

REVIEWS

Cynthia M. Vakareliyska. *Lithuanian root list*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2015. ii + 91 pp. ISBN 9780893574475.

Reviewed by Peter Arkadiev

Lithuanian root list by Cynthia Vakareliyska is a welcome publication, in that probably for the first time in English, it presents the basic elements of Lithuanian word formation, i.e., roots and affixal morphemes with their variants, in a systematic and fairly comprehensive fashion. The book consists of a short introduction (1–6) outlining the purposes of the root list, describing the most common phonological and morphophonemic rules affecting the shape of morphemes as well as the methodology of presentation of the material. The central part of the book is the root list itself (7–64), containing about 2,000 Lithuanian roots and root variants in alphabetical order. There follows a comprehensive list of the common derivational affixes (65–85) arranged according to the part-of-speech (noun, adjective, verb) they derive, including both suffixes and prefixes with their basic meanings or functions and, importantly, information about the accentuation of the respective derivatives. The book closes with a concise glossary of linguistic terms for nonlinguists (86–90) and a short list of references (91).

It is worth noting, as the author herself does on page 1 of the introduction, that the root list provides the synchronic forms and meanings of roots disregarding etymological information. Therefore, it is not surprising that having abstracted away from the more or less automatic morphophonological processes affecting the shapes of roots, such as, e.g., palatalization or “mutation” of the final consonant before certain suffixes (e.g., *rýt-as* ‘morning’ ~ *pùs-ryči-ai* ‘breakfast’, lit. ‘half-morning-ers’), Vakareliyska lists (sometimes in the same entry, sometimes in different entries) root variants related by such nonautomatic processes as ablaut (e.g., *skand-* ‘sink, drown’ ~ *skend-* ‘submerge, drown’), nasal infixation (e.g., *gud-*, *gund-* ‘accustom’), or synchronically opaque final consonant variation (e.g., *moj-*, *mos-* ‘wave’). This is perfectly justified given that such variants, which for some roots are quite numerous (e.g., *svar-* ‘weigh, weight’, *svarb-* ‘important’, *sver-*, *svèr-*, *svor-* ‘weigh’ ~ *svir-*, *svyr-* ‘bend, hang’), tend to develop their own meanings, often lexicalized in combination with certain derivational affixes.

All in all, the book is certainly useful, both for students of Lithuanian, for whom it facilitates breaking up polymorphemic words of Lithuanian into their constituent parts and recognition of the sometimes fairly complex rela-

tions between words, as well as for scholars, who now have an opportunity to make synchronic generalizations about Lithuanian roots and their variants, as well as derivational affixes (though for scientific purposes a reverse index of roots would also be welcome).

The general criticism that is possible to level at this book concerns the lack of explicit criteria for the choice of material and the somewhat inconsistent use of those criteria, which are spelled out in the introduction. Starting with the introduction itself, the list of the common ablaut patterns attested in verbal inflection (2) crucially lacks the pattern *e-e-e*: (*kėlti* : *kėlia* : *kėlė* ‘raise’); there also is no reference to the nonautomatic lengthening of the stressed /a/ and /æ/ (perhaps because this is not reflected in the orthography). The description on page 2 (repeated on 89) of the alternation illustrated above by the pair *rýtas* ~ *pūsryčiai* is at best inaccurate if not entirely misleading, since as it implies that any *t*, *d* “mutates” to *č*, *dž* “before a back vowel,” while in reality this “mutation” occurs only in positions where an etymological **j* preceded the back vowel. It cannot be formulated without reference to the so-called “soft” inflectional classes and “palatalizing” derivational suffixes. The formulation on the same page that nasals “can drop before obstruents” is also inaccurate. Nasals never drop before stops and systematically drop before fricatives and affricates (with a number of well-defined exceptions). The characterization of the so-called “grave accent” as “falling” (3) is inadequate, since this accent sign is no more than a purely graphic marker of stress on short syllables. Moreover, speaking about “tones” in Lithuanian is an outdated and ill-informed practice, which I would strongly advise linguists to discontinue; see Dogil (1999) and Daugavet (2015: 169–73) for informed and empirically adequate treatments of the complex interaction of vowel quality, quantity, and pitch in Lithuanian syllable “intonations.”

