

Linguistics

Pietro U. Dini, *ALILETOESCVR: linguistica baltica delle origini*. Livorno: Books & Company, 2010. 844 pp. ISBN: 978-88-7997-115-7.

The “Contents” of Dini’s *ALILETOESCVR: linguistica baltica delle origini* alone takes 14 pages (pp. 7–20). Therefore let me only list the main eleven chapters while omitting the titles of numerous subchapters: (1) “Descriptions of Lithuania and the Slavic Theory,” pp. 50–146; (2) “Myths of Origin and the Linguistic Theories,” pp. 147–236; (3) “The Quadruple Theory,” pp. 237–280; (4) “Descriptions of Samogitia and Onomastic Interest,” pp. 281–340; (5) “Descriptions of Prussia and Theories about Prussian,” pp. 339–445; (6) “Diversity of Livonian Languages,” pp. 447–524; (7) “Linguistics of Latinizers and Variants of the Latin Theory,” pp. 525–568; (8) “Illyrian Theory,” pp. 569–618; (9) “Descriptions of Sambia and Amber-logy,” pp. 619–650; (10) “The Hebrew Theory,” pp. 651–696; (11) “Epilogue: Baltistics before Baltistics?” pp. 697–743. Afterward “Sources” (pp. 745–804) and Bibliography (pp. 805–844) follow. Unfortunately, an Index is missing. Its lack is partly compensated by the wide sections of “Sources” and “Bibliography.” All in all *ALILETOESCVR* is an impressive 844 pages opus.

The author Prof. Pietro U. Dini is a linguist, a well-known Balticist working at the University of Pisa (Italy). He is a foreign member of both the Lithuanian and Latvian Academies of Sciences, an author of numerous books about the Baltic countries and cultures, a translator of multiple literary works from Lithuanian and Latvian into Italian, an author of works in various branches of historical Baltic linguistics: first of all Lithuanian, Prussian, and Latvian. Dini founded (together with Nikolai Mikhailov) and edited an Italian Baltic journal *Res Balticae* (1995–2007, vol. 1–11).

It took at least two decades for Dini to complete *ALILETOESCVR*. According to the bibliography his first

publication on the topic of Renaissance Baltic linguistics was an Italian article “Baltic Languages and Cultures in Renaissance: Baltic Theonyms in ‘Il Regno degli Slavi’ by M. Orbini,” printed in 1991 (this and all other translations into English in the review are mine—G. S.). Then dozens of articles in various languages (mostly in Italian, Lithuanian, German, and some in English and French) followed, so that to finalize his work in a single volume Dini had to rework (often to translate?) his ideas into one language—his native Italian.

The title of the book *ALILETOESCVR* is a riddle to almost everyone who comes across it. Dini hints that this is “a mysterious expression of an alchemic origin posted as an emblem—more than a title—for this book; it was coined by an adventurous and vagabond follower of Paracelsus to point to the rich linguistic variety on the eastern coast of the Baltic sea” (p. 21). But Dini does not decipher the emblem at once and leaves it to the reader to unearth an answer in the depths of his opus. Two attached subtitles, however, help: “Origins of Baltic Linguistics; Linguistic Theories and Contexts in the Sixteenth Century.”

Instead of writing several books, Dini composed one huge volume. He confesses he was deliberating between two different paths: short or long redaction. He opted for the second type (p. 24). So now most of the chapters include quite long quotations of original sources, and often chapters are concluded with appendices of even more extended excerpts from the same sources. I would assume that source quotations take up to about 15% to 20% of Dini’s book; and those are in many languages: Latin, German, Polish, Italian, Greek, Spanish, Catalan, French, English, and Russian. The quotations are intended to substitute in part the originals (presented in original orthography), so the reader has fewer reasons to reach out for those rare resources himself. Dini has travelled around Europe and gathered data in various libraries of Italy, Germany, Spain, Switzerland, Poland, France, Lithuania, and Latvia; he also visited certain libraries in the U.S.A. All this resulted in his *magnum opus*, which beside linguistic history covers certain aspects of history, religion, beliefs, customs, and geography of the Baltic people. In a sense it is a 16th century encyclopedia for the Baltic territories,

peoples, cultures, and especially languages. Everyone that would want to have a say in these matters in the future would have either to simply begin from *ALILETOESCVR* or at least to give references to it.

In my review I will mostly concentrate on the linguistics aspects of Dini's research and findings. I assume the enormous material that Dini had to embrace could have been organized in various ways: (1) Ideology (ideas and content of theories); (2) Circulation (spread of the theories); (3) Quality (novelty, systematicity, coherence, and elaborateness); (4) Geography of the emergence of a theory (a text, composed or printed either in Italy, Germany, Poland, Prussia or Lithuania); (5) Metalanguage of the texts (texts in Latin, Greek, Italian, German, and Polish obviously had disparate chances to achieve significance of impact). In one or another way all these aspects are discussed in Dini's book. But what he has chosen for the backbone of his opus, is the first (ideological) approach: chapters are approximately organized around the linguistic theories (ideologies) concerning the Baltic languages (the term *Baltic* was adopted to mean a branch of Indo-European languages quite recently, in 1845 by a German linguist Ferdinand Nesselmann, cf. p. 23). But the most impressive novelty, strength, and merit of Dini's book are the circulation paths of the theories he defined. Well-known theories are often positioned in a new light of popularity (numbers of reproduction, imitation, and translation) and geography (affected areas of Europe). Dini goes by theories: Slavic Theory, Latin Theory, Greek Theory, Hebrew Theory, etc. He has no objective to render a history of the texts themselves, that is, he does not attempt to unearth which text was copied from which exactly. Dini primarily registers and discusses ideology and journeys of linguistic thoughts; he wants to achieve a lush image of linguistic theory distribution zones.

Besides this, Dini takes care to spot, to explore, and to elevate the most subtle linguistic thoughts (qualitative aspect), to single out the pioneers of concrete theories, to trace down and identify pre-modern proto-perceptions of the Baltic branch languages and their inner nexuses. Dini pays attention to any piece of a Baltic linguistic datum that

he encounters in the 16th century sources, which I would classify into four major groups: (1) Myths of origin (of peoples and of languages); (2) Kinship of languages, their mutual (un)intelligibility (their commonality and incongruity); (3) Onomastics (names of languages, peoples, locations, etc.); and (4) Appellatives (quoted words, phrases, even longer texts in Baltic languages). Definitely, the first two aspects dominate Dini's book.

Chapter 1. "Descriptions of Lithuania and the Slavic Theory." Dini begins with a set of ideas that he generalizes as a Slavic Theory: "The earliest theory about Baltic languages was Slavic" (p. 49). It was popular even before the 15th century, even if some scholars (like Eugenio Coseriu) claimed the Slavic idea of Baltic origin was known only since Conrad Gessner (*Mithridates*, 1555; p. 49).

Dini analyses ideas by Enea Sylvio Piccolomini, the future pope Pius II (1405–1464), who didn't speak very much about languages. What he mentioned was the language of the Lithuanian State (Grand Duchy of Lithuania; p. 51). Speaking about his sources, Piccolomini mostly referred to Hieronymus Pragensis (from Prague), who was on a mission in Poland and Lithuania in the years 1394 and 1413. Piccolomini must have met Hieronymus personally between 1431 and 1433. Dini emphasizes his importance as the main source for Piccolomini's knowledge about Lithuania, and is skeptical about other suggested but not proved sources by recent authors (p. 59).

