

RICK DERKSEN. *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, vol. 13). Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2015. xii + 684 pages.

ISBN (13): 9789004278981

Reviewed by DANIEL PETIT, École Normale Supérieure, Paris

Writing an etymological dictionary requires two qualities: the author must have a good knowledge of the linguistic material and of the scholarly literature, and he must be able to present them from far enough away to make a sufficiently objective assessment of them without always putting his own opinions first. This is not an easy task for two reasons. First, decisions constantly have to be made regarding the degree of detailed information provided to the reader: should every word be discussed extensively both in its philological and in its etymological aspects? should its history be outlined briefly or developed in great detail? should the focus be put on its position within the language or on its prehistory? There are, in the etymological literature, different practices: whereas, for example, Ernout & Meillet (1932) focus on ‘word history’ (*histoire des mots*), other reference works such as De Vaan (2008) concentrate more on the Indo-European background. Each practice has its advantages and disadvantages, and there must be no question of disputing the usefulness of each of them. Second, an etymological dictionary has to decide to what extent the author’s opinions should take first place or be treated as objectively and impartially as his colleagues’ views are: whereas, for example, Karulis (1992) generally limits its ambition to referring to the state of debate, Smoczyński (2007) gives priority to the author’s own views. Each practice has a right to exist, the former being more objective, the latter more original. The important thing is that an etymological dictionary has to offer something useful and new to its reader, and it is from this perspective that we can assess the positive contribution of Rick Derksen’s recently published *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon* (hereafter: EDBIL).

As a preliminary remark, it may be recalled that Rick Derksen is one of the most talented Balticists of our time. His contributions to Baltic linguistics are of very high quality and testify to his familiarity with the three Baltic languages as well with their Balto-Slavonic and Indo-European background. His book on metatony in Baltic (1996) has become a

reference work and is widely used as a valuable source of guidance on a particularly intricate issue of Baltic accentology. More recently, Derksen has published an etymological dictionary of Slavonic (2008) in the same collection and with the same principles as the book under review. Derksen's works focus on historical phonology, with a strong emphasis on accentology and etymology. These personal interests are echoed in the *EDBIL*. In the introduction, the author presents in detail his views on stress and tone in Baltic and on their Balto-Slavonic prehistory (p. 5–26). One of the clearest merits of the dictionary is that the accentological information is always presented in a comprehensive way: even if the headwords are left unaccented, the author indicates for each of them the accent paradigm; accentual variants are also given carefully. These indications are very valuable if one thinks how casual and offhand Indo-Europeanists (including myself) can be when dealing with Balto-Slavonic accentual data.

A second preliminary remark is that the author was formed at the Dutch school of Indo-European linguistics (the so-called 'Leiden school'), which has occupied a very strong position in Indo-European linguistics over the last decades. As with every leading school, equipped with a ready-made body of doctrine, this offers the advantage of intellectual consistency in comparison with freelance scholars, but the risk is to introduce a certain degree of dogmatism. There is no doubt that we find in the *EDBIL* echoes of the Leiden doctrine, particularly of Frederik Kortlandt's reconstruction of Balto-Slavonic accentology (see Kortlandt 2009), but the author has developed his own views which are not always aligned with those of his masters. In any case, the reader must be aware of this Leiden coloration: once one agrees with its principle, one can get the most out of this book.

The *EDBIL* belongs to a collection of etymological dictionaries, the *Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series*, edited by Alexander Lubotsky since 2005 at Brill. More than the impact of the Leiden doctrine, the most important feature of this collection is that the dictionaries generally derive from databases created within the *Indo-European Etymological Dictionary* project (*IED*). As recognised by the author (p. 1), this origin 'is still apparent from the way the lemmata are structured'; as a matter of fact, most entries are very short, consisting of the lemma, its Indo-European reconstruction, its comparanda in the other Indo-European languages and a few additional comments. On the one hand, this can give the impression of a very dry, technical presentation and it is true that scholars accustomed to rhetorical formulations *à la française* can cringe at an ety-

mological dictionary limited to a collection of brief notices. But, on the other hand, this increases the value of the book as a reference tool, since the data are easily accessible and the information is not diluted in a long-winded commentary. Needless to say, as one might expect from a book like this, written by a renowned specialist, the Baltic data are perfectly reliable, based on first-hand standard works, and the same holds true for the Indo-European background. The Slavonic comparanda are fully mastered by the author, who has already written a valuable etymological dictionary of Proto-Slavonic.

The organisation of the book had to respond, from the outset, to a series of difficult questions. First, in comparison with Common Slavonic, which is an indisputable notion almost reachable shortly before the beginning of the written tradition, Common Baltic remains a very controversial issue. There is no doubt that the three documented Baltic languages (Lithuanian, Latvian, Old Prussian) share common features which point to common innovations in terms of Leskien's subgrouping principle, but, on the other hand, the reconstruction of a common proto-language is very problematic, considering the profound divergences between Old Prussian, the only representative of West Baltic, and Lithuanian-Latvian, the two representatives of East Baltic. In any case, lemmatisation of Common Baltic forms would have resulted in a series of internal contradictions. The choice made by the author is more practical and, in one sense, wiser: the *EDBIL* juxtaposes an etymological dictionary based on the Lithuanian lexicon (p. 43–525), another one based on Latvian (p. 526–554) and a third one based on Old Prussian (p. 555–567), with the principle that every Latvian or Old Prussian word that has a cognate in Lithuanian is discussed in the Lithuanian section; this explains why the Latvian and the Old Prussian sections are extremely short. The reviewer agrees with this choice, which treats Lithuanian as a 'default language' for Common Baltic, provided that this is only a pragmatic choice, with no claim to reflect any privileged position of Lithuanian within the Baltic family.