The characterization in footnote 2 on page 4 of the “monophthongization of the nasal diphthong /en/” to *ę* in cases like *brend-*, *bręs-* as “less predictable” is strange, since this process is almost automatic (with well-defined exceptions). This does not invalidate Vakareliyska’s decision—in my view, correct—to list such root variants, which are related to each other by more than one phonological process. But the description should be accurate. Unfortunately, this decision is not always consistently implemented; for example, among the variants of the root ‘bite’ only *kand-* is included (22), but not *kąs-*, which arises due to the very same processes as *bręs-* (the same goes for *siunt-*, *siųs-* ‘send’). The same inconsistency concerns root variants with metathesis described on page 3: why for ‘knot’ are both *mezg-* and *megz-* listed, while for ‘throw’ only *blokš-* is mentioned, but not *blošk-*, and for ‘signify’ only *reišk-*, but not *reikš-* (the same with a number of other roots of similar structure)? The very next footnote 3 on page 4 apparently treats root variants such as *bail-*, *baim-*, *bais-* ‘fear’ as related through ablaut, which is certainly not the case. The historical excursus con-

tained in this footnote is probably necessary, but it should have been more accurately worded.

More generally, the introduction does not contain the explicit criteria that the author used when making decisions regarding the inclusion or noninclusion of a particular root into the list or of assigning meanings to roots. References to dictionaries and grammars are certainly insufficient. This would not be in itself a problem for a book designed primarily for pedagogical purposes, if not for the sad fact that the list contains numerous lacunae. Below I list alphabetically those missing roots, root variants, and meanings that I found comparing some parts of the list to the Lithuanian-Russian dictionary by A. Lyberis (Lyberis 1962), containing ca. 37,000 words, which may well be not exhaustive, since I purposefully limited systematic cross-checking to those letters of the alphabet which do not start many different roots.

ak- 'eye': the meaning 'blind' (*ãkti* 'get blind') and the productive root variant *akl-* 'blind' are not listed.

The inclusion of *dukt-* instead of *dukt(er)-* for 'daughter' on page 14 appears to contradict the statement on page 4, while the more colloquial variant *dukr-* as in *dukrà* 'daughter' is not listed at all. For the root *džiaug-* 'glad' the productive variant *džiug-* is missing, as in *džiùginti* 'make someone happy'.

For the letter E, the following roots are missing: *eln-* 'deer' (as in *élnias*) and *ér-* 'lamb' (as in *éras, érëlis*).

For the root *gryn-* 'pure', including the meaning 'cash' as in *grynaĩs* 'in cash', would be helpful for those wishing to use Lithuanian practically.

For the letter I, the following roots are missing: *iešm-* 'spit' (*iëšmas*), *iev-* 'bird-cherry' (*ievà*), *inkar-* 'anchor' (*iñkaras*). For the root *ilg-* 'long', the meaning 'longing' as in *ilgëtis* 'miss, long for' could also be included.

For the letter J, the following roots are missing, including, to my amazement, some of the productive and important ones: *jauk-, juk-* 'mix' (as in *jaũkti* 'lump together', *jukinỹs* 'mess'), *jaut-, jut-* 'feel' (as in *jaũsti* 'feel', *jutimas* 'sensation'), *jok-* 'none' (as in the negative adjective *jóks*), *jũs, jus-* 'you (plural)' (if pronominal roots are included in the list, they should all have been listed). For *juok-* 'laugh' the variant *juk-* is missing (as in *jukdýti* 'amuse').

Listing *kelt-* as a variant for *kel-* 'raise, lift' is strange, since the /t/ is always part of some suffix.

For *lip-* 'stick' the root variant *limp-* (as in *limpa* 3rd pres.) should have been listed.

For *man-* 'think' the root variant *mãst-* (as in *mãstýti* 'think') should have been listed.

For *mũs-* 'us, our' the variant *mëš-* 'we' should also have been listed.

For the letter N, the following roots are missing: *nard-* 'dive' (as in *nardýti*), *ner-1* 'dive' (as in *nérti*), *ner-2* 'knit' (as in *nertinis* 'knitted'), *niek-* 'nothing' (as in *niėkas*). For the root *našl-* the meaning 'orphan' (as in *našláitis*) should also have been included.

omen- 'mind, memory' (as in the frequent expression *turėti omenyjė* 'have in mind').

par- 'day and night' (as in *parà*).

