homeland underwritten by the evidence of linguistic palaeontology.

Reinach concludes:

> La lecteur a vu defiler devant lui une longue série de savants, attaquant chacun à son tour, avec toutes les ressources de l'érudition la plu ingénieuse, un problème qui, dans l'état actuel de la science, ne comporte pas de solution assure. C'est déjà beaucoup, cependant, d'avoir remis en question des résultats trop facilement acceptés et d'avoir fait valoir des arguments sérieux à l'appui de la théorie nouvelle qui place dans l'Europe orientale la residence des tribus aryennes avant leur separation.

Appended to the reprint is a very useful bibliography of works pertaining to the Indo-European homeland, prepared by Xavier Delamarre, arranged chronologically, from 1864 up to 2015.

J. P. Mallory
Queen's University Belfast

Linguistics

Dieter Gunkel & Olav Hackstein (eds.), *Language and Meter*. Leiden: Brill, Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 18, 2018. viii + 434 p. [Hardcover]. ISBN 978-90-04-35777-8. EUR-€116 / US-$134.[1]

The eminent scholar W. De Melo once began his review of an editorial volume on Terence with a rather ominous comment: "conference proceedings are normally a pain for reviewers" (De Melo 2008: 137). He is certainly right, for

[1]As with most academic publications, some people need to be praised in front of it. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to prof. dr. em. J. P. Mallory, for giving me the opportunity of writing a review of "Language and Meter" in the *JIES*. Second, prof. dr. Mark Janse as supervisor of my MA.-thesis at Ghent University about Homeric metrics, for providing me with an exemplar of the book under review. Third, dr. Filip De Decker, the co-supervisor of my thesis, for his careful proofreading of this review and valuable comments. However, following another academic κοινὸς τόπος, all inconsistencies and errors remain, of course, my own.

editorial volumes are written by different authors, with diverse backgrounds and varying opinions about the underlying theme of a conference. In addition, the broad title of the book under review bears witness to the wide range of topics and languages discussed in the book. Still, I can only praise the general outcome of the book, which collects entries of talented scholars concerning a rather complex, but important and fascinating field of research: Indo-European poetics.

The volume arose as the outcome of the Munich colloquium on "Language and Meter in Diachrony and Synchrony", which was held at the Department of Historical and Indo-European Linguistics in September 2013. As can be glanced, some gap of time exists between the conference and the eventual publication of the book. This permitted both the authors to adapt some parts of their work according to the criticisms which were raised during the colloquium (cf. the fact that references to scholarly work up to 2016 were added in different papers) and to the editors for a thorough revision of the complete volume. The Munich scholars Olav Hackstein and Dieter Gunkel (the latter in the meantime moved to the University of Richmond) open their volume with a concise, but informative essay about the contents of the book. Moreover, the general lay-out of the book is excellent and only minor typo's caught my eye. To name a few, correct in the contribution of Kiparsky (pp. 77-128) the reference to Oldenberg's *Prolegomena* on p. 89 (read Oldenberg 1888 instead of 1988), rectify the accent of παίδας (p. 111) to παῖδας and change the order of the references to Gunkel & Ryan (2011; 2013) (p. 125). These are however only minor details, which never affect the overall high editorial quality, which one may also expect from the rather high price of the book.

In total, the book consists of fifteen essays, covering all major Indo-European branches, except for Anatolian, Balto-Slavic and Armenian. The papers are written in English, French and German. The Greek branch is definitely best represented with six papers dealing with it (Katz pp. 54-66; Kiparsky pp. 77-128; Le Feuvre pp. 158-179; Nussbaum pp. 267-318; Tichy pp. 346-361; West pp. 362-379), followed by Italic (three essays: Dupraz pp. 7-33; Martzloff pp. 222-252; Mercado pp. 253-266). Gunkel & Ryan (pp. 34-53) and Kümmel (pp. 129-157) are

concerned with the Indo-Iranian material, respectively Vedic and (Old) Avestan. Tocharian is taken into the debate by Malzahn (pp. 207-221) and Peyrot (pp. 319-343). Finally, Lühr (pp. 180-206) offers a description of Germanic alliteration and Widmer (pp. 380-406) compares Celtic and Germanic traditions. They are arranged in an alphabetical order, according to the author. This is of course a possible classification, although a thematic one would make more sense in my opinion. Therefore, I will group the essays together in my discussion according to the linguistic branch they deal with (as the editors do themselves in their introduction). Due to its prevalence in the book and my own interests and background, I will pay somewhat more attention to the chapters covering the Ancient Greek language.

