

Sonderdruck aus

KRATYLOS

KRITISCHES BERICHTS-
UND REZENSIONSORGAN
FÜR INDOGERMANISCHE
UND ALLGEMEINE
SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

JAHRGANG 58

2013

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG · WIESBADEN

Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau. Herausgegeben von **Rosemarie Lühr** und **Sabine Ziegler**. Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden, 2009. 534 Seiten. Broschiert, 128,00 EUR. ISBN: 978-3-89500-598-5.

The present volume contains thirty-five papers from the 2004 meeting of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft in Cracau, Poland. The range of issues discussed is extensive (see the list of contributions at the end of this review), although questions of historical morphology receive the most attention. It is difficult to discern a unifying arc to the volume, as only a handful of papers bear a clear relationship to the title of the volume (*Protolanguage and Prehistory*). The quality of the contributions varies considerably; given the format of the volume, they are necessarily limited in length and scope, and most read more like squibs (or, in a few cases, like handouts) than full-fledged research articles. The book is not well-produced. There was a slip in the printing, and pp. 57-58 ended up being printed after pp. 59-60. With only a couple of exceptions, the English that appears in the volume (which is usually in the form of an abstract preceding a paper) is awkward and poorly edited. Typographical errors are not infrequent.

The diversity of the papers makes general remarks unfeasible, but I will call attention to two features that characterize most of the contributions. The first is that, while nearly all the papers focus on some aspect of the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European, only a tiny fraction of them actually discuss language change, that is, how and why the developments from the protolanguage to the daughter languages occurred. To my mind the importance of these questions is on par with reconstruction, and would presumably aid efforts in this direction. Second, and this point pertains more to presentation than to method, the great majority of the papers unfold inductively. The author builds up his argument stepwise, which at the end comes together in the formation of a claim. The result is that the reader is led through a series of discussions and a range of data without necessarily knowing to what end. (This is, to be sure, mitigated somewhat by the presence of the abstracts, which often make the claim of the paper clear at the outset; not all papers are prefaced with an abstract, however.) Clearer and more forceful would be to structure the presentation deductively, that is, to present the claim(s) to be argued for at the outset, and then show throughout the body of the paper how the data do or do not answer the predictions of the claim. As it stands, one is better served by reading the concluding paragraphs of the paper first, then going back to the beginning. In the remainder of the review, I offer more detailed comments on papers whose topics lie within my areas of interest. (Failure to mention any particular contribution is not to be taken as a reflection of its quality.) A list of the contributions not treated in my review can be found at the end of the review.

Alexandra Daues (82-99) takes up the question of **-ske/o-* forms in Homeric Greek and Neo-Hittite. Puhvel argued that the similarities in usage of Greek and Hittite

*-*ske/o-* forms resulted from contact between speakers of the two languages. Daries, while acknowledging the overlap in usage, nevertheless argues that it is not induced by contact, but rather the result of independent developments (96-97). She demonstrates that while *-*ske/o-* forms exhibit “iterative-distributive” and “durative” semantics in both languages, they also show divergences: e.g. in Hittite -*ške-* forms are remarkably frequent in relative clauses (91), while Greek has a unique “iterative of the past” construction. Despite the overall success of her argument, I had reservations about one of her claims, namely the repeated characterization of -*ške-* and -*σκε-* forms as optional (e.g. p. 84). The basis of this description is the co-occurrence of -*ške-* and -*σκε-* forms with quantificational adverbs like Hittite *humandaza* ‘every time’ and Greek *μάλα πολλάκις* ‘quite often’ (but is it possible that *μάλα* scopes over the entire clause and not simply *πολλάκις*?). At first glance the presence of such adverbs makes the pluractional meaning of the verbs seem redundant, but it is worth bearing in mind that some *-*ske/o-* forms may have developed non-pluractional lexicalized meanings, in which case the adverbs would not be otiose (a possibility that Daries herself registers on e.g. p. 92 n. 16). We find such a phenomenon with *re-* compounds in Latin, for instance.

