

Nussbaum, Alan J.: *Head and Horn in Indo-European*. Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1986, gr.-8°, XIII, 305 S. (Untersuchungen zur Indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft. Neue Folge, 2.) Geb. 160 DM.

The book, which starts on p. 1 without any introduction, treats a very complicated matter: all forms derived from the root *\*ker(h)<sub>2</sub>*- “horn” and/or “head”. Therefore, I shall discuss it chapter by chapter, adding some comments (C:) immediately.

I: N. argues that several words with a suffix *n* or *u* mean “horn”, and that these forms do not have a laryngeal. The *u*-stem may have been a proterodynamic (= PD) neuter. (Avestan might point to a HD [= hysterodynamic] *\*kru-(e)h<sub>2</sub>*.)

C: N. holds that there is no certain evidence for a laryngeal. But Lith. *kàrvė*, SCr. *krāva*, with acute accent, point unambiguously to a laryngeal, and not to lengthened grade *ō*, an interpretation long since abandoned (Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée* I 238 ff.). Therefore cases like Lat. *cervus*, W. *carw*, Goth. *haur̥n* must be reconsidered. – For Greek words like *χορφή*, *κόρυμβά*, non-Indo-European origin should be considered.

IIa: All other forms had a laryngeal, but never *n* or *u*, and they do not consistently mean either “horn” or “head”. Here a discussion of Peters’ *Untersuchungen* is inserted. N. objects to three different paradigms which would all mean both “head” and “horn”. Especially, he objects to a PIE *r/n*-stem (with which I agree; cf. Kratylus 26, 1981, 111 ff., which N. does not know).

Then he starts with the words with *\*kerh<sub>2</sub>*- (without suffixes) meaning “horn”. – Hitt. *karawar* is derived from a fem. *ā*-stem *\*kr-eh<sub>2</sub>* or its Lindeman variant *\*k<sub>1</sub>yr-eh<sub>2</sub>*, derived from anit *\*ker*- “horn”.

Myc. *kerajapi*, which cannot be derived from *κέρας*, would presuppose a form *\*kerā* “horn” (also supposed in *kerā dedemena* “bound with horn”, and in Hom. *κέρα* τ 211). N. concludes to a PD fem. *\*ker-h<sub>2</sub>*, *\*kr-eh<sub>2</sub>*- (on which see below).

Ch. IIb. discusses the forms with *\*kr-eh<sub>2</sub>* meaning “head”. For Gr. *κέφα* the explanation from *\*krh<sub>2</sub>-s-n* is rejected. It is derived from the Lindeman variant of *\*kr-ēh<sub>2</sub>*. The compounds *κηδεμνον*, *κηγηγος* could support this interpretation, as they are best explained as having *κη-* < *\*kreh<sub>2</sub>*- or *\*krh<sub>2</sub>*-. Also *ἵκηρος* can best be explained from *\*en-krh<sub>2</sub>-o-*, with early loss of *h<sub>2</sub>* in compounds.

C: N. doubts that *ἄκαρος* continues *\*h<sub>2</sub>-krh<sub>2</sub>-os*. Another reason to doubt this is that the zero grade of *ēv* (PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>en*), i.e. *\*h<sub>1</sub>n-*, would have given *\*ēv-* in Greek.

Gr. (ἐπὶ) *κά* could not have *\*k<sub>1</sub>*, as an unextended form did not exist, nor be a locative *\*krh<sub>2</sub>*, as a locative did not have (double) zero

grade; the idea that it was taken from  $\kappa\alpha\rho\rho\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$  is also rejected (also in App. I). A locative  $*\acute{k}r\text{-}eh_2$ , reduced to  $*\acute{k}rh_2$  in a univerbation (as in  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\upsilon\iota < *me\text{-}g^hsri$ ) is considered, as well as a bahuvrihi-compound. The  $-h_2$  would then have been lost. Hitt.  $(kit)kar$  "at/to the head" is explained in the same way, with  $-kar < *-\acute{k}ar(h) < *-\acute{k}r(h_2)$ .

C: It must be stressed that the loss of the  $-h_2$  is unparalleled.

Indic  $*\acute{s}r\bar{a}ya$ - "head" would also contain  $*\acute{k}reh_2(-)$ .

Iic: The forms pointing to  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}(e)h_2$  "bone", and those deriving from  $*\acute{k}r\text{-}eh_2$ - "head" cannot be reduced to one paradigm. For "bone" a PD word, nom.  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$ , is posited, and the relation to the other word is solved by assuming a (HD) collective  $*\acute{k}r\text{-}\bar{e}h_2$  "the (mass of) head-bone" > "skull, head", parallel to the collective  $*u\acute{e}d\text{-}\bar{o}r$  from  $*u\acute{o}d\text{-}\gamma$  etc.

(Another derivative of  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$  "bone" is seen in  $*\acute{k}\bar{e}rh_2\text{-}o$ - in Av.  $s\bar{a}ra$ - "head", and in Lat. *cernuus* <  $*-\acute{n}ouo$ - "with the head inclined".)