Let me, however, start in the East, where the sun rises with his horses and chariot, and end in the West, when dusk is falling, paying tribute to this Indo-European myth, put on the cover of Martin West's (2007) monumental work on Indo-European poetry and myth. Since its discovery in the early 20th Century, Tocharian has been a puzzle for Indo-Europeanists. How could a centum-language be found in China? After a long period of negligence, Tocharian stands nowadays in the middle of Indo-European attention. For example, it has received its own academic journal: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies (TIES)*, co-edited by one of the contributors of the volume under review: Michaël Peyrot. In his chapter, entitled "A comparison of the Tocharian A and B metrical traditions", he tries to add metrics as one of the factors, where a distinctive influence of Tocharian B on Tocharian A can be observed and not vice versa. Doing so, he provides an overview of the main principles of Tocharian verse (pp. 320-321) and the different meters (pp. 324). This offers the possibility for readers without a genuine knowledge of Tocharian to understand his main arguments and critically assess them. His principal claim is that Tocharian A copies some names of meters and certain patterns from Tocharian B, which points to a cultural influence of the B-variant on Tocharian A. This is in agreement with results of earlier research (e.g. Peyrot 2008) and the historical context, which is briefly outlined at the beginning of his paper (pp. 319-320). In addition, Tocharian scholars will find his appendix (pp.

331-343), with a collection of the known metrical tunes and meters of Tocharian A and B, a useful resource for future editions of metrical texts and linguistic studies.

The other study on Tocharian equally deserves our appraisal. Malzahn ("*Lautliche Aspekte tocharischer Dichtersprache*") is concerned with the interface between language and meter, for she pays attention to some characteristics of the Tocharian *Dichtersprache*. She rightly compares this to the situation in the Homeric epics, where new and old forms stand together in perfect harmony. For instance, reference is made to Hackstein's (2002: 19-33) analysis of linguistic younger forms in the Homeric epic (cf. also the paper of Nussbaum *infra*). Amongst others, she sketches the linguistic history of "mobile o" which replaces original (*)-ä# in later Tocharian texts (p. 211). Through the course of time, more "mobile o's" are found in Tocharian poems. Interesting in this case is Malzahn's remark (p. 212) that this is mostly found at the end of a colon or a *pāda*. Here, she could have extended her comparison between the Tocharian and the Homeric *Kunstsprache*, because Witte (1913) already observed the fact that both archaic and innovative, artificial forms in Homeric hexameter are placed before or after the bucolic diaeresis.

Reading the chapters by Gunkel & Ryan and Kümmel, one's attention is drawn to some metrical peculiarities of the Indo-Iranian poetic language. Building on previous research concerning *pāda*-cohesion in the *Ṛgveda* (cf. references p. 35), Gunkel & Ryan provide phonological evidence that Vedic bards composed their poems in strophic structures. Using statistical studies, they conclude that hiatus is more averted within a couplet than between them,[2] the same can be said about VC#V-structures. Therefore, the two most common Vedic dimeter stanzas, *gāyatrī* and *anuṣṭubh* (e.g. Arnold 1905: 7-8), need to be analyzed respectively as (a+b)(c) and (a+b)(c+d). Future research can follow the example of these young scholars and provide a broader framework for the study of Vedic stylistics,

[2]This was not yet noticed in older studies, cf. the comment in the standard work by Arnold (1905: 71): "The Saṃhitā text takes as its unit the *distich*, or pair of trimeter or dimeter verses. But the appearance of hiatus seems to be quite as common at the end of verses *a* and *c* as at the end of verses *b* and *d*, and very much commoner at the end of the verse than at the caesura".

taking into account different linguistic factors (phonology, morphology, syntax etc.) which play their roles and to the interfaces between them.

