Electronic offprint from

BALTIC LINGUISTICS

Vol. 2, 2011

ISSN 2081-7533

Daniel Petit, *Untersuchungen zu den baltischen Sprachen.* (Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics, 4.) Leiden–Boston: Brill 2010. viii + 353 pp.
isbn 978-90-04-17836-6.

Reviewed by Rick Derksen, Leiden

This collection of studies by Daniel Petit originates from a series of lectures presented at the Indo-European summer school in Berlin in 2006. It consists of five chapters, which deal with dialectology (49 pp.), accentology (88 pp.), the neuter gender (65 pp.), the semi-thematic flexion (56 pp.), and the syntax of clitics (48 pp.), respectively. The introductory character of the first two chapters (the first chapter is actually called "Einführung in die Baltische Dialektologie") is without doubt connected with the background of the book. On the whole, it is not an introduction to Baltology, however, nor is it intended to be, as the author explains in the preface.

In the chapter on Baltic dialectology, which is not confined to the languages spoken today, Petit deliberately refrains from discussing the problem of the Balto-Slavic unity, on which topic he has already published a lengthy article (Petit 2004a). As in the case of Balto-Slavic, Petit appears to be aware of the limitations of the family-tree model when it comes to classifying the Baltic languages. It is indeed true that there once was a complex Baltic language area, which was inhabited by a multitude of tribes. Under these circumstances one must reckon with substratum influences and convergence (cf. Girdenis 1994, Zinkevičius 2006). For practical purposes Petit adopts a traditional classification, which among other things involves a Proto-Baltic stage. Such a stage is hardly controversial, but in my view the decision to group Old Prussian together with Lithuanian and Latvian as opposed to Slavic is largely intuitive. Petit's list of common traits of East and West Baltic does not convince me otherwise, as a sequence of shared innovations is lacking. Among the developments that are supposed to illustrate the split between East and West Baltic Petit includes the monophthongization of **eį̯* (p. 12). This implies that Petit does not subscribe to the hypothesis that the same development affected **ai* < **$h_2$ei*, **oi* (cf. Stang 1966, 52–60).

The way in which Petit presents the differences between East and West Baltic as well as the differences among the languages and their dialects belonging to either group is systematic and convenient. Much attention is paid to lexical differences, including cases where one of the languages has replaced an inherited word with a borrowing. Though this information is not particularly relevant to the subgrouping of Baltic, it is useful that the reader becomes acquainted with words belonging to the basic lexicon. Furthermore, Petit's etymologies of the inherited forms serve as an exercise in Baltic historical phonology. A real asset of the first chapter is the tables of Old Lithuanian and Old Latvian texts (pp. 42–44, 45).

The chapter on Baltic accentology begins with the introduction of a number of concepts relating to stress and tone which Petit has adopted from his compatriot Paul Garde (cf. Garde 1968). Then follows a description of the Latvian and Lithuanian prosodic systems and the various orthographical conventions one is bound to encounter. Alongside the traditional four Lithuanian accent paradigms, Petit offers his own classification, which involves a distinction between strong and weak morphemes (cf. Dybo 1968). The relationship between the Lithuanian and Latvian prosodic systems is an issue that is addressed on several occasions, for instance in connection with the North West Žemaitian system. In this chapter the historical element is never far off, as was to be expected.

Petit's decision to start with a description of Latvian prosody is unconventional, but cannot actually be faulted. On the other hand, the fact that the realization of the acute and the circumflex Standard Lithuanian is often considered to constitute a reversal of the original situation seems hardly a weighty argument in favour of Petit's order of presentation. It is difficult to understand the Latvian system with three tones without resorting to the Lithuanian accent paradigms. Then there is the question to what extent the Latvian tones continue an earlier stage. Petit correctly observes that the Latvian broken tone is the regular reflex of the acute in originally unstressed syllables, while the Žemaitian broken tone basically occurs in stressed syllables. He mentions the traditional view that the Latvian broken tone is an innovation (according to Endzelīns it originated from a retraction of the stress), but at the same time he realizes that it can hardly be a coincidence

that both in Latvian and Žemaitian we find a broken tone reflecting an original acute (p. 75), which to my mind is an understatement. The most logical solution is to assume that the Latvian and Žemaitian broken tones have the same origin, but were preserved under different circumstances, as has been argued by Kortlandt sinds the early seventies. Petit is close to accepting this, one feels (cf. p. 103), but here as well in his discussion of the Indo-European origins of Baltic prosody (see below) he does not seem eager to commit himself.

