

PETER ARKADIEV, AXEL HOLVOET, BJÖRN WIEMER, eds., *Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics*. (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs, 276.) Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2015. viii + 554 pp.

ISBN 978-3-11-034376-2

Reviewed by NICOLE NAU, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

Twenty-five years have passed since the Iron Curtain was raised. Latvian and Lithuanian regained their status as national languages of independent European states and have become more visible on the international stage, and contacts between linguists from East and West have intensified. This may be a good time to reflect where Baltic linguistics is standing now, what has been achieved and what lies ahead. However, changes take time and beginnings may be slow. Only in recent years have we witnessed an increase of interest and scholarly activities regarding the Baltic languages, and for today's audience it may be more worthwhile to watch what is going on than to ponder over results. This volume provides an excellent opportunity to do so, presenting 13 individual studies by an international cast. They are preceded by an introductory article by the editors which has the length of a small monograph and is probably the most comprehensive overview of the state of the art of Baltic linguistics that has ever been written.

The first half of this review will be devoted to the introductory article. As I am on very friendly terms with the editors, I feel compelled to review their work extra critically.¹

Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet and Björn Wiemer: Introduction: Baltic linguistics—State of the art

With 109 pages (of which 34 pages include references and 4 pages summaries of the contributions to the volume), this chapter goes far beyond the usual introduction to a collective volume and rather stands on its own. Its goals are (i) to give a critical overview of the existing literature on topics concerning the systems of the modern Baltic languages, (ii) to present

¹ Although my name is mentioned in the acknowledgments of the introduction, I have contributed next to nothing to its content and never commented on a draft version as a whole.

some basic facts about Lithuanian, Latvian, and Latgalian structures, and (iii) to point out research results as well as fields of future research that should be of special interest to general linguists and language typologists. The article quite clearly addresses readers with no or little knowledge of Baltic languages, and the authors' mission is to show

why the Baltic languages are not to be dismissed as, on the one hand, only another tiny group of European languages (and thus not exotic enough from a global perspective), and yet, on the other hand, too obscure and hardly accessible in order to be worth labor (and thus too exotic on a European background) (p. 1).

The article impresses with a wealth of information, especially on existing research (it partly reads like an annotated bibliography), and will certainly be of great use to anybody interested in this research, including experienced scholars of Baltic languages like myself. However, I wonder whether the authors have not been too ambitious in their endeavor to cover as much as possible. Often interesting issues are touched upon only superficially and readers with no background in Baltic linguistics may not always get the point (I will give some examples below). The very long bibliography is in contrast to the authors' constant complaint that there is too little research on a given topic. Their negative attitude is sometimes too pessimistic – they tend to see the empty space and not the liquid in a bottle that is half full. Still more disturbing is their habit to include personal judgements in their reviews, dismissing some work or approach as outdated (the reader can get the impression that *traditional*, *structuralist*, or *Neogrammarian* approaches are their favorite enemies) or Soviet-style. As these labels are given without further explication and there is no space for a detailed argumentation, such judgments are out of place.

The paper begins with Section 1 “General outfit of the Baltic languages”, which contains a sketch of the genealogy and two short subsections on sources for the study of Baltic languages, the first about grammars and handbooks, the second about corpora. In the genealogical tree on page 3, the Latvian branch is divided into High Latvian, which divides into “Selonian” and “Latgalian” (this is common in Latvian dialectology) and Low Latvian, which further divides into “Curonian” and “Semigalian” (this is not). It is not clear whether this tree is meant to reflect the historical development or the current situation. In the text (p. 2) two more varieties—Tamian and Livonian dialects—are mentioned (leaving the reader won-

dering where these belong), and three paragraphs later (p. 3) the reader is informed that there is a “so-called central dialect (*vidus dialekts*)” which “comprises the dialects of Vidzeme [...], and those of Kurzeme (Courland) and Zemgale (Semigalia)”, while “Low Latvian also comprises the so-called Livonian (*libiskais*) dialect”. In short, the description of Latvian dialects is confusing.