Martin Kümmel's contribution on the other hand, provides a new metrical analysis of the Old Avestan text corpus (hence its title "*Silbenstruktur une Metrik: Neues zum Altavestischen*"). Compared to Vedic and Ancient Greek metrics, which were successfully compared by Antoine Meillet (1923), Avestan remains a *Sonderfall* in the study of comparative Indo-European metrics. The *Gāθās* are clearly written in a poetic style, comparable to the Vedic stanzas, with a fixed number of syllables. However, when one tries to scan them with the prosodic rules of Old Indic, no clear metrical pattern can be observed, hence it is commonly believed that Avestan has lost the prosodic opposition between long and short syllables (e.g. West 2007: 50). Kümmel's discussion advocates a different point of view. After providing a useful summary of Indo-European metrics (pp. 130-133), he proposes to scan Avestan meter on the basis of Sogdian principles. Because Iranian languages lack geminates, he is convinced that the traditional Indo-European prosodic rules, where a closed vowel counts as a long syllable is not valid in Avestan poetry. Instead, he proposes to scan the sequence VTC rather as V.TC than as VT.C (T refers to an obstruent, C to any consonant), somewhat similar to the *muta cum liquida* rule in Attic Greek and Latin. When this is done, Old Avestan texts show a clear cadence at the end of the meter (∪∪×) (see pp. 138-143 for details concerning the different strophic structures and pp. 146-157 for full statistics). Quite an amazing observation, the question remains which conclusions can be drawn from it. Do we need to completely revise our conceptions about Indo-European prosody and verse or is the Avestan system an Iranian innovation? Kümmel reluctantly advocates the first option, pointing to the lack of geminates in other Indo-European branches in contrast to Greek, Indic and Latin (p. 144). However, I am not convinced by this argument. Previous scholarship, beginning with the already mentioned book by Meillet (1923) has clearly shown the remarkable similarities between Vedic and Greek (cf. also Kiparsky *infra*), on the basis of which an Indo-European tradition can be reconstructed to which Slavic (Jakobson 1952) and Celtic

(Watkins 1963) parallels can be added (cf. also Mercado *infra* on Italic). Did Vedic and Greek develop independent of each other a system which is clearly cognate? Would it not seem more reasonable that Indo-Iranian and Greek inherited traditional prosody from Indo-European times and that (East) Iranian with Avestan and Sogdian went their own ways after splitting up from the Indic tradition? As Kümmel prudently mentions (p. 144), this needs to be discussed in future research.

As I already stressed, Greek can be called the core business of the editorial volume, moreover because all six entries are written by distinguished scholars in the field. The late Martin West, to whose memory the volume is dedicated, was invited to hold the key lecture of the conference, with the inauspicious title "Unmetrical Verses in Homer". "The author of the *Odyssey* in particular (...) must be convicted of occasional bad versification" (p. 379) or in the words of Horace himself: "Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus" (*Ars Poetica* 359). Schulze (1892: 374-462), in his *Quaestiones Epicae* was the first scholar to pay considerable attention to these στίχοι ἀκέφαλοι, λαγαροί and μείουροι of the Homeric poems (oddly enough not mentioned by West). The value of West's article lies not so much in original ideas as in providing a useful classification of possible historical explanations of anomalous Homeric prosody (cf. the comments by the editors p. 2). The paper is concluded with a meticulous analysis of some individual cases, which cannot be easily explained with reference to the loss of historical sounds etc.

Unmetrical verses are traditionally also used as an argument in the fierce debate about the origins of the Greek hexameter (e.g. Kiparsky in this volume). Two papers deal with this proto-hexameter and present opposite views as from which prototypes the Homeric meter eventually arose. Building on her earlier work (Tichy 1981; 2010), the German scholar remains convinced that, with some modifications, the proposal of the Norwegian Homerist Nils Berg (1978) to split up the hexameter at the hephthemimeral caesura into a glyconic (○○–∪∪–∪–) and a pherecratean (○○–∪∪––) can strengthen our understanding

about the early history of the epic meter.[3] However, she adapts it to a sort of "polygenetic model",[4] through which different variants, in fact every possible variant, contributed to the genesis of the eventual hexameter ("In der Entwicklung zum Hexameter wurde nicht eine Variante des Ausgangsverses bevorzugt, es wurden alle Variante einbezogen" p. 352). She does so, because the hypothesis of Berg cannot account for the existence of the different caesurae in the colometry of Homeric verse (p. 353), only for the hepthemimeral caesura, which is by far not the most important (Bassett 1917: 85-86).[5] Postulating different proto-hexameters does not help us in this case, I am afraid. In doing so, you can explain how individual caesurae have come into being in the verse, but how can you explain how one meter has evolved with those different breaks all-together? Interesting in this case is to take a look at Tichy's scheme at p. 353, where she explains how the presupposed Aeolic fifteen-syllable verse (indicated only with the hephthemimeral caesura!) evolved into the Ionic hexameter (with an attempt to explain the trochaic caesura). Why does she not give an overview of the different variants? This would help the reader to follow her argument. With this tentative proposal as her background, Tichy tries to recover older parts of the Homeric poems, as she already tried to do in her monograph of 2010. In their preface (p. 2), the editors of the volume refer in this case to West's review, where he characterizes Tichy's

[3]Space does not permit me to give a full criticism of this proposal, reference can *inter alia* be made to Magnelli (1995: 118-124); Weilo & Haug (2001); West (2011); Schoubben (2018: 70-75); Kiparsky (this volume pp. 105-106).

