

ACTA LINGUISTICA LITHUANICA

X L V I (2 0 0 2) , 2 1 3 - 2 2 2

NAUJU DARBŪ APŽVALGA

Survey of recent publications

LITHUANIAN LINGUISTICS 1998–2002: STUDIES PUBLISHED OUTSIDE LITHUANIA

First of all, one should mention the festschrifths that were published in honour of V. N. Toporov (Nikolaeva 1998), Ju. V. Otkupščikov (Zajcev 1999), V. V. Ivanov (Osipova 2000), Ju. S. Stepanov (Kubrjakova 2001) and M. Hasiuk (Marcinkiewicz, Osipowski 2001), all of them well-known authorities on Baltic linguistics. Actually, the contributions do not exclusively deal with Baltic topics, which reflects the broad scope of interests of the honorands (regrettably, Toporov's and Stepanov's festschrifths do not contain a bibliography of their works¹). A laconic review of Stepanov's investigations in the field of Lithuanian studies (verbal system and categories of aspect and voice, syntactic structure and the opposition of animate and inanimate objects and verbs, accentological studies) is presented by V. A. Rodionov (2001).

Otkupščikov has recently prepared two collections of previously published articles, a considerable number of which are devoted to the problem of the Balto-Slavic unity (Otkupščikov 2001a: 294–366) and to Baltic (especially Lithuanian) and Slavic etymology (Otkupščikov 2001b: 81–239). Important republications also appeared in the Polish series *Baltica Varsoviensia* edited by Wojciech Smoczyński: a collection of articles by Tamara Buch (1998) and a collection of the editor's publications on the Lithuanian language (Smoczyński 2001).

An important event in Russian Baltology is the publication of the Russian translation of P. U. Dini's comprehensive monograph on the Baltic languages (Dini 2002, translation from the Italian original completed by A. V. Toporova, general editing of the book carried out by V. N. Toporov). Dini's book had already been translated into Lithuanian and Latvian in 2000, but Russian is the first major language in which it is published. Unfortunately, the Russian edition completely ignores the many improvements that were introduced by the editors of the Lithuanian and Latvian editions. In this respect the Russian translation is to be considered a step backwards in comparison with the Baltic editions. An important part of books of such an encyclopaedic character are indexes that permit the reader to use them as reference books. Thus, one may expect publishers to add at least an index of topics and a word index. In this case one is amazed to find that even the index of names of the Italian edition is lacking. As a result of this rather indifferent attitude to a book belonging to the classics of Baltic philology, a specialist in Baltic philology would hardly consider the Russian edition to have superseded

¹ The bibliography of V. V. Ivanov is also not included in the festschrift. It can be found in Ivanov (1998: 813–909); for Ju. S. Stepanov's bibliography cf. Logunov, ed. (2000).

the Lithuanian one. The book shows some technical flaws as well. Besides many misprints, the frequent use of unusual symbols for the Lithuanian nasalized letters is particularly disturbing. Splitting the bibliography into a Latin and a Cyrillic part resulted in some duplications (e.g. Мажюлис 1974b (p. 472) and Маžiulis 1974b (p. 513), which refer to one and the same work). On a final note, glued binding will not last a long time.

Another publication of a general character that deserves to be mentioned is the encyclopaedia of the languages of the Russian Federation and contiguous states, whose first volume contains V. N. Toporov's article on Baltic languages (Toporov 2001). In the second volume we find concise presentations of Lithuanian (Bulygina 2001) and Latvian (Blinkena 2001). These presentations, however, are not well coordinated. Unfortunately, all Baltological publications contain many misprints². It should also be noted that the article on the Lithuanian language, written by the late T. V. Bulygina, a renowned specialist in Lithuanian grammar, was obviously prepared much earlier. Though the change of the linguistic situation after the restoration of independence in 1991 is mentioned, the bibliography does not go beyond 1986 (the 14th volume of the Academy dictionary of Lithuanian), which means that it says nothing about the Academy grammars of 1994 and 1997 and mentions only old (dating back to the fifties!) editions of Russian-Lithuanian and Lithuanian-Russian dictionaries, which is particularly strange in an encyclopaedia intended for Russians³.