Section 1.2 on handbooks and grammars includes some of those that the authors judge outdated and ideologically biased, so why not include some of the more famous grammars of the 19th century (Schleicher, Bielenstein)? The updated English edition of Dini’s book (Dini 2014) had probably appeared too late to be included, which is a pity as it will be certainly of use to more readers than the Italian, Lithuanian, or Latvian editions.² For Latgalian, Cibulš & Leikuma (2003) is missing, although it is much more up-to-date, easily accessible and more accurate than Bukšs & Placinskis (1973). In section 1.3 the authors make the laudable effort to inform readers about existing corpora. There are some errors in the description of the Latvian corpora. First, there is not one, but several versions of what they call “The Corpus of Contemporary Latvian” (which may be the reason why its size is not mentioned on the website—it can be found in each individual corpus when opening it). One, millions-2.0m, containing 3.5 million tokens, has been automatically annotated, but the one with 4.5 million tokens (LVK2013) has not. Not mentioned is the corpus timeklis-1.0, which has been compiled from Internet resources and contains about 97 million tokens, of which a part, about 60 million word-forms, has been annotated.

Section 2 “Description of structural levels” (pp. 6–46) is the longest and most detailed part of the introduction, and it shows the authors’ vast knowledge of the language systems and of relevant research. Though they cannot fully avoid the usual Lithuanian bias, they try very hard to get Latvian out of its role as the poor cousin and even report as much as they could find about Latgalian. The major subsections (on phonology, nominal inflectional morphology, verbal inflectional morphology, derivational morphology, syntax of simple sentences, complex sentences) start with remarks about the Baltic languages in general and continue with details first on Lithuanian and then on Latvian and Latgalian. This principle is

² Especially as it is freely available on the Internet at: http://www.esparama.lt/es_parama_pletra/failai/ESFproduktai/2014_Foundations_of_Baltic_Languages.pdf

not always strictly followed (sometimes peculiar Lithuanian phenomena are already treated in the general section, and vice versa—to a certain extent this may be inevitable), and sometimes comparable phenomena in Lithuanian and Latvian are described at different places and not connected with each other. For example, the peculiar Latvian evidential form in *-ot* is described in section 2.3.2.2 (p. 27), while in section 2.3.2.4 (p. 31) on the evidential the authors state “Only Lithuanian has developed a second device of marking evidentiality” (referring to the peculiar Lithuanian forms in *-ma/-ta*). Another example is the separate treatment of possessive perfects: the peculiar Lithuanian HAVE-perfect (a construction with *turėti* ‘have’ and active anteriority participles) is mentioned on page 30, while the Latvian possessive perfect (with a dative possessor and a past passive participle) is described on page 43, and no connection is made.³ This reflects the fact that in Baltic linguistics, synchronic contrastive analyses of Latvian and Lithuanian are still unusual. Sometimes the authors shortly state some difference between Latvian and Lithuanian, but fail to make their point clear. For example, in the section on participles (p. 28) we read: “In Lithuanian, the inventory tends toward symmetry in terms of voice distinctions, while in Latvian and Latgalian, such a symmetry is lacking.” As Latvian has an active and a passive participle in present and past tense, I do not understand what the authors mean by lack of symmetry in the inventory. In the description of verbal derivational morphology the authors create the impression that Lithuanian has a lot of derivational suffixes while Latvian does not.⁴ But then (p. 37) they name exactly two productive suffixes in Lithuanian (*elė/er(ė)* and *(d)inė*), both of which have a parallel in Latvian (*elē* and *in(ā)*), of which we hear nothing. Instead, we are given the information that “Latvian has lost most of its productive derivational suffixation, the only exclusion being causative suffixes. Instead, it has developed a rich inventory of ‘verbal particles’ [...]” (p. 36) – which may lead readers to the idea that the ‘verbal particles’ in Latvian have the same functions as the derivational suffixes in Lithuanian (of which we get to know only *elė/er(ė)* and *(d)inė*), which is

³ I also noted that the mention of the Latvian construction, though explicitly called “a kind of possessive perfect”, has not been indexed. The index has only an entry “have-perfect (Lithuanian)”.

