

WILLIAM R. SCHMALSTIEG
The Pennsylvania State University

Fields of research: Indo-European studies, Baltic, especially Old Prussian, Slavic languages.

BŪDVARDŽIŲ DARYBOS RAIDA. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADJECTIVE FORMATION

Saulius Ambrazas; sudarytoja
Danguolė Mikulėnienė

Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2011, 274 p.
ISBN 978-609-411-066-5

With this monograph the author has completed his three-part work on the development of the formation of Lithuanian substantives. The first part “Daiktavardžių darybos raida. Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodiniai vediniai” devoted to the development of the nouns (verbal derivatives) appeared in 1993 and the second part “Daiktavardžių darybos raida. Lietuvių kalbos vardažodiniai vediniai” devoted to the development of nouns (nominal derivatives) appeared in 2000. Sadly enough the author passed away before he could prepare for publication the final version of the third part of his work. This monograph was prepared on the basis of his manuscripts and articles published in Lithuanian and non-Lithuanian linguistic journals. It is divided into publications in three different languages. The major portion consists of six chapters in Lithuanian devoted to adjectival formation (pp. 7–155) followed by a section in English entitled ‘Some Indo-European Features of the Baltic Adjectives’ (pp. 156–180). The concluding text is an article translated into French by Daniel Petit entitled ‘Baltique orientale et baltique occidentale, baltique et slave: le problème de leurs relations anciennes du point de vue de la formation des mots’ which was originally published in the journal *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 26/II (2004): 43–79 (pp. 181–211). Following this are the abbreviations (pp. 212–213), references (pp. 214–239), an index of Lithuanian words (pp. 240–266) and an index of names (pp. 267–272).

In chapter 1 the author writes that one can find important information about the formation of adjectives already in the earliest Lithuanian grammars, the grammars of Daniel Klein (1653 – *Grammatica Litvanica*; 1654 – *Compendium Litvanico-Germanicum*) and Kristupas Sapūnas and Theophylus Gottlieb Schultz (1673 – *Com-*

pendium Grammaticae Litvanicae). Both these grammars emphasize that diminutives retain both the gender and endings of the root word, e.g., *juodas* 'black' has the diminutive *juodokas* 'blackish' whereas *saldus* 'sweet' has the diminutive *saldokus* 'sweetish'. This feature, however, is apparently not an ancient derivational technique, but rather an innovation found particularly in eastern dialects. Another diminutive suffix is *-intelis(-ė)*. Thus in the aforementioned earliest grammars one encounters *silpnintelis* 'a bit weak' as well as *silpnokas* 'id'. The first grammars also register the adjectival suffixes *-iškas* and *-inis*, cf., e.g., *kūniškas* 'corporal, corporeal' and *geležinis* 'iron'. In Klein's grammar there are some numerical adjectives with the suffixes *-(i)okas(-a)* and *-(i)opas(-a)*, e.g., *vienokas* and *vieneropas* 'the same, similar' although in Sapūnas and Schultz' grammar we encounter only the suffix *-opas*, e.g., *vieneropas*. The grammars of August Schleicher (1856) and Friedrich Kurschat (1876) are mentioned as well as the works of other scholars such as August Leskien, who was the first to investigate Lithuanian nominal suffixes on the background of Indo-European word-formation. The work of Pranas Skardžius, Kazimieras Būga, Pranas Kniūkšta, Jan Otrębski, Jan Endzelin and others is discussed and the chapter ends with Adelė Valeckienė's classification of six categories of adjectives: 1) adjectives denoting strengthening or quantity; here the most important are diminutives with the suffix *-(i)okas(-a)*; 2) adjectives denoting inherent characteristics; belonging to this category are derivatives with the suffix *-ingas(-a)* and also the extremely productive verbal adjectives with the suffix *-us(-i)* denoting the characteristic property deriving from the corresponding action (state), e.g., *apdairūs(-i)* 'circumspect', *atsargūs(-i)* 'careful', etc.; 3) adjectives denoting external properties *-(i)uotas(-a)*, *-(i)otas(-a)*, *-ėtas(-a)*; 4) adjectives denoting similar or characteristic qualities, for the most part formed with the suffix *-iškas(-a)*; 5) adjectives denoting characteristic features; to this category belong the productive derivatives with *-inis*; 6) adjectives denoting the resulting characteristics; these are for the most part verbal derivatives with the suffix *-us(-i)*, e.g., *aptakūs(-i)* 'streamlined', *išlaidūs(-i)* 'extravagant'. Still as Ambrazas remarks the boundary lines between the categories are not always completely clear.

