

Als Argument für eine solche Betrachtungsweise kann das litauische Verb *ziñtyti* (-ija, -ijo) „sich gegenseitig beschimpfen, sich zanken, sich streiten; zögern, zaudern“ (Dusetos, Daugėliškis, Užpaliai – LKŽ_{XIX} 1037) angeführt werden, das als Denominativ von *ziñtas* „jemand, der sich streitet, sich zankt“ betrachtet werden kann. In der einschlägigen Forschung besteht schon längst die Einsicht, dass ein Teilgebiet Nordostlitauens (Zarasai, Dusetos usw.) und das südwestliche Areal³ der Balten und der Preußen durch einen Bündel Isoglossen verbunden sind.

Die im Rahmen der von deutschen Herausgebern finanzierten und veröffentlichten Reihe *Hydronymia Europaea* erschienene Studie „Baltische Ortsnamen in Ostpreußen“ von Grasilda Blažienė ist als eine originelle und gründlich durchdachte wissenschaftliche Forschungsarbeit zu betrachten.

Simas Karaliūnas

Lietuvių kalbos institutas

P. Vileišio g. 5, LT-10308 Vilnius, Lietuva

GIACOMO DEVOTO

Baltistikos raštai · Scritti baltistici

Edited by PIETRO U. DINI and BONIFACAS STUNDŽIA

Vilnius: Tyto alba, 2004, pp. 263[1], ISBN 9986-16-383-8

According to the preface (p. 9) here for the first time are published all of Giacomo Devoto's Baltistic writings which have for the most part historical significance, not only in the sense of linguistic historiography but also in the broader sense of the cultural bonds between Italy and the Baltic (particularly Lithuania). Today newer discoveries and more modern scientific methods have gone beyond the theoretical and factual statements encountered in Devoto's writings. Nevertheless the works published here show the maturity of Italian Baltic studies attained during the interwar period and seem to emphasize the direction of their further development. Devoto's articles are divided into two groups, (i) Linguistics and (ii) Literature and other subjects. They are published in Lithuanian translation in the first part of the

³ Vgl. S. KARALIŪNAS, *Baltų praeitis istoriniuose šaltiniuose II*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2005, 239–240, 310–311.

book (pp. 37–128) and in the Italian original in the second part of the book (pp. 165–263).

There are two introductory articles about Devoto, one by Pietro U. Dini, “Giacomo Devoto baltistas: Nuomonės ir citatos” (pp. 13–29) = “Opinioni e citazioni su Giacomo Devoto baltista” (pp. 141–158) and the second by Bonifacas Stundžia, “Žymiojo italų neolingvisto baltiškoji trajektorija” (pp. 30–34) = “La traiettoria baltica di un famoso neolinguista italiano” (pp. 159–164).

Dini notes that Baltic studies was not Devoto’s primary interest, but rather ancient languages. Devoto himself wrote in the first issue of *Studi Baltici* (1931: 3) that his only connection with the Baltic languages was a result of study with W. Schulze and M. Niedermann. Perhaps Devoto’s study of the Baltic languages would have ceased had he not been appointed the editor of *Studi Baltici*. It seems that all of his Baltic studies began at that time (p. 14). Among these are articles which today we would consider purely informational (p. 15, 143), although they probably did not seem such in Italy of the 1930s. Dini writes that Devoto knew the Baltic lands personally (p. 18, 146). In the fall of 1933 until December he studied Lithuanian and taught at the University of Kaunas. During this period he took several side trips to visit Prof. Mikkola in Helsinki, Prof. Endzelīns in Riga and Prof. Kieckers in Tartu. Although Devoto was asked to contribute to Endzelīns’ Festschrift he was unable to, but he wished to be included in the *Tabula gratulatoria* (p. 19, 148).

Dini writes (p. 25, 153) that Devoto was one of the most eminent Indo-Europeanists of his time and that his interest in Baltic languages was connected with Indo-European studies. Devoto was most likely more interested in the classical languages, Italic languages and the Italian language. Perhaps this is why some scholars who studied with Devoto in Florence are inclined to rate his Baltic work as being of third-rate importance.

