

RECENZIJOS

Wojciech Szmoczyński, **Laringalų teorija ir lietuvių kalba**, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2006, 292.

As A. Holvoet points out in the preface (p. 9) the laryngeal theory has long ago abandoned the status of a revolutionary theory to become generally accepted as part of our picture of the Indo-European phonemic system. In addition, although controversy remains concerning their exact phonetic nature and their reflexes in some specific environments, there is general agreement concerning their number (three laryngeals, neither more nor less) and most of their reflexes in the daughter languages.

While this holds true for the mainstream of Indo-European studies, laryngeals often keep some of their mystery among non-specialists. Myths like the notion that laryngeals were lost “very early” and can, accordingly, be left aside in studies of, say, Baltic comparative linguistics are still widely held. This is an error, as the divergent reflexes of the laryngeals in most environments make it clear that their loss was a process carried out independently by every branch of the family – a process that in some cases demonstrably postdates other specific sound changes.

Closer home, the laryngeal theory is still far from being generally accepted in Lithuania and its usage, when this is done, is not up to modern standards. This is a pity, as serious work in comparative linguistics is being done in this country and scholars currently working on these languages would benefit enormously from a more up to date knowledge of comparative Indo-European linguistics, where laryngeals play an important role.

Against this background, the publication of this monograph by Prof. W. Szmoczyński (S.), who has contributed a number of relevant studies to the reflexes of the laryngeals in Baltic and Slavic (2001, 248-252; 2003a; 2003b, 171-224), is specially welcome. Although its main focus is on Lithuanian, S. has very reasonably included material from the other Baltic languages and from Slavic as well, even in cases where it is absent from Lithuanian.

The book is based on a series of lectures held in the linguist’s summer-school at Salos in 2004. It offers a relatively complete introduction to the laryngeal theory (13-86), followed by a survey of its reflexes in Baltic (and Slavic) (87-217). The book is completed with a bibliography (219-226), a list of abbreviations (227-233), and a list of words

(235-292). Being written in Lithuanian, in part it serves a pedagogical goal. It follows from this general purpose that this monograph is not intended to be a comprehensive treatment of the laryngeals in Balto-Slavic in the line of Beekes (1969) for Greek or Schrijver (1991) for Latin. This remains a major desideratum for the future. The coverage of data, although ample, is not exhaustive, but rather of an illustrative character. In addition, as it is for the most part S.'s practice (this has also been criticized in Fec ht's review of S.'s *Hiat laryngalny*, 2006, 157), there is very little proper discussion of problematic cases or alternative views. As a result, generally accepted laryngeal developments and etymologies are not always clearly distinguished from controversial issues and hazardous etymologies. Fortunately, the former largely outnumber the latter, so the book can still be recommended as a reliable presentation of the laryngeals and their reflexes in Balto-Slavic.

The presentation of the laryngeal theory is adequate and up to modern standards. Practically all relevant phenomena that should have been included are conveniently presented and exemplified.

S. has probably made the correct choice in limiting himself to a presentation of the currently standard doctrine, simply passing in silence alternative views concerning the number of laryngeals and proposals concerning their reflexes in particular environments that have not

met with general approval. Nevertheless, a critical discussion could have been of some use for non-specialists that may easily go astray in this area of research. In this respect, it would have been useful to extend the history of the laryngeal theory (72-83: from de Saussure's *Mémoire* to Kuryłowicz' seminal articles in the late twenties) down to the present day, and to offer some comments on the vast literature on the subject (simply sketched on p. 83). Thus, readers should have been informed that Mayrhofer's presentation of the laryngeal theory (1986, 121-150; 2004, 17-39) can be regarded as representing the standard version of the theory, while the views of Lindeman (1997) or those of the Leiden School (e.g. Beekes 1988b; Schrijver 1991), beside much valuable discussion, include ideas that are not generally accepted.

