

2011

*Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*  
(Book Review)

Dieter C. Gunkel

*University of Richmond*, [dgunkel@richmond.edu](mailto:dgunkel@richmond.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/classicalstudies-faculty-publications>

 Part of the [Indo-European Linguistics and Philology Commons](#)

**Recommended Citation**

Gunkel, Dieter. Review of *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*, by Coulter George, Matthew McCullagh, Benedicte Nielsen, Antonia Ruppel, and Olga Tribulato. *Kratylos* 56 (2011): 68-79.

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Classical Studies at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classical Studies Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu](mailto:scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu).

*Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary Volume 32. Edited by **Coulter George, Matthew McCullagh, Benedicte Nielsen, Antonia Ruppel, and Olga Tribulato**. The Cambridge Philological Society Cambridge, 2007. viii, 214 Seiten. Gebunden, 45,00 GBP. ISBN: 978-0-906014-31-8.

The volume (henceforth GLIEP) contains seventeen papers originating from a conference held in Cambridge in 2005, "dedicated to the light which the classical languages shed on Indo-European Linguistics and, conversely, the way in which historical linguistics can improve our understanding of Greek and Latin" (vii). Aside from keynote speakers Joshua Katz and Andreas Willi, the meeting was organized as a venue for junior scholars to present and discuss their work. In the opinion of the junior scholar responsible for this review, the resulting contributions are of high quality.

The papers are divided into six sections: Phonology; Verbal Morphology; Particles, Preverbs and Pronouns; Nominal Morphology; Etymologies; and Poetics. The studies are all written in English and range from five to fifteen pages in length, averaging eleven. They are cleanly edited and followed by a comprehensive bibliography. There is unfortunately no word index.

Thomas Olander opens the Phonology section with a fine contribution on "The accentuation of Greek monosyllabic words." In lexical monosyllables that contain a long vowel or diphthong (henceforth *VV*), we find a contrast between acute and circumflex accent. Olander argues that this distribution was phonologically predictable

at a stage of Greek predating the change of word-final *\*-ts > -s*: acute if the form ended in two or more consonants, circumflex if the form ended in less than two. We would thus have had *\*klóps* 'thief' and *\*kréts* 'Cretan' vs. *\*g'ou̓s* 'ox' and *\*krī̃* 'barley'. Changes including that of *\*-ts > -s* (e.g. *\*kréts > \*krés*) introduced monosyllables in *-VVC* bearing acute accent and rendered the distribution phonologically opaque. Learners then arrived at a new generalization: if the accusative is disyllabic (e.g. κλώπα, Κρήτα), then the nominative bears an acute (κλώψ, Κρής); if the accusative is monosyllabic (e.g. βῶν/βοῦν, κρῖ), then the nominative bears a circumflex (βῶς/βοῦς, κρῖ̃). Olander's attractive suggestion reminds me of the distinction one finds in recessively accented polysyllables in *-V̇CC(C)* vs. *-V̇(C)*, e.g. πολυπίδαξ 'having many springs' vs. πολύπικρος 'very sharp'. In the former, the accent recedes only to the penultimate syllable, in the latter, to the antepenultimate syllable (cf. Probert 2003: 33 with refs.). This raises some questions for future research. Is anything to be made of the fact that word-final *-CC(C)* (or put differently, *-(C)Cs*) restricts accent recession in both mono- and polysyllables? Can we put Olander's reconstructed phonological distribution on plausible phonetic footing?

I would like to draw attention to one point in the analysis. Olander quite rightly excludes monosyllabic finite verbal forms from analysis, since they — along with polysyllabic finite verbs — have default recessive accentuation as a class. In other words, there is no point in searching for a more original distribution in a morphological class of words where the synchronic grammar affords no contrast between acute and circumflex accent. He does not exclude neuter monosyllabic nouns, however, although there is apparently no synchronic contrast there either, e.g. δῶ 'house', κρῖ̃ 'barley', σκῶρ 'dung'. Since all polysyllabic neuter athematic nouns are recessively accented in Greek, one can view the neuter athematic monosyllables as a special synchronic subclass thereof whose default recessive accentuation gives way in the oblique cases to the accentual mobility that is productive in athematic monosyllabic nouns of *all* genders. Olander offers a different option: "[a]n interesting consequence of the distributional law is that the rule that monosyllabic neuters regularly have circumflex tone — which is often given a morphological explanation — has a simple phonological basis, as neuters never end in more than one consonant in Proto-Greek" (6).

