



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Sistemi i numerimit

Vaan, M.A.C. de; Demiraj B.

Citation

Vaan, M. A. C. de. (1999). Sistemi i numerimit. *Kratylos*, 44, 87-93. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14944>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14944>

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

schmerzlicher empfinden lassen (z. B. 81 „Parison“, 131 „kontrastierende Priamel“, 483 „Inzidenzschema“).

An dieser Stelle muß gerechtigkeitshalber darauf hingewiesen werden, daß das detaillierte Sachverzeichnis (mit gegliederten Lemmata) den genannten Mangel bis zu einem gewissen Grade wettmacht. Aber erstens ersetzt auch ein noch so gutes Sachverzeichnis nicht die synthetische Darstellung, wenn die zusammengehörigen Passagen nicht schon von vorneherein aufeinander abgestimmt sind, zweitens ist der permanente Umweg über ein Verzeichnis (anstelle von Querverweisen) bemühd, und drittens ist das Verzeichnis selber auch nicht ganz vollständig (z. B. fehlt 243 ad 44.26 unter „Verbum in Anschlußstellung“ sowie das Lemma „Parison“).

Bei aller möglichen Detailkritik an der Gesamtanlage dieser Arbeit soll hier zum Schluß aber unmißverständlich gesagt sein, daß Tz.s Kommentar mit seinen vielen beherzigenswerten Diskussionsbeiträgen für die weitere Beschäftigung mit Sappho ganz und gar unentbehrlich sein wird. Und auch der neuartige Versuch, syntaktische und stilistische Einzelheiten dieser Gedichte zusätzlich von der Warte der sprachlich-literarischen Verwandtschaft im Osten aus zu betrachten, die heute ja nicht mehr selbstverständlich im klassisch-philologischen Blickfeld liegt, bringt dem aufgeschlossenen Leser viel Lehrreiches, auch dort, wo es zum unmittelbaren Verständnis nicht viel beiträgt.

Seminar für Klassische Philologie
Nadelberg 6-8
CH-4051 Basel

Rudolf Wachter

Demiraj, Bardhyl: Sistemi i numerimit të gjuhës shqipe: Vështrim diakronik. Tiranë, Akademia e Shkencave të Republikës së Shqipërisë, Instituti i Gjuhësisë dhe i Letërsisë, 1997, 8°, 198 S. Brosch.

1. The (lower) numerals of most Indo-European languages belong to the inherited vocabulary, which is very resistant to foreign influence. For this reason, the numeral system of Albanian has played an important role in demonstrating the Indo-European origin of Albanian in the beginnings of Albanian studies around 1850 (cf. Bopp 1855).

In the subsequent research on the historical developments that have led to the present shape of the Albanian language, the numerals have kept their prominent evidential role, simply because Indo-Europeanists have comparatively little evidence at their disposal. The two main reasons for this situation are well-known. In the first place, the written transmission

of Albanian starts only in the 16th century AD, when the language had already assumed a completely different shape. Secondly, Albanian has borrowed so extensively from Latin, and, to lesser degree, from Greek, Slavic and Turkish, that only a small part of the word stock directly reflects PIE heritage. The Albanian numerals thus play an important role in the linguistic reconstruction of the pre-Roman era.

On the other hand, the numeral system is one of the most tight semantic systems in a language, and therefore all the more prone to internal change by means of analogical adaptation to other members of the system. Well-known examples are Slavic *devět* “nine” (from **n-*) influenced by *desět* “ten” or Iranian **puxda-* “fifth” influenced by **turja-* “fourth”, **xšušta-* “sixth”.

In Albanian, a first glance at the lower numerals immediately reveals that here, too, some influence from one numeral on the other must be assumed. As to the origin and direction of this change, however, there are no immediate clues, and different solutions have been proposed in the course of research.

Gustav Meyer (1884) wrote the first monograph on the Albanian numerals, and although separate items were taken up by various subsequent scholars, a new analysis of the Albanian numerals, incorporating both the changed formal insights about Indo-European, and our advanced knowledge about the development of numeral systems, was a clear desideratum. For this reason, D. has submitted the Albanian numerals to a new and thorough analysis in his doctoral dissertation which was completed in 1989 and approved for publication by the Albanian Academy of Science in 1990.