S. correctly highlights the importance of the laryngeals for Indo-European root structure (13-17, 28-30), and root apophony (17, and *passim*). S.'s discussion of the Indo-European vocalism, however, is inadequate and rather confusing. On p. 13 only *e a o* are given as full vowels, *eĭ aĭ oĭ eŭ aŭ oŭ* as diphthongs, while *i u* are classified with the sonants (*i u* being mere allophones). From pp. 17 and 20 one could get the impression that S. is prone to assume a one-vowel-system for primitive Indo-European and explain the long vowels, *a* and even *o* as due to the fall of the laryngeals. This is probably not what is meant, as S. later uncontroversially

assumes the existence of long vowels (p. 24: \bar{e}), of o and a (p. 31), but S.'s formulation is simply confusing. On p. 31, fn. 9, a list of words is given that had a -vocalism in Indo-European, so one could get the impression that in the end S. is assuming the standard vowel system for the parent language ($\check{a} \check{e} \check{i} \check{o} \check{u}$), but on pp. 85–86 the “traditional” vowel system of Mayrhofer and Szemerényi ($\check{a} \check{e} \check{i} \check{o} \check{u}$) is contrasted with the “laryngeal theory” system of Beekes ($\check{e} \check{o}$), and S. finally opts for a system $i u \check{e} \check{o}$. Szemerényi's version of the laryngeal theory was idiosyncratic (he accepted only one laryngeal), but Mayrhofer's system is as fully laryngealist as that of Beekes. S.'s discussion could give the impression that a reduction of the inventory of Indo-European vowels goes hand in hand with the laryngeal theory, what is certainly false (although, of course, the occurrence of $a \bar{a} \bar{i} \bar{u}$ has diminished dramatically). A full discussion cannot be attempted here, but it is probably safe to say that the “traditional” system $\check{a} \check{e} \check{i} \check{o} \check{u}$ remains the most generally accepted today (cf. Mayrhofer 1986, 168ff.; 2004, 10ff.).

As far as the basic reflexes of the laryngeals in the daughter languages are concerned, S. treats virtually all relevant phenomena: the change of $*e$ to $*a$, $*o$ in the neighborhood of $*h_2$, $*h_3$ respectively (pp. 20–26), while $*o$ (31–35, 42–46) and $*\bar{e}$ (24) (and a *fortiore* $*\bar{o}$) are not colored by an adjacent laryngeal (for $*\bar{e}$ this is often called “Eichner's Law”, cf. Eichner 1973, 72), compensa-

tory lengthening $*-EHT- > *-\bar{E}T-$ (37–52), reflexes of $*-R̥H-$ (52–57), $*-THT-$ (61–66), $*-TH \#$ (66–67), the “triple representation of *schwa*” in Greek (58–61 for initial position, and *passim*), laryngeal metathesis $*-HU- > *-\bar{U}H-$ (50–52), irregular lengthening in compounds (45–46, 49–50) as well as in augmented and reduplicated forms (41–42) in Indo-Iranian, aspiration of a voiceless stop by $*h_2$ in Old Indic (35–37).

Hittite data are introduced on every pertinent occasion, but usually in a separate section (23–24, 34–35, 40). This procedure may give the wrong impression of a particular position of Anatolian with respect to the rest of the family. Different variants of the Indo-Hittite hypothesis continue to be discussed, but the development of laryngeals as such does not anymore play a role in the modern debate – in spite of the importance of the preservation of $*h_2$ in most positions.

S. (24) states that $*h_3$ is preserved in initial position in Hittite (while it is lost in other positions). Whether word-initial $*h_3-$ was lost or preserved is a major subject of controversy of Anatolian historical phonology (cf. Kloekhorst 2006, 85ff. for a brief survey of the main positions). In my view, the issue cannot be said to be definitively settled yet.

