



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Boekbespreking

Vaan, M.A.C. de

Citation

Vaan, M. A. C. de. (2005). Boekbespreking. *Kratylos*, 50, 60-65. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14456>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14456>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

liana, ma che non possono essere ricondotti a nessuna delle lingue italiche o baltiche e che debbono essere attribuite rispettivamente «a la existencia de un substrato pre-italico y prebáltico, similar en ambas zonas, y dialectalmente muy similar si no idéntico a la lengua hispana meridional-ibero-pirenaica» (414).

Non c'è dubbio che questo volume del V. aprirà molte discussioni fra gli specialisti di lingue paleoispaniche e di dialettologia indoeuropea. Può darsi che alcune delle sue conclusioni siano da modificare: del resto, il destino delle opere veramente importanti è quello di essere discusse a fondo, ma anche di suggerire nuove ricerche. Questo è quanto ci auguriamo che accada, soprattutto nella direzione di una migliore comprensione della complessità dei processi di indoeuropeizzazione dell'Europa, con studi che, in altre aree del continente, si muovano con la stessa serietà e felicità di risultati per i quali dobbiamo essere grati all'illustre collega e amico spagnolo.

Dipartimento di Linguistica dell'Università di Pisa
Via S. Maria 85

I-56126 Pisa

Filippo Motta

Stüber, Karin: Die primären s-Stämme des Indogermanischen. Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2002, gr.-8°, 311 S. Geb. 68 EUR.

Since 1998, Indo-Europeanists dispose of the *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, in which all verbal roots and their derived verb stems which can be reconstructed for PIE are conveniently listed. If one wants to find all the PIE evidence for a certain nominal formation type, however, there is as yet no complete work apart from Pokorny's outdated 1959 dictionary. Of course, the compilation of an on-line, electronic Indo-European Etymological Dictionary (<http://iiastnt.leidenuniv.nl/ied/>) is making much progress, and will in future provide an enormous wealth of data which can be updated any minute. For the time being, however, this collection is not complete.

The existing lacuna in the collection of nominal forms has led S. in her 2001 Zürich Habilitationsschrift to collect and critically discuss all known evidence for PIE *s*-stems, one of the nominal categories which can

con las lenguas bálticas las coincidencias exclusivas son o claramente arcaismos (indistinción a/o, asociación derivacional de *-ēto-* con los temas en *-ē*, nominativo asigmático de los temas en *-ē*) o rasgos que podrían serlo (procedimiento composicional en los topónimos, compuestos toponímicos con preverbio, apelativos varios), o innovaciones muy poco específicas (confusión de sonoras aspiradas con sonoras, alteración de *-m* final en *-n*)» (414).

be most easily distinguished and which has remained productive in Indo-Iranian, Greek and Latin. S. offers "eine Darstellung der primär gebildeten Stämme mit einfachem Suffix **-s-* im Urindogermanischen" (15). Thus, she excludes composite suffixes such as PIE **-nes-*, **-ies-*, **-ues-*. The aim of her investigation is to single out the different forms and functions which *s*-stems could have in PIE. It appears to me that S. has fully succeeded in achieving this aim: she has written a very useful summary of all or most there is to know about the synchronic analysis of PIE *s*-stems, and of how they fit into current views about the PIE nominal inflection. Apart from being a work of reference for Indo-Europeanists, parts of her study will also be of interest to general linguists who are interested in the synchronic analysis of abstract nouns.

The book is divided into three parts, viz. Preliminaries (19–68), Evidence (69–198) and Evaluation (199–262). In the Preliminaries, S. discusses the three different semantic functions which can be reconstructed for PIE *s*-stems: neuter abstract nouns (nom.sg. in **-os*), collective nouns (nom.sg. in **-ōs*), and second member of possessive compounds (nom.sg.m./f. in **-ēs*). This three-way distinction coincides with the different ablaut patterns of the PIE *s*-stems; it returns in the discussions of the evidence and in the evaluation.

Part 2 treats the *s*-stems reconstructed for PIE according to the formal and semantic relationship to the PIE root from which they have been derived. S. distinguishes three categories: 75 *s*-stems to verbal roots (from **b^heh₂-* 'to shine' to **ues-* 'to wear'), 12 *s*-stems belonging to a Caland system (from **délh₁g^hos* 'length' to **uétos* 'year') and 7 isolated nouns (among which are **h₂éusos* 'ear' and **h₃óh₁os* 'mouth'). The choice of this subdivision is not accounted for in the preceding pages, so that the reader is taken somewhat by surprise, but the three categories are discussed extensively in the third and last part of the book.