The section on Old Prussian accentuation (pp. 75–100) is comparatively long. In the last fifteen years quite a number of articles have been published on the subject. Petit discusses the evidence of the Enchiridion and presents his views on the various hypotheses that have been put forward. It appears that he subscribes to the classic view that the function of the macron is to designate stressed long monophthongs as well as falling (circumflex) and rising (acute) stressed diphthongs, in which the macron is on the first or the second element, respectively. He rejects Saussure's law for Old Prussian (p. 98), but adopts a neutral stance regarding Kortlandt's progressive stress shift from short syllable to the next (p. 84). Kortlandt's hypothesis that a double consonant indicates that the next vowel is stressed is rejected, the argument being that the use of double consonants is in fact a German orthographical convention to indicate a preceding short vowel (p. 79). These views are not incompatible, however. It should be noted that Kortlandt never claimed that double consonants were consciously used to mark the place of the stress (cf. Kortlandt 1999, 76) and that his (independently formulated) progressive shift is crucial to his interpretation. Interestingly, Kortlandt has recently argued that Old Prussian "had a quantitative but no tonal distinction in the vowel system" (2009, 267). In this view the old distinction between acute and circumflex is reflected in stressed diphthongs as a quantitative distinction, i.e. in originally circumflex diphthongs the first element is relatively long. Instances of an original diphthong with a macron on the second element, which are rare and often suspect, cannot be used as evidence. For a yet more sceptical view on the link between the use of the macron and prosodic distinctions I refer to Smoczyński (2005, 330–331).

Since it is clear that sequences containing a laryngeal yield an acute, the section on the Indo-European origins of the acute and the

circumflex (pp. 100–139) focuses on the eternal debate about the reflex of a lengthened grade. One of the circumstances that have made it difficult to reach a consensus on this point is that those who assume that the regular reflex is an acute tend not to adhere to Winter's law, which traces many acute long vowels back to a short vowel, and are more easily inclined to posit morphologically motivated long vowels. Petit, who is the author of a book on ablaut in Baltic (2004b), declares himself to be a supporter of Winter's law (p. 130). He is rightfully critical of acrostatic presents, i. e. athematic root presents with stressed lengthened grade in the singular and stressed full grade in the plural (pp. 130–131), which in Balto-Slavic amount to examples of circular reasoning, and other ill-founded instances of lengthened grade, such as the alleged vr̥ddhi in Lith. *várna* 'crow' or *vìlkė* 'she-wolf'. Nevertheless, he ultimately adopts an agnostic attitude (p. 139), merely stating that the endings of Lith. *akmuõ* 'stone', *vanduõ* 'water', *duktẽ* 'daughter' are in agreement with Kortlandt's view that morphological long vowels are circumflex in Baltic. This does not come as a complete surprise, as Petit's careful approach has considerably limited the evidence.

Understandably, Petit avoids tackling the intricacies of Slavic accentuation. In a discussion of the origin of Baltic prosody this is a huge concession, however. The examples of a Proto-Slavic rising acute and falling circumflex (p. 101), which suggest a direct correspondence that just is not there, may only lead the reader astray. Petit's choice to ignore Slavic prosody makes it impossible for him to do justice to Kortlandt's theory about the origin of the Balto-Slavic tones (p. 103), in which the quantitative distinction between original sequences of a vowel plus a laryngeal and lengthened grade vowels is essential. With the exception of certain definable cases, the former yield short vowels, the latter long vowels.