The root *rup-* 'toad' could better be split into two: *rup-* 'coarse' (as in *rupùs*) and *rup-ũž-* 'toad' (as in *rupũžė*).

The root *stab-* should have as its primary meaning not 'idol' but, first, 'stop' (as in *stabdyti*) and, second, 'wonder' (as in *nuostabùs* 'wonderful').

Since the pronominal root variant *taĩp* 'so' is included in the list, we could question why its counterparts *kaip* 'how' and *šiaip* 'so' are missing.

For the root *til-*, *tyl-* the primary meaning is simply 'silent' (as in *tylėti* 'be silent') rather than 'become silent'. For *tur-* giving the meaning 'must' alongside 'have' would also be welcome.

For the letter U, the following roots are missing: *ub-* 'oven' (as in *ùbas*), *ũdr-* 'otter' (as in *ũdra*), *ui-* 'drive, scold' (as in *ùiti*), *ũk-* 'hoot' (as in *ũkti*), *uoks-* 'hollow' (as in *úoksas*), *uos-* 'ash tree' (as in *úosis*), and *ũž-* 'bluster, murmur' (as in *ũžti*).

For the root *vaizd-* 'view, represent' the variant *vyzd-* (as in the frequent word *pavyzdýs* 'example') is missing; for the root *verk-* 'cry, weep' the variant *vir-* (as in *virkauti* 'cry at times', *virkdyti* 'make cry') is missing. Listing the root 'fall' as *virst-* (as probably in the rather marginal *virstelėti* 'stoop') and not *virt-* (as in *viřto* 3rd past of *viřti* 'fall') is clearly incorrect and runs counter to the author's own methodology.

For *žin-* 'know' listing the variant *žj-* or even *žjst-* (as in *pa-žjst+a* 'is acquainted') would have been instructive for the users, since this variant is morphologically irregular (nasals are normally retained before the present tense suffix *-st*).

There are missing cross-references between clearly related root variants, e.g., *krauj-* and *kruv-* 'blood' (25, 26), *laip-* and *lip-* 'climb, ascend' (27, 29), *lenk-1* 'bend' and *lank-1* 'bow' (28), *lauž-* and *lũž-* 'break' (28, 30), *skand-* and *skend-* 'drown' (42).

In general, I do not understand and would object to the treatment of /j/ appearing in some vowel-final roots in intervocalic position as part of the basic variant of the root itself, as in, e.g., *joj-* 'ride' (cf. the infinitive *jóti*, iterative *jodinėti*). In my view, listing such roots without this epenthetic /j/ would be more consistent.

The list of derivational affixes is fairly comprehensive and accurate but also raises a few questions. No examples of the result meaning of deverbal formations with *-en+a* are given on page 66; the suffix *-et+ė* (67) is doubtful

since it appears to be limited to loanwords adopted from French directly with this suffix. “Deadjectival nominalizer” *-is* on page 70 is not a derivation suffix but an inflectional ending (*+is* in Vakareliyska’s notation) and should not have been included at all or should have been treated separately with other kinds of affixless derivation. The suffixes *-tuv+as* and *-tuv+é* do not always bear stress, cf. *kártuvès* ‘gallows’ or *kùltuvás* ‘flail’. The superlative suffix *-iáus+ias* is listed, but the comparative *-èsn+is* is not. The treatment of the verbal suffix *-y-* on page 80 is erratic and has obviously suffered from the common but nonscientific bias towards treating everything that appears in the infinitive as “basic.” In fact, there are two different elements with entirely distinct behavior and distribution: the denominal suffix *-ij-* (before vowels) ~ *-y-* (before consonants) as in *dalýti* : *dalija* : *dalijo* ‘divide’ and the deverbial causative/iterative formations involving conjugation change rather than suffixal derivation, as in *mirkýti* : *miřko* : *miřké* ‘soak (tr.)’ (on the treatment of the latter, see, e.g., Pakerys 2011 and Arkadiev and Pakerys 2015: 47–48). Listing *gýdyti* ‘cure’ as a formation of the last type is anyway wrong, since this verb is formed by the suffix *-d+y* discussed on the next page. The statement on page 84 that the prefix *par-* “can derive a reflexive verb from a transitive verb” is entirely cryptic to me. Finally, though Vakareliyska should certainly be praised for not ignoring such frequent though understudied verbal prefixes as *te-*, *be-*, and the like, in their treatment on pages 84–85 she unfortunately follows the tradition of calling such elements “particles,” which does not make much sense, especially for the reflexive marker *-si-*, which, first, is as good an affix as any other Lithuanian prefix or suffix and, second, does not belong together with *te-* and *be-* distributionally; “non-Aktionsart prefixes” would be a more accurate term. Calling *be-* a “reinforcement particle” is not the best choice; I would at least single out such combinations as *tebe-* ‘still’ and *nebe-* ‘not any more’, which are arguably the most frequent and the most clear cases of usage of *be-*; see Arkadiev 2011.