Piccolomini mentioned (*De Europa*, 1458) a language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: "The language of the people is Slavic; this language of theirs is very wide and divided into various sects" (p. 55). Dini attributes the concept of the huge linguistic stretch to the vast territory of the Lithuanian State (from the Baltic to the Black sea; pp. 59–60). Differently from certain other researchers, Dini interprets the "various sects" not as particular dialects of a language, but as a division of peoples, religions, and other rather ambiguously specified societal peculiarities (p. 60).

Piccolomini became a pope, and as his ideas became influential, there were multiple publications and translations of his works in the 16th century (1531, 1571, 1582, 1699, an Italian translation of Fausto da Longiano in

1544, etc.; p. 55). Dini switches to the continuators and simplifiers of Piccolomini's message: Giacomo Foresti, (*Novissime historiarum omnium repercussiones*, 1506, 1513; pp. 62–64), Hartmann Schedel (*Liber Chronicarum*, 1493 and *Liber Chronicarum cum figuris*, 1497), Georg Alt (*Das Buch der Chroniken*, 1493), and Johannes Cochlaeus (*Brevis Germanie Descriptio*, 1512). Dini also mentions other works on Lithuania, mostly non-linguistic ones: works by Marco Guazzo, Cesare Campana, Giovanni Tarcagnota, Giovambattista Botero, Paolo Giovio, Girolamo Lippomano, Pietro Duodo, Mauro Orbini, Sigismond Herberstein, etc.

And that's not all. The subchapter that follows is entitled "Variations on the Topic of the Slavic Theory" (pp. 84–93), containing at least three distinct variations. The first one preponderantly refers to the addition of Polishness, first found in Cocci Marco A. Sabellico (*Enneades sive Rhapsodia historiarum*, 1498–1504): "the People's language, like Polish, [is] Slavic," which acquired relative popularity among contemporary authors (pp. 84–91). The second variation is ascribed to Raffaele Maffei Volaterrano, who termed the language of Lithuania *Semi-Dalmatian* in 1506 ("[they] use the Semi-Dalmatian language"; pp. 91–93). Volaterrano loved to attach the prefix *semi-* to other language names as well (for instance, in Dacia people supposedly spoke a *Semi-Italian* language; p. 92). Dini argues that because Dalmatians were attributed to Illyrians, and Illyrians were considered Slavs, then the term *Semi-Dalmatian* must have been pointing to the Slavic nature of Lithuanian: "the language in question was nothing else than, one more time, a Slavic language, obviously, *Semi-Dalmatian* from the Illyrian region" (p. 93). Dini remarks that this was the first time the concept *Illyrian* was attached to a Baltic language, and it was a relatively isolated case for some time.

One more subchapter on the "Cases of Contamination of the Slavic Theory" follows (pp. 94–122). Certain authors were accepting the Slavic Theory, but making simultaneous references to other theories such as Pietro Bizzarri (*Pannonicum bellum*, 1573), who wrote about the Latin origin of Lithuanian, and who followed concurrently Piccolomini's formula (with the inclusion of Polish; pp. 94–95) on the same page. Dini argues that this was simply an

uncritical blend of two contrasting theories. Bizzarri must have been unable to distinguish clearly the multi-ethnic and plurilingual Lithuanian State (the Grand Duchy) from a specific Lithuanian ethnicity (p. 95). Also Abraham Ortelius (*Theatrum orbis terrarum*, 1570) repeated the Polish variant of the Slavic Theory. His book turned into a remarkable success; it was translated into many languages: German, Spanish, English, French, and Italian (pp. 97–100). The German (1580) and French (1590) translations termed the language in question *Windisch*, but this was just another term for a Slavic language. Dini observes that those texts that usually mention Polishness, do not include the term *Windisch* and vice versa (p. 102). Dini believes the term *Windisch* comes from Schedel (p. 103). *Windisch* as a synonym for *Slavic* had wider circulation; Dini points out that the anonymous *Enchiridion Cosmographicum* (1599) made them mean the same, cf. “Poland is in the Windisch language area,” “Sclavonia or Windischland” (p. 104). It seems that the information given on pp. 96–97 (in a quotation from Ortelius 1570) is somewhat contradictory to a table at the end of the subchapter on p. 103 (quoting the same Latin text of 1570): the term *Windisch* is absent from the first citation, but included into the second one. Could Dini have meant two different contradicting quotations from the same work (there is only one Ortelius’ opus of 1570 listed, cf. p. 788), or has he merely mislabeled the second quotation?

All in all Dini demonstrates the stunning abundance of texts circulating the idea of the Slavic nature of the language in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or the Lithuanian language itself. Many followed Piccolomini’s claim and others copied Sabellico’s *Polishness*, Volaterrano’s *Semi-Dalmatianness*, Ortelius’ *Windischness*. Great diversity within the single Slavic Theory and the numerous ways to perceive the language(s) in Lithuania are simply overwhelming. And among all these copies, reprintings, translations, and abbreviations Dini spots only a few somewhat original chunks of knowledge. Recycling of the ideas seems to have been at its extreme.

Knowing all this there is no wonder that the Slavic Theory is not dead today. I can recognize the traces thereof, for instance, in the notorious novel *The Jungle* by

Upton Sinclair (1906) about Lithuanians in the Chicago Stockyards. Sinclair considered Lithuanians to be Slavs; he had paid some attention to Lithuanian, but did not draw his own linguistic conclusions of language kinship.

The subchapter on the opposition to the Slavic Theory (pp. 106–122) follows. At first it seems unexpected: if there were authors who denied the Slavic Theory, then they rather have to appear in further chapters, dedicated to different theories. Dini sets Jan Stobnica (*Epitoma europe*, 1512) among the opponents. Stobnica knew very well that “Lithuanians speak their own language” and are different from Slavic speaking Ruthenians in the Lithuanian State (pp. 106–108), even if he was preparing an epitome of Piccolomini’s *De Europa*. Stobnica managed to correct the intrinsic ambiguity proposed by Piccolomini—as early as 1512. Dini remarks that “the great authority of Piccolomini, along with the wide distribution of his work, rendered his Slavic Theory and its variations much more popular than the compendium by Stobnica, which remained on the margins of the circulation of knowledge” (p. 110).

Then Dini comments that the impact of a Pole Johannes Crassinius’ (Jan Krasieński) work *Polonia* could have become greater, had his work been published earlier (it appeared only in 1574, that is, 62 years after Stobnica’s). Crassinius termed the Slavic Theory “erroneous” (p. 113) and explained that the aristocracy used Polish and Ruthenian, and that “plebeians have their own Lithuanian language” (p. 114). This was much more adequate than the theory of Piccolomini’s, as Dini remarks, but Crassinius was relatively late: he could use texts by other earlier Polish historians of the beginning of the 16th century like Długosz, Miechowita, and Cromer (p. 113), that were not available to Piccolomini.