Anna Helene Feulner (119-133) takes up the much disputed semantic history of the root **sneig*^{wh}-. Almost across-the-board in Indo-European the root means ‘snow,’ but the Sanskrit root *snih-* means ‘be sticky.’ The debate centers on whether the Indic semantics are innovative or archaic. Gonda, for instance, argued that **sneig*^{wh}- means ‘zusammenkleben’; Hoffmann offered a similar ‘kleben bleiben.’ Under these analyses, the meaning ‘snow’ is an *einzelsprachlich* innovation. Feulner, by contrast, claims that PIE **sneig*^{wh}- originally meant ‘snow.’ It is thus Indic that innovates here, with the following postulated development: ‘schneien’ > ‘fallen und (an dieser Stelle) liegenbleiben’ > ‘haften, bleiben’ > ‘klebrig sein, klebrig bleiben.’ While steps like this enable us to trace the development from one stage to the next, one has to ask what exactly they are supposed to correspond to. Are they empirical stages, i.e. over time the word was used in each of these various senses, and progressed stepwise from one to the other? Or do these represent cognitive steps of the development, which do not necessarily correspond to actual usage? For as plausible as this account seems, there are questions that it does not address. For instance, *snih-* not only develops the meaning ‘klebrig sein,’ but also loses the sense ‘schneien’: why was polysemy not tolerated in this case? And looking at the situation more broadly, why did this change take place in Indic and nowhere else (or at least, nowhere else that we know of)?

Rosemarie Lühr, in “Sprachliche Beschränkungen in altindogermanischen Sprachen” (304-317), uses Optimality Theory (OT) constraint-ranking to describe certain stress patterns in Sanskrit, Old High German, and Latin. The engagement with contemporary linguistic theory is refreshing, and L. is indeed able to offer more precise formulations of certain phenomena. But ultimately I wondered (as many have with

OT) where the explanation was. Take for instance, epenthesis in cases like the Latin feminine abstract suffix *-tudo*, whereby genitive singular *-tūd-nis* becomes *-tūdinis*, which is essentially a repair to get rid of the trimoraic syllable *tūd*. L. raises the question (p. 314): why was another repair not chosen, i.e. deletion of *d*, to give *-tūnis*? Her answer is essentially that the constraint forbidding deletion outranks one forbidding epenthesis (i.e., in OT terms, MAX » DEP). But why is that? Why for Latin speakers was epenthesis a better repair strategy than deletion? What makes a process more optimal, besides the constraint rankings?

Thomas Krisch, “On vowel quantity in the Rīgvedic *auslaut*” (255-270), examines discrepancies of *Auslaut* vowel length in the Samhitā and Padapāṭha texts, such as we find in the following example (the relevant vowel appears in boldface):

- (1) *imām me varuṇa śrudhī (śrudhī Padapāṭha)*
hāvam adyā ca mṛṣaya
 ‘Hear my call, Varuṇa,
 and be favorable today.’

In the Rīgvedic Pratiśakhya, such lengthening is described as *pluti* (although it is not further characterized by ३, as with e.g. *pluti* vowels in yes/no-questions), considered a *metri gratia* phenomenon (i.e., *sāmavaśa*); Benfey by and large agreed with this view. Krisch investigates in particular the first book of the *Rīgveda*, and makes the following observations:

- (2) a. *The vast majority of word-final vowel lengthening occurs in 2s. directives*¹
 (that is, active forms of the imperative, optative, subjunctive, and injunctive used to give instruction).
 b. There is no instance in Krisch’s corpus of lengthening of the final *u* in the endings *-atu* and *-antu* of the 3rd person imperative.

From this division, Krisch claims (p. 264) that word-final vowel lengthening serves to highlight “a summons to a partner directly (or, in [the] case of a god, virtually) present” in the world of the discourse. Krisch may well be on the right track here, but the challenge that confronts his analysis is to explicate what exactly pragmatic (if *pragmatic* is the right descriptor here) “highlighting” or “intensification” is. Krisch does not undertake this task, and so more work remains to be done in this direction. We will also need to know how we can rule out an analysis that would attribute the lengthening to the performative context, or even to affective meaning (i.e., the emo-

¹ The term *directive* is mine, not Krisch’s.

tional tenor of the verse). Krisch does, however, observe the following tendency. When there is more than one imperative in an utterance, the lengthened imperative tends to be the last one in the series, as in the following example (imperative forms are underlined>):

- (3) *tám jusasva gíram mama*
vājayántim avā dhíyam!
 ‘Enjoy this praise of mine
 Support the song that longs for reward!’ (RV 3.62.8a-b)

How exactly this pattern fits into the larger story is not yet clear. It also needs to be kept in mind that, even if the “intensification”-analysis is correct, it will still leave the non-directive (i.e., indicative) forms unexplained, as Krisch himself notes on p. 267. On p. 262 ex. 17, read γε for δέ.