T. V. Bulygina's essay may be called a good example of a presentation of the Lithuanian language from the point of view of general linguistics and language typology. An important advantage of this study is that it is not merely an account of traditional views, but reflects the author's personal ideas, which instead of being scattered over separate publications are now collected in one place. Some of them were incorporated in the Academy grammar of V. Ambraszas, but other ideas have received less attention from the Lithuanian scholarly community and are worth mentioning here.

Lithuanian *pluralia tantum* are treated as having two homonymous sets of forms for singular and plural (Bulygina 2001: 248), i. e. in a similar way to A. A. Zaliznjak's (1967: 57–61, 75–80) approach to the Russian language (cf. Bulygina 1970: 16–17). Semantically this interpretation is correct, but whereas in Russian it is supported by some formal peculiarities of agreement (7th agreement class in Zaliznjak 1967 resulting in the postulation of a fourth gender), in Lithuanian it is not so clear-cut: there are no problems connected with gender, so only the usage of multipli-cative numerals (disappearing in colloquial speech) supports Bulygina's interpretation formally.

For the discussion of the grammatical status of the so-called neuter form of the adjective an interpretation of the comparative suffix as having two allomorphs (*-iau* in the impersonal predicative form (cf. superlative *-iausia-*) and *-esn-* before case endings) is interesting (Bulygina 2001: 250, cf. Bulygina 1970: 35–36).

² In the bibliography this results in some errors: “Fraenkel E. <instead of Endzelins J. > Darbu izlase. 1–4. Riga, 1971–1982” (Toporov 2001: 154), “Серейскис Б. Грамматика литовского языка. Вильнюс, 1985” — ?! (Bulygina 2001: 258).

³ The essay on the Latvian language compiled by A. Blinkena, though somewhat old-fashioned and completely traditional, is not so old — it could be dated rather precisely: after the completion of the Dictionary of the modern Latvian literary language (1996) but before the rise of the periodical *Linguistica Lettica* (1997).

No arguments are put forward in favour of the specific segmentation of nominal endings in "pre-desinence" (предокончание) and ending proper (*vyr-a-ms*) in the publication under review (Bulygina 2001: 249). This interpretation was first suggested and discussed in detail in Bulygina (1970: 18–23). It makes the morphological structure of nominal endings more similar to the verbal system if there the stem vowels are viewed as morphemes of present and past tense (equally with *-si-* for the future tense and *-davo-* for the frequentative past) and a unique paradigm of personal endings is added to them, with differences between conjugations explained as morphonological alternations (Bulygina 2001: 253; 1977: 268–269; cf. Ambrasas 1985: 263).

In Bulygina 2001: 252, it is claimed that interrogative-relative and indefinite pronouns show no opposition between animate and inanimate gender, thus abandoning the author's former idea of splitting these pronouns in two, e. g. animate *kas*¹ (possessive genitive *kieno*, non-possessive genitive *ko*) and inanimate *kas*² (both possessive and non-possessive genitives *ko*), cf. *kieno čia būta : ko čia būta* (Bulygina 1985: 134). This former interpretation, however, seemed promising.

An interesting problem for a formal description of Lithuanian conjugation are the interrelations between the three main stems (see also the discussion of J. F. Levin's article below). In Bulygina 1977 (252–253) we find an explanation of the principal difference between present and non-present variants of the stem, but neither in the Academy Grammar (Ambrasas 1985), nor in the publication under discussion was this distinction explicitly made (cf. the opposition of preterit and non-preterit stems in Toporov 2001 (152) according to his earlier publication on the system of inflectional endings in the verb (Toporov 1965)).

Bulygina's position with regard to the question of voice is not quite clear. On the one hand, she defends a strictly morphological approach, voice being morphologically expressed only in participles (Bulygina 2001: 252, cf. Bulygina 1970: 66–67). On the other hand, compound forms of the passive voice are now considered as well (Bulygina 2001: 253).