S.'s treatment of the *s*-stems is generally trustworthy and well-balanced. Of course, one may have different opinions or additional remarks about individual forms. By way of illustration, I will mention a small number of points which caught my attention.

– p. 93–94: The reflexes of the PIE root **h₂eg^h-* basically have two different meanings: the notion of 'fear' is expressed by OIr. *-ágor* 'fear', Go. *og* 'fears', *agis* 'fear', the notion of 'sorrow' by Gr. *ἄγομαι*, *ἄχνημαι* 'to mourn', *ἄχος* 'mourning pain, sorrow'. In order to bridge the semantic gap, S. assumes that the basic meaning of the root in PIE was 'in seelische Erregung geraten'. To my mind, the latter meaning is too unspecific to be credible; among other things, one might also expect a resulting meaning 'to be glad, rejoice'. Furthermore, the link with the nasalized root **h₂eng^h-* 'to tighten, oppress' (cf. LIV², s.v. **h₂emg^h-*, fn. 2) would be lost if we would assume a meaning 'in seelische Erregung geraten'. Thus, it seems more likely that **h₂eg^h-* 'to fear; mourn' is based on an original meaning 'to be oppressed, be cornered.' We may reconstruct **h₂eg^h-* with a pala-

tal velar, since the reconstruction of the pure velar is only based on the connection of the adj. Skt. *aghā-*, Av. *aya-* ‘bad’, which is not compelling.

– p. 110: S. correctly doubts the testimony of long *ā* in Avestan *huuāpah-* ‘beneficent’: the *ā* may have arisen during the text tradition. In fact, this has also been argued by Lubotsky 1990: 131. The original short vowel appears in the voc.sg. *huuāpō*, and the lengthened vowel in the nom.sg.m. *huuāpā*.

– p. 137: For Latin *pūs*, Greek *πύος*, Latvian *puvēši* (m.pl.) ‘pus, matter’, S. reconstructs a zero grade PIE **púH-os* rather than a full grade **péuH-os*. This is now confirmed by the Sanskrit cognate, which has recently been found by Lubotsky in the Atharva Veda (Paippalāda recension) 4.14.3 abl.sg. *puvasah* ‘pus’. This is the reading of the Orissa mss., against *pumsah* in the Kashmir recension (A. Lubotsky, communication at the Third Int. Vedic Workshop, Leiden 2002; the reference can be found in the Online database of the Indo-Aryan inherited lexicon, <http://iasnt.leidenuniv.nl/ied>).

– p. 139: I agree that Avestan *raodah-* in Nērangestān 26 belongs to the root ‘to cry’ rather than to ‘to grow’. Instead of ‘weeping’, however, I would translate the form as ‘howling’:

*yō gāθā srāuuaiēiti apō vā paitiš.x^vaine
raodahō vā kərəsanəm vā gadōtinəm *vā
gaēthanəm vā vāsaiiatəm*

‘He who recites the gathas while there is an interfering noise of water
or of howling or of highwaymen or robbers
or of lowing livestock.’

(translation as in Kotwal-Kreyenbroek 1995: 55,
except for *raodahō*)

S. adopts Zimmer’s explanation (1984: 192) of Vispered 2.7 *huraodah-* as ‘who has a beautiful face’, assuming a semantic shift in Indo-Iranian of ‘weeping’ to ‘face’. Apart from the (im)probability of such a semantic shift, I think that Bartholomae (1904: 1837) is right in assuming that *huraodah-* is simply an aberrant form of the stem *huraoda-* ‘well-shaped’ which occurs frequently throughout the Avesta, among others in contexts which are conspicuously similar to that of Vispered 2.7.

– p. 158: S. derives **témHos-* ‘darkness’ from a PIE root **temH-* meaning ‘to faint’, attested in Indo-Aryan (Skt. subj. *tamat*) and Slavic (*tomiti* ‘to vex’). However, the reverse direction of semantics is at least equally likely, in view of the parallels adduced by S. herself (English *black-out* which went from ‘darkness’ to ‘fainting’) and others (e.g. Russ *moróka* ‘darkness’, *óbmorok* ‘fainting-fit’). In that case, **témHos* would not belong to the *s*-stems derived from known PIE verbal stems.

