

Reviews

Bill J. Darden. *Studies in phonological theory and historical linguistics*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers, 2015. viii + 434 pp. ISBN 978-089357-446-8.

Reviewed by Rick Derksen

As suggested by its title, this collection of studies by Bill Darden consists of two parts. The first part contains 17 articles on historical linguistics, 14 of which were originally published in the 1990s. The topics range from Proto-Indo-European and Balto-Slavic to Baltic and Slavic individually. The 10 articles on phonological theory which make up the second part of the book were for the greater part published in the 1970s and 1980s. The most recent phonological study, which is also the article that concludes the volume, is a retrospective on phonology in Chicago in the period 1965–2004. Considering that the author has “never felt any disconnect between diachronic linguistics and linguistic theory” (1), it will come as no surprise that the division between the two parts of the book is not as strict as it may seem. The phonological studies feature many examples from Slavic and Baltic that involve historical developments, while phonological theory is employed to gain a better understanding of historical changes. Throughout the collection one can observe an interaction between phonological theory and empirical findings.

Since I feel that I could hardly do justice to Darden’s theoretical work on phonology and morphophonology, I shall focus on the first part of the book. The earliest article on historical linguistics in this collection (Darden 1979) is actually, I am ashamed to admit, the only publication that I knew beforehand. It is a critical assessment of Illič-Svityč’s monograph on Slavic and Baltic nominal accentuation (1963, English translation 1979), which tries to clarify the relationship between Slavic and Baltic nominal accent paradigms while providing comparative proof for its Indo-European origins. Darden rejects Illič-Svityč’s claims, finding himself closer to Kuryłowicz’s view that the Balto-Slavic and Indo-European accent classes are genetically unrelated. When I first read Darden’s article, which must have been when I was working on my dissertation (Derksen 1996), I considered Kuryłowicz’s accentological work largely obsolete and, to be honest, I see no reason to change my mind. Darden makes a number of valid points, however, as I already realized at the time. First, Illič-

Svityč's handling of data from dialect descriptions and manuscripts, which on the whole was a crucial step forward in comparison with that of many predecessors, occasionally seems somewhat eclectic (92). Second, there is the fundamental issue of to what extent it is justified to identify etyma from different branches of Indo-European as a form that can theoretically be traced to the same proto-form, since one or more cognates may have been created at a later stage (*ibid.*)¹ I agree with Darden that some of Illič-Svityč's comparisons have little evidential value. It does not seem very useful, for instance, to compare Lith. *gānas* 'herdsman', cf. *ganýti* 'to herd', directly with Skt. *ghaná-* 'striker, killer, club' (101; cf. Derksen 2015: 163). In a publication from 1989, Darden tries to evaluate part of Illič-Svityč's Lithuanian comparative data—the discussion is limited to nouns with a so-called short root—by classifying them into six categories. This categorization is based on the reliability of the etymological connection. Then he combines these sets of forms with a system that purports to quantify the reliability of the accentual variants. Darden again reaches the conclusion that Illič-Svityč's claims cannot be substantiated.