Without further evidence, I find it difficult to decide between two basic views. On the one hand, Olander's distributional law is a plausible step in whatever series of language changes eventually resulted in the synchronic generalization that all neuter athematic nouns have default recessive accentuation. On the other hand, circumflex accent in neuter monosyllables can just as well be a byproduct of that generalization. If one adheres to the latter view and excludes the neuters from Olander's data on p. 5, circumflex accent is only found in four monosyllabic words: βῶς/βοῦς 'ox', δρῦς 'tree', μῦς 'mouse', and σῦς/ῥς 'pig'. These of course support Olander's hypothesis, but the

removal of the neuters permits other analyses as well. For example, in contrast to monosyllables with acute accent, these four words (along with Ζῆν) have long vowels in the accusative that arose from PIE compensatory lengthening.<sup>1</sup> What is not made explicit here, but should have been, is the “light” that Olander’s results potentially “shed on Indo-European Linguistics.” The genesis of acute vs. circumflex contrast in Greek monosyllables bears on the larger question of whether PIE itself had such a contrast.<sup>2</sup>

In "Monophthong for expected v-diphthong in Greek," Adam Hyllested and Paul S. Cohen propose a "(Pre-)Greek" sound change of  $*V_u > u / \# \_ C[+lab]$  (13, my notation), which would have applied both to inherited diphthongs and those which arose via what they call "Extended Lex Rix" (9), i.e. Martin Peters' conclusion that PIE word-initial  $*H_iuC-$  likely yielded Proto-Greek  $*E_iuC-$  (Peters' notation), e.g.  $*h_2u(H)géh_2 > ἀγγή$  (Peters 1980: 5-125). Their specific point of departure is Peters' discussion of ὑφαίνω 'weave', which, if from  $*h_2ub^h-$ , poses an apparent exception to this development. After a useful discussion of potential IE cognates, Fenno-Ugric evidence, and recent literature, Hyllested and Cohen conclude that ὑφ- indeed continues  $*h_2ub^h-$ , via  $*aup^h-$  (by "Extended Lex Rix"), which then undergoes the authors' proposed monophthongization to attested  $(h)up^h-$ . I use  $(h)$  to represent the dialectal (non-)aspiration of word-initial  $u-$ . Fenno-Ugric specialists will be interested to note the possible correspondence between PIE  $*HuV-$  and Fenno-Permic  $*wV-$  (12). Hyllested and Cohen then suggest that a group of forms derived from or related to κῶφός 'hunchbacked' and ὕβός 'humpbacked', both of which they view as derivatives of a root  $*h_2eub^{(h)}$ -, constitute a further counterexample to  $*H_iuC- > *E_iuC-$ . I suspect that a number of scholars will find this additional counterexample less convincing, *inter alia* because the supposed evidence for  $*h_2$  involves a putative development of  $*h_2 > k$  in forms such as κῶφός. As the third piece of evidence for  $*V_u > u / \# \_ C[+lab]$ , the authors point to a general absence in the lexicon of  $\#V_uC[+lab]$  sequences that do not arise from  $\#V\{s, i, u\}uC[+lab]$  (my formulation based on their examples εὐ- <  $*esu-$  <  $*h_1su-$  and οὐ- [presumably <  $*oju-$  <  $*h_2oju-$ ]). After supporting it with several typological (near-)parallels, the authors apply their proposed change to modify existing etymologies for ἰπνός 'oven', ὕβρις 'arrogance, etc.', and ὕμνος 'song'. Regarding the last, note that the authors' "alternative derivation ...  $*h_1su-mn-o-s > *esu-mn-o-s > *eu-mn-o-s > *e_u-mn-o-s >$  (via the rule we posit here)  $*u-mn-o-s > ὕμνος$ " (17) is inconsistent with their claim noted just above (13 fn. 12), namely that

<sup>1</sup> On the lengthening processes, cf. Schindler 1973: 153f., and for the hypothetical connection with circumflex intonation, cf. Hollifield 1980: 28-29, 52.

<sup>2</sup> This connection is made explicit in Olander 2009: 69. Note that it is typologically plausible for tonal contrasts in a language to be restricted to monosyllables (cf. Zhang 2004).

the change they propose did not apply to  $\varepsilon\upsilon$ - < \**esu*-. Before concluding, the authors briefly discuss the possibility that the same change applied word-internally, specifically that \**V<sub>u</sub> > u / C \_\_ C[+lab]*.