The article by Bonifacas Stundžia emphasizes Devoto’s positive feelings about the Lithuanian nation. Stundžia (p. 34, 164) quotes from Devoto’s article about the Lithuanian language: “Ma chi pensi che è occorso il prestigio di Dante e dei grandi artisti toscani per dare all’Italia la sua lingua letteraria; che ci son voluti secoli di lotte da parte dei re di Francia per consacrare il prestigio politico della città di Parigi non meno di quello linguistico del suo dialetto, rimarrà ammirato e sorpreso dall’ardimento con cui i patrioti lituani hanno voluto senza un genio letterario, con una autonomia politica ai primi passi, creare artificialmente queste condizioni, tentare per la prima volta la coltivazione in serra di una pianta che non era cresciuta se non attraverso i secoli, lenta e libera da ogni volontà umana.” – “But whoever

keeps in mind the fact that the prestige of Dante and that of the great Tuscan artists were necessary to give Italy its literary language and that centuries of struggles on the part of the French kings were necessary to give the city of Paris its political prestige and the prestige of its dialect, will admire and be surprised at the boldness with which the Lithuanian patriots, without a literary genius and with a political autonomy in its early stages, have wished to create these conditions artificially, to attempt for the first time the cultivation in a greenhouse of a plant (tree?) which has only grown through the centuries, slowly and free from any human intervention.” Stundžia adds then that probably no foreigner has ever said anything nicer.

The first article in the linguistics section “Lietuvių kalba” (pp. 37–49) = “La lingua lituana” (pp. 167–179) containing the quotation given above (p. 40, 170) is a brief general description of the Lithuanian language intended for the non-specialist. Here Devoto notes the appearance of Alfred Senn’s grammar *Litauische Sprachlehre* (Heidelberg, 1929), at that time the only grammar available to foreigners since the publication of Leskien’s *Lesebuch*. Minor inaccuracies such as the correction of the name of Senn’s grammar to *Kleine Litauische Sprachlehre* are given in the footnotes to the Lithuanian translation of Devoto’s article (p. 48), but not in the original (p. 178).

Of considerable interest is the “Pristatymas” (p. 40) = “Presentazione” (p. 180) from the first volume of *Studi Baltici*. Here Devoto calls to our attention that this journal is the first international journal devoted to Baltic philology outside of the Baltic countries. Devoto also announces his intention to publish articles in languages other than Italian. Dini (p. 20, 148) writes that in the first eight volumes of *Studi Baltici* there were 102 articles by authors of various nationalities, approximately 20% by Italians and 80% by foreigners (p. 24, 153). At present outside of the Baltic countries there is only one other journal devoted exclusively to Baltic linguistics and culture, viz., the Italian journal *Res Balticae*, a worthy successor of *Studi Baltici*. The Italian journal *Ponto-Baltica* could in principle also be called a worthy successor, but it does not emphasize exclusively Baltic subjects.

In the article “*Tauta ir ļaudis*” (pp. 51–57) = “*Tauta e l’audis*” (pp. 181–187) Devoto writes that the word *tauta* denotes the original organization of ‘state’ or ‘government’ and derives from a root **teuta* / **touta*, whereas *ļaudis* refers to a people with common inheritance and derives from the root **leudh-* ‘to grow’.

The article “Lietuvių *úošvis*”, latv. *uôšvis*” (pp. 58–64) = “Lit. *úošvis*, Lett. *uôšvis* ‘suocero’” (pp. 188–194) notes that originally the Baltic word meant only the ‘wife’s father’ not, as later became possible, also the ‘husband’s father’. For this word Devoto reconstructs a root *ŌUKJ-* (p. 193) (which in contemporary transcription

would be **ōuk-* with a long diphthong and a palato-velar *k̑*). Devoto, presenting several different possibilities of development finds the same root in a different ablaut grade in Lat. *ūxor* ‘wife’. Although Fraenkel (1955: 1168) writes that the etymology of *úošvis* is ‘zweifelhaft’ he quotes Devoto’s article and some other scholars who approve the connection with Lat. *uxor*. Although the acute stress implies a phonetically long vowel one wonders whether in the passage of **ōuk-* to **ōk-* there was an early monophthongization (Schmalstieg 1980: 32–33).