A considerable block is formed by publications on accentology. One may distinguish at least three series here. The first series is constituted by the publications of V. A. Dybo, the main protagonist of the Moscow school of morphological (paradigmatic) accentology. The second series presents an alternative approach to the description (and attempt at an explanation) of accent matters developed by Ju. S. Stepanov. Finally, we should mention J. F. Levin's study, where attention is paid to the cognitive aspect of accentuation rules. Naturally, these publications cannot be analyzed separately from some earlier studies by the same authors, even though they may be separated by a long interval.

The Moscow accentological school (henceforth MAS), which has made numerous significant contributions to Slavic accentology since the early sixties, has always shown a keen interest in Baltic accentual data, one of the highlights being Illič-Svityč's monograph on nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic (1963). V. A. Dybo's latest publications are devoted to de Saussure's Law and the problem of secondary dominant morphemes in Baltic and Lithuanian⁴. In 1998, V. A. Dybo published an analysis of Old Prussian nominal accentuation

⁴ It should be noted that the articles often repeat one another. Thus, Dybo's surmise about the direct connection between circumflex metatony and recessiveness of the root (Dybo 2000: 59–73),

as reflected in the *Enchiridion*. It is generally assumed that in this text accented long vowels and diphthongs are indicated by a macron. In the case of diphthongs, the place of the macron seems to reflect a distinction between originally acute and circumflex diphthongs. Much more controversial is the accentographic function of the double consonants. Dybo adopts Kortlandt's hypothesis that double consonants indicate that the following syllable is stressed. Finally, Dybo assumes that acute *i* and *ü* were diphthongized under the stress. Curiously enough, his most frequent examples of the latter development involve *ij*, which is usually interpreted as [i]. This does not appear to have important consequences for Dybo's analysis, however.

Drawing a comparison with Lithuanian accentual data, including data from Daukša's *Postilla*, Dybo establishes four accentual paradigms for disyllabic nouns with a long (acute or circumflex) stem and a single paradigm for disyllabic nouns with a short stem. The latter merger would be a consequence of the Old Prussian progressive stress shift from short stressed vowels to the immediately following syllable. As this shift was proposed by Kortlandt in 1974, Dybo refers to it as "Kortlandt's law", while adding that he had discovered the rule independently. In recent years, Kortlandt's law, which had gone largely unnoticed for a long time, as well as his interpretation of the function of the Old Prussian double consonants have been hotly debated (Parenti 1998; Young 1999; Kortlandt 1999; 2000; Schmalstieg 2001).

The classification of Old Prussian nouns according to the four Lithuanian accentual paradigms only makes sense if it can be shown that de Saussure's law also operated in Old Prussian. Dybo concludes that Old Prussian represents a Baltic stage when de Saussure's law exclusively operated before dominant acute suffixes or in those cases where the valency of the accented syllable was not higher than the valency of the acute syllable (17–18). The evidence for or against de Saussure's law, be it in the traditional or in Dybo's formulation, is extremely limited, however. In view of "Kortlandt's law", one is forced to turn to the relevant case forms of nouns with a circumflex long vowel or diphthong in the root. It is not at all clear that these forms justify Dybo's conclusion. The root stress of *rānkans* 'hands' and *āusins* 'ears' (Lith. *rankās*, *ausis*), for instance, may just as well be taken as direct evidence against the operation of de Saussure's law. Nouns such as *imtā* 'taken' or *spīgsnā* 'bath' may have been mobile (cf. Stang 1966: 173). One cannot escape the impression that Dybo's eagerness to find evidence that would permit him to formulate some version of de Saussure's law seems to hamper his ability to study the facts objectively and prevent him from taking alternative solutions into consideration, which is remarkable considering the ease with which he proposes a retraction of the stress from circumflex final syllables (17).