The structure of the lemmata, packed into limited space, could lead to pedagogical shortcuts, but the author generally adds useful linguistic comments which justify the reconstruction as it stands. For example, Lithuanian *jentė* 'husband's brother's wife' (p. 211) is presented with a variant *intė*, which, at first glance, could appear as a zero-grade ablaut variant, but the author rightfully indicates that its root vocalism is due to the typically East Lithuanian raising *\*en* > *\*in*. The derivation of Lith.

*irštva* ‘bear’s den’ from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>rtko-* ‘bear’ (p. 204) is well-argued and supported by interesting semantic analyses. In some cases, however, one could wish a little more information. For example, the acute tone of Lith. *bėrnas* ‘fellow, lad; hired worker; child, boy’ (p. 88) compared with the reconstruction of an *ani-*-prototype *\*b<sup>h</sup>er-no-* would have required some comment; it is probably an instance of *métatonie rude* (cf. Derksen 1996, 216). Similarly, the coexistence of Lith. *širdis* ‘heart’ (p. 448–449) and *šerdis* ‘core, kernel, pith’ (p. 443) should be problematised in terms of Indo-European ablaut; it seems that *širdis* reflects the PIE zero-grade oblique case *\*k<sub>1</sub>rd-* (cf. Hittite gen. sg. *kartiiaš*), whereas *šerdis* is based on the full-grade locative *\*kerd-* (cf. Hittite dat.-loc. sg. *kerti*), which is consistent with its semantic specialisation. Old Prussian *seyr* should also be added to the discussion. In sum, it is not surprising that the reader sometimes finds all s/he sought, but is sometimes left hungry: this is unavoidable in such a work and the author cannot be reproached for this. This results from the difficulty of weighing the amount of information necessary in an etymological dictionary. The author has generally chosen to give preference to conciseness, and this is a strategic choice which I find perfectly legitimate.

As already said, the author pays a lot of attention to historical phonology, particularly to accentology, somewhat less to morphology and to semantics. Not surprisingly, here and there the reviewer would have added more comments about word formation or meaning. For example, it is not sufficient simply to derive Lith. *ruduõ* ‘autumn’ from *rudas* ‘dark yellow’ (p. 384) without explaining that the nasal suffix *-uo, -en-* is probably a vestige of the more archaic designation *\*h<sub>1</sub>os-en-* (cf. Old Prussian *assanis*) and that the semantic development implies a syntagm ‘the reddish autumn, when leaves turn red’ (*\*rudas asen-* > *\*ruden-* with suffix transfer). Similarly, the morphological reconstruction of Lith. *mėnuo* ‘moon, month’ with all its inflectional variants should have required a more extensive discussion; I am thinking, in particular, of the dialectal variant *mėnas* and of its possible analysis as an archaic *\*-es/-os-stem* (*-as* from PIE *\*-os* vs. PIE *\*-es-* in the gen. sg. *mėnesio?*). The semantic divergence between Lith. *naudà* ‘use, profit, property’ and Latv. *naũda* ‘money’ (p. 330) could be semantically supported by the Old English cognate *nēat* ‘neat, cattle’ (and the parallel of Latin *pecus* : *pecūnia*). Lexical replacement is also a type of information that might have some place in an etymological dictionary: it is for example not completely irrelevant to note that Old Lith.

*jeknos* ‘liver’ (p. 211) was replaced in the modern language by *kėpenys*, derived from *kėpti* ‘to bake’ (just like Russian *pečén’* from *peč’*). Of course, it would be easy to imagine an ideal etymological dictionary with a full treatment of all parameters involved in the history and the prehistory of a word, but there is nothing inherently improper about the choice made by the author to concentrate on phonological issues. This choice is not always restrictive: in the EDBIL there are a lot of well-argued notes in which morphological and semantic evolutions are correctly described, e.g. Lith. *aukā* ‘sacrifice, victim, offering’ (p. 69), *gelumbė* ‘woolen cloth, wick’ (p. 170), *krósnis* ‘oven’ (p. 260), *mėsà* ‘flesh, meat’ (p. 312–313), *pelenāi* ‘ashes’ (p. 348–349), *stuomuō* ‘stature, figure, trunk, piece of linen for a shirt’ (p. 433), *tautà* ‘people’ (p. 461), among many others.

The treatment of the linguistic material in the EDBIL is very professional, and the forms can be used with confidence. Here again, the unrepentant philologist could sometimes expect more extensive developments. For example, the Old Lithuanian lexeme *krienas* ‘bride-price’ (p. 258) has a complicated philological background: first mentioned in a Latin source as *krieno* (Michalo Lituanius 1615, 28), it does not surface directly in any Old Lithuanian text, but its existence is confirmed by the Latvian cognate (Old Latvian *kreens* or *krene*). This fragmentary attestation is obviously due to the fact that *krienas* refers to an archaic custom, which could hardly find a place in the Old Lithuanian literature, mostly translated from Latin, German or Polish or at least created within a Christian context. Another addition that would be welcome in the EDBIL is a more complete treatment of the Baltic loanwords in the Balto-Fennic languages: whereas Lith. *šiėnas* ‘hay’ (p. 447) and *tiltas* ‘bridge’ (p. 466) are duly compared to Finnish *heinä*, Liv. *aina*, North Saami *suoidni*, resp. Finnish *silta*, one would wish to find the same information for Lith. *piemuō* ‘shepherd’ (p. 353) to be connected with Finnish *paimen* ‘id.’; cf. also Lith. *marti* ‘daughter-in-law, bride’ (p. 306) vs. Finnish *morsian* ‘id.’; Old Lith. *pėlūs* ‘chaff’ (p. 350) vs. Finnish *pelu* ‘id.’; Lith. *rātas* ‘wheel’ (p. 376) vs. Finnish *ratas* ‘id.’; Lith. *sėmuō* ‘flaxseed, seed, sowing’ (p. 393) vs. Finnish *siemen* ‘id.’. The semantic discussion about Lith. *salà* ‘island’ / East Lith. ‘village’ (p. 387) is incomplete without Finnish *salu* ‘island’. Note also the absence of Old Prussian *panno* ‘fire’ (p. 562), for which one should mention the Finnish loanword *panu*. Whether these details belong in an etymological dictionary or not, is a matter of taste; it depends on where the author moves the cursor and which kind of book s/he intends to write.

