E. A. HAHN, *Naming-Constructions in Indo-European Languages* (American Philological Association, Monograph 27). Cleveland (Ohio), Press of Western Reserve University, 1969. XXVIII, 222 p. Pr. D. 8.00.

E. Adelaide Hahn, who was professor of Classics at Hunter College since 1925, died in 1967. An obituary (with bibliography) may be found in Language 43 (1967), 958-64. She wrote many articles, especially on Virgil, on syntax, and Hittite. Strangely enough her name is best known from a book she never wrote, an Hittite syntax, planned as volume II of Sturtevant's *Comparative Grammar*.

The manuscript of the present book was completed just before her death, and has been published unchanged. We cannot be sure that the author did not want to make some corrections, and we must appreciate the book as we have it. As it is, it is in many respects a curious book. Half of it is formed by the 871 notes, much of it appeared earlier in articles; it finds its unity only in its title (many sections are irrelevant to the central problem).

The central problem is the origin of 'name' as an accusative of specification (*acc. Graecus*) in constructions of the type Sanskrit

āsīd rājā Nalo nāma 'there was a king Nala (his) name'. The pre-
vailing idea is Brugmann's: *Nalo nāma* was originally a parenthetic
nominal clause. Miss Hahn objects that we should expect 'his'
expressed, as in Οὖτις ἐμοί γ' ὄνομα. I cannot find this a serious
objection: it may be true of Greek, but not of P(roto)-I(ndo)-
E(uropean). Her thesis is that *nāma* originally stood in partitive
apposition to *rājā*, 'there was a king his name Nala'.

There is the principal difficulty that 'name' mostly occurs in
nominative and accusative, which cannot be distinguished in *nāma*
etc., as it is a neuter. Therefore Miss Hahn's solution is possible
everywhere, but its correctness cannot be demonstrated. Latin and
German do not have the type (Latin uses *nomine*). In Celtic, which
has no *acc. Graecus*, the type has been explained as a nominal clause,
but it might be an apposition. Indic has no *acc. Graecus* (though it
has the adverbial acc., but this qualifies the *verb*; Thieme), Avestan
has it for body-part nouns. Positive evidence gives Hittite, where
there is no sure *acc. Graecus*, and where LU-*as Appu SUM-an-set*
'a man (-*as* nom.) Appus [1]) his (-*set*) name (*lāman/SUM-an*)' is most
probably an apposition, as this construction is widespread in Hittite
(A.ŠÀ-*an* ZAG-*an* 'ein Feld die Grenze' = 'die Grenze eines Feldes').
The best evidence is O(ld) P(ersian), where we find *nāma* with
masculine and neuter substantives (*Tāravā nāma vardanam* 'a town
(neutr.) its name T. (fem.)'), but *nāmā* with feminine substantives
(*Tigra nāmā didā* 'a fortress (fem.) its name T. (masc.)'). This is
now mostly—and I think rightly—considered to be agreement in
gender [1]) (cf. the agreement in *case* in Lat. *huic Menaechmo* (dat.,
not nom.) *nomen est*, and Sanskrit *Dadir* (nom., not acc.) *yo nāma
patyate* 'who possesses the name Dadis'), which is recent, but proves
that in OP *nāma* was an apposition to the substantive.

I think the author did not prove her hypotheses. Hittite need
not have preserved an old type here, and the agreement in OP might
be recent, as is its formal expression (-*ā* : -*a*). Nevertheless the
idea is a probable one. Miss Hahn referred to widespread traces
of apposition in Homer (TAPA 85, 1954, 197-289). Her interpreta-
tion of Skt. *Havir asmi nāma* as 'I my name am Havis' and Κτήσιπ-

1) She rightly condemns the modern representation of Hittite names
without the nominative -*s* (Hattusa, Telipinu, Mursili). She regards the
s-less forms as agreeing in gender with 'name' (n. 841).

2) The author rightly holds that *nāma* is the easiest starting-point, which
is corroborated by *čašma*. Brandenstein-Mayrhofer (*Handb. d. Altpers.*, 32)
adduce as 'evidence' for -*ṇ* > -*ā* a reconstructed, i.e. non-existing, **haftā*
(ἑπτά etc.)! The idea rests on the hypothesis that *ṇṃ* had become *a* already
in Indo-Iranian, but this is not sure to my mind. The identical result does
not prove anything (Greek also has *a*), and *ṛ ḷ* were preserved down to the
separate languages.

πος δ' ὄνομ' ἔσκε as 'he his name was K.' seems to me more natural than 'he was K. as regards his name'. But some doubts remain. Mostly *nāma* etc. follows the name (*Nalo nāma*), not the owner as we should expect. Hittite has both word orders here, while in other cases of apposition the 'déterminant' directly follows the 'déterminé'. Also in other types of apposition the possessive pronoun seems not to be used in Hittite (but I base myself only on Friedrich, *Heth. Elementarb.*, 124). Her interpretation of Mycenaean *tiripo apu kekaumeno kereha* (*tripos apu kekaumenos skeleha* 'one tripod, burnt away at the legs') and *tono ajameno opikereminija erepate* (*thornos . . . os . . . ans elephantei* 'a throne inlaid with ivory at the back') as having nominatives (*-ai* not *-ans*) seems forced: as Greek, it should be interpreted on the basis of (classical) Greek, not of reconstructed PIE, and this makes an *acc. Graecus* probable.

Though I have objections to the book as a book, the thesis—if right—is not without importance: apposition is recognized as a much used PIE process, and the importance of Hittite is demonstrated once more. Moreover we may welcome any treatise on PIE syntax.

OEGSTGEEST, Prinsenlaan 23   R. S. P. BEEKES