I have no intention of discussing Darden's accentological studies in detail, though his transparent and open presentation reads like an invitation to do so. I would like to point out, however, that apart from questioning certain aspects of Illič-Svityč's methodology, Darden also succeeds in pinpointing one of the main weaknesses of the monograph, to wit, the unconvincing treatment of the fate of the neuter *o*-stems (93). According to Illič-Svityč, Slavic neuter *o*-stems with a short root regularly correspond to Lithuanian masculine *o*-stems with mobile stress, but the evidence does not bear this out. A common pattern is accentual paradigm (AP) b in Proto-Slavic corresponding to AP 2 (original stem stress) in Lithuanian (e.g., *keřslas* AP 2/4 'cutter' vs. PSI. **čerslò* AP b 'plough-share'). I have argued that in these cases the Lithuanian barytone stress results from an East Baltic retraction of the ictus from **-ā*. The stress shift is often accompanied by metatony. Here it is unfortunate that Darden does not discuss nominals with a "long root", as it distorts the overall picture. His motivation was undoubtedly that long roots under certain circumstances attract the stress, which would obscure an original distribution between barytones and oxytones. However, the conditions of this retraction, which is known as Hirt's law, are such that there remains plenty to be said about the preservation of the original state of affairs. Furthermore, a discussion of Lithuanian nominals with an acute root may benefit from Latvian data supporting the Lithuanian evidence for the original paradigm. It is an interesting fact that the majority of Slavic neuter *o*-stems with an originally acute root that escaped Hirt's law belong to AP b, which means that they behave like nouns with a nonacute root (cf. Nikolaev 1989, Derksen 1996: 103–28). I have linked this to the conditions of Kortlandt's late Balto-Slavic retraction from final open syllable

¹ Darden (92 fn.) acknowledges that this was pointed out to him by Eric Hamp.

bles (in disyllabic forms), which did not operate when the preceding syllable was closed by an obstruent (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 4–7). I assume that there must have existed a Balto-Slavic class of oxytone neuters, which in Slavic ended up in AP b after the loss of laryngeals in pretonic syllables. In East Baltic, these nouns typically have fixed stress and metatony (see also Derksen 2011).

It seems to me that the two articles by Darden discussed above clearly demonstrated the need for additional research on Balto-Slavic accentology and etymology. I should add that with respect to the accentual evidence from other branches of Indo-European there was also still a lot of work to be done, as the accentuation of the Sanskrit and Greek comparanda cannot simply be taken at face value (cf. Lubotsky 1988). On the other hand, Darden's articles do not exactly abound in references to accentological publications, which since Illič-Svityč 1963 have substantially grown in number. As a consequence, his theoretical framework remains somewhat unclear. Darden's appreciation of Kuryłowicz would suggest that he rejects both the Proto-Slavic progressive shift known as Dybo's law and the Proto-Slavic retraction of Stang's law, two pillars of modern accentology.² The latter sound law, however, meets with Darden's approval on page 89. One of the things we know with absolute certainty is that Darden assumes a reconstructible Balto-Slavic stage, as is apparent from many articles included in the volume under review (e.g., pp. 22, 72, 79, 128). This fits in with his acceptance of Winter's law (61, 123), which to my mind is one of the strongest arguments in favor of a Balto-Slavic linguistic unity.

Within the field of Balto-Slavic studies, Darden displays a special interest in verbal morphology, which must be viewed in the context of his more general fascination with the evolution of verbal systems. The opening article, "Rebuilding Morphology without Grammaticalization" (1995a), includes Balto-Slavic material, which serves to illustrate functional changes in grammatical categories, in particular the shift from indicative to nonindicative. As its title suggests, "Aspect, Tense, and Conjugation Class in Proto-Indo-European" (1994) is an article that belongs to the realm of comparative Indo-European linguistics. An important role is played by the Hittite evidence and the Indo-Hittite hypothesis, in which Darden has shown a keen interest (cf. Darden 2001). A related study is "The Evolution of the Balto-Slavic Verb" (1996), which contains a lengthy introduction on the Indo-Hittite and Indo-European situation. Here Darden correctly notes (contra Kuryłowicz 1964:

² In his introduction to Proto-Indo-European and Balto-Slavic accentology (2013: 22 fn.), Sukač states that "neither Darden's nor Kuryłowicz's works have had any impact on the accentology", referring to Darden's rejection of Dybo's law and Illič-Svityč 1963, as well as to his idiosyncratic interpretation of Saussure's law (Darden 1984). Obviously, this is not the kind of attitude that I would personally advocate. It should be noted that Sukač is incorrect in claiming that Darden does not refer to any works by Dybo and Kortlandt.

