

RECENZIJOS

Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, Thomas Olander, Birgit Anette Olsen, Jens Elmegård Rasmussen (eds.), **The Sound of Indo-European: Phonetics, phonemics, and morphophonemics**, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press (= *Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European* 4), 2012, 630 p.

The book under review includes most papers presented at the conference *The Sound of Indo-European*, held in Copenhagen in 2009. To judge by the present volume, the conference was a real success. It was immediately followed by a twin conference *The Sound of Indo-European 2* (Opava, 2010), the proceeding of which have also been recently published (Sukač, Šefčík 2012).

A list of the topics addressed by the 29 articles that make up this book will suffice to give an idea of its scope:

Distant Proto-Indo-European (PIE) connections: V. Blažek (PIE and Afroasiatic laryngeals), T. Smitherman (loan words between PIE and Proto-Kartvelian), G. Whitaker (Euphratic question).

PIE syllabification: A. M. Byrd (laryngeal deletion in consonant clusters), G. Keydana (phonological status of *s in clusters), R. Lühr-S. Zielfelder (constraints of perfect reduplication).

(Pre-)PIE phonological processes:

P. S. Cohen-A. Hyllested (**h₃u- > *h₂u-), E. Hill (**o-mi > **-ōi > *-ō), M. Kümmel (PIE stops and vowels from a typological perspective), P. Milizia (assimilation rule *-skē- > *-zǵ^(h)e- after *^oD^(h)-).

PIE ablaut types: G.-J. Pinault, P. Widmer (both dealing with the origin and derivational status of amphikinetic nouns).

Anatolian: J. V. García Trabazo (PIE “essive” suffix *h₁-ié/ó- in Hittite), A. Kloekhorst (value of Hitt. ē with and without *scriptio plena*), V. Shevoroshkin (laryngeals in Milyan), Z. Simon (*h₁ > a/#_R in Lydian).

Indo-Iranian: M. Frotscher (*-r̥ in Vedic and Latin), I. Hegedús (*ruki*-rule in Nuristani).

Germanic: L. Brink (North Germanic *we > *wə > u/o in unstressed position), P. Gąsiorowski (*-sr- in Germanic), G. Kroonen (consonant gradation among *ōn*-iteratives), C. Prescott (lowering of vowels in *ruki*-like contexts).

Celtic: A. Griffith (no raising *e > *i before *μ in Old Irish), A. R. Jørgensen (*sk in British Celtic), D. Stifter (no lenition *s > *h in Gaulish), N. Zair (laryngeal loss in consonant clusters).

Italic: M. Frotscher (see above), K. Nishimura (vowel reduction and syncope in Sabellic), B. Vine (Italic raising °e.iV° > °i.iV° in unstressed position).

Armenian: G. Schirru (realization of stops in Armenian).

There are no articles dealing specifically with Greek, Tocharian, Albanian, Baltic and Slavic. This is in part imputable to chance, but in the case of Baltic the reality is that there are relatively few scholars actively working on Baltic in an Indo-European perspective. It is only to be hoped that the situation will improve in the future. Considering the interests of most potential readers of *Baltistica*, in what follows I will focus on papers that either include some observations on Baltic or, at least, may have an indirect impact on Baltic (Balto-Slavic).

Two papers deal with the *ruki*-rule. According to I. Hegedűs, “The RUKI-rule in Nuristani” (145–167), in Nuristani the *ruki*-rule did not apply after $*\hat{k}$ (which gave $*c$ very early) and after $*i/uH$ (because the laryngeals were still preserved at that stage). If correct (I admittedly lack the expertise to judge), this points to different relative chronology of the *ruki*-rule among the Indo-Iranian languages. C. Prescott, “Germanic and the *ruki* dialects” (425–433), observes that most early Germanic languages present some type of vowel lowering and/or retraction before r, w, x – a set remarkably similar to the one that triggered the *ruki*-rule in Indo-Iranian, Baltic and Slavic. The common feature underlying both processes is Retracted Tongue-root.

The consequences of both papers for Baltic, where the *ruki*-rule often fails to apply, are self-evident. They support the

idea that the *ruki*-rule was a relatively late process that was differently implemented across a wide post-Indo-European dialectal area. Since the late sixties most scholars assume that the *ruki*-rule was fully regular in Baltic, but was followed by a strong tendency to eliminate its effects (e.g. Karaliūnas 1966; Andersen 1968). Some counterexamples nevertheless remain and the whole issue clearly deserves further study.