Chapter 2 is devoted to the categories of adjective formation from the historical point of view. Like the nouns, the adjectives can be divided into verbal and nominal categories. Verbal adjectives usually denote characteristics deriving from actions (or states) and are usually formed with the suffix *-us(-i)*, e.g., *platūs(-i)* 'wide', *našūs(-i)* 'productive'. This ancient word formation type became very productive and spread at the expense of other types. Lithuanian has also inherited from Indo-European other rarer suffixes with a similar function: **-no-*, **-lo-*, **-ro-*, **-to-*, **-uo-*. These are represented by old derivatives with cognates in a number of related languages, e.g., *pilnas* 'full', *tūlas* 'many', *āštras* 'sharp', *stātas* and *statūs* 'steep, vertical', *gyvas* 'alive'. The suffixes **-to-* and **-no-* have ancient semantic

connections, cf. *bál-tas* ‘white’, and *bál-nas* ‘white-backed’. The *-t-* suffix came to be used for the passive participle in Baltic, where, differently from Slavic, the *-n-* suffix did not adopt this function. Lithuanian nominal adjectives have several types of productive formations. They have a greater semantic differentiation, but if we examine them historically we find connections between earlier semantic relationships and the types of formation which at first glance are quite different. Already Pranas Skardžius noted that adjectives with the suffixes *-(i)otas(-a)*, *-(i)uotas(-a)*, *-ėtas(-a)* denote not only exterior, superficial characteristics, but internal characteristics (like derivatives with the suffix *-ingas(-a)*). The age of the semantic derivatives of this type is confirmed by such cognates as Lith. *barzdótas* ‘bearded’ which corresponds well to OCS **bradatъ*, Pol. *brodaty*, Russ. *borodatyj*, Lat. *barbātus*. At the same time the derivatives with the same suffix may denote an inner quality, e.g., Lith. *dievótas* ‘devout, pious’, Latv. *dievuots* ‘good, splendid’, OP *deiūwuts* ‘blessed, saved’ just like OCS **bogatъ* ‘rich’ and Latin *fortūnātus* ‘id’.

The diminutives form a special category of nominal adjectives. They generally denote a greater or smaller amount of the quality and have a nuance of endearment, e.g. *gerókas* ‘fair, considerable’, *didókas* ‘pretty big’. These are closely connected to the derivatives of numerals, e. g., *vienókas(-a)* ‘the same, homogeneous’, *dvejókas* ‘of two kinds’ (cf. OCS *dvvojakъ*) which already in the 16th century were being replaced by derivatives in *-(i)opas(-a)*.

Therefore in the history of the derivation of the Lithuanian adjectives we would have to distinguish three categories: 1) adjectives denoting action and the result of that action; 2) adjectives denoting attribution; 3) diminutive adjectives. These categories were most likely inherited from the later Indo-European proto-language but from ancient times they were closely bound up with each other.