⁴ Section 2.4 Derivational morphology deals almost exclusively with verbal derivational morphology; nominal derivation is only touched upon in one paragraph (for Lithuanian) and a single reference (for Latvian).

not the case. The mentioned ‘verbal particles’ in Latvian were described before (p. 33, using the label ‘adverb’) as a peculiar Latvian means to form the imperfective aspect (“perfective verbs with spatial prefixes have exact imperfective counterparts in the form of phrasal verbs containing adverbs semantically corresponding to the prefix in combination with the simple verb”). There are no examples of Lithuanian verbs with suffixes expressing imperfective aspect, and I wonder whether the authors really wanted to say that the counterpart of a Latvian construction “simple verb + adverb” in Lithuanian is a verb with derivational suffix (if so, they should have given examples). What is more, the idea that in Latvian there is a grammatical opposition imperfective (simple verb with adverb) vs. perfective (prefixed verb) is not uncontroversial. It has been rather uncritically passed on in grammars since Endzelins’ time, but I do not know of any solid empirical investigation of the matter. On the contrary, ongoing research on the use of the adverbs/particles in construction with a verb (by Daiki Horiguchi or Antra Kalnača) reveals that the postulated imperfectivizing function is at best marginal.

The whole section is written in a very concise manner and a reader not familiar with the Baltic languages may wish for more examples, especially in the description of verbal morphology and its functions. The formation of tense and mood forms is shown for each language (including Latgalian) in a table, which facilitates a comparison—and would have done so even more if cognate verbs had been chosen and the segmentation of forms explained. In the tables showing nominal declension forms are not segmented at all; here as well cognate example words would have been an advantage. Nominal morphology is less problematic in Baltic than verbal morphology, and so is its description in this chapter. A few points may have been made clearer, such as the intriguing question of nouns inflecting for gender (p. 14) or the statement that in Latvian case distinctions have retreated in the plural (p. 18).⁵

The subsections on Lithuanian and Latvian phonology differ in an interesting way: for Lithuanian, we get a rich list of references for various issues in phonology, but we do not get much information about the phonology itself (apart from charts showing the phoneme inventory). The section on Latvian is more informative in this respect, maybe just

⁵ I don’t understand what this refers to—maybe the syncretism of NOM and ACC for feminine nouns? But the reference given is to an article about local cases.

because there is less literature on it. For example, in the Latvian section the authors give the following description: “Like Lithuanian, Latvian has a system of syllable accents, traditionally referred to as intonations; rather than being purely tonal, they involve a cluster of features including tone, length, and glottalization” (p. 10). This is concise and very clear. In the preceding subsection on Lithuanian, on the other hand, the reader will find it very hard to understand what (phonetically) stands behind “the so-called syllable intonations (often somewhat misleadingly called “tones”)” (p. 7). We are told in passing that the “view that Lithuanian has a tonal opposition” is inadequate (p. 8)—but why could someone hold such a view, and why is it inadequate? Maybe for the authors these questions are trivial, but for a reader it is unsatisfying to be informed what is wrong without being told what is right (and why).

The section on syntax starts with the already familiar complaint about lack of research and outdated sources, but then goes on to report about a not so insignificant number of studies on various topics ranging from case functions and grammatical relations to clause combining, comprising synchronic and diachronic perspectives. The authors could thus have been more optimistic, especially since a wealth of studies has been carried out only in recent years, others being in progress. The most recent work is not always cited, probably due to the fact that the introduction was written earlier, which is usual for such volumes. For example, none of the studies by Bjarnadóttir on non-canonical case-marking in Lithuanian (compiled in Bjarnadóttir 2014) is mentioned. Regarding the beginnings of Latvian syntax, the authors rightly give justice to Kārlis Milenbahs (while ignoring Bielenstein 1863), but fail to give a reference to Milenbahs’ work.