80–84) that in the third sg. of the *i*-inflection the East Baltic endings cannot continue **-ei* (61). The Old Prussian form *turri* ‘has’, which Darden adduces, occurs alongside *turei* and *turrei*, however, and there is no reason why Old Prussian should have to be in agreement with East Baltic.

What the above-mentioned articles have in common is that the author pays a great deal of attention to the impact that changes have on the system as a whole. Instead of merely pointing out developments, he tries to show us what is going on. A more specific topic is addressed in “The Slavic *s*-Aorist and the Baltic *s*-Future” (1995b), formations which Darden by no means regards as an argument against Balto-Slavic. As a possible origin he could have mentioned a PIE *s*-present of the shape **CC-és-ti* : **CC-s-énti* (cf. Pedersen 1921: 26). Remarkably, the metatony in Lithuanian third person future forms such as *duōs* ‘will give’ is left out of the discussion. “Balto-Slavic Factitive-Iteratives” (1997a)³ is a survey of the relevant formations in Baltic and Slavic and an attempt to establish the Balto-Slavic paradigm. In Darden’s scenario, the optative occupies an important position. What I particularly like about this study is how Darden, using examples from English, illustrates the relationship between potential and iterative. Again we may observe that Darden is not content with showing that a postulated development is formally possible.

“On the Prehistory of the Slavic Nonindicative” (1997b) is one of several articles that show another side of Darden’s scholarship, viz., his ability to drive his point home by referring to examples in Old Slavic texts. In this case he deals with the prehistory of the imperative, a direct continuant of the optative, and the complex form that is usually called the conditional. Darden’s command of Old Slavic philology is even more prominent in “The Contextual Uses of the Present Perfect in *The Primary Chronicle*” (1995c). In the latter article, the author defines various contexts in which we find forms of the *l*-participle + present tense forms of *byti* ‘to be’ (the auxiliary is sometimes absent). Since in the majority of cases, but not always, these constructions are best translated with an English perfect tense, this is also a contrastive study. Darden concludes that in *The Primary Chronicle* the present perfect is best regarded as a present tense. In “A History of the East Slavic Imperfect” (2004),⁴ Darden takes a closer look at the disappearance of the imperfect in East Slavic. This requires a survey of the distribution of the aorist, the imperfect, and the perfect in various documents, including birchbark letters from the 11th and 12th centuries. The heterogeneity of the material makes it far from easy to draw any definite conclusions,

³ To my knowledge, this paper, which was first presented at a meeting in Toronto in 1997, had not yet appeared in print. It has been available online, however, on the University of Chicago website.

⁴ To be exact, this is actually the first publication of a paper presented at a conference in 2004.

one of the complicating factors being the influence of Old Church Slavonic on the written language of the writers. Nevertheless, it seems likely that the imperfect was a live form in the speech of at least some speakers of East Slavic in the 13th century. An important criterion for Darden is the correct use of the perfective imperfect, as this could hardly be learned purely from Old Church Slavonic documents, where the form is rare.

In spite of being a review article, “Comments on Ivanov’s *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*” (1991) is arguably the centerpiece of this collection, if only because of its length. The confrontation between Ivanov’s views on Russian historical grammar and Darden’s own presents an ideal platform for the expertise that he developed in the course of a career of teaching, since a historical grammar touches on a wide range of subjects. Darden informs us straight away that in his opinion Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963 is still the best general source on the history of Russian (141). This is in particular true for historical morphology and syntax. As to the section on Russian historical phonology, Darden notes that Ivanov’s (1990) book—unlike Borkovskij and Kuznecov—incorporates insights from theoretical phonology, but also that he sometimes finds himself in disagreement (*ibid.*). Interestingly, Darden adds that in the end the absence of theoretical considerations might be advantageous because the phonological theory one adheres to may become outdated. I am inclined to say that whenever it is possible to provide an accurate description of historical developments without recourse to a specific phonological theory, one should do so. In this case, however, we are almost forced to use phonological terms. The evolution of the vowel system, for instance, is connected with the rise and loss of /j/. It is crucial whether a variety of East Slavic at a certain stage (and in a certain position) had a phoneme /j/ or whether it was just an automatic glide. Likewise, the phonemic status of palatal and palatalized consonants cannot be determined independently of the vowel system. Darden tries to clarify matters by analyzing the spelling variation that we find in Old Russian texts.