An etymological dictionary has a strong bibliographical component, since it is expected to summarise an existing body of secondary literature. It is usual for a reviewer to point to omissions in the bibliographical references, and I could easily find here and there a few pages that could have been mentioned by the author, but I do not want to go along with this game. Generally speaking, the *EDBIL* is well-informed and refers quite fairly to colleagues' works. Not surprisingly, the literature belonging to, or deriving from, the Leiden school is better treated, but the author displays a good knowledge of the extra-Leiden literature as well and refers to it fairly and professionally. References to the works of our Lithuanian and Latvian colleagues are also mentioned. As it stands, the *EDBIL* is thus a major reference tool, allowing easy access to the rich Baltological literature.

Indo-European etymology is generally presented in a summarised form in the *EDBIL*. The result of this presentation is that theoretical options of the Leiden school or of the author himself are taken for granted and consequently used in the dictionary without any discussion of alternative options. This is not in itself wrong, since an etymological dictionary is not necessarily the place where fundamental choices have to be put on the table. The reader is supposed to know the basic tenets of the Leiden school and to accept to operate with them. The reviewer shares a lot of his concerns with the Leiden school, but is very much attached to freedom of thought. It comes as no surprise that one can sometimes disagree with the author's views; that is part of the game. For example, it is well known that the Leiden school rejects the existence of a vowel *\*a* in Indo-European and systematically ascribes words with *a* to substratum influence (see p. 14 and the more balanced presentation given on p. 27–28). Sometimes this can lead to the use of 'overlaryngealistic' reconstructions in order to avoid positing a vowel *\*a*. The risk of circularity is evident. I find it doubtful that Lith. *žąsis* 'goose' goes back to *\*ǵʰh₂ens-* (p. 515); *\*ǵʰh₂ens-* is only a means to avoid a reconstruction *\*ǵʰans-*, but the morphemic structure of the word gains nothing from this reconstruction. Winter's law (Winter 1978) is another controversial issue: the author adheres to the view that, in the prehistory of Balto-Slavonic, short vowels were lengthened before voiced stops (analysed as glottalic stops) and consequently mentions Winter's law to account for unexpected long acute vowels, see e.g. Lith. *údra* 'otter' compared with Gr. *ὕδρα* 'watersnake' (p. 477). The reviewer agrees with this option, but thinks that alternative explanations should also be referred to, if only briefly, considering their broad diffu-

sion in the scholarly community (see e.g. the treatment of the issue in LIV<sup>2</sup>2001): I agree with the author that Lith. *ésti* ‘to eat (of animals)’ is a good example of Winter’s law (p. 157–158), but the alternative explanation through a Narten-formation *\*h<sub>1</sub>éd-* / *\*h<sub>1</sub>éd-*, propagated by LIV<sup>2</sup>2001, s.v. *\*h<sub>1</sub>ed-* ‘beissen, essen’) on the basis of Hitt. *ēdmi*, Lat. *ēsse* and indirectly Arm. *owtem* ‘to eat’, should be mentioned as well: there is nothing more rewarding than treating with scrupulous respect opinions that we do not agree with. Another example: the short vowel of Lith. *būtas* ‘flat, (dial.) house’, Old Prussian *buttan* ‘house’, is considered ‘problematic’ (p. 107) in contrast with the long vowel of the verb *būti* ‘to be’. This is indeed a nice honest admission. The author mentions briefly the existence of a short vowel in Old Irish *both* ‘hut’ (< *\*b<sup>h</sup>ūtā*). Whereas the Old Irish short vowel can be due, according to the author, to the evolution of *\*Hu* in pretonic position (if from *\*b<sup>h</sup>h<sub>2</sub>u-téh<sub>2</sub>*, following the Leiden-style reconstruction), this cannot be extended to Balto-Slavonic, where such pretonic shortening is not attested. It would be, of course, quite uneconomical to analyse Baltic *\*būtas*, *-tā* as a Celtic borrowing (as does Hock in ALEW 2015, I 153) or to treat the Celtic word itself as ‘borrowed from some unknown language’ (as argued by Matasović 2009, 85). There is another solution, based on an internal analogy: on the model of *\*stā-ti-* vs. *\*stā-ta-* (ultimately from *\*steh<sub>2</sub>-* vs. *\*sth<sub>2</sub>-*) a new ablaut was created in *\*bū-ti-* vs. X (X = *\*bū-ta-*). The same process explains the Greek couple *ἔφυν* ‘I grew, I became, I was’ vs. *φῦτός* ‘grown’, by analogy to *ἔστην* (*ἔστᾱν*) ‘I stood’ vs. *στᾱτός* ‘placed, standing’. In Celtic, *\*b<sup>h</sup>ūtā* (Old Irish *both* ‘hut’) could owe its short vowel to the prehistoric influence of the verb *\*b<sup>h</sup>ūje/o-* (Old Irish *büid* ‘is wont to be’); and finally Old Icelandicic *búð* ‘house, residence’, sometimes added to the file, is inseparable from the verb *búa* ‘to live in (wohnen)’.