I found the paper stimulating, especially the absence of #*V<sub>u</sub>C[+lab]* structures in the Greek lexicon. Future discussion of the #*V<sub>u</sub>C[+lab]* gap should in my opinion begin by showing that the lexical gap *is* in fact unexpected from a statistical standpoint. One could go about testing the dependency between the labiality of the consonant and whether a diphthong or monophthong precedes in various ways, e.g. by setting up a contingency table comparing the distribution of #*V<sub>u</sub>C[+lab]* and #(h)*uC[+lab]* with that of #*V<sub>u</sub>C[-lab]* and #(h)*uC[-lab]* in the corpus. In fact, this lexical gap, if significant, could prove to be the strongest evidence for the authors' proposed monophthongization, since a development of \**h<sub>2</sub>up<sup>h</sup>- >  $\upsilon\phi$ -* could also be attributed to Peters' λῆνος effect, which is taken up in some detail by George Hinge in his contribution to GLIEP, namely the apparent absence of a vocalic laryngeal reflex in the Proto-Greek context \*# \_\_ C{*əL, Lə*}C, e.g. \**h<sub>2/3</sub>u<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>nos > \*u<sup>h</sup>l<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>nos > λῆνος* 'wool' (Peters 1980: 23 fn. 18) and possibly in a more general context including \*# \_\_ *uCən*, e.g. \**h<sub>2</sub>ub<sup>h</sup>ηιο/e- > \*hup<sup>h</sup>ηιο/e- >  $\upsilon\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$*  (Peters 1980: 26).

Brett Miller closes the Phonology section with "Ejectives to plain voiced stops in PIE? Phonetics, typology and Glottalic Theory," an excellent contribution that stands somewhat apart in GLIEP, since it has little to do with Greek or Latin specifically. Miller asks whether the change of ejectives to plain voiced stops (T' > D) is phonetically plausible and whether it has been observed elsewhere. He concludes that the answer to both questions is yes, but that a (hypothetical) glottalic PIE remains questionable due to systematic differences between the T' > D processes observed in or plausibly reconstructed for other languages and what has been reconstructed for glottalic PIE. First, in a number of languages, the process is too highly restricted, e.g. morphologically to reduplication in Tillamook and Columbian, phonologically to non-initial *k'* alone out of a four stop series in Xhosa. Second, where the process is/was less highly restricted (Slave, Nakh, Kabardian), both the ejectives and the less marked plain voiced stops (T) become voiced, which suggests that voicing of T' may in fact imply the voicing of T in languages that have both. No such multi-series lenition process {T, T'} > D has been reconstructed for glottalic PIE. Miller goes on to suggest that there is a further difference between Kabardian and glottalic PIE: the voicing of ejective plosives is permitted "only where this is minimally likely to impair perception of the ejective feature" (30). Before concluding, he briefly discusses the developments of the problematic "emphatic" plosives of Semitic. Miller's contribution has several marks of a new standard in this sort of study: up-to-date phonetics; an explicit theory of sound change (referencing Ohala 1990); and lucid, logical presentation.

Opening the Verbal Morphology section, Andreas Willi takes on the pre-history of the PIE tense/aspect system in a fourteen page contribution entitled "Of aspects, augments, aorists — or how to say to have killed a dragon." As he acknowledges, such questions cannot be satisfactorily dealt with in a short paper. I only sketch some of his conclusions here, and look forward to forthcoming work on the topic. For Willi, the prehistory of PIE is marked by the same evolution from aspect-marking to tense-marking that we observe in a number of the daughter languages, e.g. Sanskrit. Setting out to find a formal marker of perfective aspect that can be plausibly reconstructed for early PIE, Willi argues that the reduplicated aorist provides evidence that in early PIE, reduplication in general marked perfectivity (including e.g. the reduplication in the formation that became the later PIE perfect), and further, that the augment, which he reconstructs as *\*h<sub>1</sub>e-*, "originated as the reduplication syllable of verbs with initial first laryngeal (formally *\*h<sub>1</sub>e-h<sub>1</sub>...*)" (46).

In "Iteratives and causatives in Latin: a unified approach," Daniel Kölligan argues that the semantics of the Latin avatars of PIE "primary stems with *o*-grade (or sometimes zero-grade) root and the suffix *-eje/o-*" (49) are distributed according to "the agentivity of the base verb from which they are derived" (63): if the base verb is [+agentive], then the derived verb is iterative-intensive; if the base verb is [-agentive], then the derived verb is factitive-causative. (Note that *cēuēre* 'to bounce, to waggle', whose long first vowel is metrically secured in the Juvenal passage cited on p. 50, is printed throughout as *ceuēre*.)