[4]I base this term on the writings of Gentili and Giannini (1977), according to whom the hexameter arose due to a combination of different variants of shorter verses.

[5]This is caused by a common neglect of colometry in Homeric studies, which do not pay considerable attention to the importance of syntactic and semantic units when placing caesurae. A more dynamic attitude towards colometry is presented in Janse (2012), applying a modern linguistic framework (Chafe's intonation units) to the Homeric data. Metrical cola needs to be equated with cognitive intonation units which are demarcated by prosodic boundaries. On this basis, it is for instance argued that a caesura between a prepositive or postpositive word and the noun it is attached to is impossible (contra e.g. West 1982: 36). For a preliminary English summary of Janse's theory with discussion of traditional proposals, reference can be made to Schoubben (2018: 36-60).

attempt as "sensational" (West 2011: 158), but this is only part of the story. At the end of his assessment, West speaks of "wasted ingenuity" (West 2011: 163). This appears to be the better comment, I suspect. The Homeric epics are part of an oral tradition and we have to consider ourselves fortunate that we have at least a transmitted record of one version of the story, to search for older layers is maybe a dream for Homerists, as Tichy confess herself (p. 353), but in this case dreams seem to be lies. Standing in a long tradition of German analysts, she aims to detect which "books" of the *Iliad* are older than others. She pretends this to be possible while restoring the transmitted text to Aeolic fifteen-syllables. The easier this goes, the more likely it is that we have an old verse in this case. However, what she actually does is search for late Ionic forms in the different books (she provides a list p. 354 e.g. plural instead of dual), which leads *inter alia* to the conclusion that the *Dolony* contains more late forms than other books (78,1%) and is therefore likely to be a later addition (p. 356). This conclusion *stricto sensu* makes sense, but what does this analysis of morphosyntactic forms tell us about the underlying meter that Tichy is concerned with? In addition, when she actually attempts reconstructions of Homeric verses, this is laid upon circular grounds. She starts from the attested text, chooses a word she wants to delete or to add and then explains the text as we have it, from her reconstructed text. Her adaptations are in some cases even counter-intuitive. For example, on p. 358 (concerning *Il.* IX, 547f.) she deletes the transmitted tmesis. Would it not make more sense that tmesis, being an archaic poetic device, was replaced by more innovative syntactic forms throughout time than the other way around?

More promising, but nonetheless somewhat problematic, is Paul Kiparsky's proposal to derive the Homeric hexameter from a couplet of two iambic octosyllables.[6] As in his other work, this is done within a generative framework, which is clearly explained at the beginning of his essay and which can indeed provide useful metrical analyses, as is also shown by Mercado's chapter in the book under review. Doing so, he pays attention to a hitherto neglected common feature of Indo-

[6]For a fuller discussion, I refer to Schoubben (2018: 79-82).

European verse: anaclasis or - as Kiparsky denotes it himself - syncopation, through which long and short vowels can be metathesized.[7] Importantly, this feature is typologically rare and can only be found in the Indo-European tradition, therefore this offers somewhat firmer ground than Meillet's (1923) comparisons, to posit a common Indo-European metrical tradition (cf. Kuryłowicz 1970 who finds the similarities too vague and typologically too common). Through this anaclasis, Kiparsky is able to derive a dactylic sequence from the typical iambic structure of Indo-European and Vedic verse, which gave rise to a meter of its own (p. 107). Until here, his proposal works quite well, but problems arise when he tries to explain the synchronic colometry of Homeric verse with his theory. For the penthemimeral caesura, this is not a big problem, for this can be explained as the position where the two parts of the hypothesized distich (postulating a catalectic variant) coalesced into one meter. The other caesurae are explained with reference to the corresponding positions in the iambic meter (p. 114-116), as can be visualized with the following scheme (percentages borrowed from West 1982: 36; 41):

(∪) −∪||$_{3}$−||$_{17}$×−||$_{9}$∪|$_{5}$− // ×||$_{23}$−∪ ||$_{2}$−×−∪−||$_{49}$ (iambic distich)
−||$_{6}$∪||$_{2}$∪||$_{6}$−||$_{7}$∪∪−||$_{12}$∪||$_{9}$∪−||$_{3}$∪∪||$_{11}$−∪∪−×||$_{63}$ (hex., correspondences in bold)

There are, however, some problems with the proposal. First, there is too much difference between the matching percentages. To name only one, the importance of the bucolic diaeresis is much less in the corresponding iambic line. In addition, Kiparsky fails to explain Hermann's bridge. According to him, this can be accounted for by the lack of sense-pauses in the corresponding iambic meter, but why did this come into being only at this position and not in other positions where sense-pauses are limited in the iambic distich? The trochaic caesura constitutes another problem. There is no corresponding place in the iambic model, in addition one would expect from this theory that a caesura after the third dactyl would arise,

[7]Because the short and long vowels are metathesized and not syncopated, I prefer to continue the term anaclasis, although this is only a common term in the Graeco-Roman tradition.

which is strongly prohibited in the hexameter (so-called Varro's law).