S. draws most examples from the classical languages and Old Indic. This is perfectly reasonable as a pedagogical procedure, but as a result readers are left uninformed about the development of laryngeals in languages like Celtic, Armenian, or Tocharian. For an introduction this is

not a great loss, but in some specific environments the testimony of less favored languages may be important. Thus, concerning the evolution of *-UH(-) and the metathesis *-HU- > *-UH- (46-52), it should have been mentioned that in Tocharian (like in Greek, but differently from the other languages), a final sequence *-UH is solved with vocalization of the laryngeal, but only in the case of **h*₂ and **h*₃. In addition, the laryngeal is also vocalized in internal position *-UH-: *-U*h*₁(-) > *-*Ū*(-), but *-U*h*_{2/3}(-) > *-U*Ū*A(-)/*-*Ū*A(-) > Proto-Toch. *-*(U)Ū*Ā(-) (e.g. nom-acc. n. **tri*-*h*₂ > Pre-Toch. **triya* > Proto-Toch. **täryā* > TA *tri*, TB *tarya*, cf. Gk. τρία vs. Ved. *trī*, cf. Hackstein 1995, 17-19; Pinault 1997, both with references).

S. (61) follows Rix (1976:70) in assuming that the double representation of **i*- in Greek is conditioned by a preceding laryngeal. **H**i*- would give ζ-, while **i*- would give /*h*-. Nowadays Schindler's unpublished defense of the opposite view can be said to be generally accepted: **i*- > ζ-, **H**i*- > /*h*/ (e.g. Myc. *u-ta*^o /*hut*^h*ā*/ "fight", Gk. ὕλλος, ὕσ-μίνη "battle" < **H**i**ud*^h-, with initial laryngeal confirmed by the irregular length in compounds in Indo-Iranian: Ved. *amitrā-yúdh*-, *vṛṣā-yúdh*-, Av. *aspā-iiāoda*- < Ir. *^o*a-H**i*[*a*]*ud*^ho-, cf. Mayrhofer 2005, 37, with references).

Evolution of *-*R̥*H-. S. (53ff.) seems to assume that -*R*η/*ā*/*ω*- is the only reflex of *-*TR̥*H^t- in Greek. However, it is now generally held that

*-*R̥*H- had a double reflex in Greek depending on the accent: unaccented *-*TR̥*H^t- gives -*R*η/*ā*/*ω*-, while (secondarily) accented *-*TR̥*H^t- gives -*ε**R*ε-, -*α**R*α-, *ο**R*ο- (e.g. Rix 1976, 73; Mayrhofer 1986, 129). A similar process perhaps took place in Latin: unaccented *-*R̥*H- > -*Rā*-, but accented *-*R̥*H- > -*aRa*- (e.g. *palma* < **palama* < **p̥h*₂-*mah*₂, Gk. παλάμη, OIr. *lám*, OHG *folma*, cf. Meiser 1998, 108ff., but also Schrijver 1991, 193-197 for criticism of this view). Finally, it seems that in initial position the laryngeal of a sequence **R*H^t- was vocalized at least in some languages (Lat. *macer* "lean, meager", Gk. μακρός, OHG *magar* "long" < **mh*₂*k*-*ró*-, cf. Gk. μήκος "length" < **meh*₂*k*-*es*-, cf. Beekes 1988a; Schrijver 1991, 161-172; Meiser 1998, 107).

Some relevant phenomena concerning the reflexes of laryngeals are not mentioned by S. An introduction is of course not the place for a discussion of all reflexes of laryngeals in the daughter languages, but I believe at least a brief mention should have been made of phenomena like the Germanic *Verschärfung* (cf. Jasanoff 1978), or the gemination of *-*ER*H^t- > *-*ERRE*- in Anatolian (cf. Melchert 1994, 79-81; Kimball 1999, 410-420), and, probably, in Germanic (cf. Lühr 1976).

Further refinements in the laryngeal theory have allowed to specify the contexts where the laryngeals seem to have fallen (or were not vocalized) already in the parent language, thus causing what apparently surface as "irregular" reflexes

in the daughter languages. Again, most relevant phenomena are conveniently treated by S.: loss of *-H in pause (69-70), loss in the second member of compounds (70-71, “*νεογνός*-rule”), as well as in reduplicated formations (71-72), loss in the first member of compounds with final accentuation (71), loss in a sequence -T/RH_i- (68-69, “Pinault’s Law”), loss in *HRO_T- and *-oRHT- (67-68, “Saussure’s Law” or “Saussure-Hirt’s Law”), part of Stang’s Law (72, *ā*-stem acc. sg. **-ah₂-m* > **-ām*), as well as some other, less clear cases of lack of vocalization of a laryngeal (65).