Among those who contradicted the Slavic Theory Dini included Fulvio Ruggeri (manuscript of 1565), who claimed that “the Lithuanian language differs completely from Polish and German, and it contains some words that sound like the Latin ones” (pp. 116–117); and then Albert Krantz (*Wandalia*, 1575), who claimed that “the language and customs of Lithuanian people are different from those of their neighbors” (p. 118); and also Laonicus Chalcondyla

(*Historiarum demonstrationes*, ca. 1440–1471), who argued that “the Lithuanian Language is similar neither to Sarmatian, nor to Hungarian or German, nor to Dacian. They speak their own particular language” (p. 121). Surprisingly, the latter theory was aired quite early, but had no circulation at the time.

So, why does Dini ascribe these authors (Stobnica, Crassinius, Ruggeri, Krantz, and Chalcondyla) to the opponents of the Slavic Theory? Obviously, they opposed it, but there were many more others like them, who nevertheless were moved to the further sections of other theories (like Długosz, Miechowita, and Cromer, see further). It seems that here Dini seeks to single out only those authors who merely contradict the Slavic Theory with no clear intention to render an interpretation of their own. If so, then we can consider them uncreative critics: judges with no alternative proposals. Indeed, this must have been the case with Krantz and Chalcondyla, but Stobnica and Crassinius seem to have advocated their own somewhat underdeveloped theories (correcting Piccolomini, separating Lithuanians out of other inhabitants of the Lithuanian State). More than that, Ruggeri claimed that Lithuanian “contains some words that sound like the Latin ones,” which looks at least suggestive of the Latin Theory (see further). All in all, there were many more who opposed the Slavic Theory, but only those that had their own ideas expressed faintly found their way into this subchapter. Once again it only proves that classification criteria can be blurred and present additional challenges with painful choices to the author.

Chapter 2. “Myths of Origin and the Linguistic Theories.” The major myth that is dealt with in this chapter is the origin of Lithuanians from the Romans. Dini terms it the *Latin Theory*. He admonishes us at once that the myth of Roman origin of Lithuanians was not even hinted at in the texts of the Western European authors. At this point the geography of theory circulation begins to take shape: the Slavic Theory was very popular in Western Europe, and the Latin Theory was not; it was, then, a product of other areas in Europe.

Such texts as *Historia Polonica* (1455–1489) by Jan

Długosz had tremendous influence in Eastern Europe. Prior to its publication (1614–1615), it was copied from the manuscript and used by many contemporary authors. Długosz was one of the first to claim Lithuanians originated from Romans. He believed that Romans had arrived by ships to the Baltic Sea with their families during the upheavals either under Mario and Silla, or under Pompey and Caesar (pp. 154–155). Interestingly, Długosz used linguistic arguments “to prove” his thesis: from the language of Lithuanians and Samogitians (Lowland Lithuanians), from its sounds and symmetry (proportion), Długosz believed, it was possible to infer that Lithuanians and Samogitians originated from a certain branch of Romans (Latins) (pp. 154–156). Besides, he etymologized the toponym *Lithuania* to support his theory: the Romans must have named their new homeland on the banks of the Baltic Sea *Litalia* in accordance with the name of their old homeland *l'Italia* (*Lithalia*) (pp. 154–156). Many wondered what might have been the sources of Długosz’s ideas, but there is no single clear answer to this.

Beside Lithuanian and Samogitian, Długosz defined a language of Jatvingians as related to Lithuanian, thence, of Latin origin as well (pp. 156–157). Also the language of (old) Prussians was explained as partly descending from Latin, as somewhat similar to Lithuanian (p. 157). But Dini observes that the Prussian language acquired an alternative interpretation in Długosz’s chronicle, making his concept somewhat incoherent: Długosz claimed that some of the Prussians originated from Greeks (p. 159). Dini quotes the most probable source for Długosz’s Greek idea: Albertus Stadensis (13th century) spoke about Macedonians, who after the death of Alexander the Great travelled to Prussia (pp. 160–161). In other words, Prussians were claimed to be related to Lithuanians through the Latin Theory, but were torn away from them by the Theory of Greek origin. More than once Dini reiterates that the significance of Długosz’s theory lies in his complete disregard of the Slavic Theory; Długosz was isolated from Piccolomini and his followers’ discourse (p. 161).

The supporters of Długosz were numerous; Dini discusses them in his subchapter “Continuators of Długosz” (pp. 164–180). He, for instance, lists a papal nuncio for

Poland-Lithuania Zaccaria Ferreri (*Vita Beati Casimiri*, 1521), who linked the toponyms *Lituania* and *l'Italia* (pp. 164–165); then the French historian André Thévet (*Cosmographie Universelle*, 1575) follows, who, being somewhat skeptical, made a reference to Długosz nonetheless, and echoed certain details of his theory (both Caesar's conflict with Pompey and the Roman arrival in Prussia) (p. 167). Dini also traces down the fact that a naturalized Pole, a secretary at the court of the Polish-Lithuanian king Sigismund the Old, Ludovicus Decius (*Quatuor libros historiarum regni Poloniae*, 1521), was an adherent of both the Latin and Greek Theories of Długosz (Decius was less attentive to the linguistic details than Długosz; pp. 169–172).

Dini traces certain echoes of Długosz's ideas in the State of Prussia as well; for instance, in *Chronologia* (printed in Königsberg, 1552) by a German, Johannes Funck (pp. 172–173). Dini speculates about the first authors that used Lithuanian for writing and printing in Prussia (16th century): Martynas Mažvydas, Abraomas Kulvietis, and Baltramiejus Vilentas. According to him, they must have known the narrative of the Roman origin of Lithuanians; this is very likely indeed, but concrete data supporting this supposition is simply absent. One more author, Johannes Behm, a theologian in Prussia in 17th (not 16th) century ("Preface to the Reader," 1625), believed that "Lithuanian is a mixed language (*eine gemischte Sprach*), composed of other major languages" (p. 175). Even if the languages from which Lithuanian acquired the most words assumingly were Latin and Greek (Długosz had not linked Lithuanian to Greek, merely to Latin), it is obvious that Behm believed Lithuanian was not a separate individual language, but a mixture of others. Another author, a Czech intellectual Matouš Benešovský (*Knížka slov Českých*, 1587) was an analogous believer in the mixed nature of the Lithuanian language, which consisted of Greek, Slavic, Italian, and German (p. 180). It seems that these two authors, Behm and Benešovský, instead of being included among the followers of Długosz, might have been singled out as the authors of a distinct theory, which constituted a concept of the mixed linguistic nature of Lithuanian. Such a theory, in accordance with Dini's proposed paradigm, could have

been termed a *Mixed Theory*. Arguments against such a theory by various 19th century Lithuanian writers (like Simonas Daukantas) might serve as testimony it was not a phantom. Indeed, it is very difficult to see any influence of Długosz's theory on Benešovský, who referred not only to Italian (which could admittedly hint at Długosz), but also Slavic, which might be interpreted as a continuation of Piccolomini's ideas instead. All this is to say that classification of this enormous material has its challenges.

Then again, as in the case of the Slavic Theory, Dini groups certain authors as opposing Długosz's theory (pp. 181–199). One would think that all those earlier listed followers of the Slavic Theory might have been attributed here, at least those, who were familiar with Długosz's theory, even if they did not refer to it in any conceivable way. But often there is no way to know which of them knew the theory and ignored it, and who were simply ignorant of it.