The paper by Joshua Katz also wants to look back to Indo-European times from the Homeric hexameter, not starting from the meter itself, but from a common poetic device. According to him, we have to interpret the /a:/ in the opening invocation μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά (*Il.* I, 1) not as an Aeolism as is commonly thought (e.g. Wachter 2000: 68 but with some problems, e.g. lack of *barytonesis*), but as an instance of "hymnic long alpha". The epic singer literally starts to sing with this long vowel, just like Sanskrit mantras are started with the holy syllable *oṃ*. Normally, the beginning alpha of the verb ἀείδω ("to sing") is lengthened to a hymnic long one, but because this is not possible within the meter here, θεά takes over this function. Katz's idea is in fact as simple as it is brilliant. Future research needs to assess the possible Euboean origin of this lexeme, an hypothesis which is briefly mentioned by Katz (p. 66 following Hackstein 2010: 402), but which is not fully explored in the paper[8]. One needs namely to account for the existence of the lexeme in other parts of the epic poem. They cannot simply be explained as modelled on the opening, for this would be in contradiction with Katz' claim (p. 60; quoting Maslov) that "it [sc. the opening line] should rather be placed near its [sc. the epic tradition's] end".

The two remaining "Greek papers" are written in the tradition of Witte, Parry and their followers and study the interface between the two parts of the book title: language and meter. They analyze the influence of the epic hexameter on the *Kunstsprache*, concerning the transitive use of κάμνω (Le Feuvre) and certain late Ionic forms (Nussbaum). Speakers of Modern Greek are mostly unaware of this fact, but the polyfunctional word κάνω ("to do") is directly derived from Ancient Greek κάμνω ("to be tired (from working), to be sick"). In order for this to be possible, the verb had to become transitive. However, as Le Feuvre (p. 160) herself stresses, this is

[8]Before West and Ruijgh extended this hypothesis, Euboean influence was first proposed by Wathelet (1981) on the basis of the lack of the "third compensatory lengthening" in certain Homeric forms, e.g. μονωθείς (*Il.* XI, 470) instead of the expected East Ionic form **μουνωθείς (for discussion cf. Wathelet 1981: 825).

only a phenomenon that emerges from Byzantine Greek onwards in certain "light-verb constructions" (she does not uses this term herself). Nonetheless, some transitive usages of the verb κάμνω are found in Homer, which are not adequately explained by previous research. Sometimes reference is made to the fact that the transitive function only occurs in the aorist which is generally more transitive (cf. p. 159 for further references; transitivity in the history of the Greek verb is most recently discussed by Willi 2018: 286-356; 417-503 especially stressing the transitive function of the s-aorist, which is not attested for κάμνω). Therefore, a formulaic analysis seems the better option according to Le Feuvre. She is able to do so in a convincing manner. Let me reproduce one aspect of her analysis. Because the verb κάμνω was sometimes used in the aorist after the bucolic diaeresis accompanied with a relative pronoun before it and a participle τεύχων immediately after it. Although the relative pronoun was originally the complement of τεύχων, it was re-analyzed as the direct object of the forms of κάμνω, when τεύχων was replaced by, for example, ἄνδρες, hence κάμνω became a transitive verb. In a similar way, Le Feuvre also addresses other instances where similar re-analyses occur with the verb κάμνω and gives an explanation of the verbal compounds in -κμητος (pp. 174-178).

Alan Nussbaum discusses some other Homeric innovations: late Ionic forms which can be traced back to a cluster *ĕ(C)ĕ(C)V and are represented in the Homeric corpus as ĕV (εα/εο). Because they are in most cases metrically guaranteed (p. 269), a solid explanation for their appearance needs to be found. Past research proposed two phonological reasons, respectively referred to as "hyphaeresis" (p. 271) and "quantitative metathesis" (QM) (p. 272). The former can be represented as *ĕ(C)ĕ(C)a/o > *ĕĕa/o > *ē̯a/o > ĕa/o (with vocalic shortening). The latter on the other hand, postulates a metathesis from *ē̯a to ĕā (not valid in the cases with the vowel /o/). However, the scarce attestations of the sequence ĕā in the Homeric epic, which according to Nussbaum can mostly be explained as metrical lengthenings due to formulaic usage, cast

serious doubts on the QM-theory.[9] Therefore, the former is to be preferred, although Nussbaum convincingly stresses in the rest of the paper (pp. 288-317) the fact that formulaic language is important to explain how these forms came into being.[10] Influenced by "formulary templates" (p. 305), which are defined as "a line segment of a given metrical size and shape, position, syntax, and (lexical) semantics" (p. 304), the late Ionic forms under discussion can be explained as innovative forms which intruded in formulaic contexts, where the sequence of two shorts could easily be used in the metrical structure.