Dybo's article on Old Prussian accentuation must be viewed within the context of the recent developments in the MAS. While the scope of the Proto-Slavic retraction known as Stang's law is reduced, the progressive shift referred to as Illič-Svityč's law or Dybo's law is replaced by a "правосторонний дрейф" that is assumed to have operated in a number of stages and is connected with early dialectal differentiation. According to Dybo, the only truly Proto-Slavic

based on S. L. Nikolaev's investigations (Nikolaev 1989: 75–97) was already published in Dybo 1997 (165–184) and, as far as the part on secondary dominant morphemes (2000: 63–73) is concerned, also in Dybo 1998a (119–129). The latter publication contains the same description of the Abkhazian accent system and some general remarks (Dybo 1998a: 129–202 = Dybo 1997: 65–163), cf. Dybo 1989, which is very similar.

progressive shift is the transfer of the ictus from a circumflex or short syllable to a following dominant acute syllable (Dybo 2000a: 94). As de Saussure's law in Lithuanian is reformulated as a shift of the ictus from a circumflex or short syllable to a following internal acute if both syllables have the same valency or to a final acute syllable irrespective of valency (Dybo 1998: 57; Dybo 2000b: 75), it seems natural to assume a Balto-Slavic origin for these shifts. This is virtually tantamount to a rehabilitation of de Saussure's law – or rather de Saussure's and Fortunatov's law – as a Balto-Slavic development, the rejection of which was one of the cornerstones of modern accentology. Since it is not very plausible that this accent shift, which is of a phonetic nature, would be conditioned by purely morphological properties, it seems that at that stage there was an inherent phonetic difference between dominant and recessive morphemes. According to Dybo's main hypothesis, there must have existed a tonal opposition (Dybo 2000b: 68).

The recent developments in the MAS are summarized in Lehfeldt 2001 (an improved and completed edition of Lehfeldt 1993), which is an introduction to the morphological conception of Slavic accentology as propagated by this school. It should be noted that this book, which contains a chapter on Lithuanian accentuation in synchronic and diachronic perspective, is essentially an introduction to the conceptions and achievements of the MAS prior to the radical developments that have taken place since the early nineties. The appendix by Willem Vermeer, on the other hand, is a critical discussion of the *modus operandi* of the MAS that devotes particular attention to its more recent publications. Among other things, he criticizes the MAS for not paying sufficient attention to the reliability of the data they are working with, neglecting existing knowledge and other relevant scholarship, and underestimating the possibility of secondary (post-Proto-Slavic) developments.

Whereas Vermeer's theoretical framework is compatible with that of the MAS and his criticism may be regarded as criticism „from within“, Ju. S. Stepanov has fundamental objections to the paradigmatic approach of the MAS (Stepanov 1997a; 1997b), which he traces back to de Saussure. Stepanov disapproves of conceptions that assign inherent prosodic properties to morphemes (such as tone or valency). Instead, he stresses the importance of syllable and phrase structure and often resorts to moraic analysis.

Stepanov puts forward a number of methodological theses, opposing his view to the theories of V. A. Dybo, P. Garde and B. Stundžia. These critical remarks should be regarded as strong stimuli to the development of morphological accentology rather than as a complete rejection of the latter. An improved approach should obviously combine both views. Some revisions may be observed within the framework of morphological accentology itself. Thus, Stepanov's claim that no investigations into the relationship between morpheme and syllable segmentation were conducted (Stepanov 1997a: 65) is incorrect, cf. Girdenis, Stundžia (1994). It seems that taking into consideration derivational characteristics is not at variance with a morphological approach (Stepanov 1997a: 79; 1997b: 7): dominance (understood as the ability to change accentological features, generally strength/weakness, of other morphemes (Stundžia 1995: 8–12)) should probably not be ascribed to a morpheme but to the derivational model (cf. Andronov 1999 on the dynamic aspect of the description of Lithuanian stress). A general analogy of ictus movement to the left in Lithuanian dialects and at older stages of Lithuanian remains a bright hypothesis since Stepanov (1972). A further development of the same approach resulted in an interpretation of Leskien's law in the same terms and an attempt to explain

the „reversed“ character of Lithuanian syllable accents (falling acute and rising circumflex) (Stepanov 1997b: 22). An important role in the history of accent shifts in Lithuanian is played by a revision of Wackernagel’s law, which is generalized to the whole organization of the peaks of intensity in Indo-European phrase (Stepanov 1997b: 15). On the whole, Stepanov’s articles contain interesting comments on the history of accentological theories and crucial theoretical problems as well as subtle observations on material from Lithuanian and Ancient Greek.