Chapter 3 is a discussion of the derivational suffixes of adjectives denoting action or the result. The most widespread of these is the **-u-* stem suffix *-us(-i)*, an old derivational type. Thus Lith. *platūs(-i)* ‘wide’ differs only in ablaut grade from OI *pr̥thú-* and Avestan *parəθu-*, Gk. *πλατύς* ‘wide’. In Lithuanian this derivational type became very productive and frequently derivatives come from secondary as well as from primary verbs, e.g., *skalūs* ‘easily split’ from *skáldyti* ‘to split’ and sometimes with ablaut variation, e.g., *marūs* ‘easily dying’ from *mir̥ti* ‘to die’. It seems that the lack of OP and Latv. **-u-* stem adjectives would be evidence that its productivity in Lithuanian is recent. There is a rather large number of deverbal **-no-* derivatives in the Baltic as well as in other Indo-European languages, e.g., Lith. *pīlnas(-à)*, Latv. *pīlns*, OP *pīlnan*, Slavic **pōlnъ / pōlnъ*, Germanic *fulna*, Old Irish *lān*, Skt. *pūrṇá*, Avestan *parəna-* ‘full’. There are many such derivatives in Lithuanian, e.g., *drėgnas* ‘damp’ (cf. *drėkti* ‘to become damp’), etc. In the LKŽ there are 105 examples, of which 73 have **-u-* stem doublets, e.g., *kīlnas(-à)* ‘noble’ and *kīlnus(-i)*. Derivatives with **-no-* frequently have doublets in **-lo-*, cf., *krėšnas* ‘heavy-set, with a solid

build' and *krēslas*. Verbal adjectives with the suffix **-ino-*, created from a small number of verbs, are characteristic of western dialects. Some of these derived from transitive verbs, are close to participles in meaning, e.g. *nėšinas(-à)* 'carrying'. In general verbal adjectives with derivative suffixes from **-no-* are no longer productive in the Baltic and related languages. Verbal adjectives with the suffix *-tinas(-à)* generally have the meaning of necessity and are frequently called 'participles of necessity', thus *nėštinas(-à)* 'which must be carried'. Similarly to the suffix *-tinas* the suffix *-tinis* is derived from passive participles in **-to-* but these are more recent, arose only in Lithuanian and are encountered mostly in Sirvydas' dictionaries, e.g., *abejotinis* 'wąplywy (doubtful)'. Some of the Lithuanian verbal adjectives in **-lo-* have deep historical roots. Thus the derivative *tūlas(-à)* 'many' from the synchronic point of view can no longer be separated into its constituents *tū-las(-à)*. From the IE verb **teu-/tu-/tū-* 'to swell, to increase' we also have Lith. *tù-mtas*, *tu-ñtas / tù-ntas* 'big crowd, regiment', *tù-mstas*, *tūkstantis* 'thousand'.

In a few cases we encounter the alternation of the three suffixes *-lo-*, *-ro-* and *-no-* with the same root, cf. *kiblùs(-ì)* 'hanging on to, sticking to', *kibnùs* 'hanging on to', *kibrùs(-ì)* 'curious'. The suffix *-lus(-i)* has become quite productive and here the *u*-stem forms has been replacing the *o*-stem forms. Thus the older adjective *gāillas(-à)* 'sad, sorrowful' has been replaced by the *u*-stem form *gailùs(-ì)*. The suffix *-lus(-i)* also has the variants *-slus(-i)* and *-šlus(-i)*, thus, e.g., *bailùs* 'fearful, cowardly' and *baislùs*, and *tuklùs* 'obese' and *tukšlùs(-ì)* 'soft'.

The suffix **-mo-* has been used from the earliest times to form adjectives from verbs. The Indo-European forms **kai-ma-/ *kei-ma-* have supplied Lith. *káimas*, OP *caimis* 'village', Lith. *kiēmas* 'courtyard' and Latv. *ciems* 'village'. (Ambrasas' reference PKEŽ III 76tt. should be corrected to PKEŽ II 76tt.). Ambrasas notes that the suffix *-mas(-a)*, is also encountered with the *-u-* stem variant *-mus(-i)*, e.g., both the variants *lai-mas(-a)* 'fortunate' and *lai-mus(-i)* are attested.

The majority of the verbal adjectives with the suffix **-mo-* in the Baltic languages have become passive participles, although a few of them even now seem to be more akin to adjectives, e.g., Lith. *gālimas* 'possible', *įmānomas* 'imaginable', *įstikimas* 'faithful', etc. Interestingly enough Germanic **werma-* 'warm' has the same adjectival suffix.