Marcin Cromer, the bishop of Varmia, a Polish historian (*De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum*, 1555, 1589), discussed certain ideas of Długosz, for instance, he considered Długosz's etymology of *Prussia's* name *fabulous* ('imagined'; p. 182). But having said this, Dini demonstrates that Cromer confirmed the theory of Romans arriving at the Baltic Sea (first through Livonia), and that he even admitted the Latin origin of the Livonian (Latvian?), Lithuanian, and Prussian languages. So, it seems we can surely claim that Cromer's theory was at the same time *Latin*, influenced by Długosz even more than those of Behm and Benešovský. Dini must have faced a tough choice of including Cromer either among the followers or opponents of Długosz.

Another thing was Marcin Bielski, a Polish historian (*Kronika*, 1551, 1554, 1564), who was specifically interested in Baltic peoples and their languages (pp. 186–192). First of all, Bielski clearly declared that Lithuanians (who later split into Prussians, Samogitians, Livonians, Polowcians, Jatvingians) "didn't come from Italy, as others wrote, but from the islands" (p. 187). Bielski claimed that "Some chroniclers wanted to derive their people [Lithuanians] from Italy, but no text was found anywhere about that" (p. 190). Thus, Bielski sternly opposed the basic message about

the Romans; he spoke about the Gothic (from *Gepidi*) origin of Lithuanians and other Baltic peoples (p. 186–188). Funny thing, though, is that Bielski believed Lithuanians were travelling all around different nations: Germans (borrowed their word *konigos* ‘priest’, contemporary Lith. *kunigas*), Greeks (borrowed their word *Dziewos* ‘God’, contemporary Lith. *Dievas*), and others, although no texts about those travels survived as well. Dini did not crystalize a distinct Gothic (Gepidic) Theory in his book, probably due to the meager layer of supporters and insignificant distribution.

As shown by Dini, Bielski was quite subtle in drawing borders of the Baltic language group and languages inside it: “These Jatvingians were of the same language with Lithuanians and with Old Prussians,” and, in another place: “Samogitians, also Courlanders, speak differently from Lithuanians or Jatvingians” (p. 188). Claiming the languages were the same he meant their resemblance within the (Baltic) group, and asserting the people spoke differently, Bielski demonstrated his awareness of particular languages inside that group. Bielski, however, wrote in Polish, and not in Latin, Italian, or German, so circulation of his message was limited. Maybe this was one of the reasons why Bielski’s theory was allocated a place among those opposing Długosz, and not among the original theories.

Filippo Callimacho (p. 192–199), an Italian who stayed in Poland for a long time, was one more hard nut for classification (*Vita et Mores Sbignei Cardinalis*, 1555). Callimacho denied the Latin origin of the Lithuanians (*Litifani*), and proposed their Gallic origin, then claimed Lithuanians had parallel customs with Bosphorians (!), and then observed Lithuanians worshiped snakes (*Gyvotem*; contemporary Lith. *gyvatė* ‘snake’), like Greeks and Romans did, so the correspondence with those seemed also obvious to him. Dini clearly uncovers Callimacho’s confusion and incoherence: “At the end he leaves an open possibility to the contradictory opinions” (p. 199). Dini did not attempt a separate chapter on a “Gallic” or “Bosphorian” theory.

All in all the opposition to Długosz’s theories did not include those followers of the Slavic Theory that were already discussed in previous chapters.

After the Latin Theory Dini switches to the Sarmatian one (pp. 200–207). For instance, Joannes Vislicensis (*Bellum Prutenicum*, 1516) included the Baltic area in the Sarmatian (Slavic) world, but did not discuss the languages (p. 200). Biernat Wapowski (*Chronica Polonorum*, before 1535) considered Lithuanians to be Sarmatians, that is Slavs, and explicitly denied their origin from the Romans (p. 201–202). Aleksander Guagnini (*Sarmatiæ Europææ Descriptio*, 1578), however, even if included in the chapter on “Sarmatian Myth and the Baltic Languages,” did not openly attribute Sarmatian features to the Baltic peoples. Instead, according to Dini, Guagnini “crammed [one of his chapters] with at least three distinct theories of the origin of Lithuanians in a series that was very popular then: Gothic, Alanian, and Latin” (p. 203). Guagnini used some linguistic arguments: “[Lithuanians] have Latin and Italian words intermixed in their language” (p. 206); he also explained that the aristocracy had these Italian (Roman) words, and that the people originated from the Goths (*Gepidi*) (pp. 206–207). The idea of the Mixed Theory may have emerged here again.

Maciej Strykowski (*O początkach*, 1576–1578; *Kronika Polska Litewska, Żmudzka y wszystkiey Rusi*, 1582) and his thesis of “one people, one language” (pp. 208–214) receives a separate subchapter among those sundry theories. Dini notes that “Lithuanian scholars consider Strykowski as a Lithuanian patriot; Russian ones emphasize his attachment to Slavophilia; and Poles consider him a Polish patriot, to whom Lithuanian or Russian separatism was foreign” (p. 208). Strykowski’s first chronicle (in verse) was not published until the 20th century, so it had no contemporary influence. Nevertheless, its linguistic theory about the Baltic languages is very intriguing. Strykowski claimed that there was one people consisting of Lithuanians, Courlanders, Latvians, Samogitians, Jatvingians, Polowcians, and Prussians. And this people spoke one language: “Today also this Lithuanian language [reaches] beyond Königsberg, [and] in Latvia, Kurland, and Prussia almost the same words [are used]” (p. 210). On the other hand, Strykowski recounted that “Latvia has a different speech from that of Kurland” and that “Samogitians and Lithuanians also somewhat mix their language” (p. 210). These words seem

significant indeed: Strykowski, who lived in many places of Lithuania himself (in Trakai, Luokė, Varniai), must have had a firsthand knowledge of the language, even if he did not speak much of it himself. And he referred to certain features inside the languages that we may reinterpret today as the first known mention of Latvian and Lithuanian dialects; not that Strykowski purveyed their particularities, he merely pointed them out. Other than that, Strykowski derived Lithuanians from Goths (*Gepidi*) (p. 211). In his later *Kronika Polska Litewska, Żmudzka y wszystkiej Rusi* (1582) Strykowski somewhat modified his idea about “one people, one language”; basing himself on others (on what he heard) Strykowski wrote: “as we can hear, Courlanders, the remainder of Old Prussians, Latvians, Lithuanians, and Samogitians have different languages and various words in their speech” (p. 213).

Dini devotes another small subchapter to the two rather insignificantly circulated theories: Alanian and Herulian (pp. 215–229). Dini elucidates the linguistic peculiarities of the Alanian Theory: “it does not constitute a proper linguistic theory, but a historical thesis containing and transmitting a myth of origin as well” (p. 215). Erasmo Stella (1518), Cromer (1555, 1562, and 1589), and Pier Francesco Giambullari (1564) connected the origin of the Old Prussians with the Alans (pp. 215–223). Wolfgang Lazio (*De Gentium*, 1557) wrote about Heruli and presented the Lord’s Prayer in Latvian (pp. 226–229) as an example.

Dini’s research makes it obvious that the circulation of texts written and published in Polish were exerting a meager impact on the distribution of ideas throughout Europe, although generally the texts that were prepared in Poland and Lithuania tend to seem more precise, containing more details than those circulating in the Western European countries.