A close reading of the dictionary can give rise to a wide range of detailed comments, but I am not sure that a review is the right place to develop them in length and breadth. Just one observation will serve as an example of the type of discussion that can be carried out within the framework of a scientific dialogue with the author. It proves how very interested I was in reading this book.

Lith. *ugnis* ‘fire’ (p. 478) is notoriously a difficult word and has not yet received a satisfactory explanation. There are two problems. The first problem is the vocalism *u* in comparison with *o* in Slavonic (Old Church Slavonic *ognь*); Sanskrit *a* (in *agní-*) and Latin *i* (in *ignis*) may receive various explanations. The second problem is the absence of the effect of

Winter's law. The author adheres to Kortlandt's analysis (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 37, 66), who reconstructs *\*ungnis*, 'where *\*-ngn-* blocked the operation of Winter's law', and admits that the first nasal was 'lost as a result of dissimilation'. In Slavonic, the author says, *\*un* was lowered to *\*on* 'before a tautosyllabic stop'. The prototype *\*ungnis* is then traced back to PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>ngʷ-ni-*, which could also be the source both of Sanskrit *agní-* and Latin *ignis* (if from *\*ingnis*). This scenario has much to recommend it, but problems still remain. If Czech *výheň* 'forge, hearth' (< *\*ūgnj-*) belongs to the same source, one gets the impression that Winter's law did operate at the Balto-Slavonic stage, but was secondarily eliminated, which seems to be quite difficult to reconcile with Kortlandt's blocking rule. The lowering process assumed for Slavonic (*\*un* > *\*on*) is likewise somewhat hard to swallow. In fact, both the vocalic variation and the effect of Winter's law appear as random and unpredictable as in the inherited word for 'water', where (1) we find both *u* and *o* and (2) where Winter's law operates in Baltic, but not in Slavonic: compare Latv. *ûdens* vs. Lith. *vanduo* (< Baltic *\*ūnd-* vs. *\*vānd-*) and Old Church Slavonic *voda* (< *\*uod-*). This comparison could be part of the solution. In the word for 'water', the *u* / *o* variation reflects the *membra disjecta* of a PIE ablauting paradigm (zero grade *\*ud-* vs. full grade *\*uod-*). One could argue that the pattern reflected by *\*ūnd-* vs. *\*vōnd-* 'water' was analogically imitated by its antonym *\*ū(n)gn-* vs. *\*ō(n)gn-* 'fire'; analogical influences between antonyms are no rarity (cf. Latin *mortuus* 'dead' after *ūiuus* 'alive'). The directionality of the analogy remains to be determined, and the varying effects of Winter's law are still unexplained, but I think that this analogical pattern can have played a role in the prehistory of Lith. *ugnīs* and Old Church Slavonic *ognь*. Going further, it is striking that we find a similar variation in two couples of words belonging to the same semantic sphere ('water, river, stream' on the one hand) or to the antonymic domain ('fire' on the other hand): Lith. *ùpė* vs. Old Pr. *ape* 'river'; Czech *pyř* 'ashes' (< *\*pūr-*) vs. Old Pr. *panno* 'fire': the same analogy could have been at work here as well. Murky areas still remain in this scenario, however, and the final word has not yet been spoken on this issue.

The distinctive feature of a good book is to find its readership and to stand the test of time. It is clear that the *EDBIL* will soon become a reference book, useful to more than one generation of Balticists. The author should be congratulated for having written an excellent work in a time which is so unfavourable to research in the humanities and mistreats so much

those who practise it. We may only hope that Rick Derksen will continue to enrich the area of Baltic studies by further works of the same quality.

**Daniel Petit**

*École normale supérieure*  
*Centre d'études anciennes*  
 45, rue d'Ulm, F-75005 Paris  
*École pratique des hautes études*  
*Section des sciences historiques et philologiques*  
 46, rue de Lille, F-75007 Paris  
 daniel.petit@ens.fr

**REFERENCES**

- DERKSEN, RICK. 1996. *Metatony in Baltic*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- DERKSEN, RICK. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- DE VAAN, MICHIEL. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- ERNOUT, ALFRED & ANTOINE MEILLET. 1932. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- HOCK, WOLFGANG *et al.* 2015. *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (ALEW)*. Hamburg: Baar.
- KARULIS, KONSTANTĪNS. 1992. *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*. Rīga: Avots.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2009. *Baltica & Balto-Slavica*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- LITUANUS, MICHALO. 1615. *De moribus Tartarorum, Lituatorum et Moschorum fragmina*. Basel: Grasser.
- MATASOVIĆ, RANKO. 2009. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- RIX, HELMUT *et al.* 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben (LIV)*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH. 2007. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas.
- WINTER, WERNER. 1978. The distribution of short and long vowels in stems of the type Lith. *ésti* : *vèsti* : *mèsti* and OCS *jasti* : *vesti* : *mesti* in Baltic and Slavic Languages. In: Jacek Fisiak, ed., *Recent Developments in Historical Phonology*. Mouton: The Hague, 431–446.