Laryngeals probably also participated in Szemerényi’s Law (*-ERH > *-ĒR like *-ERs > *-ĒR in **ph₂-tér-s* > **ph₂tér*). This would explain the length of the nom.-acc. of hysterokinetic and amphikinetic collectives: **uéd-or-h₂* > **uédōr* (Hitt. *widār*, Gk. ὕδωρ), **h₁néh₃-mon-h₂* > **h₁néh₃-mōn* (Av. *nāmān*), cf. Nussbaum (1986, 129ff.).

The consonantal clusters where a laryngeal was lost are not yet absolutely clear, but serious work is currently being done in this direction. S. mentions Ved. 1 pl. *da-dh-mási*, 2 pl. *dha-t-tá* (*dhā*- “to put”), and the gen. sg. of the word for “blood” Ved. *asnáḥ*, Hitt. *ēsnas* < **h₁sh₂-n-és*. Cf. Hackstein (2002) for a general rule *TH.TT > *T.TT, or Jasanoff (2003, 77³⁷, 134f.) for a rule *-Th₁T/s- > *-TT/s- in non-initial syllables. In the last years a “Wetter-Regel” (-VHTRV- > -VTRV-), due to J. Schindler but not published by him, seems to be gaining general acceptance:

**h₂ueh₁d^hrom* > **h₂ued^hrom* > ON *veðr*, OCS *vedro* “clear weather”, **méh₁trom* > Gk. μέτρον (cf. Peters 1999, with references, and already Lubotsky 1981, with a different formulation).

Turning now to S.’s presentation of the reflexes of laryngeals in Lithuanian (Balto-Slavic), it is basically a list of material ordered according to the position of the laryngeals in the word: Indo-European *HE- > Balto-Slavic *E- (87-101), *-HE- > *-E- (112-115), *-EHT- > *-ĒT- (115-163), *-EHE- > *-Ē- (*-Ē-) (163-177, including *-EHUT- > *-EUHT- > *-ĒUT- 166-167, and *-UHE- > *-UŲE- 168-177), *HT- > *T- (177-187), *-THT- > *-TT- (187-188), *-ERHT- > *-ĒRT- (189-198), *-EUHT- > *-ĒUT- (199-206), *-RHT- > *-Ī/ŪRT- (207-217).

Concerning the basic reflexes of laryngeals in Balto-Slavic (which for the most part are uncontroversial), S.’s presentation is lucid and fully reliable. There are, however, a number of general issues on which I would like to comment.

S.’s treatment of *-THT- is probably the only one I find utterly unsatisfactory. S. assumes that the laryngeal was unconditionally lost without vocalization. His only example is the word for “daughter”: Lith. *duktė*, OCS *dvŕsti* < Balto-Slavic **dukter-* < PIE **d^hugh₂ter-*. Starting from such an assumption, S. proposes alternative explanations for some words traditionally supposed to show vocalization of the laryngeal, e.g. Lith. *stātas*, denom. *statyti* < **sth₂-etó-* (108, 187f.) instead of traditional **sth₂-tó-* (: Ved. *sthítá-*, Gk. στατός, Lat. *status*).

But it is well-known that in the word for “daughter” we have cases of non-vocalization of the laryngeal in languages where a laryngeal between stops is otherwise vocalized (Arm. *dowstr*, Os. **futír**, Gaul. *duxtir*), beside cases of vocalization (Ved. *duhitár-*, Gk. θυγατήρ, TB *tkācer*, perhaps Lyc. *kbatra*). This fact has been convincingly attributed to an Indo-European regular loss of the laryngeal in some specific clusters, probably nom. sg. **d^hugh₂tér* vs. gen. sg. **d^hugh₂trés* > **d^hugtrés* (cf. Ringe 2006, 137f., with references). It follows that Lith. *duktė*, OCS *dbšti*, Go. *dauhtar* fail as evidence for the reflexes of **-THT-* in Balto-Slavic and Germanic. On the other hand, loss in medial position would not entail automatically loss in other positions. Germanic is particularly illustrative, as laryngeals were vocalized in initial position (e.g. ON *faðir*, OE *fæder* < **ph₂ter-*), but lost in medial and final position (cf. Ringe 2006, 79f., 137ff.).