For financial reasons, the work could not be published until 1997, by which time Eric Hamp (1992) had published his study of the Albanian numerals in the collective volume *Indo-European Numerals*. D. has faithfully cited and commented on Hamp’s analysis in the present edition of this thesis. He also regularly refers to Klingenschmitt’s unpublished study *The Albanian Numerals*, with which D.’s original version was unfamiliar. Other literature of the period after 1990 is mostly left out of consideration.

We thus have three recent independent works on the Indo-European origin and the later development of the Albanian numerals, a luxurious situation for a little-studied language like Albanian. Furthermore, D.’s *Albanische Etymologien* (1997) must be mentioned, an etymological dictionary preceded by a short historical phonology, in which the author presents his view of the development of the PIE sound system into Albanian.

2. The book is structured in the following way. The introduction (11–16) provides a review of the most important preceding studies, and

then summarizes the problems that have not yet received a generally accepted solution. The latter in fact applies to most of the issues connected with the numerals. Among others, D. raises the following questions: Which elements are direct IE heritage? Which elements have arisen during the (pre)historical development of Albanian? Has the system undergone foreign influence? Can a relative chronology be determined for some of the phonological or morpho-syntactical phenomena?

The seven subsequent chapters discuss the numerals 1 to 5 (17–58), 6 to 9 (59–80), 10 and the decades (81–99), the ‘additional’ numerals 11–19, 21–29 etc. (100–110), the hundreds and thousands (111–118), the vigesimal system (119–125) and the ordinals (126–135). After a short summary of the conclusions (136–139), D. has appended a German summary (140–160) of the separate chapters, which makes the book accessible also to those who cannot read Albanian. The final summary of the Albanian text is left untranslated, however. The book is concluded by a list of abbreviations, a bibliography and a word index per language. I have not found any relevant printing errors.

3. D. pays special attention to word formation, which to his mind has previously been somewhat neglected in studies of the Albanian numerals. For this reason, he sketches for every numeral the development of its grammatical function as observable in the older Albanian texts and the Albanian dialects, and compares this with the data known to us from other Indo-European languages.

In order to be able to make historical claims about Albanian, it is always necessary first to reconstruct the Proto-Albanian form, i.e. the form before the first developments that split Albanian into a Geg and a Tosk dialect. D. does not go into details about the Proto-Albanian reconstruction of the separate numerals, since this is not his first interest. The reader who is interested in the different Old Albanian and dialectal forms of the numerals can find them in Hamp 1992.

The first paragraph of his Conclusions amounts to a motivation for this methodological approach, and since the Conclusions have not been translated into German, I may be allowed to provide a translation of the first paragraph (136): “The discussion of the problems which the diachronical study of the numeral system of Albanian presents, leads to the conclusion that this system is part of the Indo-European heritage of this language and that in the course of time, part of its constituents has been subject to many grammatical, word-formational and to a certain degree also functional reforms. These reforms are the result of the internal organisation of the numeral system in this language, which had as a starting point the simplification of the multidirectional oppositions, inherited or arisen in the course of the centuries.”

4. A short comment on some of the numerals may serve to exemplify the comparative use of the monographs by D., Hamp and Klingenschmitt.

“1”: this numeral especially has raised many difficulties. Since it is not discussed in D.’s Etymologien, I may briefly summarize the problem. The word “one” can be used in different functions: as a cardinal “one” (*një*), as a substantivized cardinal “the one” (Tosk *një*, Geg stressed *njâ*, unstressed *një*, *nji*), as an indefinite pronoun “a certain” (T. *njëri*, G. *nâni*) and as an indefinite article “a”. D. regards the uses other than “one” as secondary, on the general assumption that the indefinite function of the pronouns must derive from the use of the numeral in an indefinite sense (18). This argument is not imperative, however, since the reverse development is also attested. In fact, PIE **Hoinos* “one” is built on the pronominal stem **h₁e-/*h₁i-*. D. then proceeds to explain the form *nâ* in Geg and the indefinite *njëri/njâni* as secondary, in order to reconstruct **nē* for Proto-Albanian. The rejection of the other forms is too rash, in my view. D. argues that Geg **nâ* has been reshaped after nouns like *zâ* “voice”, because the accented **nē* which he expects would not fit the Geg phonemic system. This argument is of course illicit for native words. D. furthermore believes that *njëri/njâni* is also secondary, built on *një* after the inflection of nouns like *zë*, *zëri/zâ*, *zâni* “voice”. This seems again more complicated than necessary.