Aleksandar Loma in “Krieg und Frieden – vom Indogermanischen zum Griechischen” (286-303) proposes (albeit tentatively) a new etymology of Greek π(τ)όλεμος, namely **tp̥lh-em-o-s*, which he glosses as ‘Stadteroberung.’ The compound is comprised of an athematic noun **tp̥lh-* (taken to be an earlier form of the Homeric and classical *i*-stem πόλις; cf. Vedic *púr-*) and the *e*-grade of the verbal root meaning ‘take’; Loma compares the formation θέσ-κελ-ος ‘von einem Gott getrieben.’ One immediate objection to this analysis, which Loma himself identifies (299), is that the root **h₁em-* is not otherwise attested in Greek. Loma offers little in the way of motivation for the change from ‘conquest’ to ‘war.’ While it is easy to imagine a metonymic shift from ‘conquest’ to ‘war,’ Loma does not provide any explicit motivation for the change. One is left wondering if there is any trace of the erstwhile semantics in the Homeric usage of π(τ)όλεμος.

In one of the most interesting papers in the volume (381-406), Roland Pooth investigates the tense-aspect system of early Indo-European, in particular the following question: why do certain roots, such as **g^vem-* ‘to come, go,’ not form root presents? In answering this question, he argues first, on the basis of the injunctive, that early Indo-European was a non-tensed language (meaning essentially that verb forms simply did not encode information about tense, as is the case in Mandarin Chinese). As Thurneysen and Watkins have argued, the injunctive represents the oldest layer of the Indo-European verbal system. Despite various attempts to explain the semantics and pragmatics of this category, Pooth adopts the view that its tense value is underspecified and determined by context (as such, it can assume past, present, or future temporal reference). The *hic et nunc* **-i*, Pooth argues, originally encoded progressive semantics, a function that grows out of its role as a locative case marker. The progressive semantics of this progressive **-i* was compatible with roots of only certain *Aktionsart*-classes.