From this point of view, S.’s **sth₂-etó-*, for which no internal or external support is offered, loses all its attractiveness. Darden (1990) has proposed that **RHT-* yielded **RaT-* in Balto-Slavic (e.g. Lith. *mātas* “measure”, denom. *matúoti*, if from **meh₁-* “to measure”). I find most of his examples questionable, but it is clear that the issue of the vocalization of laryngeals in Balto-Slavic awaits a full and unprejudiced study.

S. (165ff.) assumes a laryngeal metathesis **-EHUT-* > **-EUHT-* > **-ĒUT-* in order to explain the acute intonation of cases like Lith. acc. sg. *piemenį* “shep-

herd” < **pāimen-* < **paiHmen-* < **po.h₃i.men-* (: Gk. ποιμήν; I would rather reconstruct **poh₂imen-*, but this is irrelevant for the present question). A further example can now be added: Lith. *áuksas* (via *HauHsa-*?), Lat. *aurum* < **h₂e-h₂us-o-*, cf. Driessen (2003). I personally see no other way of handling cases like *piemenį*, but S. himself gives some examples where no metathesis seems to have taken place, e.g. Lith. *di-enì* “pregnant (cow)” < **d^heh₁i-n^o* (: Ved. *dhenú-* “giving milk; cow”). The conditions under which a sequence **-EHUT-* underwent metathesis thus remain to be worked out. It should be noted that Leiden School authors derive the acute directly from **-EHUT-*, thus implying a Balto-Slavic syllabification **paHimen-*.

Apart from the important contrast between acute and circumflex in sequences involving a sonant followed or not by a laryngeal (probably the major contribution of Baltic and Slavic to the laryngeal theory in general terms), suprasegmental phonology is not treated in this book. A chapter on “Laryngeals and Balto-Slavic Accentology” would have been of some interest (for instance, Hirt’s Law is usually traced back to a stage when laryngeals were still preserved as a segmental phoneme).

Virtually every Baltic or Slavic word is derived from an Indo-European prototype. For practical purposes this is a legitimate procedure, but it may be misleading. In part it gives a wrong impression of Indo-European morphology and its transformation in Baltic and Slavic. I

think it would have been useful to distinguish systematically between a reconstruction (a real Indo-European word is reconstructed from which a given Lithuanian word is derived) and a transposition (a rewriting in Indo-European terms of a given word or form that is probably to be regarded as a post-Indo-European coinage). To give a clear example, on p. 171 the preterit Lith. *bùvo* “was” < **buu-ā-* seems to be derived from a “pide. **b^huh₂-eh₂-*”. Whether a “**b^huh₂-eh₂-*” existed in Indo-European is more than doubtful, but *bùvo* is known to be a very recent innovation vis-à-vis OLith. *biti*, *bit*, Latv. *bija*, OPr. *bēi*, *bei*, *be* (a matter on which S. himself has contributed a relevant paper [S. 2004]!).

This example illustrates another unfortunate aspect of S.’s book. Controversial reconstructions are frequently given without further justification. This root is reconstructed as **b^hueh₂-*, as in the LIV (s.v.), a view supported only by Rix’ interpretation of OLat. subj. 2 sg. *fuās* as an inherited aorist injunctive **b^huah₂-s*, and of the Latin imperfect in *-bā-* (Lat. 2 sg. *amā-bā-s*, Os. 3 pl. *fufans*) as derived from a Proto-Italic pluperfect **fu-β(ū)ā-* (e.g. Rix 2003). Rix’ views have been seriously criticized (e.g. J a s a n o f f 2003, 112f.⁵²). Ved. *ábhūt*, Gk. *ἔφῶν* show unexpected zero grade in the singular of the root aorist, an idiosyncrasy that has often been projected back into the parent language: **b^huH-* would display no ablaut, and the nature of the laryngeal would not be recoverable. For Italic an analysis **b^huH-eh₂-* (whatever

the origin of **-eh₂-* might be) remains in any case possible.