AXEL HOLVOET & NICOLE NAU, eds., *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*. (Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic, vol. 1) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2014. vii + 370 p.  
ISBN 9789027259097 (hardback), ISBN 9789027270399 (e-book)

Reviewed by ANDREJ L. MALCHUKOV, Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz & Institute for Linguistic Research, Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg

The volume under review deals with various aspects of non-canonical argument marking, grammatical relations and argument alternations in Baltic languages. The volume is a gold mine both for typologists interested in grammatical relations as well as for the students of Baltic languages. Since the reviewer is a typologist rather than a specialist in Baltic languages, in my review I will focus on some aspects which are of general typological interest.

The introductory chapter “Argument marking and grammatical relations in Baltic: An overview” (pp. 1–41) by Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau introduces major topics addressed in the volume as well as individual volume contributions. In terms of size and content it is more substantial than usual introductions to edited volumes and may count as a separate research article. The topics covered include: noncanonical subjects and objects in Baltic languages; differential case marking (in particular, the genitive-accusative alternation) across Baltic; syntactic subject properties of oblique subjects and non-canonical marking of arguments. All these topics are addressed from a contrastive perspective; in particular, the authors put to good use available parallel corpora of Lithuanian and Latvian. Along the way, the authors raise a number of topics of general interest, including the distinction between differential and non-canonical marking: indeed these are overlapping concepts, which are sometimes used indiscriminately. Another controversial question addressed (in particular, with regard to the patterns of pain-verbs) is whether the patterns with non-canonical subjects (A) and objects (O) qualify as transitive or intransitive (“extended intransitive” in the terminology of R.M.W. Dixon). One aspect which one would have wished to see more highlighted in this otherwise very instructive discussion is a diachronic outlook. Indeed, what looks synchronically like noncanonical marking of As and Os, diachroni-

cally, often represents intermediate stages of construction reanalysis (e.g. transitive to intransitive reanalysis of transimpersonals, as described in Malchukov & Ogawa 2011, or reanalysis of object experiencers into subject experiencers, as described in Haspelmath 2001). Apart from that, the editors do an excellent job in outlining research questions, laying a conceptual framework, as well as briefly introducing the contributions to the volume.

The volume opens with Peter Arkadiev's chapter "Case and word order in Lithuanian infinitival clauses revisited" (pp. 43–95). Arkadiev, who is better known as a typologist, here adopts a generative framework, which must be partly due to the fact that his analysis takes the minimalist account of Franks and Lavine (2006) as its starting point. Yet, the paper has a pronounced typological outlook in that the author takes inspiration from a typological comparison with Australian languages like Kayardild featuring case-stacking in the form of "complementizing" and "associating" case marking (Evans 1995). The construction under discussion is unusual in that the rules of object assignment with infinitives differ from verbs in a matrix clause: instead of accusative the object of the infinitive may appear in nominative, genitive or dative. Such variation, unattested in this form in matrix clauses, is indeed puzzling and in need of explanation. (One may, however, note in passing that nominative marking is reminiscent of emergence of the unmarked object in subjectless contexts in Finnish, while genitive and dative marking of objects is reminiscent of antipassive constructions in Australian languages, which—like infinitive/supine constructions—are often associated with incomplete/irrealis/future contexts). After presenting Franks & Lavine's movement analysis of case assignment in infinitival clauses, the author raises a number of empirical and conceptual problems with this account. His critique is substantial, and evidence against the proposed analysis is solid (also informed by the corpus data). Instead, he proposes an account informed by the analysis of multiple case-marking in languages like Kayardild. In essence, Arkadiev proposes that the dative and genitive cases are assigned by some higher heads to the verb phrase containing the object of the Infinitive and then percolate to its constituents (ending up on the object). The analysis is interesting and certainly an improvement as compared to earlier generative treatments. One may add that it is also in line with a typological observation that infinitives frequently originate from case-marked verbal nouns (Haspelmath 1989). It would be interesting to

compare the author's generative account and its predictions with Nordlinger's (1998) influential "Constructive Case" approach to multiple case marking (couched in Lexical Functional Grammar). One aspect, which I am missing in this otherwise excellent paper, is a diachronic dimension: the origin of the constructions in Lithuanian is not explained in detail, although the diachronic scenario could also inform synchronic analyses of whatever persuasion.<sup>1</sup>

The next chapter, by Axel Holvoet and Marta Grzybowska (pp. 97–135), is an in-depth study of non-canonical grammatical relations in the Latvian debitive construction. The aim of the paper is to account for the pattern of grammatical relations with the debitive, an inflectional form of the Latvian verb expressing necessity. The authors argue that the debitive construction displays what they call "diffuse grammatical relations". The debitive construction of the type *Man jā-dzer ūden-s* [1SG.DAT DEB-drink water-NOM] 'I must drink water' is unusual in that it shows non-canonical argument marking with the A in the dative, and the O in the nominative (or accusative, if the O is a 1st or 2nd person or reflexive pronoun). The authors show that some of the subjecthood tests (like control) cannot be applied here (for lack of nonfinite forms of the debitive), while the results of some other tests (such as conjunction reduction) are inconclusive. Moreover, those tests which can be applied (like reflexivization), raise a more general question, whether the purported subjecthood diagnostics do not diagnose topics rather than subjects (p. 119). As far as I am aware, this issue in its general form remains unresolved in typology, as it is related to the question of cross-linguistic comparability of constructions used as diagnostics and, in a broader perspective, to the hotly debated distinction between language-particular categories vs. cross-linguistic concepts (Haspelmath 2010). The authors further propose to regard Dative experiencers as 'demoted subjects' (an analysis inspired by Relational Grammar), and explain their subject properties by a higher rank on the 'obliqueness hierarchy'.<sup>2</sup> In effect, this means that the demoted subject-experiencer outranks the object in prominence. What can account for the diffuseness of grammatical relations in these structures? The authors warn