Gradual terminative roots (or rather, in Vendler classes, accomplishments), such as we have in **g^wem-*, were excluded. This incompatibility is paralleled in German of the Rhein-Ruhr area, which has a progressive construction *am* + infinitive (e.g. *die ist am duschen* 'she's showering'). For as persuasive as much of Pooth's analysis is, it remained unclear precisely which *Aktionsart* classes (or even better, which semantic features) were compatible with the early Indo-European **-i* progressive. I also wondered why roots like **g^wem-*, which could not form root presents at the time when **-i* was a progressive suffix, did not later become compatible with such a formation when **-i* fused with the person markers (e.g. **-t*) to form the portmanteau suffix **-ti*. Oddly no mention is made of Paul Kiparsky's 1968 article, "Tense and mood in Indo-European syntax," *Foundations of Language* 4: 30-57; I assume that his 2005 article came out too late for Pooth to consider, "The Vedic injunctive: Historical and synchronic implications," *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, pp. 219-235. – The following is a list of contributions, not dealt with in my review: Balles, Irene, "Zu den *i*-stämmigen Adjektiven des Lateinischen" (1-26). – Bichlmeier, Harald, "Die Wortstellung in Komparativgruppen und Verwandtes im Jungavestischen" (27-43). – Bock, Bettina, "Semantische Analyse proto- und altkirchenslavischer substantivischer Nominalkomposita" (44-60). – Casaretto, Antje, "Zur verbalen Suppletion im Indoiranischen: Die avestischen *verba vivendi*" (61-74). – Cuzzolin, Pierluigi and Maria Napoli, "An Overview of the Impersonals in Proto-Indo-European" (75-81). – De Simone, Carlo, "Die messapische Sprache: zum aktuellen Stand der Forschung" (100-104). – Dupraz, Emmanuel, "Das nord-oskische Partizip *burus* als Spur eines *o*-stufigen Perfektstammes im Italischen" (105-118). – García Ramón, José Luis, "Idg. **(s)peh₂-* 'in (heftige) Bewegung setzen, ziehen': Ved. *pā* 3, heth. *pipp(a)-^{hi}* und gr. *σπάω*, arm. *hanem*" (134-148). – García Trabazo, José Virgilio, "Über die Vertretung der indogermanischen Aktionsarten ‚Fientiv‘ und ‚Essiv‘ im Hethitischen und Lateinischen" (149-159). – Gotō, Toshifumi, "Notizen zu den Verben in Yasna 9 (Hōm-Yašt)" (160-181). – Häusler, Sabine, "Die ausdrucksseitige Repräsentation von Possession und Affiliation im (Altkirchen)Slavischen. Diachronie und Typologie" (182-201). – Hyllested, Adam, "PIE **-b^h*- in Nouns and Verbs: Distribution, Function, Origin" (202-214). – Irslinger, Britta, "Indogermanische Abstraktsuffixe – synchron und diachron" (215-235). – Kapović, Mate, "Rising Mobility in Slavic *i*-stems" (236-243). – Kloekhorst, Alwin, "Hittite *kane/išš-^{zi}* ‚to recognize‘ and other *s*-extended verbs" (244-254). – Litscher, Roland, "Die Genese des dritten Genus: ein neuer Versuch" (271-285). – Meiser, Gerhard, "Zur Typologie des urindogermanischen Mediums" (318-334). – Melchert, Craig, "Hittite *hi*-verbs from Adverbs" (335-339). – Oettinger, Norbert, "Fälle von *o*-Stufe der Wurzel hystero-kinetischer Nomina im Indogermanischen" (340-347). – Olsen, Birgit Anette, "The Conditioning of Laryngeal Breaking in Greek" (348-365). – Poljakov, Oleg, „Mor-

phonologie und Rekonstruktion der idg. Silbenakzente" (366-380). -- Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård: "Is the Indo-European lexical accent predictable?" (407-417). -- Remmer, Ulla, "Zarathustras Töchter Namenkomposition, Laryngaldehnung und weibliche Kurznamenbildung im Avestischen" (419-426). -- Sadovski, Velizar, "Syntax und Formulierungsstil in der indoiranischen Dichtersprache: Einleitendes zum Periodenbau und zu einigen *figurae per ordinem* im Avesta und Veda (*Figurae Elocutionis*, III)" (427-444). -- Schmidt, Uwe, "Über den Nutzen des romanischen Substratwortschatzes zur Rekonstruktion der indogermanischen Grundsprache" (445-453). -- Schuhmann, Roland, "Zum Ausdruck der Ruhe und der Bewegung bei Ruhe- und Bewegungsverben" (454-465). -- Simon, Zsolt, "Die etymologische Herleitung des Names *Rōma*" (466-477). -- Tremblay, Xavier, "Die thematischen Wurzelpräsentia im Hethitischen" (478-512). -- Ziegler, Sabine, "Zur Vokativakzentuierung im *Ṛgveda*" (513-526).

David M. Goldstein
 Universität Wien
 Institut für Sprachwissenschaft
 Sensengasse 3a
 A-1090 Wien, Österreich
 GoldsteinDM@gmail.com

New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 4: Complex Sentences, Grammaticalization, Typology. Edited by Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin. Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 180.4. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin New York, 2011. xxxiv, 926 Seiten. Gebunden, 159,95 EUR. ISBN: 978-3-11-025340-5.

Le quatrième volume de cette monumentale syntaxe historique du latin, qu'ouvrent des « acknowledgments », un sommaire, une table des matières détaillée et une liste des abréviations (v-xxxiv), comprend des *epilegomena* (1-10), qui rappellent les enjeux de l'ouvrage, dix chapitres (11-894), un index des sujets traités (895-902) et un index des références citées (903-926).

Après avoir survolé, dans un premier chapitre, « Adverbial subordination: Introductory overview » (11-18), les différentes sortes de subordonnées qui seront explorées dans la suite de l'ouvrage, Concepción Cabrillana, « Purpose and result clauses » (19-92), cherche à circonscrire les paramètres qui rapprochent et qui distinguent les