It is obvious from this and other publications that S. doesn’t accept Winter’s Law, which in fact is never mentioned. This influences the way he handles part of the evidence, e.g. *áugti* “grow” < **h₂eug-* (93), *ožỹs*, *óžio* “goat” (94f.), *bégti* “run”, *ésti* “eat, fressen” (120f.), *mélžti* “milk” (181), etc. The acute long vowel of *bégti* and *ésti* could be explained from an inherited Narten present, as per S., but his account of *ožỹs* (< **āž-īa-*, derivative of **až-a-* < **h₂eĝ-ó-*) is not clear to me, and *áugti*, *mélžti* are just said to have a “secondary acute”, which is not actually explained. S. is of course free to dismiss this controversial law, but I believe a discussion would have been in order. Simply passing in silence a theory that is being intensively discussed today is not the best way to contribute to the scholarly debate – and it simply misinforms non-specialists. In this respect, Kortlandt’s alternative views concerning vowel length and intonation (the acute would be due to a laryngeal or to Winter’s Law, while old long vowels would have circumflex intonation in Balto-Slavic, e.g. Kortlandt 1985) would also have merited a separate discussion.

Most reflexes of the laryngeals in Balto-Slavic are illustrated with a large number of for the most part well chosen examples. However, it must also be said that a good number of S.’s actual reconstructions are questionable. For lack of space I will refrain from a discussion of the many items on which I

would disagree with S., but readers are well advised to use S.'s rich collection of data with caution.

In a review it is almost unavoidable not to highlight the most problematic aspects of a book. For this reason, it is important to emphasize that S.'s presentation of the laryngeal theory and its application to the Baltic languages is, in general terms, fairly complete and reliable. It fills a pressing need in the literature, especially in Lithuania and in Baltic (and Slavic) studies in general. It is only to be hoped that it will help advancing the acceptance of the laryngeal theory as part of the "new look" of the Indo-European phonemic and morphological system, against which serious work on Baltic comparative linguistics must necessarily be done.

REFERENCES

- Beekes, Robert S. P. 1969, *The development of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Greek*, The Hague-Paris.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 1988a, PIE. RHC- in Greek and other languages, *IF* 93, 22-45.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 1988b, Laryngeal developments: A survey, In A. Bammesberger, *Die Laryngalthorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*, Heidelberg, 59-105.
- Darden, Bill J. 1990, Laryngeals and syllabicity in Balto-Slavic and Indo-European, *CLS* 26,2, 61-70.
- Driessen, C. Michiel 2003, **h₂é-h₂us-o-*, the Proto-Indo-European term for "gold", *JIES* 31, 347-362.
- Eichner, Heiner 1973, Die Etymologie vom heth. *mehur*, *MSS* 31, 53-107.
- Fecht, Rainer 2006, review of Smoczyński (2003a), *Kratylos* 51, 155--160.
- Hackstein, Olav 1995, *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsenstambildungen des Tocharischen*, Göttingen.
- Hackstein, Olav 2002, Uridg. *CH. CC > *C.CC, *HS* 115, 1-22.
- Jasanoff, Jay 1978, Observations on the Germanic Verschärfung, *MSS* 38, 77-90.
- Jasanoff, Jay 2003, *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*, Oxford.
- Kimball, Sara E. 1999, *Hittite historical phonology*, Innsbruck.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin 2006, Initial laryngeals in Anatolian, *HS* 119, 77-108.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 1985, Long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 21, 112-124.
- Lindeman, Fredrik O. 1997, *Introduction to the "Laryngeal theory"*, Innsbruck.
- Lubotsky, Alexander 1981, Gr. *pégnumi*: Skt. *pajrá-* and loss of laryngeals before mediae in Indo-Iranian, *MSS* 40, 133-138.
- Lühr, Rosemarie 1976, Germanische Resonantengemination durch Laryngal, *MSS* 35, 73-92.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred 1986, *Indogermanische Grammatik I/2. Lautlehre. Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen*, Heidelberg.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred 2004, *Die Hauptprobleme der indogermanischen Lautlehre seit Bechtel*, Vienna.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred 2005a, *Die Fortsetzung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Indo-Iranischen*, Vienna.
- Meiser, Gerhart 1998, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der Lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt.