Not only Latin, but also Umbrian and South Picene are prominently studied in the Italic essays of the volume. The Brussels' scholar Emmanuel Dupraz is not so much concerned with metrics *stricto sensu*, but he analyzes a stylistic feature of the Umbrian *Kunstprosa* as it can be gleaned from the Iguvine Tablets. According to Dupraz, an Umbrian ritual description was formed by sentences which show a similar structure (e.g. first an accusative, second the dative and finally the verb), no matter how long the particular elements were. There was however some variation, most notably in the first sentence which normally deviated from the pattern of the other sentences. To enforce his argument, the author regularly denies the influence of pragmatics on the word order (e.g. p. 18: "Keine syntaktische oder pragmatische Besonderheit des ersten Satzes den zwei anderen gegenüber erklärt m.E. diese Verschiebung"). In the later part of the essay, this becomes somewhat more

[9]For example, Nussbaum (p. 275-276) examines the Homeric verse: ὄφρα ἴδωμαι // οἰκῆας ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον υἱόν (*Il.* VI, 365-366). The /a/ in οἰκῆας needs to be scanned long in this case, which could be seen as an argument in favor of the QM-hypothesis. This assertion is however weakened due to the formulaic nature of the verse. The sequence ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον υἱόν can be found in another verse (*Il.* V, 688) and with some variation in *Il.* XVII, 28 after the trithemimeral caesura. Hence, the long /a/ can be explained as a metrical lengthening caused by the formulaic context (p. 276). In addition, Nussbaum could have referred in my opinion to the etymology of ἄλοχος from PIE *sm̥-log^{h}os (lying in the same bed, hence "wife"; e.g. Beekes & Van Beek 2010: 852-853 s.v. λέχεται). The intermediate stage *halok^{h}os, as a mycenaeism, could also cause metrical lengthening, similar to the notorious Διῒ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον (Ruijgh 1995: 77f.).

[10]Time and space does not permit me to discuss the individual examples, but the explanations are generally well-considered and persuasive.

nuanced, because iconic factors are also taken into account. It seems to me that this is a better way of approaching such a difficult problem as word order and stylistics. For example, in his discussion of a passage from the *piaculum* (pp. 11-13), the different structure of the first sentence is only explained as part of a stylistic convention, without reference to the pragmatic function. However, does it not seem reasonable that in this case the word order is altered because Jupiter Grabovius is referred to? Being the supreme god of Umbrian society, placing him in front of the sentence can be interpreted as rendering homage to this deity. As Dupraz rightly mentions (p. 32), "Die Verflechtung stilistisch-sprachlicher und religiös-referentieller Assymetrien im Umbrischen ist ein Thema für kunftige Forschungen" and for critical readers of his generally erudite chapter.

Due to the specific nature of their transmission (only inscriptions), searching for metrical patterns is a difficult task in the case of Archaic Latin, Faliscan and the Sabellic languages. Nonetheless, considerable progress has been made since the influential book by Angelo Mercado (2012), which forms the background of both his own paper and the essay of Martzloff. Similar to Tichy and Kiparsky for Greek, Mercado attempts to reconcile the Italic evidence with the postulated Indo-European metrical system. Based on a generative framework, through which he distinguishes between abstract metrical patterns and the eventual outcome of it as a real metrum, he explains the evolution from Indo-European to Italic verse as a re-analysis. Because a new accentual system arose in the Italic languages, with a strong accent on the first syllable, the Indo-European patterns were re-analyzed resulting in accentual dactylic-trochaic sequences. These went their own ways in Sabellic and Latino-Faliscan. Possibly, even an Italo-Celtic period could be hypothesized on the basis of this analysis, but this is only briefly mentioned in Mercado's paper and requires further study.