Joshua T. Katz opens the section on Particles, Preverbs, and Pronouns with a persuasive study entitled "The epic adventures of an unknown particle." He argues that Homeric formulaic *αὐτάρ* reflects a previously unnoticed usage of the enclitic particle *ταρ*, namely (#)Adversative + *\*tr<sub>2</sub>*, which may be added to the two usages famously discussed by Calvert Watkins (Watkins 1995: 150-151), #Interrogative + *\*tr<sub>2</sub>* (e.g. Homeric #τίς *ταρ*, Cuneiform Luvian #*ku-(i)-iš=tar*) and #Verb of emotion + *\*tr<sub>2</sub>* (e.g. Homeric #θάμβησέν *ταρ*, Cuneiform Luvian #*ma-am-ma-an-na=tar*), the first of which was adopted by Martin West in his edition of the *Iliad* (West 1998-2000). Katz begins by providing collocational evidence against the etymological analysis of the conjunction into *\*aut(e) + ar(a)*: in Homer, *αὐτάρ* frequently and formulaically cooccurs with the particle *ἄρ(α)/ῥ(α)*; *αὐτάρ* never does. Katz plausibly explains the latter fact as due to persistent avoidance of clitic doubling, and argues that we would expect the same in *αὐτάρ*, if it actually arose from *\*aut(e) + ar(a)*.

In favor of an alternative etymological segmentation *\*ay + tar*, Katz points out that *αὐτάρ* shares two features with #Interrogative + *ταρ*: both are imbedded in formulaic language and both function as scene-changers. Furthermore, *αὐτάρ* shares a curious feature with Watkins' #Verb of emotion + *ταρ*, namely cooccurrence with *ἔπειτα* and other words containing *ἐπ-/ὀπ-*. Finally, there is a possible Cuneiform Luvian

parallel where (#)Adversative + \*tr̥ is followed by a Luvian member of the ἐπ-/ὀπ- family: #pā=tar āppa ... dādduwar (KUB IX 31 Ro. ii 25-6). Unlike the clitic-doubling argument just noted "[w]hy exactly (-)ταρ and ἐπ- have such a close relationship remains unclear, but each is originally locative (cf. CLuw. -tar) and would seem therefore to reinforce the other" (74). Katz closes with a mini-study of "the poetics of a particle" (77), where he discusses *inter alia* another tantalizing collocational fact: it is always a verb of ritual and dining that fills the frame αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ [⊃—⊂]<sub>Verb</sub> ||. A phonological problem noted by Katz, namely that instead of oxytone αὐτὰρ "one might have expected αὐ̄ + ταρ to give αὐ̄ταρ" (72 fn. 38), may be understood as a further example of a phenomenon treated since the publication of GLIEP by Olav Hackstein: certain grammaticalization processes, including the change of adverbs to conjunctions, are apparently accompanied by a shift to proclisis and oxytonesis both in Greek and other Indo-European languages, e.g. adverbial ἄλλα > ἄλλα 'but' (Hackstein 2011). Katz' contribution will hopefully invite further study of collocational patterns in epic and elsewhere, and should be of special interest to philologically and linguistically inclined Classicists.

The same can be said of Dag Haug's "The prefix *co(m)-* with motion verbs in Plautus: philological study and etymological implications." Haug convincingly argues that the actional meaning of *co(m)-* (i.e. the one that does not express togetherness) developed out of the illative meaning 'in, to'. This is reflected in Plautine verbs of motion: those prefixed with *co(m)-* nearly always occur with an expressed goal of motion, e.g. *in urbem ... comneo, huc commigrauit, ad ianuam concessero*, etc., whereas their simplex counterparts do not. After mentioning further support for the meaning 'in, to' from archaic Latin nouns and Sabellic, he closes with a discussion of the difficult deeper reconstruction. Haug understands well how to restrict the scope of his study in order to allow for clear execution in a short essay.

In "Reconstructing reflexive markers in Indo-European," Nicoletta Puddu concludes that one actually can't: "\*se- was originally an anaphoric pronoun that referred to the topic or macrotopic" and "\*s(e)we- a possessive adjective" (98). Puddu's brief sketch of the parallel post-PIE development of reflexive markers in the various daughter languages — perhaps the most interesting aspect of the problem — will hopefully send readers to her lengthier treatments cited in the bibliography.