Melchert, Craig H. 1994, *Anatolian historical phonology*, Amsterdam-Atlanta.

Nussbaum, Alan J. 1986, *Head and horn in Indo-European*, Berlin-New York.

Peters, Martin 1999, Ein tiefes Problem, In H. Eichner et al., *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, Praha, 447–456.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 1997, Remarque sur le pluriel tokh. B *akrūna*, A *ākrunt*. In: A. Lubotsky, *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, 219–233.

Ringe, Don 2006, *A linguistic history of English. Volume I: From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*, Oxford.

Rix, Helmut 1976, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*, Darmstadt.

Rix, Helmut 2003, Towards a reconstruction of Proto-Italic: the verbal system, In *Proceedings of the 14th UCLA Indo-European Conference*, Washington, 1–24.

Schrijver, Peter 1991, *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Latin*, Amsterdam-Atlanta.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2001, *Język litewski w perspektywie porównawczej*, Cracow.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2003a, *Hiat laryngalny w językach balto-słowiańskich*, Cracow.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2003b, *Studia balto-słowiańskie, część II. Baltisch-slawische Studien, Teil II*, Cracow.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2004, Altpreussisch *bēi*, *bei*, *be*, *Baltistica* 39, 127–130.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON

Vytautas Magnus University

Vileišio g. 14–35

LT-10306 Vilnius, Lietuva

[miguelvillanueva@yahoo.com]

Daiva Sinkevičiūtė, **Lietuvių dvikamienių asmenvardžių trumpiniai ir jų kilmės pavardės**, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto I-kla, 2006, 316.

Recenzuojamoji knyga – antroponimikos darbas. Lietuvių asmenvardžių tyrimų šiuo metu tikrai nėra daug, todėl paimti į rankas naują monografiją, skirtą savito mūsų antroponimijos sluoksniu – senųjų dvikamienių asmenvardžių trumpinių – labai išsamiam aptarimui, buvo ypač malonu. Žinoma, ir smalsu.

Monografija parašyta 2004 m. rudens apgintos daktaro disertacijos pagrindu, bet, kaip teigiama *Pratarmėje*, nuo pastarosios „jau gerokai skiriasi“ (p. 10). Tai liudija, kad darbo autorė yra jauna mokslininkė, kad tai pirmasis didelis jos darbas, per dvejus metus po disertacijos apgynimo brandintas, tobulintas, išplėstas ir pateiktas skaitytojui nemažos apimties monografijos forma. Taigi viskas, kas ir kaip knygoje pasakyta apie lietuvių senųjų dvikamienių asmenvardžių trumpinius ir jų kilmės pavardes, jau tapo neatsiejama lietuvių antroponimijos tyrimo konteksto dalimi, kurią kaip naujausią reikia analizuoti ir vertinti.

Tai bus pamėginta padaryti šioje recenzijoje. Iš karto pasakytina, kad monografijos autorės ir recenzentės požiūris į daugelį tyrime išdėstytų dalykų gerokai skiriasi. Todėl atrodė svarbu konstatuoti, kad recenzija rašyta laikantis nuostatos, pagal kurią į monografijoje pateiktą tirtų asmenvardžių vertinimą žiūrima kaip į mokslininkės teisę turėti savo nuomonę ir ją pateikti. Tokią pat teisę turi ir