Chapter 3. “The Quadruple Theory.” This chapter is much more linguistic than the previous two. Dini gives an epigraph for it: “the Lithuanian Language is quadruple”—a quotation from Maciej Miechovita (p. 237). This is an obvious turn to the linguistic history after the discussions of the myths of origin. More than that, this chapter is practically devoted to one significant author, Maciej from

Miechow, called Miechovita (*Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis*, 1517; *Chronica Polonorum*, 1519, 1521), who produced an original theory, which was, in Dini's words, a rare case (p. 237). The *Tractatus* in which Miechovita described the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was well known to European scholars (p. 238). It is very likely that the *Tractatus* in Latin (and not Polish) helped circulate his ideas. It was republished and translated many times. Dini remarks, however, that followers often did not comprehend the quadruple theory of Miechovita exactly (p. 237).

According to Dini, Miechovita operated with a "nation-language concept" (p. 239). The essence of Miechovita's theory was as follows: "The Lithuanian language [*linguagium*] is quadruple: the first language [*linguagium*] is of Jatvingians, who reside by the fortress Drohicin and of whom few survive. The second is Lithuanian and Samogitian. The third one is Prussian. The fourth one is in Latvia or Livonia, around the river Dvina and the city Riga" (p. 239). In addition, Miechovita remarked that "they don't understand each other completely" (p. 240). In Dini's words, Miechovita presented the Lithuanian language "uniform and quadruple at the same time" (p. 240). *Lithuanian* here was used in two different meanings: as a hypernym, comprising four distinct languages (Jatvingian, Lithuanian and Samogitian, Prussian, and Latvian), and one of the particular languages, a hyponym (Lithuanian and Samogitian). Dini emphasizes Miechovita's concept of "certain [linguistic] continuity and partial linguistic intelligibility" (p. 241).

In essence Miechovita was an innovator, who created, what in today's terms we see as Baltic languages (his term was the hypernym *Lithuanian*), and four particular Baltic languages: Jatvingian (extinct), Lithuanian, Old Prussian (extinct), and Latvian. He saw commonality of those languages but simultaneously pointed out their partial intelligibility. This is the most subtle and advanced interpretation of the Baltic languages.

On the other hand, the theories that were already discussed, by Bielski (classified among opponents to Długosz) and by Strykowski, carry a certain similarity to Miechovita's. Miechovita preceded those two, so he must have been the one exerting the impact. Like Miechovita,

Bielski made a distinction between the commonality of languages (“These Jatvingians were of the same language with Lithuanians and with Old Prussians”) and their differences (“Samogitians, also Courlanders, speak differently from Lithuanians or Jatvingians”). Strykowski analogously referred to one common language of Lithuanians, Courlanders, Latvians, Samogitians, Jatvingians, Polowcians, and Prussians, but simultaneously observed certain (dialectal) variation between Latvian and Lithuanian in Courland; between Lithuanian and Samogitian. Bielski’s and Strykowski’s wordings, true, are different from Miechovita’s, but comprehension of commonality (Baltic languages) and difference in languages are present there as well. Obviously, all three authors had their own experience of Baltic languages and based themselves on their own knowledge, but Miechovita’s framework must have made Bielski’s and Strykowski’s task of organizing their ideas much easier. Miechovita must have been a pioneer in demonstrating a *concept of the Baltic languages*, Strykowski could have been the first who also demonstrated knowledge of dialectal partition inside concrete languages. Beside all of this, Dini emphasizes that Miechovita could have known Długosz in person and that he followed Długosz’s myth of Roman origin very uncritically (p. 241–242). As if Miechovita cared much more about the contemporary deployment of linguistic continuum than about the historical theories.

Then Dini lists variations of the Quadruple Theory and warns at once that, “as often occurs, a too innovative theory does not find supporters among the contemporaries” (p. 255). So he finds only some deformed versions of Miechovita’s Quadruple Theory, for example, in Decius 1521 (who was “close in letters but distant in spirit,” p. 256) or in Fulvio Ruggieri 1565 (who “simplifies the letters, but remains quite faithful to the spirit of the Quadruple Theory,” p. 260).

Chapter 4. “Descriptions of Samogitia (Lithuanian Lowlands) and Onomastic Interests.” Having dealt with the most salient theories, Dini uses a modified perspective in his fourth chapter: narrows his focus to one specific area of the Baltic peoples and languages, namely to

Samogitia(n/s), today's Lithuanian Lowlands. The term *Massageti* for 'Samogitians', as rendered by the same Piccolomini (pp. 288–289), may serve as an example of an interesting linguistic fact. Dini offers an interpretation (etymology) of this peculiar name; he convincingly claims that Piccolomini must have been told the name for Samogitians was something like **sa-ma-ge-tae*, and having no former knowledge of it Piccolomini could have distorted **sa-ma-ge-tae* into *ma-sa-ge-tae*. Dini finds a typologically comparable distortion in Angelo Rocca's *De dialectis* (1591), where <SAMARITANORUM LINGVA>, according to Dini, is to be amended to **<SAMAGITANORUM LINGVA>* or rather to **<SAMAGITARORUM LINGVA>* (p. 298–299).

Out of the many that commented on Samogitians (or *Massageti*) there were only a few who hinted at their way of speaking. Jan Łasicki (*De Diis Samogitarum*, 1580 [1615]), for instance, wrote that "Lithuanians with Samogitians have almost the same language" (p. 305). Samogitians "call themselves *Zamagitis*" (p. 307; the contemporary Lith. term is *Žemaitis*, and *Žemaičiai* in the plural).

Chapter 5. "Descriptions of Prussia and Theories about Prussian." The fifth chapter on Prussia has a great potential for being a separate book on Prussian historiography, Prussian customs, culture, deities, and prejudices. It is here that Dini has probably included most of the geographic, ethnographic, and mythological data of all his chapters. This must be a sign of Dini's particular attachment to and extreme passion for this extinct Baltic people and language.

In this chapter only some authors consider the linguistic features of Prussian. Piccolomini did not hint at the language, he merely stated: "In Prussia, which also is called Ulmerigia" (p. 341). Cultural prejudices launched by Piccolomini, however, were spreading around Europe, and it was not only about Prussians, but also about Lithuanians, Samogitians, and all Baltic peoples generally undifferentiated (p. 345).

Simon Grunau (*Chronik Preußens*, manuscript 1526), on the other hand, formulated a quite subtle linguistic assessment: "Prussian is a separate language" (p. 359), and "a Prussian has a particular language, and a Pole doesn't understand him, and a Lithuanian quite little" (p. 360).

Dini claims that Grunau had his own original ideas about Prussian, and mentions his famous vocabulary of Prussian words (so called *Grunau's vocabulary*) (p. 360).

In 1555 Cromer referred to the Prussian language as not dissimilar to Lithuanian (p. 368). Old Prussians, according to him, had their own language distinct from the new Prussians who spoke German with a mixture of Polish (p. 368). Cromer gave certain sociolinguistic remarks about language usage in Prussia; according to him, comparatively soon the German language would become the most used language, especially in cities and in fortresses (p. 370), thus, it would eliminate autochthonous language usage in at least those places.