Martzloff starts his analysis from Mercado's *Relative Stress Principle* (2012: 113-115), according to which the accented syllable of a full lexeme bears the highest accentual degree [2], a function word contains a somewhat less prominent accent [1] and unaccented syllables are marked with [0]. This is however

the situation when the words are extracted from the actual context they occur in, because the surrounding sounds are important in determining if a syllable really bears a metrical accent, for example when a [1] is surrounded by two unaccented syllables [0], it becomes more prominent due to the contrast and is eventually realized as if it were a [2]. Applying this methodology to a South Picene inscription (*ST* Sp TE 5) and the notorious *Duenos*-inscription in Old Latin, a similar metrical pattern for both inscriptions can be found. In passing, he proposes to read the end of the difficult second line of *Duenos* as "oites iai paca rivois" ("in that case, calm down using the floods [sc. of the perfume]"), explaining *oites* as the ancestor of Classical Latin *ūtens*, *iai* as a locative variant for *iam* and *rivois* as the complement of *oites* (pp. 236-241). As with other proposals, this remains somewhat speculative and has little chance to become a *communis opinio*. For example, this proposal presupposes the sound change V>V̄/_nS (S: s, f) to have taken place already at this early point in the history of Latin (presumably 6th century BC), which is somewhat doubtful.[11] This is however not the main point of the article, and therefore does not detract from the overall metrical analysis.

Finally, we reach the western parts of the Indo-European world, with the contributions on Germanic and Celtic poetics. Rosemarie Lühr with her paper "*Zur germanischen Stabreimtechnik*" analyzes Old German verse as a combination of two shorter half verses, consisting in total of four accents, which can either be grouped symmetrically over the two parts of the verse (2/2) or asymmetrically (3/1 or 1/3). This is in fact an old theory of Sievers (cf. pp. 183-184 for full references), to which Lühr adds an analysis of alliteration (cf. p. 189 for basic

[11]Cf. Meiser (2006²: 94): "Vor den Spiranten *s f* ist *n* **im Altlatein** unter Dehnung des vorhergehenden Vokals (…) geschwunden, wurde aber in der Standardaussprache (nach der Schrift) festgehalten" (bold face added). In the introduction of his book (2006²: 2) "Altlatein" was defined by Meister as the period between 240 BC and 81 BC, so if this is the correct period, a chronological problem arises with Martzloff's proposal. A similar situation is found in Weiss, who defines "Old Latin" as the language of the third and second century BC (2009: 23) and in a later chapter (2009: 129) refers to "numerous instances of omission [*sc.* of <n>]" in "Old Latin". In any case, evidence for Old Latin remains very scarce.

rules), based on a comparison between the Old High German *Song of Hildebrand* and *Muspilli*.

The chapter by Paul Widmer, titled "*Aðalhending, cynghanedd und kenganez: Kultur- und Sprachkontakt im Insularem Raum*" reviews the possible Celtic influence on the Scandinavian "courtly meter" *dróttkvætt*. Although there are some clear similarities between this poetic form and its Irish counterparts (stanzaic structure, syllable-counting, both internal and external rhyme and a trochaic cadence) (p. 381), these are only superficial. For example, the German verse normally consist of six syllables, whereas the Irish one favors seven syllables. Therefore, Widmer rightly asks the question to which extent we can posit a direct influence in this case. Doing so, he pays considerable attention to the poetics of Brittonic literature, which is generally neglected in the debate of Celtic influence on Germanic traditions. From this analysis the author's view emerges that variation is a central feature of Celtic verse, alongside alliteration, rhyme and other poetic devices. No one-to-one relationship can be discovered between the different Celtic and Germanic traditions, but at least a shared "poetic feeling". In his opinion, the influence of the Celtic tradition on the Germanic tradition lies here, on the pattern-level not on the matter-level, quoting a contact linguistic template of Matras (2009: 236). After the fall of the Roman empire, new poetic devices were created in Britain and Ireland, both in Latin literature and folk literature, which gradually expanded to the Scandinavian areas. Widmer denotes this as language contact in the "Insularem Raum" ("the area between the islands"). I would go even further, why not postulate the existence of a cultural and linguistic *Sprachbund* (e.g. Matras 2009: 265ff.) centered around the North Sea, which could explain shared poetic features? Nagy (2011) applied this model already, and to my mind successfully, to the cultural and poetic background of the Homeric epics.

To conclude, "Language and Meter" deserves to find its path to the desks of a wide range of scholars, anyone interested in one of the branches discussed in the books, the Indo-European family in its totality or in general metrics and stylistics. Some contributions contain certain problematical points, but this cannot be avoided in such a hypothetical field of

study as Indo-European poetics. As the editors stress in their preface (quoting a handbook article): "Linguistics, texts, theory and data - these are the essential preliminaries. At the turn of the 21st. c., pretty much everything still remains to be done." Whoever wants to contribute to this progress, will certainly benefit from the vast range of topics discussed in this very readable volume.