In the following contribution, the first in the section on Nominal Morphology, "The master of the house — Greek οἶκαδε and related issues," Jenny Helena Larsson argues that Old Lithuanian *wieβpats* 'lord' and the related Baltic forms are best understood as continuing a Proto-Baltic compound \**u̯aiš-pat(i)s* either from an earlier \**u̯aiša-pat(i)s* via regular loss of the thematic/compositional vowel of an initially stressed immobile first member \**u̯aišas* 'house' < PIE \**u̯oikos*, or perhaps from an earlier \**u̯aiši-pat(i)s* with a first member \**u̯aišis* 'guest' (possibly calqued on the Sla-

vic compound that yielded Old Church Slavic *gospodъ* 'lord') via the same process. Under either scenario, the Baltic words do not attest to a hoary PIE genitive singular *\*ueik-s* (cf. Schindler 1972: 32), leaving Greek οἴκαδε 'homeward' as the only potential evidence for a full grade of any sort in the root noun, which elsewhere only continues *\*uik-*. As Larsson argues, the Greek form need not reflect a root noun *\*uoiḱ-m* either, but could just as well continue a Proto-Greek thematic neuter plural *\*uoiḱa* with "collective" meaning (for which cf. Homeric δώματα 'house' and non-neuter κλισίαι 'tent') that follows the morphological pattern seen e.g. in κέλευθος 'path' with plurals κέλευθοι and κέλευθα.

Following Larsson, Roland Litscher takes up another topic famously treated by Jochem Schindler (1975), "Κρέας, *kravīh* and the original nom.-acc. sg. of the IE *s*-stem neuters," in which he takes issue with Schindler's reconstruction of early or pre-PIE *R(é)-S(z)* morphology in the singular strong stem, e.g. *\*mén-s*. Litscher comes to a conclusion that shares much with Schindler's: "[t]o be truly parallel with the other [proterokinetic] stems, those in *\*-s-* had to preserve the syllabicity of their suffix in the nom.-acc. sg." (120). Litscher goes on to suggest that speakers fixed the problem with *\*-os*, the nearest equivalent to a phonologically illicit syllabic *\*s*, and that forms like *\*mén-s* never existed. If I understand correctly, then, what Litscher proposes is that *\*[méns]* never existed as a phonetic surface form, but it did exist as an underlying representation *\*/mén-s/*. The majority of Litscher's study consists of discussion of Indo-Iranian neuters of the type *kravīh*, which he suggests contain a complex Caland suffix *\*-i-š-* (my notation), and Greek neuters of the type κρέας. Regarding the latter, where Litscher discusses Greek-internal derivatives in *\*-h<sub>2</sub>-s-*, one may now consult Nikolaev 2010. Throughout the paper, many issues are raised that invite further treatment. For example, Litscher argues that the *R(e)-S(z)* stem allomorph *\*mans* in Indo-Iranian *\*mans-d<sup>h</sup>aH-* arose through synchronic compounding, not through the diachronic univerbation of an accusative singular object with the verb (107-108), and that morphologically independent looking avatars of *\*mán-s* and *\*iáu-š* (Old Avestan *māng* and *yaoš*) are the result of tmesis and ellipsis. This raises crucial questions about how exactly tmesis and ellipsis are constrained in the Rigveda and Avesta. Kiparsky 2010 (building *inter alia* on Insler 1998) includes discussion of the separation of constituents of Rigvedic dvandvas and determinative compounds whose first members are inflected nouns, and would serve as an excellent starting point for further study.

In "Gamonyms, internal derivation and the Greek suffix -ώ," Ulla Remmer suggests that the Greek female names formed with this suffix originate as amphikinetic internal derivatives based on masculine hypocoristics in *-i-*. For example: *\*Dōti-X* m. → shortened *\*Dōti-* m. → *\*Dōtōi-* f. [via internal derivation] > Δωτώ f." (127). This derivation, in turn, would somehow indirectly continue a process whereby gamonyms

were internally derived from non-hypocoristic *i*-stems, which would be witnessed by the Rigvedic type *agní-* 'Agni' → *agnāyī̄<sup>-d</sup>* 'wife of Agni' — on the assumption that *agnāyī̄<sup>-d</sup>* reflects an older *\*agnāj-* that has been enlarged by *-ī̄<sup>-d</sup>* (125). As Remmer points out, the Greek names in *-ῶ* differ from the Rigvedic *-āyī̄<sup>-d</sup>* type not only with respect to the morphology of their derivational bases, "they no longer exhibit any semantic or onomastic connection with the names of their husbands" (128). Remmer explains that the dissociation could have taken place when "husband and wife became separated in mythology, just as Διώνη and Zeus were mythologically estranged" (129). The fact that in attested Greek "there is no evidence of a female name in *-ῶ* with a corresponding masculine name inflecting in *-i*" (126) would be a further consequence of this mythological estrangement. For a highly attractive alternative account of the historical morphology of the *agnāyī̄<sup>-d</sup>*, *indrānī̄<sup>-d</sup>*, and Διώνη type formations, consult Rau 2007. Note also that readers not intimately familiar with accent and ablaut types may be misled by typographical errors on p. 122, where one must read "strong *R(é)-S(o)-D(ø)*" and "weak *R(ø)-S(ø)-D(é)*" in the middle of the page and "*R(ê)-S(o)-D(ø) → R(e)-S(ó)-D(ø)*" at the bottom.