In his discussion of the development of \hat{o} , Darden rightly criticizes Ivanov’s use of the term *metatony* (under neoacute stress), which may only confuse the issue. The question is under which conditions \hat{o} developed from stressed *o*. Here Darden makes a distinction between lexical accent and phrasal stress. The latter refers to cases where the stress falls on the initial syllable of a phrase, which may include a preposition or prefix (e.g., Modern Russian *zá gorod*). This implies that the noun *górod* has phrasal stress, not a lexical accent. Nouns of this type are old *mobilia*, and we know that in Proto-Slavic the stressed syllable was falling. Originally falling *o* never shows lengthening, but we do find \hat{o} in all other stressed syllables, including what Darden calls the grammatically placed accent on endings (*gorodómь*), suffixes (*volóvyi*), and the second root in compounds (*ogoródь*). I see no objection to stating that short rising $*\hat{o}$ was lengthened to \hat{o} , but Darden seems to avoid the phonetic designations rising

and falling deliberately. In his formulation, stressed or accented *o* changed to *ô* except under the phrasal stress. The terms rising and falling come up in connection with the metathesis of liquids in initial position (147–48). Darden dislikes the “normal” explanation presented by Ivanov, according to which in East and West Slavic rising **or-*, **ol-* yield *ra-*, *la-*, while falling **or-*, **ol-* yield *ro-*, *lo-*. His objection is that this hypothesis either implicitly makes claims about the tone of **or-*, **ol-* in unstressed position or even disregards unstressed syllables. For this reason, Darden distinguishes between fixed stress on an initial syllable on the one hand and phrasal accent and unstressed syllables on the other. I agree that the view represented in Ivanov’s grammar is inadequate, but I also find it difficult to endorse Darden’s formulation. For one thing, the initial metathesis is relatively early and may very well have preceded Dybo’s law and therefore the rise of AP b (cf. Kortlandt 2003: 232, Derksen 2008: 41–42). This would have an effect on the distribution: the number of forms with fixed stress on the root would be much higher. Darden does not accept Dybo’s law, of course, so within his framework the suggested rule seems to be accurate.

As far as I know, this collection of articles only includes a few papers that were presented at conferences. Nevertheless, the impression one frequently gets while reading Darden’s articles is that he is trying to make something clear to an audience. I suppose we could say that Darden’s teaching experience shines through in his articles. Furthermore, the articles are characterized by a fair amount of candor. Darden does not hold back when rejecting someone else’s conclusions (cf. 184, where Ivanov is accused of “pointless speculation”), but he is also not afraid to admit that his own view may be wrong (cf. 41, 341). As a consequence, he does not shy away from bold theories, which is surely one of the reasons why his articles will continue to make interesting reading.

References

- Borkovskij, Viktor I. and Pëtr S. Kuznecov. (1963) *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moscow: ANSSSR.
- Darden, Bill J. (1979) “Nominal accent classes in Lithuanian as compared to Slavic and Indo-European”. Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol F. Hofbauer, eds. *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*, April 20–21, 1979. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 330–38. [Reprinted in Darden 2015, 91–98]
- . (1984) “On de Saussure’s law.” *Folia Slavica* 7(1–2): 105–19.
- . (1989) “On the relationship between the nominal accent in Lithuanian and that of other Indo-European languages”. Howard I. Aronson, ed. *Non-Slavic languages of the USSR: Linguistic studies*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 56–79. [Reprinted in Darden 2015, 99–118]