The interest on Balto-Slavic accentology has considerably grown during the last decades. Two papers deal with remnants of the PIE mobile accent in languages other than Vedic, Greek and Germanic (as evidenced by Verner’s law), on which the reconstruction of PIE accent was traditionally based. There is no need to insist on the potential importance of new data for research in this area:

A. Kloekhorst, “The phonological interpretation of plene and non-plene spelled e in Hittite” (243–261), discusses the value of the *scriptio plena* of e . It marks vowel length in $(-)Ce-e$, $(-)Ce-e-C^\circ$ and $(-)Ce-e-eC(-)$, whereas in $e-eC(-)$ it marks $/?e/$ and in $(-)Ci/u/a-e-eC(-) - [ie]$ or $[ue]$. The presence of vowel length is to a large degree correlated with stress position, but *scriptio plena* by itself does not mark stress. Kloekhorst establishes several rules for the development of PIE $*\check{e}$, $*ei$, $*oi$, $*eh_1$ depending on stress position, syllable structure, and word length. His results look in principle convincing, but a number of counterexamples remain. Kloekhorst proposes that

pēda- “place”, *tēkan* “earth”, *nēkumant-* “naked”, all three with etymological **é* and (contrary to Kloekhorst’s expectations) consistent *scriptio plena* in Old Hittite, were lengthened according to Winter’s law (for *tēkan* this entails operating with a non-standard reconstruction **d^héḡ-ōm* instead of **d^héḡ^h-ōm*). Scholars may be surprised to find a Balto-Slavic sound law mentioned in an article on Hittite, but this is consistent with Leiden school’s reconstruction of the traditional PIE voiced stops **d*, **g* etc. as pre-glottalized **ʔd*, **ʔg*. From this perspective it would be surprising not to find similar phenomena in other branches as well (see Kortlandt 1985 for possible cases, all of them controversial).

B. Vine, “PIE mobile accent in Italic: Further evidence” (545–575), proposes an Italic sound law $e_{iV}^{\circ} > \circ_{iV}$ in (PIE) unstressed position. This would account for **s_uóp-eje/o-* > **s_uóp-ije/o-* > Lat. *sōpīre* “put to sleep”, *o*-stem denominatives like *seruire* (< **-ijé/ó-* < **-e-íé/ó-*), and *i*-stem nom. pl. *-īs* (< **-ij-es* < **-ei-es*) beside “standard” *-ēs* (< **-éi-es*). This article also includes a discussion of the morphology of “Narten iterative-causatives” (548ff.), arguing for a suffix **-eje/o-* (against Klingenschmitt’s original reconstruction **s_uóp-je/o-*, Klingenschmitt 1978). The issue is not without interest for Baltic, which seems to have inherited some Narten iterative-causatives as well (e.g. *tuōkti*, *-ia* “marry” < **tōk^w-eje/o-*, cf. Klingenschmitt 2008, 194ff.). Vine (546f.) briefly discusses other indirect

relics of PIE mobile accent in Italic, including his own recent interpretation of Thurneysen-Havet’s law (Vine 2006).

Three papers are directly relevant for Baltic (Balto-Slavic) derivational and inflectional morphology:

G. Kroonen, “Consonant gradation in the Germanic iterative verbs” (263–290), derives the Germanic 2nd weak class iteratives from the PIE present stem suffix **-n(é)h₂-*. Kluge’s law (**-T/D^(h)n-* > Gmc. *-TT-* in pretonic position) gave rise to a paradigm with “consonant gradation” **duk-néh₂-ti* / **duk-nh₂-énti* > **tukkōpi* / **tugunanpi* that split into two parallel paradigms, **tukkōpi* / **tukunanpi* and **tuggōpi* / **tugunanpi*, which finally surface as four different verbs in the dialects (**tukk^o*, **tuk^o*, **tugg^o*, **tug^o* > OHG *zockōn*, LG *tuken*, ME *toggen*, OHG *zogōn*, respectively). Kroonen presents arguments in favor of **-n(é)h₂-* (widespread zero grade; extra-Germanic cognates; semantics), and discusses the importance of iterative “consonant gradation” in Germanic (influence on strong verbs; secondary character of the auslaut of many roots). Kluge’s law has certainly experienced a revival in recent years and has a potential interest for Balto-Slavic accentology (see Dybo 2011 for an attempt in this direction and Villanueva Svensson 2012, 161 for criticism). I am also certain that the recognition of iterative consonant gradation has an impact in Germanic and Indo-European historical grammar (see e.g. Kroonen 2011). I am more skeptic with regard to the linear derivation of Gmc. *ōn*-iteratives