Carlo Vessella opens his contribution, "Overlength and the system of primary comparatives," with reference to Henry Hoenigswald's "working hypothesis ... that metrical composition observed distinctions more subtle than those between long and short syllables. Overlong syllables ... appeared to be avoided at verse-end" (131; cf. Hoenigswald 1991). Since the publication of GLIEP, Hoenigswald's view on weight distinctions has in fact been tested and further articulated in two brilliant studies by Kevin Ryan (Ryan 2011; to appear). Vessella's basic idea, to test the quantity of the *alpha* in comparatives such as θάσσον, μάλλον (I purposely omit the accents), and ἔλασσον by studying the way the poet(s) of the Iliad and Odyssey distributed the words in the hexameter, is very good, but the execution is lacking. He simply states that ἄσσον and μᾶσσον "occur freely in Homeric cadences, so if Hoenigswald's point of view is correct, this too would point to simple length and not overlength, i.e. to forms with a short *ā*" (132). An actual comparison of distributions (of the sort Hoenigswald provides) remains a desideratum. Vessella goes on to provide a very fine discussion of Greek primary comparatives with an excellent collection of references and concludes that "[a]part from ἄσσον, all the comparatives with overlength containing both the geminate and the long vowel must constitute a later extension of Attic features" (139). Classicists unsure of why Martin West prints θάσσον and μέζων in his edition of the Iliad.

Opening the Etymologies section, Michiel de Vaan provides a short, attractive account of "The etymology of Latin *adūlāre*" 'fawn (upon), flatter', according to which *\*ad-aidos*, essentially *\*aidos* hypercharacterized by *ad-*, becomes *\*ad-audos* by the development of *\*ai* > *au* familiar from initial syllables, e.g. in *auspex*. Either at this

stage or the next, *\*adūdos*, speakers no longer associate the form with *\*aidos*, and they dissimilate the second *d* to *l*, yielding *\*adūlos*, from which *adūlāre* is derived. A plausible semantic specialization from 'be eager' > 'fawn (upon), flatter' completes de Vaan's picture.

George Hinge takes on the etymology of several Greek words in "The authority of truth and the origin of ὄσιος and ἔτυμος (= Skt. *satyá-* and *tūtumā-*) with an excursus on pre-consonantal laryngeal loss," a Herculean effort that involves more etymologies and problems of historical phonology than either the title or this review reflects. Hinge defends Brugmann's etymology relating ὄσιος 'holy, permitted' with *satyá-* 'true, real', providing discussion of both the *o* vocalism and (later) the absence of a laryngeal reflex that one must assume if *\*h<sub>1</sub>sn̥t(i)ios* > ὄσιος. He then equates ἐτήτυμος 'true, real' with the Rigvedic hapax *tūtumā-* 'effectual'. These would reflect reduplicated forms *\*h<sub>1</sub>te-h<sub>1</sub>tu-mo-* and (presumably) Indo-Iranian *\*tūtuma-* < *\*Htu-Htu-ma-*, derived from a root *\*h<sub>1</sub>teuh<sub>2-</sub>* 'to be powerful, to be efficient', with an initial laryngeal" (148), i.e. an alternative reconstruction of the root known e.g. in the *LIV*<sup>2</sup> as *\*teuh<sub>2-</sub>* 'schwellen, stark werden'. The short *u* of the root in both forms would be due to laryngeal loss after reduplication, and the difference between the reduplication vowels is systematic. The semantics are discussed with a fondness for the philosophical. As Hinge notes, his reconstruction has implications for the development of the Vedic long reduplicated perfects: "if *tūtāva* is counted among the original long-vowel perfects, there would be a stronger basis of analogy for secondary forms like *śūśuve* and *pīpāya*, both meaning 'grow, swell'" (149 fn. 25). I fully agree that a "stronger basis" would be particularly attractive there. Note that *pīpāya* is virtually certainly to be restored as *pipāya* with a short reduplication vowel (Gunkel 2010: 88-96 with refs.) and read *\*h<sub>1</sub>u<sub>l</sub>d<sup>h</sup>*- for the typographical error *\*h<sub>1</sub>ud<sup>h</sup>*- earlier in the same footnote. Note also that the long *ū* of Avestan *tūtāuuu* may either go back to a long or short *\*u* (de Vaan 2003: 281f.), leaving the reconstruction of an Indo-Iranian long reduplicated perfect less secure. Hinge goes on to argue that ἐτάζω 'examine', σῶς 'safe', Latin *tueor* 'watch (over)', *tūtus* 'safe', and possibly Germanic *\*bewaz* 'servant' belong with the same root. Reconstructing the root as *\*h<sub>1</sub>teuh<sub>2-</sub>* requires explaining the absence of *e* < *\*h<sub>1</sub>* in σῶς. Taking up the absence of a laryngeal reflex in ὄσιος as well, Hinge provides a detailed discussion of the phenomenon noted above, namely Peters' λῆνος effect, arguing that prothetic vowels do not develop "before a closed syllable containing a syllabic consonant" (157).