As the words continuing  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$  (like Gr.  $*\acute{k}er\bar{a}$ ) are feminine, it is supposed that  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$  was feminine. It is pointed out that Schmidt's theory holds that the collectives in  $-\bar{o}r$  etc. were feminines, which came to be used as neuter plurals (Hitt.  $\acute{u}id\bar{a}r$ ), and only later became singulars ( $\acute{u}d\omega\omega$ ). The author thinks that these collectives were neuters from the beginning. And as the neuter plurals in  $-h_2$  are exactly parallel ( $-\bar{o}r$  probably deriving from  $-or\text{-}h_2$ ), the form in  $-h_2$  ( $*\acute{k}erh_2$ ) will have been neuter as well; and with them perhaps all  $\bar{a}$ -stems. This neuter  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$  would have become feminine in the proto-language.

C: The assumption of a neuter collective  $*\acute{k}r\bar{e}h_2$  (from  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$ ) is a very attractive solution for the problem of the Greek neuter  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\bar{\alpha}$ . It must be pointed out, however, that these forms had predominantly  $-\bar{o}$ -. Gr.  $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\eta\nu$  is hardly sufficient evidence for  $\bar{e}$ , Slav. *sěmę* does not derive from  $\bar{e}$ , so that only Hitt. forms remain: *hasduēr*, *utnē*, *suēl*.

C: Another difficulty may be the fact that  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$  itself is thought to be a collective; thus we have a collective of a collective.

C: As to  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\bar{\alpha}$ , which N. explains from a Lindeman form (about which I remain very sceptical), I wonder whether it could have  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\text{-} < *k\bar{r}h_2$ - from the oblique cases (either  $*\acute{k}rh_2\text{-}(os)$  or  $*\acute{k}rh_2\text{-}es\text{-}(os)$ , on which see below).

C: As to the gender of  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$ , the PD inflection was in my opinion typical of the neuters (see my *Origins* 167). N.'s conclusions depend on his preconceptions. As hysterokinetic words had no full grade root, and as amphikinetic words had  $C\acute{e}C\text{-}\bar{o}R$ ,  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$  (with full grade of the root, and no evidence for  $-\bar{o}R$ ) could belong to neither of these two types and has to be PD. In my conception, the oldest type of HD (i.e. both hyster- and amphikinetic) nominative had  $CeC\text{-}R$ , and this type was preserved especially in the case of the  $h_2$ -stems. Thus, a feminine HD  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$  would be possible. (A neuter PD  $*\acute{k}er\text{-}h_2$  would be possible as well. We may think of  $*Host\text{-}H$  "bone".) N.'s further conclusion that all  $\bar{a}$ -stems

were in origin neuters, proves to my mind that the starting-points are wrong; in my conception such a detour is not necessary.

C: As N. points out,  $-\bar{e}h_2 > \text{Gr. } -\bar{a}$  would show that Eichner's rule did not operate, at least in Greek.

C: The idea that  $-\bar{o}r$  (etc.) goes back to  $-or-h_2$  seems to me quite improbable. (Against nom. sg.  $-\bar{o}r < -or-s$  see my *Origins* 151.)

IIIa: It is argued that for both formal and semantic reasons the *s*-stems Gr. κέρας "horn (object)" and Skt. śíras "head" do not derive from one single paradigm. κέρας would be an *s*-stem derived from  $*\bar{k}er-h_2$  "horn (material)". On the other hand śíras would have been derived from the paradigm of  $*\bar{k}rēh_2$  "head". – The Gr. adjective κεραός, found in one formula, beside -κερῶν, rather continues a form  $*\bar{k}erah-o-$ ; there is no evidence for  $-\mu o-$ .

IIIb: For the *n*-stem in śírṣṇ-, κάρηνα and underlying κῶᾱτ-, N. assumes a fixed stem  $*\bar{k}rh_2sn-$ . He assumes that the oblique cases (which had a monosyllabic stem) had final stress ( $*\bar{k}rh_2sn-ós$  etc.), whereas the nom. plural had initial stress ( $*\bar{k}rēh_2sn-h_2$ , as γούνα versus γουνός). This would prove that stressed  $\gamma h_2$  developed into αῖα.

C: I am not sure that this is correct. If we accept  $*\bar{k}rh_2snós$ , we see in κῶᾱτος that the accent was withdrawn (because the stem is not monosyllabic), and in κῶᾱτός that it again shifted to the ending. Apparently the shift is fully automatic. This would imply that in  $*\bar{k}rēh_2sn̄tos$  ( $> \kappaῶ\bar{a}(h)ατος$ ) the accent was automatically withdrawn to the root, as the stem is disyllabic. And then we would expect  $*\bar{k}αρα(h)ατος$ . – Also κῶᾱαίνω  $< *\bar{k}rēh_2sn̄-ie-$  would prove the stress rule (old stress on *-ie-*, or withdrawn to *-η-*). But if the stress was withdrawn to the initial syllable, as one assumes to explain σφαραγέομαι (Rix, Griechische Grammatik 84), we would expect  $*\bar{k}αρα(h)αίνω$ .