Section 3 “Semantics and pragmatics” includes quite diverse topics, such as lexicography, function words, and means of stance-taking in discourse. It is less well structured than Section 2 and the selection of topics and references is less well founded. There is nothing on onomastics, which is a popular field of research in the Baltic countries, and very little about research on special vocabulary such as slang. In the section on lexicography, the authors rightly point out that “the normative character” of the main Latvian dictionaries compiled in the second half of the 20th century “leads to exclusion of large parts of the lexicon, such as loanwords considered undesirable, much of the colloquial vocabulary etc.” (p. 51). At this point they may have mentioned that this gap is filled by the very useful dictionary of slang (Bušs & Ernstsone 2006), which con-

tains just such words with etymology and authentic examples. Phonetic information, which is not given in the big dictionaries of modern Latvian, can be found in Ceplītis *et al.* (1995). On the whole, the strength of Latvian lexicography lies rather in smaller specialized dictionaries than in the “big projects”, for which financial as well as human resources have been lacking since the end of the Soviet times (which in this respect were more beneficial for long-time projects). Modern technology offers new possibilities, which benefit dictionary compilers as well as dictionary users; for example, at the portal *tezaurus.lv* words can be searched across various lexicographic sources. The sub-sections on pronouns and that on function words may have better been placed into Section 2, especially as the authors do not have that much to say about both topics. In the small sub-section on function words, almost half of the space is taken up by a discussion of this notion, which seems out of place and is not very helpful. Then there is a small paragraph about prepositions in Lithuanian (but not Latvian, ignoring Nītiņa 1978 and other work), and two paragraphs about particles. When it comes to the expression of stance by parentheticals and other means, the authors report about work on Lithuanian but state that they do not know of similar work on Latvian. This is curious, as in their bibliography they do have Chojnicka (2012) (to which they refer once, and a bit misleadingly, in another subsection, p. 53).

In Section 4 “Aspects of areality” and Section 5 “More from the perspective of typology”, the authors take another look at the study of Baltic languages from two special perspectives. These sections will be most welcome to linguists who may be less interested in particular details as given in Sections 2 and 3, but curious about what the Baltic languages have to offer for areal linguistics and language typology. Section 4 first includes a short overview of work carried out in Latvian and Lithuanian dialectology. I missed a reference to Bielenstein (1892), who in his pioneering study of Latvia’s linguistic geography was the first to speak of “isoglosses”. The remainder of the section is devoted to a nice discussion of selected phenomena that have been, or still are, the subject of contact-linguistic investigations. Slightly confusing is the description of Polish-Lithuanian contacts—something is missing in the last paragraph on page 58, whose first sentence includes an *either* that is never followed by an *or*. Section 5 starts with general remarks about the peripheral role Baltic languages have played in language typology (a complaint I am ready to join in) and a short overview of work where they have not been ignored.

However, the mere inclusion of a Baltic language in typological studies is not yet a success, as shown by a very interesting list of features with a wrong classification of Latvian in WALS. It is to be hoped that this list will inspire more scholars of Baltic languages to share their knowledge with language typologists, and the latter to consult more seriously with experts of Latvian and Lithuanian. To encourage such collaboration is clearly one of the missions of this introduction, and section 5.2 “Typologically outstanding features and rarities” may be read as another teaser.⁶ Section 6 “Paradoxes and conclusions” was probably meant as the prosecution of this mission by other means, but I doubt that it will reach this goal. This section is a culmination of the lamentations about the insufficiency of Baltic linguistics (and Baltic linguists) familiar from sections 2 and 3. I do not think that this kind of dispraise is in any way helpful, and would have much preferred another way of ending, continuing the positive, encouraging attitude displayed in sections 4 and 5 (and parts of previous sections).

To conclude: This state-of-the-art report is a very rich source of references on the systems of contemporary Baltic languages as well as a source of inspiration for further studies that will be of interest both within and beyond the circle of Baltic linguistics. I fully subscribe to the authors’ mission of spreading knowledge on Latgalian, Latvian, and Lithuanian in the wider world of linguistics and of encouraging new approaches to the study of these languages. However, I think that a disdain of the tradition(s) in which many Balticists have been raised is uncalled-for, especially when no arguments are given why a particular approach is better or worse than others.

Individual studies

If the introductory chapter just reviewed has overwhelmed the reader by the amount of phenomena mentioned (sometimes too briefly), the thirteen chapters that follow present welcome in-depth studies of selected phenomena. The range of topics allows insights into different parts of the language systems, and the individual authors offer discussions from vari-

⁶ There is one unfortunate misprint in the middle of page 66, speaking of Latvian postpositions (instead of prepositions). Not only are prepositions much more common in Latvian than postpositions, but the generalization of the dative in the plural affects only prepositions, while postpositions are used with the genitive in both singular and plural.

ous perspectives: those of formal and functional linguistics, language history, language contact, linguistic typology, and first language acquisition.