In his *Kronika* (1551, 1554, 1564) Bielski contemplated even more about Prussian. Like Cromer, he differentiated between the old and new Prussians: “Old Prussians were of the same language as Lithuanians, as Samogitians, and as Curonians, but they understand little of each other today” (p. 377). Then Bielski rendered certain sociolinguistic remarks about Prussian: “there still exist several tens of Prussian villages behind Königsberg towards Lithuania and nobody understands their language, except for themselves” (pp. 376–377). The commonality of Baltic languages surfaces again as Dini discusses Bielski’s view of language change: sometime in the past the Prussian, Lithuanian, Samogitian, and Curonian languages must have been a single language, in Bielski’s perception (p. 378).

Crassinius (1574) also expressed awareness of the commonality of the Baltic languages: “Indeed Lithuanians, Livonians, and Prussians […] use almost the same language” (p. 380), which was to him, it seems, a true wonder: Prussians “miraculously agree in language with Lithuanians and Samogitians” (p. 379).

Willich (1551) spoke out about the Greek origin of Prussian, and compared its history to Latin: “Prussians, whose language is not Vandalian and is greatly different [from it], but [is] a distorted Greek language, like French and Spanish are born from corrupt Latin” (p. 382). A remarkable thing is that Willich himself, while living close to the Prussians in East Prussia, tried to talk to them in Greek (p. 383). Dini gets rightfully skeptical: “It is doubtful that Willich knew the Greek language so well as not only to

be able to talk to the Prussians, but also to distinguish how much of one language was remaining in the other” (p. 386).

In several of his opuses (e.g., *Von dem Prüssen land*, 1550) Sebastian Münster conveyed certain sociolinguistic thoughts as well; only he took the Prussians for Slavs (i.e., the users of a Vandalic language). According to Münster, in Prussia the language was German in coastal cities, but some people still preserved their “old Vandalic language” in country villages inside the region (p. 393–394).

Even with all ethnographic and linguistic material that Dini used for his fifth chapter on the Prussians, the topic does not seem exhausted in its entirety. For instance, Dini only cursorily hints (p. 361) at Casper Hennenberger (*Kurtze und wahrhaftige Beschreibung des Landes zu Preussen*, 1584), although Hennenberger was termed “a father of Prussian geography” by some historians. Hennenberger wrote abundantly about Prussian ethnography, mythology, and the names of deities; actually, those names are often analyzed by Dini (e.g. on pp. 440–443). It appears that Dini is getting ready for a new opus on (old) Prussian culture.

Chapter 6. “Diversity of Livonian Languages.” This is one more chapter of a narrowed focus, like those about Samogitia and Prussia. Dini elaborates on the languages in the approximate territory of today’s Estonia and Latvia (formerly Livonia). And again, Piccolomini appears the first, although he did not supply “useful data to sketch the linguistic situation in Livonia” (p. 452), he only hinted at “forest people with an incomprehensible language living north of Livonia” (p. 452). Nevertheless, as expected by now, Piccolomini acquired a significant number of followers (p. 453–464).

Münster (1559) wrote about “the language of Latvians and Livonians by the city of Riga” (p. 465). He provided a certain quadruple model for Livonia: “Now Livonians, Estonians, Latvians, and Curonians have nothing in common in language” (p. 467). Social and geographic implications of the languages were also considered: “In Reval (Tallinn) and Derpst (Tartu) they speak Estonian, and in Riga they use Livian (Livonian), which is the proper language of Livonia” (p. 468). Münster gave an example of

a prayer in a language of the peasants around Riga (p. 469), which today we call Latvian. Dini finds the variation on the topic of Livonia's language diversity more quantitative than qualitative. Bielski (1564) also considered the linguistic quadruplicity of the same four languages and assured that they were spoken in villages, but that in the cities of Riga, Tartu, and Tallinn, and in the castles they talked in the Saxonian Language, viz. German (pp. 471–472). Bielski quoted a Latvian word for bread *meyssei* (modern Latvian *maize*; p. 475).

Dini uncovers more followers of the four-language concept in Livonia (e.g., Carion, 1569; Krantz, 1575), but it is Leonhard Thurneysser's *Onomasticon* (1583) that becomes momentous for Dini's book. Thurneysser presented a table of languages that unveiled his relative ignorance of earlier linguistic theories: he allocated the Baltic languages to three different groups: (1) Illyrian (Prussian), (2) Livonian (Latvian and Curonian), and (3) Punian (Lithuanian; pp. 480–481). And here we find an explanation of his word *ALILETOESCVR*, which was a contraction of the names of four of Livonia's languages: *Lvisch* (Livonian), *LETisch* (Latvian), *OESnisch* (Estonian), and *CVRisch* (Curonian) (p. 482). Dini was mesmerized by this neologism and selected it for his book title. The result is that the book is labeled by the acronyms for Livonian languages, but it leaves out the names of, for instance, Lithuanian (the language that absorbs more pages than any other language in the book), Prussian (the dead language of Dini's particular attention). But even before reaching the depths of the sixth chapter, I am certain, a Lithuanian reader tends to decipher the first acronym *LI* according to his intuition, rather than to follow Thurneysser's thought: as *Lithuanian* and not *Livonian*. Well, the content of *ALILETOESCVR* book itself clearly presupposes and somewhat justifies such a recasting of Thurneysser's intention.

Dini points to another variation of Livonian linguistic theory, which he terms "triple." It was Estonian, Livonian, and Curonian for Müller (1585) (Latvian was missing; pp. 485–487); it was Estonian, Latvian, and Curonian for Botero (1600) and Loewenklau (1571) (Livonian was missing; pp. 489–491). Dini discusses other insignificant

variants under the *blend* concept (pp. 491–497). Basing oneself on Dini’s findings it is safe to assume that languages of Livonia attracted fewer reports than Lithuanian, Samogitian, or Prussian. Those reports were obviously less diversified, there were fewer original theories created. The texts of the authors writing about Livonia’s languages were short of linguistic comparison, they were mostly deprived of considerations on mutual intelligibility. One assumes that contemporary authors must have been cautious about any firmer judgment regarding the so called Livonian languages due to their diversity: today we know that Latvian and Curonian were Baltic languages, but Estonian and Livonian were not even Indo-European—they were Finno-Ugrian). On the other hand, the term *Livonian* (and its contemporary synonyms) could have signified more than one linguistic concept: the language of the Livs, the Latvian language, and language(s) in Livonia’s territory.

Chapter 7. “Linguistics of Latinizers and Variants of the Latin Theory.” This chapter may be considered a continuation of the second chapter and its Latin Theory. Only this time Dini moves to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania itself and follows the development of theory from within. His coined term *Latinizers* applies primarily to the authors in Lithuania. Here the linguistic moment in the Latin Theory became very significant, all other arguments were subordinated to it (p. 527).

The unsurpassed linguistic proposition of the Latin Theory is to be found in the work by Michalo Litanus, who wrote a book *De moribus Tartarorum, Lituanorum, et Moscorum* in 1550, the fragments of which were printed in 1615 (p. 527). Dini singles out three important points in Michalo Litanus’ linguistic discourse: (1) (paleo)-comparative work, (2) identity of Latin and Lithuanian, and (3) the future role of Latin/Lithuanian in the administrative structure of the Grand Duchy (p. 528).

Michalo Litanus clearly defined his own and more generally a Lithuanian linguistic identity: “The Ruthenian language is foreign to us, Lithuanians, that is, Italians, originating from the Italian blood” (p. 528). Michalo Litanus listed 74 Latin words that had equivalents in Lithuanian to prove his claim of Latin origin of Lithuanian.