On the basis of derivatives with the suffix **-mo-* the derived suffix **-imo/ -īmo* was created, which forms not only adjectives, but nouns denoting actions and qualities, e.g., *gyvėnimas* 'life', *rāšymas* 'writing'. Verbal adjectives with the suffix **-to-* have been known in the Indo-European languages since the earliest times, e.g., Lith. *stātas*, Lat. *status*, Gk. *στατός*, Skt. *sthi-tá* 'standing'. The majority of the verbal adjectives with this suffix have become in Lithuanian (as in many other IE languages) passive participles. Only a portion of them (mostly derivatives of intransitive verbs) have retained the original adjectival meaning, e.g., Lith.

báltas(-à) ‘white’, *keĩstas(-à)* ‘strange’, etc.

Ambrazas notes writes that most likely the suffix **-uõ-* was already an independent formative affix and was closely connected to the suffixes **-no-*, **-to-*, **-mo-*. Particularly old are Lith. *gývas*, Latv. *dzĩvs*, Slavic *živũ*, Lat. *vĩvus*, OI *jĩvá-* ‘alive’ < IE **g^hei-/ *g^hĩ-*. Ambrazas suggests that Lith. *kliẽpas*, and Latv. *klĩps* ‘bread’ derive from the Indo-European root **k^hlei-* ‘to bow, to bend’ and gives a reference to Otkupščikov 2001b (a misprint for 2001a). Ambrazas does not mention the opinions of Būga and Alminauskis who suggest that the Lithuanian word derives from Old Icelandic *hleifr* nor the opinion of my own teacher, Alfred Senn, that the word derives from Belorussian *chlěb* or Pol. *chleb* (see LEW 271).

Chapter 4 is a discussion of nominal derivatives. In the ancient Indo-European proto-language derivatives with the affix **(i)jõ-/ -eijõ-* predominated, e.g., Lat. *patrius*, Gk. *πάτριος*, OI *pĩtriya-* ‘father’s, fatherly’. In Lithuanian relatively few derivatives with the suffix **(i)jõ-* have remained. These would be adjectives in *-ias(-ia)*, e.g., *apsčias* ‘plentiful’, *šlāpias* ‘wet’, etc. Lithuanian has somewhat more adjectives with the suffix *-is, -ys(-ė)* also deriving from **(i)j̥-*, e.g., *kairỹs(-ė)* ‘located at the left’, etc. Alongside the **-jõ-/ -ijõ-* stem derivatives in Lithuanian there are also corresponding **-o-* stem derivatives, e.g., beside *apsčias(-ia)* ‘plentiful’, one encounters also *āpstas(-à)*. This phenomenon is rather ancient, cf. the Lith. **-jõ-* stem *naĩjas* ‘new’ with the OP **-o-* stem (acc. pl.) *nawans* ‘id’. In general the data lead to the conclusion that in the Eastern Baltic area the adjectives with the suffix *-(i)jõ* remained productive slightly longer than in other Baltic dialect areas.

Chapter 5 takes up the general characteristics of the formation of old Indo-European adjectives in Baltic. In the Baltic languages we encounter archaic verbal adjectives denoting the qualities deriving from a verbal action or state. These are **-no-*, **-ro-*, **-lo-*, **-to-*, **-uõ-*, and the derivative endings **-u-* and **-o-*. Examples are *pĩl-nas* ‘full’, *āš-t-ras* ‘sharp’, *tĩ-las* ‘many’, *stā-tas* ‘vertical’, *gý-vas* ‘alive’, *plat-ũs* ‘wide’, *sẽn-as* ‘old’. Ambrazas notes that a number of earlier scholars have connected the alternation of the root suffixes *l, n, r* with an earlier heteroclitic declension. There is a certain number of such alternations attested in Lithuanian and related languages, e.g., Lith. *leĩ-las* ‘thin’, Old Icelandic *linr* ‘soft, weak’, Gk. *λεϊρός*. The apparent Greek cognate is, however, doubtful. According to Frisk (1970: 101) ‘Wie lat. *lilium* stammt auch *λεϊρίον* aus einer östlichen Mittelmeersprache... Auch das poetische *λεϊρίος* und *λεϊρός* als Beiwörter der Haut und der Stimme dürften als Ableitungen von *λεϊρίον* verständlich sein (‘lilien weiss, -zart’)...’ More convincing are, however, the Latvian examples *kuĩ-ls* and *kuĩ-ns* ‘deaf’.