---

<sup>1</sup> But see another recent publication by Arkadiev (Arkadiev 2013), which does address diachronic issues.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the terminology used in the paper is somewhat unconventional; thus what the authors call an obliqueness hierarchy is usually called an argument hierarchy or prominence hierarchy.

against simplistic diachronic explanations and propose instead that grammatical diffuseness “reflects obliqueness adjustments”, whose “purpose is to bring the hierarchical ordering of cases in accordance with syntactic obliqueness when an obliqueness mismatch occurs” (p. 127). Given that ‘obliqueness adjustment’ refers to realignment of grammatical relations with the prominence hierarchies, this explanation is not at variance with the diachronic explanation, as far as I can see.

The next chapter “Alternations in argument realization and problematic cases of subjecthood in Lithuanian” (pp. 137–180) by Kristina Lenartaitė-Gotaučiienė discusses the “swarm-alternation” in Lithuanian from a Construction Grammar perspective. The “swarm-alternation” is well known from English (cf. *Bees swarm in the garden* ~ *The garden swarms with bees*), but is also attested in Lithuanian (cf. *Filharmonij-oje knibždėjo įvairiausi-ų žmoniai-ų*. [philharmonic-LOC.SG swarm.PST.3 various-GEN.PL people-GEN.PL] ‘All kinds of people were swarming in the concert hall.’ ~ *Filharmonij-a knibždėjo (nuo) įvairiausi-ų žmoni-ų*. [philharmonic-NOM.SG swarm.PST.3 (with) various-GEN.PL people-GEN.PL] ‘The concert hall was swarming with all kinds of people.’). The author provides a detailed description of discourse-functional and semantic restrictions on the use of the “swarm-alternation”. In particular, she shows that five different semantic classes of verbs take part in this alternation in Lithuanian (p. 144): 1) verbs denoting (multidirectional) movement of entities or substances (e.g., *knibždėti* ‘teem, swarm’); 2) verbs denoting sound emission (e.g., *skambėti* ‘sound, resound’); 3) verbs denoting light emission (e.g., *spindėti* ‘shine, glow’); 4) verbs denoting smell emission (e.g., *kvepėti* ‘smell, scent’); 5) verbs with the prefix *pri-*, denoting massive (usually directed) movement to some location (e.g., *privažiuoti* ‘arrive massively’). Especially illuminating is a contrastive discussion of verb classes in Lithuanian, as compared with other European languages (English, but—less systematically—also other languages, like Dutch, Russian, German, Czech). This comparison reveals similarities but also some differences and raises a question of what motivates cross-linguistic variation in this domain. The variation seems to be partially due to structural factors: as the author observes, more liberal use of the “swarm-alternation” in Lithuanian may be due to its use with prefixed verbs; in fact, the verbs with the prefix *pri-* (*pribėgti* ‘flow in, run (about liquid)’ and the like) constitute the largest class of verbs in Lithuanian participating in this alternation. On the other hand, cross-linguistic similarities are semantically conditioned; thus

the author takes up a suggestion by Elena V. Padučeva (2007) that explains why olfactory perception (like *kvepėti* ‘smell, scent’ in Lithuanian and *paxnut* ‘smell’ in Russian) take part in this alternation while verbs of visual perception do not (p. 157). The author also discusses the syntactic status of arguments within the “*swarm*-constructions” concluding that “in neither variant of the Lithuanian *swarm*-alternation can either of the two arguments be considered a prototypical subject, i.e., be said to display properties on the lexical (semantic), grammatical, and discourse levels of representation that are typical of a prototypical subject”. While this observation is valid, in my view, it would be more profitable to distinguish between functional vs. syntactic properties more clearly and study the influence of the former on the latter rather than placing all these properties on a par (cf. Malchukov & Ogawa 2011). Yet, in general, this is an interesting empirical study which hopefully will be pursued more systematically in later work, as part of a wider program of contrastive analysis of argument alternations across Baltic languages.

The chapter by Rolandas Mikulskas “*Subjecthood in specificational copular constructions in Lithuanian*” (pp. 181–206) discusses specificational constructions like *Varžyb-ų nugalėtojas yra Jon-as*. [race-GEN.PL winner-NOM.SG be.prs.3 John-NOM.SG] ‘The winner of the race is John’, which are frequently considered to be an inverted variant of the more common type of predicative copular constructions (cf. *Jon-as yra varžyb-ų nugalėtojas* [John-NOM.SG be.prs.3 race-GEN.PL winner-NOM.SG] ‘John is the winner of the race’). A kind of inversion analysis is also adopted by mainstream generative accounts, which rely on movement to derive specificational constructions. The author argues convincingly against the movement-based generative accounts, but also notes some problems for the Cognitive Grammar accounts of specificational constructions. In particular, Cognitive Grammar accounts have difficulties in explaining cross-linguistic variation in these structures. Indeed, while languages like English (but also Danish, Swedish and French) treat the first nominal in specificational copular construction as the grammatical subject (for purposes of verb agreement), other languages including Lithuanian and Russian (but also Italian and German) assign subject properties (in particular, control of verb agreement) to the second nominal. On the Cognitive Grammar approach, this is unexpected on the assumption that Trajector and Landmark should be given consistent morphosyntactic expression across languages (with the Trajector mapping to subject). This also raises the question of

what is at the heart of the attested variation between languages in that domain. The author briefly considers (in footnote 15 on p. 195) a suggestion relating the possibility of having a postcopular subject to the freedom of word order (possibility of “scrambling”), but discards it pointing to some counterexamples (thus, Faroese generally disallows scrambling, like English, but shows variable agreement in specificational structures). Yet, it seems that this connection deserves further consideration, as it offers a straightforward functional explanation for the attested pattern. From a typological perspective, a single counterexample can’t falsify a statistical generalization, but of course care should be taken to offer more typological evidence for the purported correlation from a broader range of languages.