The glossary of terms in the appendix does not include such terms as “imperfective” and “perfective,” which appear in the book on pages 81 and 84, respectively; “infix” and “suffix” are included, but “prefix” is not.

A few typos are also found: *bręž-* instead of *brėž-* ‘draw’ (10), *kas-* ‘who, what’ (23) is certainly an error instead of *k-* (*-as* is the nominative singular inflectional ending), *mezg-*, *megz-* ‘knot, knit’ are listed twice: on page 31 and page 32 (only the second time is in accordance with the alphabetical order). *Gelėtas* occurs instead of *gėlėtas* ‘flowery’ on page 76.

To conclude, *Lithuanian root list* is a good book potentially very useful both for students and for scholars. The more regrettable are its, unfortunately, numerous shortcomings listed above. My advice would be to correct errors, fill the gaps, and publish a new version, preferably as an open-access publication or even as a searchable database.

References

- Arkadiev, Peter. (2011) "On the aspectual uses of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian". *Baltic linguistics* 2: 37–78.
- Arkadiev, Peter and Jurgis Pakerys. (2015) "Lithuanian morphological causatives: A corpus-based study". Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau, eds. *Voice and argument structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 39–97.
- Daugavet, Anna. (2015) "The lengthening of the first component of Lithuanian diphthongs in an areal perspective". Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet, and Björn Wiemer, eds. *Contemporary approaches to Baltic linguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 139–201.
- Dogil, Gregorz. (1999) "Baltic languages". Harry van der Hulst, ed. *Word prosodic systems in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 877–96.
- Lyberis, Antanas. (1962) *Lietuvių-rusų kalbų žodynas*. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- Pakerys, Jurgis. (2011) "On derivational suffixes and inflection classes of verbs in modern Lithuanian". *Lietuvių kalba* 5: 1–17.

Institute of Slavic Studies
Russian Academy of Sciences
Leninskij prospekt 32-A
119991 Moscow
Russia
peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

Received: February 2016

International Journal for the Study of Slavic Medieval Literature, History, Language and Ethnology, vols. 1-11 and Supplementum (Cambridge, Mass., 1993-to present).Â Book by M. Mur'ianov put the famous Igor Tale into a broad West European historical and cultural context of the mediaeval epoch. Volume V/1997, 360 pp. (sold out) The fifth issue of Palaeoslavica contains articles on the following topics: ancient Slavs on the Danube (O. Trubachev), Constantine-Cyril and Mesrop-Mas'tâ€™ocâ€™ (N. Trunte); the 14th-15th cc. manuscripts of the Novgorod Lisitsy Monastery (M. Gal'chenko); literary activity of Prince Andrei Kurbskii (V. Kalugin. Fall 2017 , pp. 792-794. The Bible in Slavic Tradition. Eds.Â To send this article to your Kindle, first ensure no-reply@cambridge.org is added to your Approved Personal Document E-mail List under your Personal Document Settings on the Manage Your Content and Devices page of your Amazon account. Then enter the â€~nameâ€™™ part of your Kindle email address below. Find out more about sending to your Kindle.Â Find out more about the Kindle Personal Document Service. The Bible in Slavic Tradition. Eds. Alexander Kulik , Catherine Mary MacRobert , Svetlina Nikolova , Moshe Taube , and Cynthia M. Vakareliyska .Â Alexander Kulik , Catherine Mary MacRobert , Svetlina Nikolova , Moshe Taube , and Cynthia M. Vakareliyska . Studia Judaoslavica Vol. 9, ed. Alexander Kulik .