- Darden, Bill J. (1991) "Comments on Ivanov's *Istoričeskaja grammatika ruskogo jazyka*, Moscow: Prosvěšćenie 1990". *University of Chicago working papers in linguistics* 7: 48–102. [Reprinted in Darden 2015, 141–88]
- . (1994) "Aspect, tense and conjugation class in Proto-Indo-European". *Chicago Linguistic Society* 30: 131–40. [Reprinted in Darden 2015, 31–44]
- . (1995a) "Rebuilding morphology without grammaticalization." *Chicago Linguistic Society* 31: 110–26. [Darden 2015, 11–29]
- . (1995b) "The Slavic *s*-aorist and the Baltic *s*-future". *Linguistica Baltica* 4: 217–23. [Reprinted in Darden 2015, 71–76]
- . (1995c) "The contextual uses of the present perfect in *The Primary Chronicle*". Simon Karlinsky, James L. Rice, and Barry P. Scherr, eds. *O Rus! Studia litteraria slavica in honorem Hugh McLean*. Oakland, CA: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 129–41. [Reprinted in Darden 2015, 201–14]
- . (1996) "The evolution of the Balto-Slavic verb". Howard I. Aronson, ed. *Non-Slavic languages of the USSR: Linguistic studies* 8. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 107–38. [Reprinted in Darden 2015, 45–70]
- . (1997a) "Balto-Slavic factitive-iteratives". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of American Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, Toronto, Canada, December 1997. [Reprinted in Darden 2015, 77–90.]
- . (1997b) "On the prehistory of the Slavic nonindicative". *Balkanistica* 10: 81–94. [Reprinted in Darden 2015, 189–200]
- . (2001) "On the question of the Anatolian origin of Hittite". Robert Drews, ed. *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite language family*. Washington D.C.: The Institute for the Study of Man, 184–228.
- . (2004) "A history of the East Slavic imperfect". Paper presented at the Conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Boston, MA, 4–7 December 2004. [Printed in Darden 2015, 215–42.]
- Derksen, Rick. (1996) *Metatony in Baltic*. Amsterdam–Atlanta: Rodopi.
- . (2008) "Notes on the Slavic metathesis of liquids". Peter Houtzagers, Janneke Kalsbeek, and Jos Schaeken, eds. *Dutch Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid*. Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi, 37–43.
- . (2011) "The fate of the neuter *o*-stems in Balto-Slavic". Tijmen Pronk and Rick Derksen, eds. *Accent matters. Papers on Balto-Slavic accentology*. Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi, 59–66.
- . (2015) *Etymological dictionary of the Baltic lexicon*. Leiden–Boston: Brill.
- Illič-Svityč, Vladislav M. (1963) *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Sud'ba akcentuacionnyx paradigm*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk.
- . (1979) *Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. Trans. Richard L. Leed and Ronald F. Feldstein. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

- Ivanov, Valerij V. (1990) *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. 3rd edition. Moscow: Prosveščenie.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. (1975) *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.
- . (2003) "Early dialectal diversity in South Slavic II". Jos Schaeken, Peter Houtzagers, and Janneke Kalsbeek, eds. *Dutch Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ljubljana*. Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi, 215–35.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. (1964) *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. (1988) *The system of nominal accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nikolaev, Sergej L. (1989) "Balto-slavjanskaja akcentuacionnaja sistema i eë indoevropskie istoki". Rimma V. Bulatova and Vladimir A. Dybo, eds. *Istoričeskaja akcentologija i sravnitel'no-istoričeskij metod*. Moscow: Nauka, 46–109.
- Pedersen, Holger. (1921) *Les formes sigmatiques du verbe latin et le problème du futur indo-européen*. Copenhagen: Høst & Søn.
- Sukač, Roman. (2013) *Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and Balto-Slavic accentology*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Kagerstraat 38
2334 CR Leiden
The Netherlands
r.h.derksen@gmail.com