I think we must accept the reconstructions proposed by Hamp (1992: 898). For Common Albanian, he reconstructs **nâ* “one”, unstressed **nē*, in definite function m. **nân-i*, acc. **nân-nē* “the one”. Unstressed **nē* can, with Hamp, easily be derived from **nâ*, which has a nasalised vowel. The preform must have contained a nasal consonant, for which reason Hamp posits (tentatively) PIE **eni-oino-*. We may however try to remain faithful to D.’s reconstruct **h₂en-io-*, which resumes the old connection with Skt. *anyá-* “the other” (cf. Meyer 1884: 328). The semantic shift involved in this reconstruction is paralleled by PIIr. **anjá-*, which arose from the deictic stem **h₂én-* “there”, as attested in e.g. OCS *onъ*, Lith. *anàs* “that one”, which was then enlarged by **-io-* in PIIr. to give *anyá-*, AV. *anîia-* “the other, another”. The same may have happened in a pre-stage of Albanian.

The semantic shift from “another” to “a certain, one”, to which Klingenschmitt (22) objects, is unnecessary. A form **h₂en-io-* could have meant “that one there”, which developed into “the other, another” in Indo-Iranian only. Compare the use of Vedic *anyá-*, which can occur in two subsequent clauses as *anyá ... anyá ...*, “the one ..., the other”. It seems that the original demonstrative meaning of *anyá-* is still present here.

A stem **h₂enio-* may have been enlarged with the suffix **-no-* at a certain stage. The fact that we cannot reconstruct this suffix in any other Al-

banian numeral is irrelevant, since the form may still have been a demonstrative pronoun at the time of suffixation. We therefore posit PIE **h₂en-io-no-*, yielding Pre-Proto-Albanian **ēnân* > Proto-Albanian **nâ*. This meets with no formal problems within Albanian, whereas the semantic development seems quite plausible, too.

“2”: D. derives Alb. *dy* from a dual form **duuo-ih₁*, in which *-ai* was re-analyzed as a plural ending, after which phonetic development led to **du-ī* > *dy* by labialization of the *i*. The long vowel in fem.neut. *dȳ* is said to have an analogical long vowel after the f.n. form for “three”, *trī* (so does Hamp). It is left unexplained, how the PIE f.n. form **duuoi* came to function as the m. form, when the numeral “three” still distinguishes the PIE masc. from the f.n. form, as we shall see. As Klingenschmitt points out (33–34), Alb. *tȳ* “you” (obl. cases) may have developed directly from the disyllabic PIE Acc.sg. **tuuēm*, in which the hiatus was preserved long enough to yield **tyē* which contracted to attested *tȳ*. Thus, both *dy* m. and *dȳ* f.n. may directly continue PIE preforms, viz. **duuo* and **duuai/duuah₂ih₁* (Klingenschmitt, l.c.).

“3”: The analysis of “3” provided by D., Hamp and Klingenschmitt is essentially the same. The m. *tre* can directly be derived from PIE **trejes*, whereas f.n. *trī* probably reflects PIE **trib₂* > **tri*, to which the fem. marker **-ā(s)* was added. The contraction of **triā(s)* yielded *trī*.

“4”: D., Hamp and Klingenschmitt also agree on the derivation of the *-a-* in *katër* from a PIE zero-grade **k^wt-*, in which a “schwa secundum” developed to “retain the morphological border” (D., 47–48). As a parallel for this phenomenon in Albanian, D. mentions the adj. *madh* “big” from **mǵ(e)h₂*, comparable to Lat. *magnus* from **mǵ-no-*. The vocalism of the second syllable of *katër* is ambiguous and can continue **-uōr-* or **-uor-*.

“5”: The discussion of this numeral is, even in the German summary of the book under review, more extensive than in D.’s Etymologien. It is now commonly held that *pesë* can be derived directly from PIE **penk^we*, with the exception of the final *-ë*, which remains ambiguous. D. explains it as a late addition, intended to match the phonetic outcome **pes* with the disyllabic structure of surrounding *katër* “four” and *gjashtë* “six”. Hamp (1992: 911) suggests that nominalization yielded a “marked plural **pénk^we-ā(s)*”, without explaining why the feminine or neuter form should have prevailed.

“6” – “10”: The numbers *gjashtë*, *shtatë*, *tetë*, *nëntë* and *dhjetë* all display an ending *-të* which, from the comparative point of view, must rep-

resent a later addition to the PIE form of these numerals. No final solution for this element has been found so far.