Alexander Nikolaev provides an impressive treatment of "The Name of Achilles," suggesting (as many before him) that it is related to ἄχος 'grief'. Quickly moving into new territory, however, Nikolaev argues that key to understanding the etymology of the name is to view ἄχος as "the result of a contamination of two different *s*-stem verbal abstracts, formed from IE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eg<sup>(h)</sup>*- 'to be afraid' (Go. *ōg*, OIr. *ad-ágor*) and

\**h<sub>2</sub>eng<sup>h</sup>*- 'to oppress' (G ἄγχω, YAv. (*nii*)āzata, L *angō*) respectively" (163). The proposed contamination would have been facilitated by the semantic and formal similarity between the nouns, the zero grade root allomorphs of which would have merged as ἄχ- in Greek, assuming that Rix's Law did not apply before nasals. As this phonological point is not *communis opinio*, Nikolaev provides plausible examples of the non-application of Lex Rix in this environment, summarizing his earlier, more comprehensive treatment of the problem (Nikolaev 2005). He then connects the hypothetical contamination product, Proto-Greek \**ak<sup>h</sup>os-* 'distress', and by extension, Achilles' name, with the Indo-European myth of victory over death, comparing the equation of Rigvedic *ámhas- tar<sup>i</sup>*- with Younger Avestan (*vī*)*tar-qzah-*, then suggesting that ἄχος, which can refer to grief over the death of a loved one, serves as a substitute for 'death' in Achilles' name, just as ὀδύνη does in Iliadic ὀδυνήφρατα φάρμακα according to Watkins 1995: 396. He provides support from the epic tradition and beyond for viewing Achilles as having originally been a death-defeating figure.

Nikolaev's reconstructed "compound \**h<sub>2</sub>ng<sup>h</sup>i-(h<sub>x</sub>)ul(h<sub>x</sub>)-o-* 'slaying pain/death' ... [with a] second member ... \*(*h<sub>1</sub>*)*uelh<sub>2</sub>*- attested in Hitt. *walahzi* 'he strikes' ... or the root \*(*h<sub>2/3</sub>*)*uelh<sub>1/3</sub>*- attested in Tocharian ... and Greek (ἔάλων 'I was captured')" (167-168) would also explain several facts about the λ ~ λλ alternation in the epic language. After studying the pattern of attestations, Nikolaev argues that "they suggest an original distribution /ak<sup>h</sup>iuleu-/ in nom./voc. > Ἀχιλλ- vs. /ak<sup>h</sup>ilēu-/ in gen./dat./dacc. > Ἀχιλ-" (169) which arose via an early dissimilatory loss of \**u* > ∅ in the syllable onset, where followed by *u* or *m* in the following syllable onset, e.g. \**uer.uos* > εἶρος 'wool'. Note that this requires the syllabification \**a.k<sup>h</sup>i.ulē.uV-* with a structure  $\check{V}.ul\check{V}$ , where the syllable boundary would descriptively mirror the morphological compound boundary. For syllable onset maximization and the relationship between morpheme and syllable boundaries in PIE, one may now consult Byrd 2010. Nikolaev closes with an account of "the missing /u/ in Mycenaean *a-ki-re-u*" (173).