The author did not convey the equivalents in Lithuanian, but Dini lists them in a footnote in modern Standard Lithuanian (p. 529); there is, however, a confusion in meaning of Lithuanian equivalent for Latin *tenuis* ‘thin’: Dini renders *tėvas* (lit. dial. *tenvas*), but *tėvas* means ‘father’, and he must have meant *tevas* ‘thin’, which is indeed dialectal. Michalo Lituanus termed Lithuanian a semi-Latin language. Dini admires Michalo Lituanus for his obvious (paleo)-comparative ideas and their significance for the history of linguistics. He regrets that so far Michalo Lituanus largely remains in obscurity and linguists rarely remember him in their histories of linguistics. Dini quotes merely two: Holger Pedersen (1931) and F. M. Berezin (1975; p. 530).

Another Latinizer was Augustinus Rotundus, a mayor of Vilnius (*Rozmowa Polaka z Litwinem*, 1564; *Lithuanian Statute II*, 1566). Rotundus commented on the sociolinguistic situation of languages in Lithuania; Dini explains: “Rotundus confirmed that one could still notice the origin of Lithuanians from Italians in the language of the people, which was very similar to Italian; on the other hand, the noble Lithuanians, who lived together with Poles and Ruthenians, switched to their language” (pp. 531–532). Rotundus advocated Latin for its restitution for the public life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Dini airs an interesting idea about the development of Lithuanian vernacular writings: “I think that this proposition of Latin=Lithuanian identity indeed played a decisive role in the retardation of the Lithuanian written language” (p. 532). I can see Dini’s presupposition that if some Lithuanians would not promote the Latin language as “Lithuanian,” there might have been a wider niche left and more attention paid to the vernacular Lithuanian. Without any intent of denial, we may keep in mind, however, that Polish and Ruthenian were the languages already quite commonly adopted by the Lithuanian nobility. Why should we believe that if the Latin Theory had not been invented, then its followers would have more ardently supported the advance of vernacular Lithuanian? Polish was already a prestigious “dignified” language of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania with a strong potential to attract creative minds.

The third Latinizer of Vilnius was Venclaus Agrippa

(*Oratio funebris*, 1553). His linguistic ideas as reconstructed by Dini look like this: Latin, disturbed by unidentified barbarians, was turned into Lithuanian, Italian, French, Spanish, etc. (pp. 542–543). In other words, Agrippa was the straightest Latinizing linguist: Lithuanian was simply a Romance language to him.

According to Dini, in Eastern Europe the ideas of Latinizers remained related to those three names; the ideas did not take root outside the circle of Vilnius humanists in the 16th century (p. 545). They only reverberated in more than one echo in Western Europe of more recent times (p. 545).

Dini discusses a Wallachian Theory (p. 550–560) as a version of the Latin Theory. Here the major reinterpretation of the Latin Theory lies in the assumption that travelers that arrived on the coasts of the Baltic Sea were not Romans from Italy on their ships, but Wallachians, Daco-Romans, from the approximate territory of today's Romania, who supposedly reached the Baltic territories by land. The first to purvey such a theory seem to have been Philipp Melanchthon, Johann Carion, and Caspar Peucer (1532); according to them, "Wallachians were guided by Sarmatians, migrated to the north, and reached the Baltic region; first they colonized Lithuania, then Livonia and Prussia" (pp. 552). There was not much information on the languages conveyed, only that they were old languages containing numerous Latin words (pp. 551–552).

There were few other followers of the Wallachian Theory. One case sticks out as admitting Wallachian origin even for Estonian: Maciej Strubicz (*Brevis atque Accurata Livoniae Ducatus descriptio*, 1577) claimed that Estonian rendered Latin via certain words, although they were especially deformed (p. 557). Strubicz was basing his Wallachian connection on his etymology for the name of the Estonian city *Reval*; in his words "*Revalis* plays with *Wallia* and *Wallachia*" (p. 557).

At the end of the seventh chapter Dini appended a subchapter "Beyond the Latinizers: the Defense of the Native Language" (pp. 561–568). He meant an ideology that did not fit into his frame exactly. Dini analyzes the ideas of a Lithuanian author Mikalojus Dauša (*Postilla*, 1599), who in the preface to his Lithuanian translation of

Jakob Wujek's Polish *Postilla* articulated his high concern about the shrinking usage of Lithuanian, about the shift to Polish by aristocrats (p. 563), and about the need to use the Lithuanian language: Daukša was certain that God and nature had predestined everybody's attachment to his own mother tongue (p. 566), and that one had to keep at it. In his own words, "what a strange thing would happen among animals, if a raven began singing as a nightingale, and a nightingale started crowing like a raven; if a lion began to bleat like a goat, and a goat roared as a lion" (pp. 565–566). Of course, Daukša's theoretical remarks were salient and important to the emergence of Lithuanian as a rather novel written means and added to the growth of its prestige. It is clear that Dini had an itch to represent Daukša's theory of native language(s) in his book; still Daukša's ideas seem to be more of a "language planning" project than speculations about its relation to other linguistic entities. The most motivated argument for placing Daukša after the Latinizers must have been the resemblance of the intended place/function for Lithuanian in the Grand Duchy: Latinizers wanted it to be chosen more often for the official documents (they meant Latin interpreted as uncorrupt Lithuanian), and Daukša strove for a greater impact on the social-cultural life of vernacular Lithuanian. By 1599, however, Daukša must have perceived Latinizers as history that had to be discarded.

Chapter 8. "The Illyrian Theory." Dini interprets the Illyrian Theory as a variant of the Slavic Theory, so this chapter again becomes a continuation of the first one. Even if Dini is not certain who initiated the Illyrian Theory, he is inclined to see its first occurrence in Volaterrano's Semi-Dalmatian Theory (p. 570). Then Giovio wrote about the corrupt Illyrian language and maintained that Moscovians, Dalmatians, Bohemians, Poles, and Lithuanians all speak a Slavic language (pp. 573–574). But the most important figure for the Illyrian Theory was the Swiss professor Conrad Gessner (*Mithridates*, 1555), the author of "probably the most significant work in (paleo)-comparative linguistics of the 16th century" (p. 575). He amply and critically recited Miechovita's opus, made certain explanations, out of which Dini mostly emphasizes these words: "Others write that

Lithuanians speak Illyrian simpler” (p. 578). This constitutes the basis of Gessner’s Illyrian Theory for the Baltic peoples and distances him from Miechovita (p. 579). In his list of peoples, using the Illyrian languages, Gessner included Prussians, Curonians, Lithuanians, Livs (Livonians), and Samogitians (he suggested reading about Samogitian in the section on Lithuanian) (p. 582–584). On the other hand, Gessner also referred to Prussian, Curonian, Livonian (Latvian?), and Lithuanian as different in a way that only dialects are different, that is, linguistically very close to each other, and that they have nothing in common either with German or Sarmatian, or Illyrian (p. 584–585). It might strike one as an obvious contradiction that first Gessner attaches the *Illyrian* label to the Baltic languages and then takes it away. Dini takes this for a more subtle interpretation of the Slavic and Baltic group at the same time (p. 588); he crowns Gessner a (*paleo*)-*baltoslavist*, who may be honored as an initiator of the Balto-Slavic Theory, which up to this day is ripe with scholarly discussion (p. 588).