On the strength of the comparison with Slavic *petb* “5” to *desętb* “10”, the additional element has mostly been reconstructed as a collective suffix **-ti-*. A formal objection to this reconstruction was put forward by Klingenschmitt (74), viz. the lack of umlaut in especially *shtatę* “seven”. This objection disappears if we accept Hamp’s reconstruction (1992: 913 ff.), who suggests that original fem. **-ti-* was replaced by productive fem. **-tā-*, which would regularly yield the forms attested. D. now adds a word-formational objection to the suffix **-ti-*, viz. the fact that there is no evidence that the numerals 6–9 ever functioned as substantives, which would be a necessary requirement for the extension with a suffix *-ti-* and subsequent replacement thereof by *-tā-*. One may add that the reason for the supposed feminine gender of these substantives is left unclear.

D. regards the element *-tę* as “thematic enlargements, which arose within the class of the Albanian numerals and in opposition with the ordinals which were formed from them” (154). The formal identity of cardinals and ordinals would have been made possible by their different syntactic behaviour, since ordinals function as adjectives in Albanian. It may be noted that D.’s interpretation differs but little from Bopp’s original derivation (1855: 512) of *-tę* in the cardinals from *-tę* in the ordinals, which he compared with Slavic *sedmъ* “7” and *osmъ* “8”, where the suffix *-mъ* seems to have been imported from the ordinal suffix *-mъ*, PIE **-mo-*.

This explanation seems functionally superior to the assumption of **-ti-*, but it must be investigated whether it does not interfere with the relative chronology of Albanian developments. Especially, the form of the cardinals suggests that the element with *-t-* was added fairly early (e.g. *gjashtë* “6” from **sekst-* with *jashtë* “outside” from **h₁eksto-*, against *djathę* “right” from **deks-*), whereas the date of the obligatory use of the preposed article with the ordinal numbers is unclear.

“20”: Especially the *z-* of *zet* “twenty” is difficult to explain historically. D. refrains from offering a solution for this problem, both in the book under review and in his Etymologien.

5. The preceding remarks do not do full justice to the value of D.’s book, which lies in the morpho-syntactical analysis of the Albanian numeral system, as opposed to the mainly phonetic approach in the other two works. This is not to say that D. neglects the formal side. There are many clear and precise discussions of problems of historical phonetics throughout the book, e.g. on the development of the PIE cluster **-k_s-* (62–64), in which the author carefully analyzes and weighs the possible solutions. Nevertheless, the author often explicitly abstains from further

details in order to go on with the main line of his story. In only a few cases is this to be regretted, so for instance in the discussion of *i parę*, “first”, where D. claims that the regular outcome of **CrHC* is *CraC*, but no examples are given in support.

Together with the other two recent works on the Albanian numerals, it can be said that we now have three works at our disposal which are for a large part complementary. Hamp’s article provides a wealth of dialect forms, from which the PALb. forms are carefully reconstructed. His reconstruction of the PIE ancestors, however, may appear too apodictic to some readers. Klingenschmitt’s work combines both a detailed description of all the possibilities from the PIE point of view and a consistent reconstruction of the Proto-Albanian phonological system at various stages. D.’s book is characterized by a much clearer style of writing, and a solid functional description of the Albanian numeral system. The latter has produced a number of new solutions which are well worth considering.

Literature

- Bopp, F., 1855: Über das Albanesische in seinen verwandtschaftlichen Beziehungen, in: Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse 1854.
 Demiraj, B., 1997: Albanische Etymologien. Untersuchungen zum altererbten Wortschatz des Albanischen, Amsterdam – Atlanta (= Leiden Studies in Indo-European, Nr. 7).
 Hamp, E., 1992: Albanian, in: Indo-European Numerals, ed. J. Gvozdanović, Berlin – New York, p. 837–921 (= Trends in Linguistics 57).
 Klingenschmitt, G., The Albanian Numerals, unpublished manuscript.¹
 Meyer, G., 1884: Albanesische Studien II. Die albanesischen Zahlwörter, in: Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der Kais. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, 107.

Leiden University
 Department of Comparative Linguistics (VTW)
 PO Box 9515

NL-2300 RA Leiden

Michiel de Vaan

¹ Prof. Klingenschmitt informs me by letter that he has the intention to publish a revised version of his study as a monograph.