Since Old Prussian, unlike Lithuanian and Latvian, still had neuter substantives, a large part of the chapter on the neuter gender is devoted to West Baltic. That does not mean that the sections on East Baltic are insignificant. As in the case of Old Prussian, a lot of attention is paid to the function of neuter or originally neuter forms of adjectives and pronouns. As to the historical morphology, I agree with Petit that *-*a* continues the pronominal ending *-*od*, not an analogically created

NAsg. ending *-*o* (*pace* Agrell 1925–1926). In my view, however, it is not true that *-*an*, which is in fact OPr. -*an*, can be traced to PIE *-*om* without any problems (p. 199), as a Balto-Slavic stage *-*um* is a serious alternative (cf. Kortlandt 1983). Here again Petit chooses not to discuss the Slavic evidence in detail, which makes it hard to reach a conclusion. Even so, it seems unjustified that the Old Prussian ending -*on*, which to all appearances is the regular reflex of *-*um*, cf. *soūnon* Asg. 'son', is effectively ignored. I consider it plausible that the East Baltic NAsg. ending of neuter *o*-stems was *-*a*, to be directly compared with Slavic *-*o*. Furthermore, I consider it possible that the original Old Prussian nominal ending was -*a* as well, one of the reasons being that most neuter *o*-stems in this language correspond to Slavic neuters in -*o*, i.e. to old oxytone neuters (cf. Derksen 2009). With respect to the evidence from Finnic, I am not as sceptical as Petit, though I agree that it is not a straightforward matter. As to Latvian, I would like to add that original neuters with an acute root vowel and fixed stress elswehere in Balto-Slavic seem to have generalized broken tone and are therefore in this sense still recognizable as a class (Illič-Svityč 1963, 82).

According to its title, the fourth chapter deals with the semi-thematic flexion. As the author says right at the beginning, though, it is actually an introduction to the structure of the Baltic verbal system with special attention to a number of problems that are relevant to Indo-Europeanists. Petit first introduces the Lithuanian conjugations, drawing on Old Lithuanian texts for the athematic presents. Next he relates the overall less archaic Latvian conjugations to Lithuanian. The classification of the Old Prussian verbs is obviously more complicated. Various scholars have tackled this problem and Petit does not fail to acknowledge their contributions. The focus of his attention is on Smoczyński's classification, however (esp. Smoczyński 2005). The points of disagreement mentioned by Petit cannot be separated from his rejection of certain aspects of Smoczyński's interpretation of Old Prussian orthography (pp. 235–236).

In Petit's view, the Old Prussian situation is not in conflict with the East Baltic facts (pp. 241–242), for which reason a Proto-Baltic stage is deemed highly plausible. The subject of the second half of chapter four is the Indo-European foundations of the Baltic verbal system. Here

again we find discussions of the most relevant theories interspersed with Petit's own observations. With respect to the thematic class and semi-thematic classes, it is important that Petit endorses Jasanoff's hypothesis (2003, 60 fn.) that Baltic generalized the primary endings, which subsequently yielded a different reflex depending on the number of syllables of the verb form, e.g. **eiti* 'he goes, they go' vs. **veda-t(i) > *veda-(t) > *veda* 'he leads, they lead' (pp. 243, 247). Petit employs this idea to explain why an original athematic present **sak-ā-t(i)* acquired thematic endings in the singular, cf. Lith. *sakaũ* 'I say', where **-m < *-m(i)* was analogically replaced with **-ō > *-úo > -u*.

Petit (p. 250) attributes to Stang (1966, 376) and Kølln (1969, 63) the hypothesis that the Baltic *ā*-preterit was originally limited to intransitive formations, while the *ē*-preterit was limited to transitive formations. He subsequently argues that the origin of this situation must rather be sought in the formations that were ousted by the *ā*- and *ē*-preterits. This is actually no different from the view held by Stang and Kølln, cf. Stang (1966, 288), where it is clearly stated that the aforementioned situation is secondary. Next, Petit proposes a scenario which derives the *ē*-preterit from the sigmatic aorist as attested in Slavic, with heteroclitic thematic forms in the 1sg. and 2sg. This requires a number of analogical developments, starting with the lengthening of the thematic vowel in 2sg. **vedes* and 3sg. **vedet*. The development of the *ā*-preterit from the thematic aorist is explained by assuming generalization of the thematic vowel **a < *o* and analogical lengthening after the *ē*-preterit. In this way the *ā*- and *ē*-preterits are viewed as Baltic innovations, which implies that there is no connection between Lith. *vẽdė* 'he led, they led' and the Slavic imperfect *veděaxъ* 'I led', which have been assumed to reflect Balto-Slavic **vedē-* (cf. Stang 1966, 387). In my opinion, Petit's scenario is just as arbitrary as some of those he mentions on pp. 250–251.