The recent paper “On the representation of Lithuanian morphology” by J. F. Levin (2000) is a sequel to his study on Lithuanian accent marking (Levin 1990). It recapitulates the latter study’s main ideas and extends them to the verbal system against the common background of cognitive speculations⁵. Levin’s approach reveals some interesting features of the Lithuanian accent system. The author stresses the specific status of the last stem mora, which loses the stress both to certain nominal and verbal endings and to verbal prefixes. The approach itself, however, seems to cause some inconveniences. On the whole, the reduction of the symmetric four traditional accent classes of nouns to three (merger of the first and second classes) obscures the parallel correlation between the classes implicated by the de Saussure’s law, which now is incorporated in a set of rules determining the place of the stress. The accentual characteristics of some nominal endings also contradict the properties ascribed to them within the framework of classical morphological accentology (Stundžia 1995). Thus, short accented endings in Levin’s system (p. 179) include Nom. Sg. *-à* (strong, attractive according to Stundžia), *-ùs* (strong, not attractive), Ins. Sg. *-ù* (weak, attractive). This results in some special amendments for the general rules of stress assignment (p. 180). The proposed deviation from the tradition would be a complication for historical studies. Similarly, it does not have any obvious advantages for the description of stress placement in derivation. The application of the same approach to the verbal system leads Levin to the conclusion that two types of accentuation of verbs are analogous to the traditional nominal accent classes 1 and 2 (p. 182), i. e. to nouns with an accentologically strong stem. This, too, can be regarded as a contradiction to the results of morphological accentology: taking into consideration the accentuation of prefixed verbs, primary stems seem to be accentologically weak in the finite forms (Andronovas 1995). In the second part of the article Levin shows the semantic/semiotic role of the structural elements which form a contrast between verbal stems and includes the accent contrasts of prefixed verbs in the same system. His observations on the dependence of the semantics of a verb and markedness of its present or past tense forms are very interesting and, by the way, not necessarily connected with the disputable accentological description in the first part of the paper.

Finally, we would like to draw attention to a few recent publications by two scholars of a younger generation from Western Europe.

Apart from an introduction to Lithuanian (1999, see Ambrasas 2000), Daniel Petit has published a number of publications on Baltic historical linguistics. Here we shall limit ourselves to three etymological studies that focus on Lithuanian data. Petit (1998) deals with the etymol-

⁵ One of Levin’s general methodological remarks is the claim that “there is no compelling need to propose morphological models whose only purpose is to reduce all lexemes to unique underlying forms” (Levin 2000: 176), which sounds as a kind of a challenge to such publications as Toporov 1966 (119) and Bulygina 1977 (238–239).

ogy of Lith. *sámbaris* 'gathering'. The article contests Dini's claim that *sámbaris* and Slavic **sъbora* 'congregation' can be traced to a Balto-Slavic cult. Petit combines a very extensive philological account of the Baltic data with an investigation of the fate of the root **b'er*- in Balto-Slavic. Petit (2000a) is a discussion of a number of Baltic forms that Karaliūnas (1976) had connected to Lith. *tautà* 'people'. The author rejects the etymological connection for every one of these cases. At the end of the article he argues that the *o*-vocalism of *tautà* may be analogical after other *ā*-stems. The objective of Petit (2000b) is to demonstrate on the basis of Lith. *stuomuō* / *stomuō* and related forms that **oh₂* yields **ō*, not **ā*. It is argued that there were originally two nouns, **steh₂-me/on-* and **stoh₂-mo-*, which yielded *stomuō* and *stúomas*, respectively. The root vocalism of these nouns were subsequently mixed up, yielding *stuomuō* / *stúomas*. At a later stage, *stuomuō*, which belonged to a productive type, was influenced by the verb *stót*.