The article “Latvių kilmė ir kalba” (pp. 65–81) = “Le origini e la lingua dei lettoni” (pp. 195–214) is a brief popular account of the origin of the Latvians and their language and “Kvietimas į baltų filologiją” (pp. 82–93) = “Invito alla filologia baltica” (pp. 215–227) sets forth some of the basic principles of the discipline, many (but not all) of which have remained valid until today.

The article “Baltai ir slavai” (pp. 94–105) = “Balti i slavi” (pp. 228–240) begins with a brief archeological evaluation of the relationships and then passes to a linguistic evaluation which notes correctly that the Baltic languages are in general more conservative than the Slavic. The brief discussion of the vocalic system (p. 97; pp. 231–232) is really unsatisfactory from the contemporary structuralist point of view. According to Devoto: “L’area baltica non è stata insensibile a contatti con l’ambiente germanico: l’avvicinamento delle vocali *o a* avviene con le stesse modalità presso i Germani e Lituani, e con altre modalità presso Lettoni e Slavi: indicando la *a* presso i primi le due vocali brevi *o a*, presso i secondi le lunghe *ō ā*; mentre presso i secondi è la *o* che rappresenta le brevi e la *a* le lunghe. Inoltre, per quello che riguarda la *-ō* in posizione finale, lituano e gotico vanno d’accordo nel trattarla in modo speciale nel gruppo *-ōm*.”

In regard to the development of Indo-European **ō* and **ā* one can say that these phonemes merged in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic, but the phonetic result was the same in Baltic and Germanic as opposed to the phonetic result in Slavic. Accompanying the Lithuanian translation (but not the Italian original) is a footnote (p. 97) by the scientific editor (apparently Bonifacas Stundžia, according to the front matter on p. 4) who corrects Devoto’s statement somewhat noting that **ō* and **ā* merge as **ā* in both Lithuanian and Latvian and that Latvian *ā* corresponds to long **ā* and only sometimes to **ō*. We must assume that Devoto knew Endzelin’s contrary opinion, since it was expressed in the journal of which he was the editor, *Studi Baltici* (1934-1935: 136): “Nach meiner festen Überzeugung dagegen kann ein ide. *ō* rein lautlich nur ein li.-le. *uo* ergeben...” Stang (1966: 47) wrote: “In Lit.-Lett. ist die Sache klar: ieur. *ō* ist durch *uo* vertreten.” Curiously enough this seems to

be contrary to his opinion expressed earlier (1942: 196, fn. 1): “Ich rechne – im Gegensatz zu Endzelin – mit einer zweifachen Entwicklung des ieur. \bar{o} im Lit.-Lett., nämlich zu *uo* und \bar{a} , vgl. Gen. Sg. *vīlko* = lat. *lupō* sowie lett. *dāsns* (lit. *dosnūs*)...”. Mažiulis (1970: 21) has suggested that stressed Indo-European $*\bar{o}$ gives Lith.-Latv. *uo*, whereas unstressed Indo-European $*\bar{o}$ gives Lith. \bar{o} and Latv. \bar{a} . The statement that Lithuanian and Gothic have the same treatment for final $-\bar{o}m$ is more or less true (i.e., when the Lith. final $-\bar{o}m$ presupposes the earlier loss of a following vowel, as in the dat. dual ending *-oma*, cf. Zinkevičius 1980: 198). Devoto’s statement is not, however, particularly relevant. Indo-European $*\bar{a}$ and $*\bar{o}$ merged as $*\bar{o}$ already in Common Germanic (Guxman *et al.* 1962, 116–117), whereas the passage of \bar{a} to \bar{o} in Lithuanian is relatively recent, examples of the retention of the etymological \bar{a} still being occasionally encountered in Mažvydas. Here we find, e.g., $*\bar{a}$ stem nom. pl. *mald-as* ‘prayers’ (Urbas 1996: 218) presumably with an $-\bar{a}$ - in the final syllable (cf. contemporary *mald-os*), while Gothic has the etymological $*\bar{a}$ stem nom. pl. *gīb-os* ‘gifts’. Gothic has a dat. pl. (with etymological $-\bar{o}m$) *gīb-om*, but Mažvydas has an instr. pl. *dawan-am-is* ‘with gifts’ (Urbas 1996: 100) showing an $-a-$ in both the first and third syllable as opposed to contemporary *dovanomīs*. Thus the early Lithuanian passage of $/\bar{a}/$ to $/\bar{o}/$ has nothing to do with the Common Germanic merger of $*/\bar{a}/$ and $*/\bar{o}/$ or any imagined Gothic influence.

