

Verba et structurae. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag. Hrsg. von Heinrich Hettrich, Wolfgang Hock, Peter-Arnold Mumm und Norbert Oettinger. Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1995, gr.-8°, VIII, 372 S., 1 Frontispiz. (IBS, 83.) Geb. 1200 öS.

I make a short note on each of the articles.

G. Dunkel maintains that ὄνος, ὄμος, ζῶμος, κῶμος and Διώνυσος are Mycenaean relics, where the long \bar{o} was regular. A full discussion is given by H. van den Oever in his forthcoming dissertation. He holds that the development was the older one, in all Greek dialects. Dionysos seems to me a non-IE word: the IE etymology is forced.

B. Forssman convincingly defends the interpretation of Av. *maini-*(*ia*)*uuasab-* as “swift as thought”, with *-as-ab-* as in Greek ποδ-ὄκ-ης. Suggestions are given on the short *-a-* (which hardly proves old full grade). (On Lat. *acu-pedius* see Schrijver 1991, 55, 77.)

J.L. García-Ramon defines the meaning of the PIE accusative as “schlicht die Richtung” (as long recognized), which implies that it does not mean that the goal was reached. To call this ‘unmarked’ does not seem useful, as it easily leads to wrong statements, like (44) “kann entweder das nicht erreichte Ziel... ausdrücken oder einfach die Indifferenz”. It does not express (i.e. mean) that the goal was not reached. Moreover, it seems logically impossible to express both these things at the same time.

H. Hettrich studies the ablative in the Rigveda, distinguishing clear categories, giving fine examples. Special attention is given to the use of other cases in comparable constructions.

W. Hock argues for *eje* > \bar{i} in the Balto-Slavic *i*-verbs. His new evidence is not convincing. E.g. the dative singular would have *-eiei* > \bar{i} . The objection to haplology that *-ei* would give an acute is not valid as only a laryngeal or a voiced unaspirated stop gives an acute. The author admits that *eje* > \bar{i} is improbable for Baltic, which makes the explanation impossible. The phonetic aspect is not discussed (loss of *e* in *üe* < *eie* is impossible, *üe* > *üi* is also unlikely) nor the semantics. Kortlandt’s solution (Baltistica 23/2, 1987, 104–111; also Lingua 49, 1979, 55f. and Baltistica 25/2, 1989, 109), athematic *ei/i* (with preterite in *-eh₁-*, as in *μαίνομαι – ἐμάηνη*), should have been mentioned.

St. Insler explains Skt. *jāniṣṭa* from 3 sg. *ājani* after 2 sg. *jāniṣṭhās*, which would have an archaic, intransitive ending *-sthās* (older **-stha*), which is compared with Toch. *-sta*, Hitt. *-šta* and Lat. *-isti* (which is not a middle ending). One conclusion is that there was no middle optative of the *s*-aorist originally. The idea that the precative *-yās* took its *-s* from the middle forms type (*pad*)-*iṣṭa* seems improbable: this is difficult even for a linguist, let alone for the speaker. One would prefer an inner-Sanskrit explanation.

H. Katz derives OIc. *sindr* “slag, Sinter” and SCr. *sēdra* from **sēndbro-*. The long vowel is assumed for the Slavic acute, but this comes from a voiced stop (or a laryngeal), so that Slavic points to **sendr-*. The difference *dh : d* points to a substratum word, as may be expected for such a technical term.

Ch. Koch gives additions to his study “Die slavische Bezeichnung des Greifen”: Po. *nóg* is old; “Kralle” as a word for griffin; the motive of the griffin as mediator between this world and the other world.

K. McCone discusses the OIr. indicative of “to be”. The explanation is quite complicated, requires new sound laws, and leaves the reader with strong doubts. E.g., in order to explain the 2 pl. he assumes that the 2 pl. abs. ending was not **-tes-es* (or McCone’s *-te-yo*), but **-tesi*; this reconstruction did not give the normal ending *-the*, however, which again requires a new explanation.

W. Meid gives a full discussion of all Celtiberian verbal forms. One notes that there is hardly a form that is completely clear. One remark: if *-mu* is the secondary ending **-mo* (142), the *-u* is unexplained if in primary *-mus* the *u* is due to the following *-s* (146).

P.-A. Mumm argues that the Vedic injunctive can also be used in an ‘aktuelle Situation’, and has the notion ‘definite’. He makes fine observations, but has not convinced me that we need this new notion: all uses seem well understandable from the basic function/meaning (non-indication of time, only ‘mention’, ‘naming’). The interpretation (178¹⁶) according to his conception of the prohibitive as “die Handlung liegt ja vor Augen bzw. ist nur erwartet” seems incorrect to me.

E. Neu draws attention to Hurrian futures rendered in Hittite with *mu-a-* “to come” + asyndetic present. Hittite texts also use *pai-* “to go” in this way. He refers to comparable observations by Dunkel, MSS 46, 1985, 47 ff.

G. Neumann assumes that the basic meaning of *κόσμος* etc. was “to fit” (“zusammenordnen”, med. “sich einfügen”). Only PIE **g^hed^h-* then remains as a possible etymology, already proposed by Carnoy. Note that *κόσμος* must be made from *κοθ-*, as **g^hod^h-smo-* would have given **χοσμος*. I keep some doubt as the word is so isolated; cf. another fundamental notion like *ὑβρις*, which is unexplained and may be of pre-Greek origin.

