

BILL J. DARDEN, *Studies in Phonological Theory and Historical Linguistics*.
Bloomington (Indiana), Slavica, 2015, 434 p.

ISBN 978-0-89357-446-8

Reviewed by DANIEL PETIT

École normale supérieure & École pratique des hautes études, Paris

Bill J. Darden (BD), who had been professor of linguistics at the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures of the University of Chicago for a long time until his retirement at the beginning of the 2000s, is an interesting figure among American linguists. Over the course of his forty-year career, he was involved in most of the evolutionary phases of linguistics in America in the past half-century, beginning with Prague-school structuralism and going through generative linguistics from the time of its inception onward up through Natural Phonology. His work articulates very original and suggestive insights into Balto-Slavic and Indo-European as well as into modern phonology and represents a rare combination of precise philological knowledge and a high level of theorization. The volume under review incorporates some of BD's most influential papers in phonological theory and historical linguistics published over the last forty years. Considering the audience of the present journal, I will focus mainly on BD's papers that are relevant for Baltic linguistics, but I can recommend that readers look at all the papers reproduced in the book, some of them dealing more specifically with Indo-European reconstruction, the Slavic languages (especially Russian) or even Greenlandic. Some papers are devoted to theoretical considerations on grammar (e.g. 'Rebuilding Morphology without Grammaticalization', p. 11-29) or on modern phonological theory, a field of research on which BD has left an indelible mark (e.g. 'Explanation and Reality in Phonology', p. 289-312). None of the papers collected in this book should be far removed from the interests of any linguist. BD's contribution to linguistics can be described as a balanced one, since he has shown during his career a keen interest in various theoretical frameworks, especially structuralism and generativism, without ever adopting their dogmatic postures too rigidly. This is the reason why an innocent reader like the present reviewer, curious about all reasonable schools of thought, approaches this book with confidence.

Every book has its history and this is even more true if it consists of a collection of papers published over a long period of time. BD's papers on Indo-European reconstruction (e.g. 'Aspect, Tense and Conjugation Class in Proto-Indo-

European', p. 31–44, originally published in 1994), reflect debates that took place in America between the seventies and the nineties. To put it briefly, this was a period in which the reconstruction of the Indo-European verbal system was undergoing a major upheaval, trying to incorporate Anatolian data into a more classic model mainly based on Greek and Vedic; fascination with Hittite led to more or less radical attempts at rebuilding the system (a good example is Watkins 1969). At the same time, BD, as a leading Balto-Slavicist, had to explain the rise of Baltic and Slavic as structurally different families, and this depends first and foremost on the way the Indo-European proto-language is reconstructed.

Many papers by BD deal with the verbal system, either at the Balto-Slavic level (e.g. 'The Evolution of the Balto-Slavic Verb', p. 45–70, or 'Balto-Slavic Factitive-Iteratives', p. 77–90) or more specifically on Slavic (e.g. 'On the Prehistory of the Slavic Non-indicative', p. 189–200). The problem is obvious to anyone dealing with Baltic or Slavic or Balto-Slavic: the Slavic and Baltic verbal systems are completely different, the Slavic languages having grammaticalized verbal aspect to an extreme degree in comparison with other Indo-European languages, whereas the Baltic languages display a more temporal than aspectual system. The areas of convergence between Slavic and Baltic are few, and most often we have to suppose a complete overhaul in one of the two branches or in both of them. A good example is the distribution of the *s*-aorist and of the *s*-future ('The Slavic *s*-Aorist and the Baltic *s*-Future', p. 71–76, originally published in 1995): while the former type is predominant in early forms of Slavic, but completely absent from Baltic, the latter appears to be residual in Slavic, but predominant in Baltic. A traditional analysis is that Balto-Slavic used both formations independently to the same degree (as Ancient Greek or Vedic do) and that each branch has selected one of them and lost the other one. Another possibility is that both formations have a common source (in originally telic verbs) and split over time in the individual languages with different specializations. BD's paper leaves this possibility open.

Another interesting paper by BD deals with the 'Balto-Slavic Factitive-Iteratives' (p. 77–90, originally published in 1997). It is well known that there is broad agreement between Slavic and Baltic in both form and meaning on this point and even many exact matches, such as Russian *prosit'* / Lithuanian *prašyti* 'to ask', etc. The challenge that has been a major preoccupation over the last century is whether this formation can be equated with the PIE *CoC-*ej-e/o*-type, which is widely attested in Vedic Sanskrit (e.g. *mānáyati* 'to cause to think' vs. *mānyate* 'to think'), Ancient Greek (e.g. *φορέω* 'to carry over and over' vs. *φέρω* 'to carry') and other IE languages (e.g. Latin *moneō* 'to remind, to admonish', Gothic *satjan* 'to set' vs. *sitan* 'to sit'). There are two problems with this equa-