from PIE $n\bar{a}$ -presents. Here I can only present some general observations: a) the evidence for consonant gradation is frequently limited to West Germanic dialectal variants. I am not certain that tracing these back to idealized Proto-Germanic constructs is sound methodology; b) the relationship of the purported neh_2 -iteratives to the eh_2 - ie/o -iteratives is not discussed; c) *pace* Kroonen, neither the vocalism nor the semantics are probative of neh_2 -origin; d) Kroonen's argumentation mixes 2nd weak class iteratives with 4th weak class inchoatives (ON *dvena* "dwindle", Go. *fullnan* "become full", etc.). The later are clearly related to the Balto-Slavic inchoative type Lith. *lipti*, *liūpa*, OCS *-lb(p)nŋti*, *-lb(p)nŋ* "stick to", which make derivation of Go. *fullnan* etc. from $*-n(\acute{e})h_2-$ extremely unlikely (see Villanueva Svensson 2011 for a full treatment); e) the extra-Germanic evidence that Kroonen quotes is rather poor (Lat. *lambō* "lick", *stringō* "draw tight", *tangō* "touch" may be simply infixal; Lith. *mīgti*, *miūga* "fall asleep", Sl. **mbgnŋti* "blink" are unremarkable inchoatives of Lith. *miegōti* "sleep", Sl. **mbžati* "have the eyes closed" and thus hardly old); f) as shown by Praust (2004), the nasal infix did not present a syllabic variant, a fact that undermines the crucial $*duk-nh_2-énti > *tugunanŋi$. In brief, while not denying the importance of Germanic iterative consonant gradation, its origin can hardly be regarded as settled.

According to P. Milizia, "On the morphophonemics of Proto-Indo-Euro-

pean $*-s\hat{k}e/o$ -presents" (361–380), the present stem suffix $*-s\hat{k}e/o-$ was assimilated to $*-s\hat{g}e/o-$, $*-s\hat{g}^he/o-$ (realized as $[-z\hat{g}^{(h)}-]$) after voiced (aspirated) stops. The evidence mostly comes from Baltic verbs of the type Lith. *ruzgėti* "stir", *blizgėti* "shine", *vizgėti* "wriggle", in addition to a couple of more problematic examples from Greek (μίσγω "mix", πάσχω "suffer, endure") and Indo-Iranian (Ved. *bhr̥jāti* "roast", if not a prakritism). Progressive assimilation, however, was not typical of Indo-European, and the expressive character of Lithuanian verbs in *-zgėti*, *-žgėti* (in frequent variation with *-skėti*, *-škėti*) renders them a weak basis for postulating a PIE variant $*-z\hat{g}^{(h)}e/o-$.

Building on an earlier suggestion by Cowgill (1985, 108), E. Hill, "Hidden sound laws in the inflectional morphology of Proto-Indo-European" (169–207), proposes a (pre-)PIE sound law $*-omi > *-ōi > *-ō$ to account for the thematic 1st sg. primary ending $*-ō$ (Gk. $-ω$, Lat. $-ō$, etc.), the *o*-stems instr. sg. $*-ō$ (Ved. $-ā$, Lith. $-ū$, etc.), and the instr. pl. $*-ōis$ (Ved. $-ais$, Lith. $-ais$, etc.), where at least the 1st sg. (for $\dagger-o-mi$) and the instr. pl. (for $\dagger-o-b^{ho}/m^o$) are unexpected within their paradigms. Hill presents some evidence indicating that the purported sound law is perfectly in order in pre-PIE terms (Stang's law, etc.), but the most challenging part of the article is probable the reconstruction of the instrumental as sg. $*-i-mi$, $*-u-mi$, $*-eh_2-mi$, $*-ō$ ($< **-o-mi$), pl. $*-i-mis$, $*-u-mis$, $*-eh_2-mis$, $*-ōis$ ($< **-o-mis$),