Regarding the verbs in **-īti* with an *ā*-present, Petit (p. 257) is inclined to follow Stang (1966, 329) in assuming that the *ā*-present was first introduced in iterative verbs and then spread to the causatives. Since the semantic distinction is doubtful (cf. Kortlandt 1989, 106), I am sceptical about Petit's hypothesis that the iteratives replaced the *ja*-present because the latter was characteristic of transitive verbs. Overall Petit regards the semi-thematic flexion as a stage of the proc-

ess leading to the elimination of the athematic flexion, not as a flexion type inherited from Indo-European.

The final chapter (pp. 261–307) deals with clitics in Baltic, which is an original topic, in particular if it includes Old Prussian. Petit attempts to formulate placement rules for enclitics and proclitics separately, while drawing a comparison with other Indo-European languages, especially Slavic. Old Lithuanian texts feature prominently in this chapter. The author shows a special interest in tmesis, which in Baltic occurs in a remarkable number of contexts (pp. 305–306).

As mentioned above, this book is not an introduction to Baltic, but a collection of studies. On the other hand, the didactic element connected with the Indo-European summer school is unmistakable. Personally I find this not at all objectionable. The five chapters of the book are essentially careful and objective surveys of a number of issues of Baltic linguistics, which is in complete accordance with the aim of the book as formulated on the back cover, but they also contain to a greater or a lesser degree original research conducted by the author, thus justifying the title of the collection. We may therefore conclude that Petit achieves what he set out to do. This book is informative as well as an enjoyable read.

Rick Derksen
Boerhavelaan 100, NL-2334 ET Leiden
r.h.derksen@gmail.com

References

Agrell, Sigurd. 1925-1926. Zur Geschichte des indogermanischen Neutrums. *Bulletin de la société royale des lettres de Lund*, 17–64.

Derksen, Rick. 2011. The fate of the neuter *o*-stems in Balto-Slavic. In: Tijmen Pronk & Rick Derksen, eds., *Accent Matters. Papers on Balto-Slavic accentology* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 37). Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 59–66.

Dybo, Vladimir A. 1968. Akcentologija i slovoobrazovanie v slavjanskom. [Accentology and word formation in Slavic] In: *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie. vi Meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov. Praga, avgust 1968 g. Doklady sovetskoj delegacii*. Moskva: Nauka, 148–224.

Garde, Paul. 1968. *L'accent*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Girdenis, Aleksas. 1994. Žemaičių savarankiškos raidos pradžia. *Baltistica* 28:2, 5–20.
Illič-Svityč, Vladislav M. 1963. *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Sud'ba akcentuacionnyx paradigm.* Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk.
Jasanoff, Jay. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kølln, Herman. 1969. *Oppositions of voice in Greek, Slavic and Baltic* (Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 43:3). København: Munksgaard.
Kortlandt, Frederik. 1983. On final syllables in Slavic. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 11, 167–185.
Kortlandt, Frederik. 1989. Lithuanian *statýti* and related formations. *Baltistica* 25:2, 104–112
Kortlandt, Frederik. 1999. Double consonants in Old Prussian. *Res Balticae* 5*,* 75–80.
Kortlandt, Frederik. 2009. Old Prussian diphthongs. In: Frederik Kortlandt, *Baltica & Balto-Slavica* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 16). Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 265–267.
Petit, Daniel. 2004a. Les langues baltiques et la question balto-slave. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 26(2), 7–41.
Petit, Daniel. 2004b. *Apophonie et catégories grammaticales dans les langues baltiques*. Leuven: Peeters.
Smoczyński, Wojciech. 2005. *Lexikon der altpreussischen Verben* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 117). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
Stang, Christian S. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen.* Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
Zinkevičius, Zigmas. 2006. *Lietuvių tarmių kilmė.* Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.