The contributions are not divided into groups, but I found their arrangement very felicitous and the proceeding from one to the next seems natural and logical. Another welcome fact is that related topics are treated by more than one author, using different approaches or choosing different languages. As usual in volumes on Baltic languages, most papers deal with Lithuanian, a fact that the editors explicitly regret but could not avoid. Only two papers (Holvoet and Horiguchi) focus on Latvian, two further papers (Daugavet and Seržant) consider both Latvian and Lithuanian, while the remaining nine are devoted to Lithuanian with occasional glances at other languages.

The first two contributions deal with suprasegmental phonology from an areal and diachronic perspective. Tonal shifts, lengthening and shortening of syllables, and related phenomena in Baltic dialects have puzzled researchers since the 19th century. Hans Henrich Hock (“Prosody and dialectology of tonal shifts in Lithuanian and their implications”) and Anna Daugavet (“The lengthening of the first component of Lithuanian diphthongs in an areal perspective”) discuss such phenomena from a modern perspective. Hock investigates what happens to pitch properties in Lithuanian dialects when a final vowel is lost or when word accent (ictus) is retracted from the final to a preceding syllable. His account embeds the Lithuanian data in research on cross-linguistically observable finality effects. In a final outlook he suggests similar analyses for Latvian data, challenging the often-supposed relevance of a Finnic substratum for the development of word-initial accent in Latvian. Daugavet starts with the observation that the “so-called tonal contrasts” in contemporary Lithuanian may “turn out to be no more than a peculiar pronunciation of some diphthongs that has little to do with pitch” (139)—thus elucidating the nebulous allusions in the editors’ introductory chapter that I have criticized above. What is traditionally called the “acute accent” describes a situation where the first component of a diphthong is half-long and the second is short, while “circumflex accent” means that the first component is short and the second is lengthened. Daugavet uncovers the processes that have led to this situation, comparing them with similar phenomena not only in Latvian, but also in Livonian. The chapter is rich in details and not always easy to follow, at least for a non-specialist. Sometimes I got

lost and did not understand to which variety and what historical period the author was referring at a given point.

The following two papers concern diminutives, a salient feature of Baltic derivational morphology that can be fruitfully investigated from many different angles. Ineta Dabašinskienė and Maria Voeikova (“Diminutives in spoken Lithuanian and Russian: Pragmatic functions and structural properties”) give insights into a broad range of formal and functional features of diminutives, comparing not only two different languages, Lithuanian and Russian, but also several functional varieties: child speech and child-directed speech, pet-directed speech, informal and formal conversations among adults. In my eyes, this is a bit too much for a single article and I wished the authors had instead investigated fewer aspects in more detail. Another problem with this paper is that the sources of data and the methods of data-collection are not entirely clear. The only reference given for the source of Lithuanian data is the corpus of Lithuanian spoken language at <http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/sakytines-kalbos-tekstynas>, but I checked several of the examples and did not find any of them there. The data from child language and child-directed speech are probably taken from earlier work by the authors, but the origin of most other examples is obscure, especially as they appear a bit too neat to stem from real conversations without editing. Furthermore, in order to understand the function of diminutives in conversation, isolated sentences are not enough. The paper thus shows that a lot of empirical work on Lithuanian diminutives is still to be done (the same is true for Latvian, of course)—and it gives many useful suggestions for such future work and its importance both for the study of Lithuanian morphology in use and for the cross-linguistic study of diminutives. One bold and very interesting thesis that the authors put forward after their comparison of Lithuanian and Russian is that “Russian diminutives are stored in the mental lexicon as a whole, whereas Lithuanian ones are produced online during the conversation” (p. 228). This thesis and its implications for the place of diminutives in the language systems is surely worth further investigation.