– p. 160: S. adopts the etymology of Gr. *ἄτενής* ‘stretched, strained’ as **n-tenēs* with **n-* as the zero grade of **en-* ‘in’. However, the preverb is usually reconstructed as **h₁en-*. Furthermore, there is no other certain evidence for a zero grade of either **h₁en* or **en* in other IE languages (cf. Beekes 1969: 27). Thus, the earlier etymology **sm-tenēs* > *ἄτενής*, with psilosis in the attested form, still seems the best option; cf. Frisk I: 177, and, hesitatingly, Beekes 2003.

In the first part of Evaluation, S. provides an outline of the ablaut characteristics of the *s*-stem neuters, collectives and second members of possessive compounds.

Following Schindler (1975: 267 and 1994: 398), S. reconstructs a static type of *s*-stems with lengthened grade of the root in the strong case forms, and full grade in the weak cases. She acknowledges the following six stems as evidence for this type: **sue^{dh}h₁-os*, **sue^{dh}h₁-es-* ‘habit, custom’; **sēdos*, **sédes-* ‘seat’; **ueg^hos*, **ueg^hes-* ‘that which is being conveyed’; **mēdos* ‘thought’, **srēgos* ‘cover’ and **uēsos* ‘piece of clothing’. As S. admits herself, this number is too small and the semantic differences with the normal type of neuters are too insignificant to assume a separate category of *s*-stems. Instead, she proposes (207) to connect these nouns with lengthened-grade verb forms, such as the so-called Narten presents. Whether these six nouns are only historical accidents which took their long vowel from such verb forms, or whether they point to specific Narten-roots, as were posited by Schindler 1994, is a point she chooses to leave open.

In my view, it is not even certain that all of these six stems had a lengthened vowel in PIE. The only nouns for which there is evidence in more than one branch is **mēdos*, which is reflected in Greek *μῆδεα* (beside *μῆδομαι*) and Armenian *mit*. In the case of **sue^{dh}h₁-os*, **sue^{dh}h₁-es-*, we are probably dealing with a compound of the pronoun **sue* and the verbal root **d^heh₁-*, cf. Skt. *svadhā-*. As S. indicates herself, one might assume that the syntagm occurred both as **sue d^heh₁-* and as **sue^h d^heh₁-* in PIE, **sue^h* being the accented variant of the pronoun. The etymology of Skt. *vāhas-* as being derived from **ueg^h-* has been dismissed by Insler 1996. This leaves the isolated forms Skt. *vāsas-* to **ues-*, OIr. *síd* to **sed-*, and Greek *ᾠγος* to **sreg-*.

In the second part of her evaluation (217–260) “Funktion und Bedeutung der s-Stämme”) S. summarizes the semantic properties of the *s*-stems according to whether they are derived from verbal roots, belong to a Caland system, or are isolated. This section contains some novelties. Among the neuter abstract nouns which are derived from extant (or reconstructible) verbal roots, S. distinguishes nomina rei actae (e.g. **kléuos* ‘fame’), nomina agentis (**h₂eusōs* ‘dawn’), nomina resultativa (**h₂ég^hos* ‘anger, sorrow’), nomina loci (**lég^hos* ‘bed’), nomina instrumenti (no certain PIE instances) and nomina actionis (only **réudHos* ‘crying’). She deduces these meanings from the semantic and syntactic characteristics of the verbal root, according to the following scheme:

| root | subject | meaning | = s-stem |
|--------------|-----------|----------------------------|--|
| transitive | | | = nomen rei actae |
| intransitive | inanimate | | = nomen agentis |
| | animate | ↔ ingressive ↔ durative | = nomen resultativum = nomen actionis |
| | an./inan. | → locative | = nomen loci |

This subdivision has a scholastic touch to it, for in which respect is 'dawn' more agentival than 'fame', or why is 'anger' more resultative than 'fame'? To take the *nomina agentis* as an example, there is no agent in the traditional sense of the word in examples such as **h₂éusos* 'dawn' to the root **h₂ues-* 'to become light', **péh₂ǵos* 'surface' to **peh₂ǵ-* 'to coagulate', **léukos* 'light, light spot' to **leuk-* 'to be bright', etc. In order to avoid confusion with other types of nouns which do indicate agents, it seems preferable not to use the term '*nomen agentis*' at all for these nouns.