Chapter 6 discusses Baltic ethnogenesis in the light of word formation. The author remarks that formational affixes travel more easily from one dialect or language to another than do inflections. Therefore word formational data can be used to help solve the difficult problems of Baltic ethnogenesis. Many common

types of Baltic word formation are inherited from Common Baltic or earlier times. Nevertheless the Lithuanian, Latvian and Old Prussian word formation processes are quite different. These differences and their relationships allow one to examine some of the processes which took place in the distant Baltic past. Nomina actionis and adjectives denoting action and result have long been created in Lithuanian and Latvian by forms with the suffix **-mo-* and in this respect the East Baltic languages correspond with the more distant Slavic, Albanian and Hittite languages. On the other hand in Old Prussian the suffix **-mo-* is encountered only in numerals and adjectives and personal names deriving from the latter. There are, however, rare exceptions. The Elbing Vocabulary (39) supplies us with *dumis* (Rouch), cf. Lith. *dūmas*, Latv. *dūmi*, Slavic **dymъ*, Lat. *fūmus*, OI *dhūmá-* ‘smoke’ and the Greek abstract $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ ‘soul’. In Lithuanian nouns of action with the suffixes **-i-mo-/-īmo-* (e.g., *nešimas* ‘carrying’, *rāšymas* ‘writing’) have been created, whereas in Latvian as in Old Prussian there exist only adjectives with this structure. One notes that differently from Lithuanian where the suffix *-mo-* is commonly used, in Latvian the adjectival suffix **-no-* is encountered in the form *-šana* (<**-s-jo-nā*), cf., e.g., *miršana* ‘death’. The closest suffix to this is not in Lithuanian, but in Old Prussian where we encounter the suffix *-sna*, cf. OP *billisna* ‘sayings’.

Ambrasas notes that when one talks about the ethnogenesis of the Lithuanians one must keep in mind that a number of word-formation isoglosses connect the Lithuanians with the Prussians and separate them from the Latvians. For example, Lith. *šeimyna* ‘family’ corresponds with OP *seimīns* ‘domestic servants’. Collective formations with the suffix **-īno-* are encountered also in the Slavic languages (cf. Lith. *beržynas* ‘birch grove’ and Slavic **berzīna-*). In Latvian, however, one encounters only the ablaut variant **-ei-no-/-oi-no-*, cf. Lith. *egļynas* ‘fir grove’ vs. Latv. *egliene*, *egliens* ‘id’. Since IE **-ei-* also gives Proto-Slavic **-ī-* it is impossible to determine whether the Slavic reconstruction **berzīna* is the earliest form or not. One could just as well reconstruct an early Proto-Slavic **berzeina-* in which case the suffix would correspond with the Latvian rather than the Lithuanian form of the suffix.

The section entitled ‘Some Old Indo-European Features of the Formation of Baltic Adjectives’ (pp. 156–180) is essentially an English translation of chapter 5 *Senieji indoeuropietiškieji baltų kalbų būdvardžių darybos bruožai*. The English translation is excellent, but I was unable to locate an explanation as to why just this section was translated into English or the name of the author of the translation.

In the final article (in French) Ambrasas concentrates on the fact that Lithuanian and Latvian show numerous structural differences particularly in the formation of nouns of action, collective nouns and the formation of diminutives. One is struck by the fact that the suffix **-imo/-īmo* known in such Lithuanian nouns as *nešimas* ‘carrying’ and *rāšymas* ‘writing’ is encountered in Latvian and Old Prussian only

