different sort of construction than one halfway to a progressive.

Further Arkadiev hypothesizes about why such categories as avertive or restrictive have not been copied by any of the languages in contact with Lithuanian. He correctly points out that the sociolinguistic status of Lithuanian as well as a relatively low frequency of these categories might have been among the reasons why Lithuanian has not 'donated' some of these recently grammaticalized categories to the neighbouring languages (excluding perhaps their dialects spoken in Lithuania). Another argument, less strong (as the author concedes) may be the lack of parallel source structures in the neighbouring languages. Indeed, there are theoretically no systematic hindrances in Latvian to grammaticalize, say, the adverb *tikai/tik* into a prefix parallel to the Lithuanian restrictive *te-*.

On pp. 337ff. the author discusses various strategies employing non-finite verb forms (infinitives and participles) in Baltic in contexts such as evidentials or non-finite subordinate clauses with a possibility of expressing the subject in the dative or accusative case. Here some outstanding properties of the Lithuanian morphosyntax are highlighted that make this language much more conservative in comparison to the

[6] The latter typically involve a state (expressed by the auxiliary 'be') and some locative marker attached to the non-finite form of the main verb (Heine & Kuteva 2002, 202), which is the inessive case that marks the infinitive here.

other genetically related languages as well as to the languages of the larger European context. Finnic languages represent the only exception, attesting a number of parallels here as pointed out by the author.

One of the constructions the author discusses is the subordinate clause headed by a converb in both Latvian and Lithuanian and allowing the subject to be expressed overtly by means of the dative case, a sort of *dativus absolutus* construction. The author's claim that dedicated anteriority converbs have gone out of use in Latvian is essentially correct, though anteriority still can be expressed by the converb in this language. In this case, the present tense converbs derived from verbs with telicity marked by a prefix may be used in Latvian, as in (7):

(7) *Viņ-am* *at-brauc-ot* *gan* *nek-as* (Latvian)
3-DAT.SG.M PREF-arrive-CNV PRT nothing-NOM
ne-bija *mainījies.*
NEG-be.PST.3 change.PPA.NOM.SG.M
'When he arrived, nothing changed.'[7]

Furthermore, the example (16), p. 343, quoted from the Latvian grammar by Mathiassen (1997) is incorrectly translated as denoting simultaneity, while it is most naturally interpreted as expressing anteriority due to the telicity encoding prefix on the converb.

One may add in this context that this type of new 'dativus absolutus' construction is attested not only in Baltic but also in the older records of some South and North Russian subdialects, e. g., in Arkhangelsk or Kholmogorsk region (Borkovskij & Kuznecov 1963, 449; Kuz'mina & Nemčenko 1971, 239):

(8) *Ja* *vyexa-l* *uže* (North Russian,
1SG.NOM take.off-PST.M.SG already Kholmogorsk district)
zakativšis' *solnc-u*
set.CNV sun-DAT.SG
'I took off when the sun had already set.'
(Borkovskij & Kuznecov 1963, 449)

Unlike Russian subdialects where this construction is already extinct, it does occur in Belarusian dialects (Borkovskij & Kuznecov 1963, 450; Karskij 1956, 415):

[7] http://www.sievietespasaule.lv/maja/majas/gaidu_vina_bernu_bet_vins_mani_pameta

(9) *Stoja-čy jamu ŭ vadz-e p'jaŭk-a* (Belarusian)
stand-CNV 3SG.DAT in water-LOC.SG leech-NOM.SG
ŭpilasja ŭ nag-u
bite.PST.SG.F in leg-ACC.SG
'While he was standing in the water, a leech bit into his leg.'
(from Borkovskij & Kuznecov 1963, 449)

After having discussed some particular aspects of the book under review (I was not able to discuss all aspects of the book and so preferred to stick rather to some more specific issues which, in my view, are of particular interest), I conclude that some minor critical remarks that have been made above should not diminish the high value of the present volume. It is obvious that the chapters have been written by leading specialists in the respective subfields who bring knowledge from dialectology, historical linguistics or sociology into their discussions. The volume in general represents an important step towards uncovering the mechanisms of language contact and areal convergence.

Misprints

p. 21: "… показатель общего отрицания не из клетки XP …" should be *"ne"* in italics
p. 22: "…клитик (V) и глагола (NEG, AUX.FUT)." should be "…клитик (NEG, AUX.FUT) и глагола (V)."
p. 39: "двух двух" should be "двух"
p. 149: "геско-тоскской" should be "гегско-тоскской"
p. 205: "*notais-to-s*" should be "*nolais-to-s*"
p. 228: "*vidu*" should be "*vidū*"
p. 230: "Нам даже…" should be "'Мне даже…"
p. 232: "простой основой…" should be "простой основы…"
p. 232: "производящей основы…" should be "производящей основой…"
p. 327: "связан" should be "связано"

Ilja A. Seržant
Institute of Lithuanian Language (Vilnius) /
University of Konstanz
Department of Linguistics
Zukunftskolleg, Box 216
D-78457 Konstanz
ilja.serzants@uni-konstanz.de

Abbrevations

acc — accusative, aux — auxiliary, cnv — converb, dat — dative, fut — future, gen — genitive, hort — hortative, inf — infinitive, imp — imperative, irr — irrealis, loc — locative, m — masculine, neg — negation, nom — nominative, part — participle, pl — plural, ppa — past active participle, pref — prefix, prs — present, prt — particle, pst — past, q — question, rfl — reflexive, sg — singular.

References

Borkovskij & Kuznecov 1963 = Виктор И. Борковский & Петр С. Кузнецов. *Историческая грамматика русского языка* [*A Historical Grammar of Russian*]. Москва: Наука.

Breu, Walter. 1994. Der Faktor Sprachkontakt in einer dynamischen Typologie des Slavischen. In: Hans-Robert Mehlig, Hrsg., *Slavistische Linguistik* 1993. München: Sagner, 41–64.

Franks, Stephen. 2007. Clitic Placement in Bulgarian Compound Tenses: pf-side versus Syntactic Approaches, *iulc Working Papers Online* 07. (https://www.indiana.edu/~iulcwp/pdfs/07-Franks.pdf)

Franks, Stephen & Tracy Holloway King, eds., 2000: *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karskij 1956 = Ефим Ф. Карский. *Белорусы. Язык белорусского народа* [*The Belorussians. The Language of the Belorussian People*]. Вып. 2–3. Москва: Издательство ан ссср.

Kuteva, Tania. 1998. On identifying an evasive gram: Action narrowly averted. *Studies in Language* 22.1, 113–160.

Kuz'mina & Nemčenko 1971 = Ирина Б. Кузьмина & Елена В. Немченко. *Синтаксис причастных форм в русских говорах* [*The Syntax of Participles in Russian Dialects*]. Москва: Наука.

Maynard, Kelly Lynne. 2009. 'I want to buy it' in the Albanian Glossary of Arnold von Harff. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 107.2, 231–252.

Mathiassen, Terje. 1997. *A Short Grammar of Latvian.* Columbus, oh: Slavica.

Plungian, Vladimir & Johan van der Auwera. 2006. Towards a typology of discontinuous past marking. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 59, 317Wälchli, Bernhard. 2001: Lexical evidence for the parallel development of the Latvian and Livonian verb particles. In: Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds., *Circum-Baltic Languages*, Vol. 2: *Grammar and Typology*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 413–441.

rnc = Russian National Corpus. http://www.ruscorpora.ru/en/index.html