Daiki Horiguchi (“Latvian attenuative *pa*-verbs in comparison with diminutives”) takes nominal diminutives and their typical functions as one of the starting points in his investigations of Latvian verbs with the prefix *pa*-. In the attenuative reading these verbs denote actions completed to a weak degree or with a weak intensity, such as *pa-lasīt* ‘read a little’. In addition—just as nominal diminutives—attenuative verbs may mark the

speaker's attitude and evaluation of events. A difference is that diminutives are often used predominantly or solely for such pragmatic reasons, while verbs with *pa-* often retain what Horiguchi calls "their objective side", that is, the meaning of weak degree. Furthermore, attenuative meaning is often fused with delimitative meaning (duration for a limited time). The paper also discusses the relation of *pa-*verbs with different aspectual meanings to perfective aspect. It is thus a welcome contribution to the study of aspect and Aktionsart in Latvian, especially as it is based on real data and does not start with a ready theory modelled after Slavic languages (or Russian in particular). In my view, it is time to complement the old and still not fully answered question "is there a category of verbal aspect (as in Slavic languages) in Latvian and how is it expressed?" by the question "what are the various functions of verbal prefixes in spoken and written Latvian texts?"

Correlations between aspect and tense, and differences between the verbal systems of Russian and Lithuanian, are dealt with in Eiko Sakurai's investigation of the "Past habitual tense in Lithuanian". The chapter is 50 pages long and partly reads more like an abridged monograph than a particular study for a collective volume. However, readers interested in the subject will surely appreciate its comprehensiveness. The author discusses several approaches to the place of "habitual" with regard to the categories of tense and aspect, and to imperfective aspect in particular. For an empirical investigation of the Lithuanian past habitual tense as opposed to the simple past tense, Sakurai discusses results of a questionnaire research carried out in 2008–2009. In the study, 282 native speakers of Lithuanian evaluated the correctness/naturalness of sentences with various tense forms. I missed information about the amount of questions asked and the source of the examples. I understood that the sentences were constructed by the author, partly based on examples from the literature. This allows her to test the acceptability of pairs of sentences differing only in the tense form, the choice of verb (for example, telic or atelic), or the inclusion of certain adverbs. The results shed new light on the meaning and of this peculiar Lithuanian verbal form and its place in the tense-aspect system of Lithuanian—as mentioned in the editors' introduction (p. 23), Lithuanian is the only European language with an inflectional form for past habitual.

One area of grammar that has received special attention in recent years—in Baltic linguistics as well as in linguistics in general—is the so-

called non-canonical realization of core arguments of the clause. This was one of the foci of the international project *Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic*, carried out under the direction of Axel Holvoet at Vilnius University during the years 2012–2015. The volume under review contains three articles written by participants of this project:⁷ Cori Anderson: “Non-canonical case patterns in Lithuanian”, Axel Holvoet: “Non-canonical subjects in Latvian: An obliqueness-based approach”, and Ilja Seržant: “Dative experiencer constructions as a Circum-Baltic isogloss”.

Anderson’s chapter is the only one in the volume based on an explicit formal framework. Her aim is to show that the distinction between inherent and structural case in standard Minimalist Syntax is not fully adequate and that there are several types of non-structural case. Her argumentation is based on the analysis of three Lithuanian constructions where an argument marked with the instrumental, the dative, or the genitive is treated like an argument for which the theory predicts accusative marking: “oblique” passivization, direct objects in purpose infinitive clauses, and case alternation between accusative and instrumental. The chapter is well written and comprehensible also to the non-specialist in formal syntax. I cannot judge whether her argumentation will have an impact on revisions of Minimalist Syntax, but at least it should convince theoretical linguists that Lithuanian is worth closer studying.

The chapters by Holvoet and Seržant both deal with constructions where a dative argument has a prominent role (“quasi-subject”). Both combine diachronic and synchronic perspectives to make sense of the current situation in Baltic languages. And thirdly, both suggest new ways of analyzing data and present interesting general ideas, however without undertaking systematic empirical investigations. Holvoet deals with three different clause patterns with a dative quasi-subject and proposes to base their analysis on the complex notion of obliqueness. The dative quasi-subject is the least oblique argument in these constructions, while the other argument (marked nominative, genitive, or accusative) is understood as a demoted intransitive subject. Seržant studies constructions with dative experiencers in Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Finnish, and Russian. He concludes that the patterns in individual languages—what-

⁷ The chapters reviewed here were not part of the project, and in fact had already been written or were in progress when the project started.

ever their ultimate origin—have been adapted to, and now display, an areal pattern that stands out against other languages. Another common interesting fact (explicitly stated by Seržant, but also visible in Holvoet’s chapter) is that certain small groups of verbs, or even individual verbs, have their own variant of a common pattern. This may be a good starting point for further work, especially for broader and more systematic empirical studies.