The article “Tautos aplinkui Baltija” (pp. 109–119) = “Genti nel Baltico” (pp. 243–255) is a brief sympathetic historical study of the nations bordering on the Baltic Sea.

The preface to *Storia delle letterature baltiche* (Milan 1957) is reproduced on pp. 255–258 (with Lithuanian translation on pp. 120–123). This book contains articles on Lithuanian literature by Prof. Alfred Senn (my own teacher), on Latvian literature by Ernsts (not Ernests as given on pp. 258, 263, 123, 128) Blese and on Estonian literature by Ants Oras. Devoto concludes his preface by saying that this book brings a word of solidarity, understanding and hope to all men of letters and their compatriots be they in their homeland or in exile (p. 258, 128). The preface to the second updated edition of this book entitled *La letteratura di Paesi Baltici. Finlandia, Estonia, Lettonia, Lituania* (Florence, Milan 1969) is reproduced on pp. 259–263 (with Lithuanian translation on pp. 124–127). The authors of the articles are the same as above, but Prof. Edoardo Roberto Gummerus was added to write the article on Finnish literature. The conclusion of this preface is similar to the previous preface, but here the specific words “nelle tre repubbliche sovietiche, in Finlandia e all'estero” have replaced “in patria e in esilio” of the first edition.

Also reproduced here are a photograph of Giacomo Devoto (p. 2), photographs of the covers of various issues of *Studi Baltici* (pp. 129–132) the cover of Devoto's *Scritti Minori* (p. 133) and a post-card sent by Devoto to Vaclovas Biržiška (p. 134).

This book is a valuable aid for research on the history of Baltic studies and is a fitting tribute to the great scholar Giacomo Devoto, who had the energy and the interest to edit *Studi Baltici*, in its time the only journal devoted to Baltic linguistics published in a non-Baltic country. This book's editors, Pietro U. Dini, Bonifacas Stundžia and the translators Dainius Būrė, Rasa Klioštoraitytė, Anna Karpič and Paola Fertoli are to be thanked for making Giacomo Devoto's Baltic work easily available in book form.

REFERENCES

- ENDZELIN, J. 1934–1935: Was ist im altpreussischen aus ide. \bar{o} (und \bar{a}) geworden? *Studi Baltici* 4, 135–143.
- FRAENKEL, E. 1955: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- GUXMAN, M. M., V. M. ŽIRMUNSKIJ, Ė. A. MAKAEV & V. N. JARCEVA, 1962: *Sravnitel'naja grammatika germanskix jazykov II. Fonologija*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- MAŽIULIS, V. 1970: *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- MAŽIULIS, V. 2004: *Prūsų kalbos istorinė gramatika*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.
- SCHMALSTIEG, W. R. 1980: *Indo-European linguistics: A new synthesis*. University Park & London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- URBAS, D. 1996: *Martyno Mažvydo raštų žodynas*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- ZINKEVIČIUS, Z. 1980: *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika I*. Vilnius: Mokslas

William R. Schmalstieg
 814 Cornwall Road
 State College, Pa. 16803, USA