Nicole Nau deals in her chapter (pp. 207–255) with Differential Object Marking (DOM) in Latgalian, a close relative to Latvian, which in some respects shows similarities to Lithuanian. The author offers a comprehensive analysis of differential argument marking based on corpus research, and thus makes a valuable contribution to documentation of this endangered idiom. The author covers a wide range of topics ranging from instances where DOM is morphologically conditioned (in particular, patterns of accusative-genitive syncretism in pronouns), to those where case variation is conditioned syntactically (by the context of negation and in irrealis clauses), as well as intermediate situations (such as accusative/partitive alternation with mass nouns). The analysis is typologically informed; for example, in discussion of bivalent intransitive verbs taking a genitive object (such as *meklēt* ‘look for’), the author notes that distribution of the semantic classes of bivalent transitive and bivalent intransitive (genitive-assigning) verbs is at variance with the one-dimensional version of Tsunoda’s (1985) Transitivity Hierarchy. In conclusion the author presents interesting discussion of DOM in Latgalian in a contrastive perspective, comparing the attested patterns of differential argument marking to other Baltic languages as well as to Russian. The analysis is insightful and suggestive, but leaves the reader wishing that this contrastive perspective could be pursued more systematically (e.g., by providing parallel data from the other Baltic languages for the Latgalian patterns summarized in Table 7 on p. 250), which would hopefully help to uncover the role of genealogical and areal factors in convergent patterns.

Ilja Seržant in his chapter (“The independent partitive genitive in Lithuanian”, pp. 257–299) looks more specifically at the accusative-par-

titive alternation in Lithuanian. The author starts by introducing a theoretical assumption that constructions with the partitive genitive (of the type *Nusipirkau pien-o* [buy.PST.1SG milk-GEN.SG] ‘I bought (some) milk.’) involve an implicit quantifier, which implies an indefinite quantity and is responsible for case assignment. Usually the quantifier is left implicit, but it may also be overtly coded on the verb with prefixes with quantificational force (cf. *Pri-važiavo žmonė-u* [QUANT-drive.PST.3 people-GEN.PL] ‘There have arrived a lot of people.’). He further proceeds to an interesting discussion of aspectual composition, i.e. interaction of object marking with aspectual properties of the verb. This interaction is familiar from both Finnic and Slavic languages, but manifests itself in different ways. In Finnish, for example, it leads to aspectual contrasts (with the partitive associated with imperfective uses, and the accusative with perfective), while in Russian the partitive genitive is blocked in imperfective contexts altogether. In Lithuanian the situation is more complex and seems to be in a way intermediate between the Slavic and the Finnic patterns. As the author shows, the partitive genitive is used more freely in Lithuanian than in Russian; in particular, it can also be used when the object is bounded. The discussion is interesting and typologically informed and the data is subtle, yet, sometimes the discussion might have been clearer and more systematic. Thus one wishes that key notions such as ‘boundedness’ (also ‘bounded indeterminate’, ‘bounded determinate’, etc.) could be more clearly defined and provided with diagnostic contexts. Once this is done they can be applied across languages and can help to pinpoint similarities and divergences between languages. Introducing the tables comparing Lithuanian to Finnish (on p. 287) is certainly a step in the right direction, but it should have been accompanied with more explanation and also cross-referencing to the examples exemplifying the relevant contexts.

The last chapter by Björn Wiemer and Valgerður Bjarnadóttir “On the non-canonical marking of the highest-ranking argument in Lithuanian and Icelandic: Steps toward a database” (pp. 301–361) takes up a systematic contrastive perspective which I also advocated above. The choice of the two languages partially reflects the expertise of the authors, but is also due to the fact that Icelandic is famous for its non-canonical subject marking, and thus provides a suitable backdrop for the presentation of the Lithuanian data. The authors note that the analysis of the corresponding Lithuanian pattern in terms of noncanonical subject marking is controversial, as the respective arguments do not pass many subjecthood tests. This