a system best preserved in Balto-Slavic and Armenian. The b^h -variants in the plural and dual oblique cases arose in the n -stems: instr. pl. $**-\eta\text{-}m\text{-}i\text{s} > *-\eta\text{-}b^h\text{-}i\text{s}$, dat.-abl. pl. $**-\eta\text{-}m(i)\text{-}o\text{s} > *-\eta\text{-}b^h(i)\text{-}o\text{s}$. The languages then generalized either $*\text{-}m\text{-}i\text{s}$, $*\text{-}m(i)\text{-}o\text{s}$ or $*\text{-}b^h\text{-}i\text{s}$, $*\text{-}b^h(i)\text{-}o\text{s}$. Within the limits of a review it is impossible to discuss an article so rich in data and ideas. Among the many problematic points (distribution of instr. sg. $*\text{-}mi$ and $*\text{-}(é)h_1$, problematic character of the sound law $**-\eta m\text{-} > *-\eta b^h\text{-}$, lack of motivation for the success of the b^h -variants, etc.), I will mention only one. It is well-known that in word-final position Baltic displays a contrast between $*\text{-}EH > *-\acute{E}$ and $*\text{-}\bar{E}$, $*\text{-}EHE > *-\bar{E}$. This is indeed one of the most important contributions of Baltic to PIE linguistics, as most other languages are ambiguous. The circumflex intonation of Lith. instr. pl. *vilk-aĩs* is expected from PIE $*\text{-}ō\text{-}i\text{s}$, but 1st sg. *neš-ù, neš-úo-si*, instr. sg. *vilk-ù, ger-úo-ju* unambiguously point to $*\text{-}oH$ (PIE $*\text{-}ō$ would have given $\ddot{u}\text{-}uō$, cf. *akmuō, dukté* < $*\text{-}mō(n)$, $*\text{-}tē(r)$).

Among the more occasional discussion of Lithuanian material one can mention P. S. Cohen and A. Hyllested (58f., relationship between *vótis* AP 1/4 “ulcer” and Gk. *οὔτα* “wounded” – a relatively widespread, but doubtful etymology), P. Gąsiorowski (121ff., on the Germanic cognates of *vākaras* “evening”, *aušrà* “dawn”), or N. Zair (615ff., on possible Celtic cognates of *álkti* “hunger”, *viras* “pimple in pork”, *sīrgti* “be ill”).

REFERENCES

Andersen, Henning 1968, IE $*s$ after *i, u, r, k* in Baltic and Slavic, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 11, 171–190.

Cowgill, Warren 1985, The personal endings of thematic verbs in Indo-European, in Bernfried Schlerath, Veronica Rittner (eds.), *Grammatische Kategorie – Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20. bis 25. Februar 1983*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 99–108.

Dybo, Vladimir Antonovich 2011, Balto-slawische Akzentologie und die germanische Konsonantengemination (Zur Verteidigung von F. Kluges Theorie), in Roman Sukač (ed.), *From present to past and back. Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology*, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang, 23–39.

Karaliūnas, Simas 1966, K voprosu ob i.-e. $*s$ posle *i, u* v litovskom jazyke, *Baltistica* 1(2), 113–126.

Klingenschmitt, Gert 1978, Zum Ablaut des indogermanischen Kausativs, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 92, 1–13.

Klingenschmitt, Gert 2008, Erbe und Neuerung bei Akzent und Ablaut in der litauischen Morphologie, in Danguolė Mikulėnienė, Saulius Ambrasas (eds.), *Kalbos istorijos ir dialektologijos problemos 2*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 180–215.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1985, Proto-Indo-European glottalic stops: the comparative evidence, *Folia Linguistica Historica* 6(2), 183–201.

Kroonen, Guus 2011, False exceptions to Winter's Law, in Tijmen Pronk, Rick Derksen (eds.), *Accent matters. Papers on Balto-Slavic accentology*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 251–261.

Praust, Karl 2004, Zur historischen Beurteilung von griech. κλίνω, der altindischen 9. Präsensklasse und zur Frage grundsprachlicher „*ni*-Präsentien“, in Peter Anreiter, Marialuise Haslinger, Heinz Dieter Pohl, Helmut Winberger (eds.), *Artes et Scientiae. Festschrift für Ralf-Peter Ritter zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wien: Praesens, 369–390.

Sukač, Roman (ed.) 2011, *From present to past and back. Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology*, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang.

Sukač, Roman, Ondřej Šefčík (eds.) 2012, *The sound of Indo-European 2: Pa-*

pers on Indo-European phonetics, phonemics and morphophonemics, München: Lincom.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2011, Anticausative-inchoative verbs in the northern Indo-European languages, *Historische Sprachforschung* 124, 33–58.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2012 (rev.), Roman Sukač (ed.), From present to past and back, 2011, *Baltistica* 47(1), 160–166.

Vine, Brent 2006, On “Thurneysen-Havet's Law” in Latin and Italic, *Historische Sprachforschung* 119, 211–249.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON
Vilniaus universitetas
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01513 Vilnius
Lithuania
[miguel.villanueva@flf.vu.lt]