tion. First, Slavic *-i-* and Lithuanian *-ý-* (from **-ī-*) cannot be traced back to **-ej-* V; BD suggests that **-ī-* comes from the optative (**-ih₁-* in IE terms) reanalyzed as an indicative, which is an original stance that still needs to be elaborated more precisely. The other problem is the combination of this formation with the *ā*-formation in Baltic (e.g. *prašýti* ‘to ask’ < **-ī-* vs. *prāšo* ‘he asks / they ask’ < **-ā-*). Instead of assuming the conflation of two different factitive-iterative formations (separately reflected in Ancient Greek *φορέω* ‘to carry over and over’ vs. *τροχάω* ‘to run over and over’), BD proposes tracing back the Lithuanian **-ā*-type to another optative formation. The evolution of an optative to a factitive-iterative formation, however, is typologically uncommon.

Another issue addressed by BD in several papers is nominal accent in Lithuanian. Two interesting papers (‘Nominal Accent Classes in Lithuanian as Compared to Slavic and Indo-European’, p. 91–98, originally published in 1979, and ‘On the Relationship between the Nominal Accent in Lithuanian and That of Other Indo-European languages’, p. 99–118, originally published in 1989) are essentially a critical review of the material collected by Illič-Svityč (1963, English translation 1979) to substantiate the claim that there is a large convergence between Balto-Slavic and other Indo-European languages (Ancient Greek, Vedic Sanskrit, indirectly Germanic) with regard to the position of stress. BD tries to show that this convergence is highly questionable and that Illič-Svityč had to rely on data of various and often dubious provenance to support his claim. BD’s views on this topic are clearly not mainstream, even today, but I do agree with his note of warning that it is necessary to ‘take a hard look at the etymologies’ (p. 98) before equating the position of stress in Baltic and Indo-European words. Stress placement is a domain in which analogies and reshufflings are as widespread as they are in any other sector of the language. BD’s paper on Lithuanian accentology was published before, and independently from, some of the major works of the so-called ‘Moscow’s school’ (Dybo) and reflects a rather traditional approach, in which the position of stress is taken for granted as a primary datum, without questioning the combination of factors whose computation produces a given surface position.

Ablaut is another issue that has received much attention in Baltic linguistics, and with good reason, since the Baltic languages have not only preserved much of the inherited PIE ablaut system, but also developed new forms of vocalic alternations to a very significant degree. BD has devoted at least two important papers to this question, ‘Laryngeals and Syllabicity in Balto-Slavic and Indo-European’ (p. 119–126, originally published in 1990) and ‘On the History and Function of Ablaut from Balto-Slavic to the Russian Verb’ (p. 127–140, originally published

in 1990). The former paper is a discussion of the treatment of *#RHC- in Balto-Slavic. Contrary to the traditional assumption that the result of this sequence is a long (acute) sonorant (*#ĩRC-), BD collects material to show that it yields *#RǎC-. The material, however, is disputable, since it can include secondary ablaut grades (as in Lithuanian *vagis* ‘thief’ to *võgti* ‘to steal’), independent roots (as in Lithuanian *mėtas* ‘time’, *mātas* ‘measure’ vs. PIE **meh*₁- ‘to measure’, Russian *metit* ‘to mark, to aim at’) or even false etymologies (as in Lithuanian *magėti* ‘to feel like, to want to’ not to Lith. *mėgti* ‘to like’, but to Gothic *magan* ‘to be able’, Welsh *cyfoeth* ‘power, wealth’, which suppose PIE *o). The latter paper deals specifically with Russian, but Baltic data are duly included into the discussion.

There is, finally, one very interesting paper dealing with the ‘Syntax of Lithuanian participles’ (p. 263–286, originally published in 1992). Two points are given special attention, the syntax of adverbial phrases (especially the distribution between the gerund and the participle in *-damas* in Lithuanian) and the use of participles in subordinate clauses (Lith. *dirbu kaip galėdamas* ‘I work as well as I can’ < ‘I work how being able’).

The editors of this book are to be congratulated for this very useful book, which makes BD’s papers, which often appeared in publications of limited diffusion, available to a large audience. Looking back at BD’s career, one can only be fascinated by his position at a crucial time in the development of modern linguistics and, at the same time, by the richness of his scientific production both in Balto-Slavic and Indo-European linguistics and in phonological and morphological theory.

Daniel Petit

Ecole normale supérieure
Centre d’études anciennes
 45, Rue d’Ulm, F-75005 Paris
 daniel.petit@ens.fr

REFERENCES

- ILLIČ-SVITYČ, VLADISLAV M. 1963. *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*. Russian original. Moscow: Nauka; English translation: *Nominal Accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*, translated by R. L. Leed and R. F. Feldstein. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1979.
- WATKINS, CALVERT. 1969. *Indogermanische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.