Lexical groups and subgroups play a major role in Nijolė Maskaliūnienė’s chapter on “Morphological, syntactic, and semantic types of converse verbs in Lithuanian”. This paper stands in the tradition of Emma Geniušienė, one of the few linguists having made substantial contributions to linguistic typology based on analyses of Baltic data. The author distinguishes different types of converse relations in a broad understanding, including not only pairs with mutual entailment (such as ‘follow’ ~ ‘precede’), but also those denoting situations which may be separated in space and time and where the second does not necessarily follow from the first (such as ‘send’ ~ ‘receive’). She then proceeds to a detailed description of morphological, syntactic, and semantic aspects of such pairs of verbs.

Aurelija Usonienė’s contribution (“Non-morphological realizations of evidentiality: The case of parenthetical elements in Lithuanian”) is part of her ongoing research on the expression of evidentiality and epistemic modality in contemporary Lithuanian. The chapter focuses on lexical items that originate in nouns and verbs used as complement taking predicates, such as *matyt* ‘evidently’ (truncated infinitive of *matyti* ‘see’), *žinoma* ‘certainly’ (impersonal passive participle of *žinoti* ‘know’), or *tiesa* ‘actually’ (nominative singular of *tiesa* ‘truth’). These words have become adverbs or particles and can be used parenthetically to express indirect evidentiality. Based on a thorough investigation of two corpora of written Lithuanian (academic texts and fiction), Usonienė discusses frequencies, semantics, and syntactic properties of these words in their use as parentheticals. This is the only chapter of the volume presenting results of corpus-driven research and hopefully will encourage others to follow in this line. It shows that, despite some shortcomings mentioned in the editors’ introduction (p. 5)—the most important being insufficient annotation—the currently available corpora of Lithuanian do allow the investigation of a number of nontrivial phenomena in various registers of written Lithuanian. The corpus of spoken Lithuanian will hopefully grow in the future, as its current size is too small for quantitative analyses. This

became evident in the study of diminutives by Ineta Dabašinskienė and Maria Voeikova reviewed above.

The next item on our wish list would be a corpus of Lithuanian dialects. Such a corpus would allow linguists to explore the language beyond the standard variety in much more efficient ways. As it is, we must rely on time-consuming manual work (reading through printed transcriptions and excerpting examples) or make do with isolated examples from dictionaries and dialect descriptions. Kirill Kozhanov took such labor upon himself to explore “Lithuanian indefinite pronouns in contact”. Standard Lithuanian has a large inventory of means to express the various functions of indefinite pronouns, which have been distinguished and arranged in a semantic map by Martin Haspelmath (1997). Most Lithuanian indefinite pronouns consist of a general indefinite/interrogative pronoun combined with a special marker of indefiniteness. In Lithuanian dialects, as Kozhanov notes, fewer indefinite markers are used than in the standard variety, and the bare pronoun series has more functions. In addition, dialects which have been in close contact with Slavic languages show a number of material and semantic borrowings, which Kozhanov discusses in detail. This chapter is a source of inspiration for further areal studies, both within Lithuanian dialects and across language borders.