in adjectives, e.g., Latv. dialect *tālīms* 'distant', cf. Lith. *tólimas*, *tólymas* 'id'. One notes that differently from Lithuanian where the suffix *-mo-* is commonly used, in Latvian the adjectival suffix **-no-* is encountered in the form *-šana* (<**-s-īo-nā*), cf., e.g., *miršana* 'death'. (A misprint on p. 126 gives us *nomina actinis* for *nomina actionis*.) The closest suffix to this is not in Lithuanian, but in Old Prussian where we encounter the suffix *-sna*, cf. OP *billisna* 'sayings'. Lithuanian and Latvian differ also in the way of forming diminutives, Lithuanian usually using the suffix **-eljo-* frequently accompanied by palatalization of the preceding consonant. Nevertheless this suffix is occasionally encountered in Latvian, e.g., *maišelis* (diminutive of *māiss* 'bag'), cf. Lith. *maišėlis* 'id'. There is very little evidence for this suffix in Old Prussian, e.g., (EV 179) *patowelis* 'step-father' and perhaps the Basel Epigram word *tewelyse* 'little father' and a few personal names. The usual Latvian diminutive, on the other hand is formed with the suffixes **-injo-* and **-itjo-*, e.g., *dēliņš* from *dēlis* 'son' and *brālītis* from *brālis* 'brother'. In Lithuanian the diminutives in **-itjo-* are much less common than in Latvian, although we do encounter Lith. *brolytis* derived from *brōlis* 'brother'. On the other hand a different ablaut grade of the same suffix, viz. **-oitjo-* is widely used in Lithuanian, e.g., *brolaitis* from *brōlis*. This suffix is not known in Latvian.

Collective nouns denoting a group of humans or living beings have disappeared in Latvian whereas in Lithuanian the category has survived, cf. Lith. *brolijà* 'brothers and sisters', Slavic **bratŕvja* 'brothers', Gk. φρατρία 'tribe, clan'. Latvian dialects do have numerous derivatives denoting a group of plants or objects located in a single place, e.g., the suffix **-ā-jo-*, cf. Latv. dialect *āksnājs* 'alder-grove', whereas Lithuanian has *āksna*, *alksnà* 'id'. The most abundantly represented Lithuanian suffix denoting a group of plants or objects located in one spot is **-ī-no-*, (cf. Lith. *šeimyna*, OP *seimīns* 'domestic servants'). Some eastern and western High Lithuanian dialects have collective nouns in *-ytė*, cf. Lith. *alksnýtė* 'alder-grove', *eglytė* 'pine forest', *karklytė* 'willow grove', (misprinted here (p. 190) as *karklylė*). This suffix must have existed in Latvian also at one time as one can see from the place names *Apsīte*, *Kalmīte*, etc., but at present an ablaut derivative is encountered in Latvian, cf., *bērzaitē* beside Lith. *beržytė* 'forest of young birch trees'. Ambrazas discusses the suffix *-ysta* (also more commonly *-ystė* for nouns denoting quality) and writes that Lith. *krikščionystà* 'Christianity' corresponds exactly to OP (EV 794) *cristionisto* (here (p. 192) misprinted as *cristiomsto*), see PKEŽ II 280. In addition to nouns in *-ulis(-ė)* denoting the possessor of a characteristic the Lithuanian language also has nouns in *-uōlis(-ė)*, e.g., *bičiūlis* and *bičiūōlis* 'friend'. Old Prussian and eastern Lithuanian dialects have the suffix *-ena* which denotes the hide or skin of an animal, e.g., Lith. *arklenà* 'horse leather', OP (EV 498) *nognan* 'Leder, leather' if the word is derived from **nōgenan*. On the other hand Latvian does not have the suffix in this form, although we do encounter the suffix **-enjo-*, e.g., *vecenis* 'old man', *rītenis*

'east wind'. Lithuanian only has a few such derivatives, e.g., *bergždēnis(-ė)* 'barren animal'. The most important Lithuanian suffix denoting the possessor of a characteristic *-inykas* has an exact counterpart in Old Prussian, but not in Latvian, cf., e.g., Lith. *laukinỹkas* 'inhabitant of the fields', OP (EV 407) *laukinikis* 'Leman, tenant', but Latv. *laūcinieks* 'peasant'. Ambrazas writes that the nouns in **-iniko-/*-ineiko-* denoting the possessor of a quality are likewise productive in Slavic and that they are frequently derivatives of adjectives in **-ino-*, cf., e.g., *grěšbnikv* 'sinner' < *grěšbnv* 'sinful'. It seems, however, that one could also understand *grěšbnikv* as an agent noun (see Vaillant 1964: 211). Thus are we to understand a sinner as possessing the quality of sin or an agent (capable of) producing sin? This seems to be a theological question, perhaps, rather than a linguistic question.