N. Oettinger posits a collective in *-ēi*, on the basis of Hitt. *kulēi* < **k^wl-ēi* “Brachgefilde”, beside *utnē*. Etymological connection with **k^wel-* “sorglich ... herum bewegen” (“to turn”, as in “wheel”, can hardly be derived from this, in my opinion) seems doubtful to me: only Latin applies the verb to cultivation, but clearly as one specialized usage, and has no noun derived from it. Gr. *ὄρνειον*, *ὄστειον* derive from such collectives. Not clear is the relation to masc.-fem. nouns (Skt. *sākhā*) nor whether the hysterodynamic inflection (type **uedōr*) or the suffix *-i-* is

responsible for the collective meaning. Relation with the ‘Zugehörigkeits-*i*’ (long since known; §9.3) seems probable to me.

O. Panagl explains ἀγαθός form $*m̥gʰb_2-d^b h_1-o-$, like Poultney (“Großes tuend”), but takes it as “made great”, observing the use in Homer notably in connection with heroes. Semantically this is not quite convincing (the rendering “hochgestellt” is misleading); would not “noble” rather derive from “good”? The etymology is a typical instance of forcing an IE etymology on a word that is probably non-IE, on the basis of the form even though the meaning does not fit. (See Beekes 1996.)

H. Rix in a fine article argues that ἐπίσταμαι is a denominative, from $*ἐπι-στᾱ-ς$ (cf. ἐπιστήμων) “Sachvertreter” > “Sachverständiger”. He has interesting observations on IE denominatives without derivative suffix. (Further on Lat. *testis* etc.)

B. Schlerath – after giving an example of modern theoreticians working without sufficient knowledge of the material – discusses the fate of the neuter *s*-stems in Germanic (list of possible forms). The interesting thing is the different treatment in the separate Germanic languages. Cf. on this point also Schenker, PBB (T) 93, 1971, 46–58.

Karl Horst Schmidt makes some comments on the nasal presents. He argues for instance that the forms with full grade I (Lat. *sternō*) are independent innovations of the individual languages, with evidence from Celtic.

K. T. Schmidt argues that Toch. *sänm-* “fesseln” etc. derives from $*säm-nā-$, where the palatal points to a full grade with *e*, which gives a verb of the type Lat. *sternō*. He assumes a root $*stemb^b H-$, which would have three final consonants. Also $*st(e)mb^b-n-H-$ would have four consonants before the *-n-* and can hardly be an old formation. He modifies his rule $H > k$ to the position after resonant (or *i, u*), vocalic or consonantal(!), before vowel. Evidence for this version of the rule is not given, except that *sruk-* “sterben” would be cognate with Skt. *sr̥v-/sr̥ū-*. (For the *k* in Lat. *senex* see Schrijver 1991, 148 ff.) The discussion of the consonantal character of the laryngeals seems based on misunderstandings (“stellungsbedingt konsonantisch oder vokalisch realisiert” is the original conception and since long the communis opinio). The nasal presents would show $-nH-$ > $-nā-$ beside $-ṅH-$ > $-änk-$. The ideas seem very speculative to me.

Rüdiger Schmitt gives a full discussion of enclisis in Old Persian. It contains several corrections of Kent.

O. Szemerényi argues in a detective-like article that Gaul. *celicnon* rather means “vase, bowl” and has nothing to do with Goth. *kelikn*. Very convincing is his explanation of the latter word as meaning “dining room” and deriving from Lat. *cēnāculum* ($*kēniklum > kēlikn[um]$). The first word is explained from κυλίχνη (where the absence of the *u* seems difficult; perhaps to Lat. *calix*?).

Eva Tichy studies Ved. *éd* = *á íd* (“siehe da”). She quite convincingly explains it as a development from ‘preverb repetition’. It could be rendered “[und traf(en)] auf wirklich” (e.g. *éd dhatám vṛtrám* [and] indeed [came] on (= found) Vṛtra killed).

J. Untermann suggests that Umbr. *aitu* comes from the root **ai-* “distribute”, but the interpretation is not quite clear to me. Secondly, he argues convincingly against a sound law Umbr. *ru* > *r*. Thus, the verbal root was *ser-* (Av. *haraiti*), not **seru-*.

C. Watkins discusses Anatolian terms for “brother” and “sister”, and “brothers, sisters of the same father” resp. “mother”.

Thus we have here a volume with 24 studies on a wide range of subjects, in the Indo-Europeanist tradition of sound scholarship, a worthy tribute to our honoured colleague. I add my congratulations, remembering among other things the fine cooperation at the occasion of the VIIIth Fachtagung in Leiden, when Klaus Strunk was president of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft.

References

- Beekes, R. S. P., 1996. Ancient European Loanwords. HS 109, 227–230.
Schrijver, P., 1991. The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin, Amsterdam.

Rijksuniversiteit Leiden
Faculteit der Letteren
Vakgroep vergelijkende taalwetenschappen
Postbus 9515

NL-2300 RA Leiden

Robert S. P. Beekes