Niels Schoubben
Ghent University

References

Arnold, Edward Vernon
1905 *Vedic Metre in its Historical Development.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bassett, Samuel Eliot
1917 The hephthemimeral caesura in Greek hexameter poetry. *TAPA* 48: 85-110.

Beekes, Robert S. P. & Lucien Van Beek
2010 *Greek Etymological Dictionary, by Robert Beekes; with the Assistance of Lucien van Beek.* Leiden: Brill.

Berg, Nils
1978 Parergon metricum: der Ursprung des griechischen Hexameters. *MSS* 37, 11-36.

De Melo, Wolfgang
2008 Review of P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers, F. Felgentreu: Terentius poeta. *Mnemosyne* 62(1): 137-141.

Gentili, Bruno & Pietro, Giannini
1977 Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro. *QUCC* 26: 7-51.

Hackstein, Olav
2002 *Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen: Faktoren morphologischer Variabilität in literarischen Frühformen, Tradition, Sprachwandel, sprachliche Anachronismen.* Wiesbaden: Reichert.
2010 The Greek of epic. In: Bakker, Egbert Jan (ed.) *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language,* 401-423. Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jakobson, Roman
1952 Studies in comparative Slavic metres. *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 3: 21-66.

Janse, Mark
2012 *Inleiding tot de Homerische taal en metriek.* Ghent: Academia Press.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy
1970 The quantative meter of Indo-European. In: Cardona, George, Hoenigswald, Henry M., Senn, Alfred (eds.) *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*, 421-430. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Magnelli, Enrico
1995 Studi recenti sull'origine dell'esametro: un profilo critico. In: Fantuzzi, Marco and Roberto Pretagostini (eds.) *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco* (volume 2), 111-138. Roma: Gruppo editoriale internazionale.

Matras, Yaron
2009 *Language Contact.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meillet, Antoine
1923 *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs.* Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Meiser, Gerhard
2006² *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Mercado, Angelo
2012 *Italic Verse: A Study of the Poetic Remains of Old Latin, Faliscan, and Sabellic.* Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Nagy, Gregory
2011 The Aeolic component of Homeric diction. In: Jamison, Stephanie W. *et al.* (eds.) *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, 133-179. Bremen: Ute Hempen Verlag.

Oldenberg, Hermann
1888 *Die Hymnen des Ṛgveda 1. Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena.* Berlin: Hertz.

Peyrot, Michaël
2008 *Variation and Change in Tocharian B.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Ruijgh, Cornelis Jord
1995 D'Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique. Analyse dialectologique du langage homérique, avec un excursus sur la création de l'alphabet grec. In: Crielaard, Jan Paul (ed.)

Homeric Questions. Essays in Philology, Ancient History and Archaeology, 1-96. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Schoubben, Niels
2018 *How to Find the Origins of a Dragon? A Cognitive Linguistic Approach towards the Proto-History of the Homeric Hexameter. Archaisms and Innovations in the Colometry of Homeric Verse.* (Unpublished MA.-thesis). Ghent University.

Schulze, Wilhelm
1892 *Quaestiones Epicae.* Gueterslohae: Bertelsmanni.

Tichy, Eva
1981 Hom. ἀνδροτῆτα und die Vorgeschichte des daktylischen Hexameters. *Glotta* 59(1/2): 28-67.
2010 *Alter als der Hexameter. Schiffskatalog, Troerkatalog und vier Einzelszenen der Ilias.* Bremen: Hempten.

Wachter, Rudolf
2000 Grammatik der homerischen Sprache. In: Latacz, Joachim *et al.* (eds.) *Homer Ilias: Gesamtkommentar: Prolegomena,* 61-108. München: Saur.

Wathelet, Paul
1981 La langue homérique et le rayonnement littéraire de l'Eubée. *AC* 50, 819-833.

Watkins, Calvert
1963 Indo-European metrics and Archaic Irish verse. *Celtica* 6: 194-249.

Weilo, Eirik, & Dag Trygve Truslew Haug
2001 The proto-hexameter hypothesis: perspectives for further research. *SymbOsl* 76: 130-136.

Weiss, Michael L.
2009 *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin.* Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.

West, Martin Litchfield
1982 *Greek Metre.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
2007 *Indo-European Poetry and Myth.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2011 Review of Tichy (2010). *Kratylos* 56: 156-163.

Willi, Andreas
2018 *Origins of the Greek Verb.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Witte, Kurt
1913 Homeros B) Sprache. In: Pauly-Wissowa (eds.) *Realencyclopädie der classichen Altertumswissenschaft,* VIII, 2213-224. Stuttgart: Druckenmüller.