In view of the number of pages spent on the theory of verbal abstracts, it comes as a surprise that so little consideration is given to the theoretical basis of the Caland system. It is legitimate to ask whether the suffixes involved in this system (e.g. **ro-*, **-mo-* for adjectives, **-i-* for adjectives when used as the first member of a compound, **-s-* for abstract nouns, etc.) did indeed form a system, in the sense that the occurrence of one variant in PIE (say, **kéuit-ro-* 'white') automatically implied that one or more of the other variants also occurred (say, **kéuit-i-*, or **kéuít-os* 'whiteness'). In a recent article, Meissner (1998) has addressed this problem, pointing out the unreliability of some of the Greek evidence. Beekes (1995: 170) simply rejects the possibility that there is a system behind these suffix combinations: "Note that the Caland system is no more than a recurring pattern of archaic forms." Still, I think that S. is right in separately dealing with *s*-stems that cannot be linked to known verbal stems, because the possible productivity of *s*-stems outside verbal bases would be a significant linguistic feature of PIE.

The epilogue of the book only takes up two pages, being a summary of general statements which can be made about *s*-stems as a nominal category. This forms the appropriate conclusion of a thorough and trustworthy, but hardly innovatory study.

References

- Bartholomae, Ch. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg.
 Beekes, R. 1969. The development of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Greek, Den Haag – Paris.
 Beekes, R. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
 Beekes, R. 2003. A Greek etymological dictionary (in progress), <http://iasnt.leidenuniv.nl/ied/index2.html>.
 Insler, S. 1996. Avestan *vāz* and Vedic *vāh*, *StIran* 20 (FS Paul Thieme), 169–186.
 Kotwal, F. und P. Kreyenbroek. 1995. *The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān*. Volume II: *Nērangestān*, Fragard 1. With contributions by James R. Russell, Paris.

- LIV² = *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. H. Rix e.a. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden, 2001.
 Lubotsky, A. 1990. La loi de Brugmann et **H_{3e-}*, La reconstruction des laryngales (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fascicule CCLLIII). Lüttich – Paris, 129–136.
 Meissner, T. 1998. Das "Calandsche Gesetz" und das Griechische – nach 100 Jahren. *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen*, ed. W. Meid, Innsbruck 237–253.
 Schindler, J. 1975. Zum Ablaut der neutralen *s*-Stämme des Indogermanischen. Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Idg. Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973, Wiesbaden, 259–267.
 Schindler, J. 1994. Alte und neue Fragen zum indogermanischen Nomen (Erweitertes Handout). In honorem Holger Pedersen, Kolloquium der Idg. Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen, ed. J. E. Rasmussen unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen, Wiesbaden, 397–400.
 Zimmer, S. 1983. Iran. *baga-* – ein Gottesname?, *MSS* 43, 187–215.

Comparative Linguistics (VTW)

PO Box 9515

NL-2300 RA Leiden

Michiel de Vaan

Southern, Mark R.V.: *Sub-Grammatical Survival*. Indo-European *s-mobile* and its Regeneration in Germanic. Washington, Institute for the Study of Man Inc., 1999, gr.-8°, iv, 394 S. (JIES. Monograph, 34.) Brosch. 48 \$.

For most intents and purposes this is an attempt to treat the difficult question of *s-mobile* (*s* movable) in a full Indo-European context. The elaborate title no doubt reflects genuine scholarly honesty: One might expect a full treatment of a pan-IE phenomenon to contain a well-argued answer to the question of its origin, but the *s-mobile* problem proves so unwieldy that no such clear message can be given by the author who, therefore, has instead chosen to focus on presenting an exhaustive account of all interesting descriptive aspects of the matter and of the perspectives that may be opened by their interpretation. Special attention is thereby given to the remarkable fact that the phenomenon has experienced a renaissance in several stages of Germanic and Baltic. It is more than anything the combined treatment of all these points that gives the book its special value.

The introductory chapter (1–19) contains what amounts to a clear and honest review of the book by the author himself, including his aspirations and his frustrations. One can only applaud this choice which gives a much more adequate and nuanced impression of the problematics than