Wojciech Sowa closes the Etymologies section with "A note on Macedonian ἄλιζα," which he characterizes as "one of the most debated Macedonian glosses" (175), suggesting the possibility that the word is best understood as reflecting the usage of derivatives of \**h<sub>3</sub>lig-* in a hypothetical Balkan Indo-European *Sprachbund* including meanings 'small, weak, ill'. The Macedonian form would reflect \**h<sub>3</sub>lig-ieh<sub>2</sub>* 'illness, disease', supporting the reading of the Hesychian codex, "but the possibility of some sort of metaphorical name for a particular species of tree — e.g. 'ill-tree' (cf. 'weeping willow', Pol. *wierzba płacząca*) — cannot be excluded either" (178).

With "The feet of Greek and Sanskrit verse," Anne Mahoney offers the sole contribution in the Poetics section and the final study in GLIEP. The question — now also treated in West 2007: 31f. *et passim* — is how Greek, Vedic, and Indo-European poets talked about their craft. Mahoney pays special attention to early usages of Greek

πούς and Sanskrit *pāda*- that refer to poetic structure, providing text, translation and (metrical) commentary on various passages, which will undoubtedly prove useful. Along the way, she indicates various points of departure for further study, e.g. parallel developments in Greek and Classical Sanskrit metrical theory and terminology, as well as the association of desire with poetry and the Greek Muses with personified Rigvedic meters.

### References

- Byrd, Andrew M. 2010. Reconstructing Indo-European Syllabification. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
- de Vaan, Michiel. 2003. *The Avestan vowels*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Gunkel, Dieter. 2010. Studies in Greek and Vedic prosody, morphology, and meter. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2011. Proklise und Subordination im Indogermanischen. In Thomas Krisch and Thomas Lindner (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der 13. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft in Salzburg, 192-202*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Hoenigswald, Henry M. 1991. The prosody of the epic adonius and its prehistory. *ICS* 16:1-15.
- Hollifield, Patrick H. 1980. The phonological development of final syllables in Germanic. *Die Sprache* 26:19-53;145-178.
- Insler, Stanley. 1998. *mitrāvárunā* or *mitrā várunā*? In Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*, 285-290. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2010. Dvandvas, blocking, and the associative: the bumpy ride from phrase to word. *Language* 86:302-331.
- LIV*<sup>2</sup> = Kümmel, Martin and Helmut Rix (eds.). 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Nikolaev, Alexander S. 2005. K dejstviju zakona Riksa v drevnegrečeskom jazyke. In Nikolai N. Kazansky (ed.), *Hrdā́ mánasā: Studies presented to Professor Leonard G. Herzenberg on the occasion of his 70<sup>th</sup> birthday*, 38-72. St. Petersburg: Nauka.
- . 2010. Indo-European \**dem(h2)*- ‘to build’ and its derivatives. *HS* 123:56-96.
- Ohala, John J. 1990. The phonetics and phonology of aspects of assimilation. In John Kingston and Mary E. Beckman (eds.), *Papers in laboratory phonology*, 258-275. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Olander, Thomas. 2009. *Balto-Slavic accentual mobility*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Peters, Martin. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Probert, Philomen. 2003. *A new short guide to the accentuation of Ancient Greek*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Rau, Jeremy. 2007. The origin of Indic and Iranian feminines in  $-\bar{a}n\acute{i}^{-d}$ . *JAOS* 127,1:57-66.
- Ryan, Kevin M. 2011. Gradient weight in phonology. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
- . To appear. Gradient syllable weight and weight universals in quantitative metrics. *Phonology*.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1972. L'apophonie des noms-racines indo-européens. *BSL* 67:31-38.
- . 1973. Bemerkungen zur Herkunft der idg. Diphthongstämme und zu Eigentümlichkeiten ihrer Kasusformen. *Die Sprache* 19:148-157.
- . 1975. Zum Ablaut der neutralen *s*-Stämme des Indogermanischen. In Helmut Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9. - 14. September 1973*, 159-267. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1995. *How to kill a dragon: aspects of Indo-European poetics*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- West, Martin L. 1998-2000. *Homeri Ilias*, 2 vols. Stuttgart/Leipzig (vol. 1), Munich/Leipzig (vol. 2): Teubner.
- . 2007. *Indo-European poetry and myth*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zhang, Jie. 2004. Contour Tone Licensing and Contour Tone Representation. *Language and Linguistics* 5,4:925-968.

Dieter Gunkel

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Lehrstuhl für Historische und Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft

Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1

D-80539 München

Dieter.Gunkel@lrz.uni-muenchen.de