Petit's approach to Baltic etymology is characterized by a careful analysis of all the relevant material, including data from old texts and dialects. He does not rely on the forms that appear in the scholarly literature, but makes use of all the resources that are accessible to the present day Baltologist. As a result, Petit's articles are instructive and useful, whether the reader subscribes to his conclusions or not.

Björn Wiemer's article (2001) is devoted to the problem of verbal aspect in Lithuanian. It should be emphasized that the author consciously keeps himself away from the erroneous practice of looking at Lithuanian aspect through the glasses of the Russian language (or, Slavic in general) (p. 34–35, 43–44). Wiemer bases his investigation on a thorough study of "aspectual" verb pairs connected by morphologically derivative relations stressing the importance of combining the analysis of lexical interrelations between such verbs with an investigation of the regularity of their functions and obligatoriness of use. An important theoretical claim is that grammatical category is not necessarily connected with inflection as opposed to derivation: thus, there is no contradiction in the fact that the category of aspect in Russian, although its members are connected by derivative relations, is considered grammatical (p. 30). In other words, the opposition "inflection vs. derivation" is not identical to the opposition "grammatical vs. lexical meaning".

Wiemer shows that Lithuanian lacks grammatical aspect because the choice between members of an „aspectual“ pair depends on their lexical features (whereas in Russian it is forced by the grammatical context). The rich and productive set of Lithuanian verbal affixes results in an elaborated system of *Aktionsart*, which has not yet developed into a grammatical opposition of aspects (p. 44). The article provides clear evidence for the already intuitively perceived impression of similarity between the situation in modern Lithuanian and an earlier stage of the development of the category of aspect in Slavic (p. 51). It is a good example of the role which theoretical synchronic grammar can play in historical language studies. The strict approach suggested in Wiemer's article clearly indicates the direction and method of further aspect studies of Lithuanian.

LITERATURE

AMBRAZAS, V., ed. 1985: *Грамматика литовского языка*, Вильнюс: Мокслас.
 AMBRAZAS, V. 2000: Nauji prancūzų mokslininko darbai apie lietuvių kalbą. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 42, 214–220

ANDRONOVAS, A. 1995: Priešdėlinių veiksmažodžių kirčiavimas morfologinės akcentologijos požiūriu. *Baltistica* 30 (1), 93–100.

ANDRONOV, A. V. 1999: Некоторые проблемы морфологической интерпретации ударения в литовском языке. Andronov, A. V., ed., *Материалы XXVIII межвузовской научно-методической конференции преподавателей и аспирантов. Выпуск 1. Секция балтистики (2–4 марта 1999 г.): Проблемы фонетики и акцентологии балтийских языков. Тезисы докладов*. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Санкт-Петербургского университета, 5–7.

BLINKENA, A. JA. 2001: Латышский язык. Виноградов, В.А., ред., *Языки Российской Федерации и соседних государств: Энциклопедия: в 3 т. Т. 2: К–Р*, Москва: Наука, 214–224.

BUCH, T. 1998. *Opuscula Līthuanica*. Warszawa: Katedra Językoznawstwa Ogólnego i Bałtystyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. (Baltica Varsoviensis, 1)

BULYGINA, T. V. 1970: Морфологическая структура слова в современном литовском литературном языке (в его письменной форме). Жирмунский, В. М., Арутюнова, Н. Д., ред., *Морфологическая структура слова в индоевропейских языках*, Москва: Наука, 7–70.

BULYGINA, T. V. 1977: *Проблемы теории морфологических моделей*, Москва: Наука.

BULYGINA, T. V. 1985: По поводу трактовки „слабо дифференцированных падежей” в литовском склонении. Zinkevičius, Z., ed., *Tarpiautinė baltistų konferencija 1985 m. spalio 9–12 d. Pranešimų tezės*, Vilnius: Vilniaus valstybinis V. Kapsuko universitetas, 133–134.

BULYGINA, T. V. 2001: Литовский язык. Виноградов, В. А., ред., *Языки Российской Федерации и соседних государств: Энциклопедия: в 3 т. Т. 2: К–Р*, Москва: Наука, 244–258.