According to Ambrazas nouns with the suffix **-iko-* have been common in Western High Lithuanian dialects, although in the Eastern High Lithuanian dialects they are less frequently attested. This suffix had its origin in the diminutive suffix **-iko-* which is well attested in Old Prussian, cf. *malnijikx* 'Kindlein, small child'.

Ambrazas writes that the Slavic languages probably got the agentive suffixes **-tā-ĭo-* and **-ē-ĭo-* from Baltic, cf. Lith. *artójas* 'plowman', Latv. *arājs* < **artājs*, OP (EV 236) *artoys* 'Ackermann, plowman' which is cognate with Proto-Slavic **ortajv* 'id'. Whereas the adjectival suffix **-(i)ĭo-* is productive in Slavic (e.g., *člověčv* 'human'), Greek (e.g., ἵππιος 'rich in horses'), Indic (cf. Vedic *ásu(i)ya-* (here misprinted as *ásviya-*) 'belonging to (or coming from) horses'). This type of adjective is not well represented in Baltic, although such adjectives do exist, cf. Lith. *šlāpias* 'damp', Latv. *slapjš*.

Ambrazas notes that the archaism of the Baltic languages is well known but there are cases where the Slavic languages have preserved a more ancient state than the Baltic. Thus Slavic has preserved the ancient suffix **-tel-*, whereas in Baltic this suffix has been completely eliminated and replaced by the suffixes **-tāĭo-* and **-ĭo-*. Certain innovations in the area of word formation unite the Balts, Slavs and the Germans, e.g., the possessive adjectives in **-isko-*, cf., e.g. OCS *božvskv*, Gothic *gudisks*, Lith. *diėviškas* 'divine'.

In addition to the few misprints already mentioned I shall mention a few more here. The date in the reference 'Vanags 1951' (p. 18) is surely a misprint, since he was born in 1962. On p. 116 and in the English translation on p. 166 we encounter Gk. ἅγιος 'holy, sacred' with the spiritus lenis instead of the correct ἅγιος with the spiritus asper; on p. 194 we find *ankštuōlis* for *aukštuōlis*; on p. 211 *exlusive* for *exclusive*. On p. 113, fn. 8 the OInd *kṛṣṇasá* 'blackish' is transcribed correctly but in the English translation fn. 7 on p. 163, the letter *-ṣ-* was omitted to give us *kṛṇasá*.

Although I have expressed very minor criticisms in this review, in sum it seems to me that all Balticists should be grateful to Prof. Mikulėnienė for putting together and making easily available the writings of this talented, but untimely de-

ceased linguist, a man whose depth of knowledge and keen insights have led to important and interesting conclusions. To get some idea of the loss we have suffered I advise people to read the obituary of Saulius Ambrazas written by Grasilda Blažienė (2010). I was particularly struck by the comment made by Saulius' father: 'Nemėgstu, kai mane aplenkia' (Blažienė 2010: 203). Balticists of my generation may share that sentiment.

ABBREVIATIONS

Gk. – Greek	Latv. – Latvian	OCS – Old Church Slavonic	Pol. – Polish
IE – Indo-European	Lith. – Lithuanian	OP – Old Prussian	Russ. – Russian
Lat. – Latin		OI – Old Indic	

REFERENCES

Blažienė Grasilda 2010: Išėjęs, kad pasiliktu. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 62–63, 201–204.

EV – Elbing Vocabulary.

LEW – Fraenkel Ernst. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1955–1965.

LKŽ – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras, 1941–2004.

PKEŽ I–IV – Mažiulis Vytautas. *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas* 1–4. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1988–1997.

Vaillant André 1964: *Manuel du vieux slave* 1. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.

Įteikta 2011 m. gruodžio 19 d.

WILLIAM R. SCHMALSTIEG
The Pennsylvania State University
814 Cornwall Road
State College PA 16803, U.S.A.
emily@leanonemily.com