Chapter 9. “Descriptions of Sambia and *Amber-logy*.” This chapter is devoted mostly to the names for amber used by Prussians and Sudovians: *Gentarus*, *Gentarn*, *Genitar*, *Gentarium* (contemporary Lith. *gintaras* ‘amber’; pp. 619–650), Dini does not examine linguistic kinship theories there.

Chapter 10. “Hebrew Theory.” The last chapter is allocated to one more theory—a Hebrew one. It was, however, rather undeveloped and marginal (pp. 651–652). Dini considers Johannes Funck (*Chronologia*, 1552) as a pioneer of the idea (pp. 653, 656). Funck observed that Sudavians (Sudavi), the people living in Sembia (Semba), that is, in Prussia, by the Baltic Sea, had similar religious rites to those of the Jewish people, and therefore “these people originated from Jews” (p. 654). No language as a judgment for the origin of the Sudavians (a Prussian tribe) was discussed. Only Severin Göbel (*Einfeltiger jedoch gründlicher Bericht*, 1616) added a linguistic hint on the language of Sudavians: “their language is not foreign to Lithuanian” (p. 660). But the Jewish link was also largely speculated on by Göbel:

Sudavians “in their old lament [they] often repeated the name Jeru Jeru as Jerusalem” (p. 660). Connecting Sudavian rites with Jewish and noting the Sudavian language’s similarity to Lithuanian Göbel indirectly suggested the inference that Lithuanians originate from the Jews as well. Dini collected the data of the authors who reinterpreted these initial sources of the Hebrew Theory in the following centuries even up to the 19th century. Dini makes a table of variations of the Hebrew Theory and lists various authors linking it either to Prussians, Sudavian Prussians, people of Livonia, Lithuanians, or Latvians (p. 684). All the more so Dini proposes a new etymology of “Jeru Jeru”: from Lith. *jērus* ‘sir; lord’, an adapted German loanword, from *Herr* ‘sir; lord’ (pp. 688–689), and this way denies Sudavians their Jerusalem nexus.

Chapter 11. “Epilogue: Baltistics before Baltistics?” At the end Dini generalizes and groups his discoveries and ideas in numerous subchapters. Probably the most remarkable result of Dini’s research, especially for the history of linguistics, one can find on the pages 697–700. Out of the many theories Dini identifies two dominant ones: (1) the Slavic Theory (with Semi-Dalmatian, Illyrian, Vandalian, and Sarmatian variants) and (2) the Latin Theory (also with the variants, e.g. Wallachian). Dini describes the geographical spread of these two major ways of interpreting the Baltic languages in the 16th century in a simple but outstanding conclusion: “The Slavic Theory and the Latin Theory were those that dominated respectively in central-western and central-eastern Europe” (p. 699). In other words, the Slavic Theory was an obvious product of Western (and Central) Europe, and the Latin Theory—a creation of Eastern (and Central) Europe. And the most ingenious interpretation of all, Miechovita’s Quadruple Theory, which did not acquire many followers because of its subtlety, gets located in Central Europe (Dini crowns Miechovita with the title of Baltic linguistics pioneer, the author of the autonomous Baltic Theory). Whatever the borders of Western, Central, and Eastern Europe Dini has conjured up, the result is rather clear cut. The salient weakness of the western (Slavic) perception was rather superficial knowledge of linguistic reality, and the key foible of the

eastern (Latin) perspective was the preeminent will to create prestige for particular peoples and languages.

In numerous tables Dini registers the theories, their particular features and the feature followers (pp. 701–708), so that in a few glimpses they uncover the tendencies of the authors' thoughts. Obviously, it must have been challenging to draw these tables, since some (if not many) authors were not deprived of incoherence and were accepting and transforming traits of more than a single theory. One example may be Paolo Gioivo, who is introduced in the first chapter of the Slavic Theory (p. 74). Dini characterizes his description of Lithuania as "very traditional" and "deprived of any reference to linguistic questions" (p. 74). Then, on pp. 260–261, Dini assigns Gioivo to those that yielded variations of Miechovita's Quadruple Theory and notices that "he mostly professed fluctuating linguistic ideas: now he endorsed the Quadruple Theory and now the Illyrian one" (p. 260). And yes, Gioivo is listed as a follower of the Illyrian theory too (pp. 571–574). Then, let's not be surprised any more, in the *Epilog* on a table on p. 704 Gioivo is marked among those who adhered to the myth of Roman origin (since Miechovita uncritically used it along with his advanced Quadruple Theory). But finally, on p. 701, Gioivo remains outside of the table of adherents of the Slavic Theory (with Illyrian and other variants). It is evident that Gioivo had no clear linguistic conceptions, was one of the most confused authors indeed; and then this may have caused complications in presenting him in a coherent way.

And, ultimately, Dini concludes his narrative with the famous Spanish author Miguel de Cervantes, who remarks about *Bituania*. Many believe he meant *Lithuania*, some even claim it was his error to choose the initial instead of <L> (p. 741–743). This elegant final touch, however, is more about notorious Cervantes leaving a trail of his knowledge of Lithuania, but neither of the Baltic languages nor theories of their origin. If so, then why could not Dini remember that Geoffrey Chaucer mentioned *Prussia* and *Latvia* in his *Canterbury Tales* (before 1400) as well?

It is difficult to overestimate the significance of Dini's *ALILETOESCVR* to the history of early linguistic thought about the Baltic languages. The results of Dini's research are convincing and hardly disputable. No doubt Dini's

ALILETOESCVR is a path-breaking monograph in understanding linguistic theory development and its circulation in 16th century Europe. It is an encyclopedic work in its scope touching upon the preponderant majority of extant sources and paying tribute not merely to the widely spread and intelligently constructed theories, but also to the rather marginal or forgotten ideas. All this is what makes Dini's book a bible for a scholar—no serious scholarship in the field can escape consulting it hereafter.

Giedrius Subačius

*Department of Slavic and Baltic Languages and Literatures
University of Illinois at Chicago
Research Institute of Lithuanian, Vilnius*

Jaan Puhvel. *Ultima Indoeuropea*. Innsbrucke Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 143. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 2012. 280 pp. € 72.00. ISBN 978-3-85124-729-9.

The volume under discussion represents a collection of the latest papers (pp. 17-139) and selected book reviews (pp. 147-258) by the retired UCLA Indo-Europeanist Professor Jaan Puhvel. As such, it continues the earlier volumes published in the same series, *Analecta Indoeuropea* (IBS 35, 1981) and *Epilecta Indoeuropea* (IBS 104, 2002), which contain collections of the earlier papers by the same author, but very few book reviews. The increase in the amount of the review material is justified in the Preface by the author's wish "to exemplify at least the tenor of criticism and some facets of scholarly discourse in the latter half of the twentieth century". The volume concludes itself with the full bibliography of Jaan Puhvel (pp. 261-80), which consists to date of 326 items.

Jaan Puhvel was one of the founding fathers of the UCLA Program in Indo-European Studies, which has been functioning without interruption since the sixties of the last century as the only institutionalized program of its kind in the United States (a brief account of its early years can be found on pp. 64-65 in the volume under review). The earlier part of his academic career was marked by