DINI, P. U. 2002: *Балтийские языки*, Москва: ОГИ.

DYBO, V. A. 1989: Типология и реконструкция парадигматических акцентных систем. Булатова, Р. В., Дыбо, А. В., ред., *Историческая акцентология и сравнительно-исторический метод*, Москва: Наука, 7–45.

DYBO, V. A. 1997: Балто-славянская акцентологическая реконструкция и индоевропейская акцентология. Касьян, А. С., Минлос, Ф. Р., ред., *Studia linguarum*, Москва: Российский государственный гуманитарный университет, 53–189.

DYBO, V. A. 1998a: Балто-славянская акцентная система с типологической точки зрения. Иванов, В. Вс., ред., *Балто-славянские исследования 1997*, Москва: Индрик, 118–205.

DYBO, V. A. 1998b: О системе акцентных парадигм в прусском языке. (Материалы к акцентологии прусского языка, I) *Славяноведение* 3, 5–18.

DYBO, V. A. 2000a: *Морфологизированные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис*. Том I, Москва: Языки русской культуры.

DYBO, V. A. 2000b: Из балто-славянской акцентологии. Проблема закона Фортунатова и поправка к закону Ф. де Соссюра. Осипова, М. А. ред., *Балто-славянские исследования 1998–1999. XIV. Сборник научных трудов. [К семидесятилетию Вячеслава Всеволодовича Иванова]*, Москва: Индрик, 27–82.

GIRDENIS, A., STUNDŽIA, B. 1994: Morfema ir skiemuo lietuvių kalbos akcentologinėje sistemoje. D. Mikulėnienė et al., eds., *Lietuvių kalba: tyréjai ir tyrimai. Pranui Skardžiui (1899 03 26 – 1975 12 18) paminėti. Konferencijos pranešimų tezės (1994 m. spalio 27–28 d.)*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 13–14.

ILLIĆ-SVITYČ, V. I. 1966: *Именная акцентуация в балтийском и славянском. Судьба акцентуационных парадигм*, Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР.

IVANOV, V. V. 1998: *Избранные труды по семиотике и истории культуры*. Том 1, Москва: Школа «Языки русской культуры».

KORTLANDT, F. 1974: Old Prussian accentuation. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 88 (2), 299–306.

KORTLANDT, F. 1999: Double consonants in Old Prussian. *Res Balticae* 5, 75–80.

KORTLANDT, F. 2000: The Prussian accent shift. *Baltistica* 34 (2), 193–197.

KUBRJAKOVA, E. S., JANKO, T. E., eds. 2001: *Язык и культура: Факты и ценности: К 70-летию Юрия Сергеевича Степанова*, Москва: Языки славянской культуры.

LEHFELDT, W. 2001: *Einführung in die morphologische Konzeption der slavischen Akzentologie. 2., verbesserte und ergänzte Auflage mit einem Appendix von Willem Vermeer*, München: Otto Sagner.

LEVIN, J. F. 1990: Lithuanian accent as a descriptive notational problem. Kangere, B. and Rinholt, H., eds., *Symposium Balticum. A Festschrift to honour Professor Velta Rūke-Draviņa*, Hamburg: Buske Verlag, 249–256.

LEVIN, J. F. 2000: On the representation of Lithuanian morphology. Осипова, М. А., ред., *Балто-славянские исследования 1998–1999. XIV. Сборник научных трудов. [К семидесятилетию Вячеслава Всеволодовича Иванова]*, Москва: Индрик, 175–188

LOGUNOV, A. A., red. 2000: *Юрий Сергеевич Степанов*. Российская Академия Наук. Материалы к библиографии ученых. Серия литературы и языка, 26. Составитель Р. И. Горячева, Москва: Наука.

MARCINKIEWICZ, J., OSTROWSKI N., eds. 2001: *Munera linguistica et philologica Michaeli Hasiuk dedicata*, Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. (Poznańskie Studia Baltystyczne, 1)

NIKOLAEV, S. L. 1989: *Балто-славянская акцентуационная система и её индоевропейские истоки*. Булатова, Р. В., Дыбо, А. В., ред., *Историческая акцентология и сравнительно-исторический метод*, Москва: Наука, 46–109.