Other Greek forms (καρη(α)τ-, Myc. *karaapi*) are discussed.

For Germ.  $*\bar{h}ersan-$   $< *\bar{k}erh_2son-$  derivation from an old locative  $*\bar{k}rh_2s-en$  (type Skt. *jm-án*) is considered. This would imply a new full grade, unless this locative with *-en* had double full grade of old. Other possibilities are given at p. 193 n. 82.

C: This section is very tentative, as the author admits, because the position of this locative is uncertain.

IIIc: Neither of the paradigms Gr.  $*\bar{k}rēh_2$ ,  $\bar{k}rh_2sn-$  and Skt.  $*\bar{k}rh_2-$  *os*,  $\bar{k}rh_2sn-$  can be safely attributed to PIE. The solution presented is that  $*\bar{k}rh_2sn-$  replaced earlier  $*\bar{k}rh_2-(e)s-$ , the *-n-* being a later, perhaps post-PIE accretion (for which there are many parallels). Then the Sanskrit nominative can easily be an innovation, so that  $*\bar{k}rēh_2$ ,  $\bar{k}rh_2-es-$  was the PIE paradigm. The zero/*-es-* type could have been taken from "ear", a neuter *s*-stem, nom.  $*\bar{h}_2eus-s$ , obl.  $*\bar{h}_2us-es-$  (du.  $*\bar{h}_2us-s-ih_1$ ), where *ss* became *s* and a suffix *-es-* appeared only in the oblique cases.

C: The interpretation is tempting. A difficulty is that *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂-es-* would have given *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂-s-n-* (with zero *s*) in both Greek and Sanskrit. The author argues that no forms of the type CC-*eC-n-* exist, so that it was replaced by CC-*C-n-*. On the other hand, *κάρηνα* requires the stem *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂-es-(n-)*, which is exactly the expected form. (I would consider a plural *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂-es-h₂* [not *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂-ēs* > *\*καρῶς*?], replaced by *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂-es-n-h₂*.)

IV: Derivatives with *-r-* like Myc. *-karaor-*, *-καραιρα*, Lat. *cerebrum* are explained from a locative *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂s-er* “in/at the head”. The first forms would presuppose a nom. *\*krās-ēr/ōr*, with fem. *-r-ih₂*. The Latin word would have the following history: *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂es-* → loc. *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂ser* → adj. *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂sr-ó-* → subst. *\*kerh₂sro-*.

C: The explanation of *-καραιρα* from *\*krābh<sub>ri</sub>a* > *\*krār<sub>i</sub>a* seems implausible. The loss of *h* is compared with that of *t* in *\*des-potn<sub>i</sub>a*, which seems to me a different matter (it must have something to do with the fact that *t* and *n* are both dentals; also the word may have been extremely frequent, like words such as *monsieur*). We expect either *\*krābar<sub>i</sub>a* or *\*krābh<sub>ri</sub>(i)a* (cf. *μεσημβρίη* < *\*mesām<sub>ri</sub>(i)a*).

C: The appearance, in *cerebrum*, of the full grade in the root (as well as the zero grade in the suffix *-r-*) seems difficult to account for, unless the derivatives are thought to be very old. The derivation of both *cerebrum* and Germ. *\*hersan-* from (two different) locatives, (both) with secondary full grade (in the root) and secondary zero grade (in the suffix), is hard to accept.

V: The word for “hornet”, Lat. *crābrō*, is derived from *\*k<sub>rh</sub>₂s-r-ó-* “having headgear” + the substantivizing suffix *-on-*. Dutch *horzel* and Balto-Slavic forms may have had *l* by dissimilation from *r*, Lith. *širšuo*, ORuss. *šbršenʹ* may have lost the second *r* by dissimilation.

App. II: *πρόχυν* is explained from *πρὸς* + *γυν*, which became *\*proksnu*.

C: The idea is based on *πρὸς γούνα* (*καθέζετο*), but this means “up against the knees” of somebody else, which seems not to fit the meaning of the adverb. – Gr. *αὔχμος* is derived from *\*saus-k-mo* > *\*sauksmo-*, a derivative of *\*sus-ko-*. If this is correct, Lubotsky’s interpretation (KZ 98, 1985, 1–10) of this word as *\*h₂sus-* explains why we find *\*(h)aus-ko-* in Greek beside *\*sus-ko-* in the other languages.

Though the problems are very complicated, the book is lucid and easily readable. Discussions are very sharp-witted, solutions adopted are ingenious and plausible. Still one cannot help feeling rather helpless: it could be, but it could well be otherwise. One wonders whether it was useful to devote a whole book to one group of words, also as not many other problems are solved or processes discovered. But I find it a sympathetic book, and it conforms to the highest standards of research, the methods used being exemplary.

The book is very nicely edited, and the price prohibitive. (I find the

letters of the notes hard to read.) The author omits asterisks, which is often disturbing, and he fails to indicate length in Latin words.

Rijnsburgerweg 88  
NL-2333 AD Leiden

Robert S. P. Beekes