The last topic to be treated in the volume is an especially intriguing one: the Baltic type of ideophones, a class of lexemes called *ištiktukai* in Lithuanian, translated most conveniently as *eventives*. These lexemes are explored from different perspectives by two authors. Andrii Danylenko (“The chicken or the egg? Onomatopoeic particles and verbs in Baltic and Slavic”) studies the intricate question of the historical relationship between eventives (such as Lithuanian *brakš* or *brakšt* ‘crackle!’) and verbs with the same root (Lith. *brakštelėti* ‘to crackle a little bit’). Comparing eventives and other words with onomatopoeic roots in the Baltic and Slavic languages and investigating their formal and semantic characteristics, Danylenko concludes that in Lithuanian as well as in Slavic languages the particles are derived from verbs. Bernhard Wälchli’s contribution (“*Ištiktukai* ‘eventives’—The Baltic precursors of ideophones and why they remain unknown in typology”) is written from multiple perspectives, which are very fruitfully combined and reconciled. Wälchli uncovers the main characteristics and functions of Lithuanian eventives with comprehensive examples from a 19th century narrative text and shows that they are well in line with ideophones in African languages which are

better known in linguistic typology. He further shows that Neogrammarian linguists such as August Leskien and Alfred Senn were well aware of the existence of this outstanding lexical class and their adequate descriptions were published already early in the 20th century. Nevertheless, for a number of reasons which Wälchli points out very accurately, Lithuanian eventives have been largely ignored in current linguistic typology, while Lithuanian philologists tend to ignore the parallels in other languages. There is a lot to be learned from this chapter, in terms of facts as well as approach.

The volume has been carefully edited; the amount of misprints and technical errors is just the usual one. As usual, some are a bit annoying, for example, the label “Lithuanian” is missing in example (6) on p. 338, which makes the sentence look like a variant of Latvian. The editors evidently have also tried to standardize the morpheme glossing of examples, which however still shows various inconsistencies, even within one chapter. More thoughts could have been given to the use of quotation marks and italics for technical terms, which is inconsistent and sometimes strange—just to give two examples from one chapter: “semantic palatalization” and “semantic” palatalization (p. 532), “eventives” and ‘eventives’ (p. 524).

Given that many chapters are thematically linked to others, a bit more cross-references would have been welcome. A subject index at the end of the book partly compensates for this lack. Finally, I note that the chapters do not have abstracts, so for quick information the reader has to use the summaries given in the editors’ introduction.

In sum, this is a very valuable volume with a wealth of information about structures of Baltic languages and how they can be researched. It hopefully will find its way into the libraries of linguists of various persuasions.

Nicole Nau

Adam Mickiewicz University

Institute of Linguistics

al. Niepodległości 4, PL-61-874 Poznań

naunicol@amu.edu.pl

<http://naunicol-e.home.amu.edu.pl/>

REFERENCES

- BIELLENSTEIN, AUGUST. 1863. *Lettische Grammatik*. Mitau: Fr. Lucas' Buchhandlung.
- BIELLENSTEIN, AUGUST. 1892. *Die Grenzen des lettischen Volksstammes und der lettischen Sprache in der Gegenwart und im 13. Jahrhundert*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- BJARNADÓTTIR, VALGERÐUR. 2014. *Non-canonical case-marking on core arguments in Lithuanian. A historical and contrastive perspective*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Stockholm Studies in Baltic Languages 9. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- BUKŠS, M[IKĒLIS] & JURIS PLACINSKIS. 1973. *Latgaļu volūdas gramatika un pareizrakstības vārdnīca*. [Second edition] [München:] Latgalischer Verlag Vl. Locis.
- BUŠS, OJĀRS & ERNSTSONE, VINETA. 2006. *Latviešu valodas slenga vārdnīca*. Rīga: Norden AB.
- CEPLĪTIS, L., A. MIKELSONE, T. PORĪTE, & S. RAĢE. 1995. *Latviešu valodas pareizrakstības un pareizrūnas vārdnīca*. Rīga: Avots.
- CHOJNICKA, JOANNA. 2012. *Linguistic markers of stance in Latvian parliamentary debates*. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- CIBUŠS, JURIS & LIDIJA LEIKUMA. 2003. *Vasals! Latgaliešu valodas mācība*. [Rīga:] n.i.m.s.
- DINI, PIETRO. 2014. *Foundations of Baltic languages*. English translation by Milda B. Richardson and Robert E. Richardson. Vilnius: Vilnius University.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- NĪTIŅA, DAINA. 1978. *Prievārdu sistēma latviešu rakstu valoda*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- WALS = DRYER, MATTHEW & MARTIN HASPELMATH, eds. 2013. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. Available at: <http://wals.info/>