NIKOLAEVA, T. M., red. 1998: *ПОЛУТРОПОН. К 70-летию Владимира Николаевича Топорова*. Москва: Индрик.

OSIPOVA, M. A., red. 2000: *Балто-славянские исследования 1998–1999. XIV. Сборник научных трудов. [К семидесятилетию Вячеслава Всеволодовича Иванова]*, Москва: Индрик.

ОТКУПШИКОВ, Ju. V. 2001a: *Opera philologica minora (Античная литература. Языкоизнание)*, Санкт-Петербург: Наука.

ОТКУПШИКОВ, Ju. V. 2001b: *Очерки по этимологии*, Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Санкт-Петербургского университета.

PARENTI, A. 1998: Old Prussian abstract nouns in *-sna*, *-senna*, *-sennis*. Bammesberger, A, ed., *Baltistik: Aufgaben und Methoden*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 129–142.

PETIT, D. 1998: A propos du lituanien *Sámbaris*: la racine ie. **bher-* en baltique oriental. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 93 (1), 229–288.

PETIT, D. 1999: Lituanien. *Lalies* 19, 7–135.

PETIT, D. 2000a: Lituanien *tausti*, *čiutnas*, et le nom du “peuple” en indo-européen. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 95 (1), 119–146.

PETIT, D. 2000b: Lituanien *stuomiō* / *stomuō* et la théorie des laryngales. *Historische Sprachforschung* 113, 259–275.

RODIONOV, V. A. 2001: Литовский язык в школе академика Ю. С. Степанова. Кубрякова, Е. С., Янко, Т. Е., ред., *Язык и культура: Факты и ценности: К 70-летию Юрия Сергеевича Степанова*, Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 421–434.

SCHMALSTIEG, W. R. 2001: Comments on a recent debate about Old Prussian stress placement. *Baltistica* 35 (1), 21–27.

SMOCZYŃSKI, W. 2001: *Język litewski w perspektywie porównawczej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. (Baltica Varsoviensis, 3)

STANG, C. S. 1966: *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo–Bergen–Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.

STEPANOV, Ju. S. 1972: Ударение и метатония в литовском глаголе. *Baltistica* I priedas, 169–183.

STEPANOV, Ju. S. 1997a: Непарадигматические передвижения ударения в индоевропейском. (Исходные положения.) *Вестник Московского университета*. Серия 9. Филология, 1997 (5), 63–80

STEPANOV, Ju. S. 1997b: Непарадигматические передвижения ударения в индоевропейском. (I. Вокруг законов Ваккернагеля и Лескина.) *Вопросы языкоизнания* 1997 (4), 5–26.

STUNDŽIA, B. 1995: *Lietuvių bendrinės kalbos kirčiavimo sistema*, Vilnius: Petro ofsetas.

ТОПОРОВ, V. N. 1966: Несколько замечаний о структуре флексивной парадигмы литовского глагола в связи с проблемой порождения глагольных форм. *Kalbotyra* 14, 119–129.

ТОПОРОВ, В. Н. 2001: Балтийские языки. Ярцева, В. Н., ред. *Языки Российской Федерации и соседних государств: Энциклопедия: в 3 т. Т. 1: А–И*, Москва: Наука, 143–154.

WIEMER [ВИМЕР], В. 2001: Аспектуальные парадигмы и лексическое значение русских и литовских глаголов: Опыт сопоставления с точки зрения лексикализации и грамматикализации. *Вопросы языкоznания* 2001 (2), 26–58.

YOUNG, S. 1999: “Kortlandt’s hypothesis” and Old Prussian stress. *Baltistica* 34 (1), 5–15.

ZAJCEV, A. I., ed. 1999: *Linguistica et Philologica*. Сборник статей к 75-летию профессора Юрия Владимировича Откупщика, Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Санкт-Петербургского университета.

ZALIZNJAK, A. A. 1967: *Русское именное словоизменение*, Москва: Наука.

Aleksey Andronov

Rick Derksen