also explains the choice of terminology: the terminology ('highest ranking argument') is adopted from Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) (Van Valin 2005 *passim*) and has the advantage that the authors do not commit themselves to the claim that they are dealing with non-canonical subjects. The authors explicitly present their study as a progress report on a project aiming at comprehensive contrastive treatment of valency patterns in Icelandic and Lithuanian, an ambitious enterprise which also envisages constructing a database of valency patterns in the two languages. In this regard the project follows up on two recent typological projects dealing with verbal valency, the project on bivalent valency patterns based in St. Petersburg (see, e.g., Say 2014), and the recently completed project on valency classes at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, which produced an edited volume (Malchukov & Comrie 2015) as well as a database (Hartmann, Haspelmath & Taylor 2013). Even though the results of the contrastive study of Lithuanian and Icelandic are preliminary, the study has already produced some interesting outcomes. As the authors show, although both languages display non-canonical argument marking, the patterns are somewhat different (see the statistical data summarized in the charts on pp. 326–329). Thus, Icelandic features dative marking on subjects more extensively than Lithuanian, while Lithuanian marks the highest-ranking argument by accusative instead (showing a preference for object experiencer verbs). A possibly correlated difference is that Lithuanian has a more developed class of physiological verbs than Icelandic, while Icelandic features some other verb classes licensing non-canonical subjects (in particular, "fructitive verbs", the name the authors use for verbs like 'manage' and 'fail'). The data is fascinating and the discussion is insightful, bridging the fields of syntactic and lexical typology, and inquiring to what extent semantics of individual verbs (and verb classes) is responsible for deviant case marking. Unfortunately, again the outlook is predominantly synchronic, and diachronic aspects are not sufficiently addressed: in particular, the authors do not relate the accusative-experiencer constructions (or oblique ambitransitives in Icelandic for that matter) to the transimpersonals scenario (i.e. reanalysis of transitive impersonals to experiencer subject constructions giving rise to oblique subjects and quasi-subjects at intermediate stages) which has been well documented across languages (Malchukov 2008: Malchukov & Ogawa 2011).

As is clear from the discussion above, the volume under review is a

valuable contribution to both Baltic studies (including language documentation, as in the chapter by Nau), and to general linguistics, and, in particular, to language typology. The thoroughness of the individual contributions makes Baltic languages some of the best investigated in the domain of argument marking. My only wish is that in follow-up studies<sup>3</sup> this research will be pursued in a more systematic manner (also through the use of questionnaires, which allow researchers to pool together all the wealth of interesting novel observations). Such systematic studies might start with the contrastive perspective (along the lines of research reported by Wiemer & Bjarnadóttir), and then be expanded to other Baltic languages, in order to create a cross-linguistic database, which can be used to inform areal typology, contact research and historical studies. A related issue already mentioned in relation to several contributions is that complementing a predominantly synchronic perspective with a diachronic outlook would be highly welcome, as it also helps to integrate the results of individual studies into a larger picture.

Overall, this is an excellent collection of papers, which makes Baltic languages among the most thoroughly investigated in the domain of grammatical relations. The discussion of non-canonical marking of subjects and objects in Baltic, as well as of related issues of diffuseness of grammatical relations, argument alternations, differential case marking and impersonal constructions, will inform the future typological and theoretical studies in this domain.

**Andrej Malchukov**

*Johannes Gutenberg-Universität*

*General Linguistics/Language Typology*

*Jakob-Welder-Weg 18, D-55128 Mainz*

*malchuko@uni-mainz.de*

---

<sup>3</sup> It is worth noting that the volume under review is part of an ambitious project on grammatical relations in Baltic languages coordinated by Axel Holvoet, whose results will appear in the series *Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic*. This project does a great service to both typological linguists as well as to specialists in Baltic languages by bringing these two research communities together. A related effort aimed at a junior audience to be mentioned in this connection is the yearly Summer School at Salos (Northeastern Lithuania) organized by Axel Holvoet and Gina Kavaliūnaitė-Holvoet since 2004, which is a forum promoting interdisciplinary approaches to Baltic languages, including descriptive, typological, historical, theoretical and corpus studies, to name a few.

## REFERENCES

- ARKADIEV, PETER. 2013. Marking of subjects and objects in Lithuanian non-finite clauses: A typological and diachronic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 17.3, 397–437
- EVANS, NICHOLAS. 1995. *A Grammar of Kayardild*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- FRANKS, STEPHEN & JAMES E. LAVINE. 2006. Case and word order in Lithuanian. *Journal of Linguistics* 42.1, 239–288.
- HARTMANN, IREN, MARTIN HASPELMATH & BRADLEY TAYLOR, eds., 2013. *Valency Patterns Leipzig*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at <http://valpal.info>.)
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 1989. From purposive to infinitive—a universal path of grammaticalization. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10.1–2, 287–310.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2001. Non-canonical marking of core arguments in European languages. In : Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, Robert M. W. Dixon & Masayuki Onishi, eds., *Non-Canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects* [Typological Studies in Language, 46], 53–83. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in cross-linguistic studies. *Language* 86.3, 663–687.
- MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ. 2008. Split intransitives, experiencer objects and ‘transimpersonal’ constructions: (re-) establishing the connection. In: Mark Donohue & Søren Wichmann, eds., *The Typology of Semantic Alignment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 76–101.
- MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ & BERNARD COMRIE, eds., 2015. *Valency Classes in the World’s Languages*. 2 vols. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ & AKIO OGAWA. 2011. Towards a typology of impersonal constructions. A semantic map approach. In: Anna Siewierska & Andrej Malchukov, eds., *Impersonal Constructions*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 19–57.
- NORDLINGER, RACHEL. 1998. *Constructive Case: Evidence from Australian Languages*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- PADUČEVA, ELENA V. 2007. Genitiv otricanija i nabljudatel’ v glagolax tipa *zvenet’* i *paxnut’* [Genitive of negation and Observer with verbs of the type *zvenet’* and *paxnut’*]. [http://lexicograph.ruslang.ru/TextPdf1/paxnut\\_2007.pdf](http://lexicograph.ruslang.ru/TextPdf1/paxnut_2007.pdf)

- SAY, SERGEJ. 2014. Bivalent verb classes in the languages of Europe: A quantitative typological study. *Language Dynamics and Change* 4, 116–166.
- TSUNODA, TAsAKU. 1985. Remarks on transitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 21.2, 385–396.
- VAN VALIN, ROBERT D. 2005. *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.