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Terumasa OSHIRO

We have met the name of Prof. Benjamin Schwartz together with J. A. Kerns in books or articles on Indo-European (IE) linguistics. Since Kerns and Schwartz endorsed the concept that Anatolian languages departed from Proto-Indo-European (PIE) earlier than the other IE languages, they surely adhered to Sturtevant's 'Indo-Hittite' hypothesis (i.e. 'Indo-Hittite' linguistics). From his earlier research, however, Schwartz is also recognized as a pioneering scholar in Anatolian languages, esp. in Hittite and in Cuneiform Luwian (= 'Glossenkeil' words):

"On the 'Glossenkeil' in Hittite", ArOr. 10/1-2 (1938), 65-78.
"The Particle -kan in Hittite" JAOS. 70/1 (1950), 18-24, etc.

In this memorial volume, Prof. Yøel L. Arbeitman has assembled thirty-six papers, which are classified into three chapters: (1) Anatolian languages, (2) Italic languages and (3) other IE languages and PIE.

The seventeen papers on Anatolian languages are discussed below in the following order: phonology, morphology, lexicon and others.

H. C. Melchert surveys word-final -r in Hittite on the basis of the recent philological result of Hittite cuneiform texts. He clarifies that the -a forms of alternative -ar/-a will indicate not only the archaic forms but also the appropriate markedness of plural number. He also suggests that the loss of final -r in plurals may be conditioned by its
position in an unaccented syllable (further, refer to K. Yoshida’s paper, “On the Prehistory of Word-final -r in Anatolian”, Gengo Kenkyu 91, 1987, 40-55). V. Shevoroshkin analyses IE stops, fricative *s, sonorants and laryngeals attested in Anatolian languages (including Carian !). He believes that the reconstruction of such consonants is corroborated by ‘Nostratic’ data: i.e. Indo-European, Kartvelian and Afro-Asianic (including Semitic). I think, however, that the linguistic relation among these families should be investigated by the ‘pure’ comparison of more detailed evidence, not by a priori hypothesis.

F. R. Adrados is concerned with archaism in Anatolian nominal inflexion. He indicates that Anatolian languages preserve a considerable number of archaic features in nominal inflexion which reflect the intermediate ‘mono-thematic’ IE stage (=IE II) between ‘pre-flexional’ IE stage (=IE I or PIE) and ‘polythematic’ IE stage (=IE III), upon which he has expounded since 1962. However, since our attested data are still fragmentary for demonstrating the various evolutionary stages in PIE, his exploration also remains a vague statement: e.g. note his view on alternation of common/neuter nouns (see a further discussion by Tischler in this book). A. Bernabé explains Cun. Luw. abstract form -ahi (f) and Hit. nominal stem -ai- as the formants with the laryngeal *H2 respectively. He finds the identification of Cun. Luw. -ahi-/-a-hit- and Hit. -ai-/-at-, which are both derived from PIE -*eH2r-/-*eH2t-. But the morphological parallelism of Cun. Luw. -a-hit- and Hit. -at- with a loss of -*H2- (later abstract nouns -atar) is not amply elucidated in spite of their functional similarity.

Eight contributions deal with lexicon and/or etymology.

F. Bader discusses the particle -šan in Hittite which is generally regarded as ‘Ortsbezugspartikel’ (Eng. ‘sentence particle’). She argues that the particle -šan can be assumed as offering “plusieurs des fonctions
que peuvent assumer les formes pronominales". G. Beckman offers a note on kuššan found in paragraph 28 of the Hittite laws. He argues convincingly that kuššan (written ku-uš-ša-an) is a wrong writing and this is correctly to be written as ku-iš-ša-an (note that the cuneiform iš is made with the addition of a single vertical wedge to the cuneiform uš). ↑ A. Heubeck discusses the form arīnas in Lycian and regards this form as not only nom. sg. *arīnant-s "Xanthos" (N 303, 2) but also nom. pl. *arīnant-s "the Xanthians" (N 320, 31–32). But if we identify *arīnant- as the ‘adjective’ form with the consonantal -*nt- stem, the form arīnas in N 320, 31–32 is also probably the ‘nom. sg.’ of the adjective form which modifies the nom. sg. noun teteri<*teteri-s “city” (i.e. teteri arīnas “the city (of) Xanthos”). We can attest arīnai of epewēltīmmēi arīnai in N 320, 32 (epewēltīmmēi “neighbours (nom. pl.)”) as the nom. pl. in -āi of the adjective form, which has so far been considered as the gen. pl. form. Thus our tentative translation of this passage is "the neighbours (of) Xanthos", not "the neighbours of the Xanthians" (for this attestation, see K. Matsumoto’s paper, “The Position of Lycian among the IE Anatolian Languages”, Bulletin of IILS, Kyoto Sangyo Univ. 6/2, 1985, 24–53). B. D. Joseph discusses the etymology of Hit. tuqqāri “be visible”. This word has so far been considered as derived from *twēk- or *dheugh-. But he reconstructs *duwk- for Hit. tuqqāri, corresponding to Albanian duk- (see also Bader’s paper, “De Pollux à Deukalion : la racine *deu-k- ‘briller, voir’ “, Fs. for E. Risch, Berlin, 1986, 467–469: Hit. tuqqāri parallel with Gr. ἐδύκω and Alb. duk-). M. O’Connor calls attention to the toponyms of Palmyra and Tadmor which both denote the identified city. He analyses these forms into *pal+mVr and *tad+mVr respectively, which are both derived from Hurrian elements: cf. Hur. pal- “know”, tad- “love” and *mVr in the names of cities under Hurrian influence. In spite of the author’s linguistic inter-
pretation for two toponyms, historical problems between ancient Hurri and the later toponyms still remain unsolved. J. Puhvel considers the Hittite word for "shoulder" as halhaldana- rather than paltana- or anašša-, and further he clearly demonstrates the semantic development of Hit. halhaltumar(i)- "corner" with the same stem. B. Rosenkranz discusses the roots of Hit. laman “name” and lammar “moment”, and offers PIE *lem- “(niedrige) Lage” as the common root of these words. However, the evidence from IE languages for PIE *lem- cited by him is still meagre. Rather Hit. laman is generally understood as the form with alternative l/n of *nāman (<*H₁noH₂m₅n by Oettinger, Die Stammbildung des hethit. Verbums, Nürnberg, 1979, 526) corresponding to Gr. ὅψις, Lat. nomen, etc., while Hier. Luw. *adman- “name” (written ā-la₃-ma –za = *atamanza) is assumed as the form with dissimilation of *n>d of *anman- (<*H₁neH₂m₅n by Oettinger, ibid., 457). Th. P. J. van den Hout comments on Hittite verb dama₃-/dame₄₁- “press” with IE s-aorist element, analysing it into the stem *demH₂- and ‘ablaut’ formant -*es/--*s-: sg. *dmH₂-es-/pl. *dmH₂-s-.

C. Brixhe discusses various linguistic features of the epichoric inscriptions (including five inscriptions recently published) in Pisidia, but the twenty-one sources cited are all fragmentary. J. Faucounau explores the beginning part (line. 1–9) of the Lycian stele inscription (TL 44a) from Xanthos. In view of the reconstructed passages he clarifies the dynasty of the sovereign Kerēi, whose achievements are possibly related on its stele. R. Gusmani points out various forms of Iranian origin in Lydian anthroponyms. We can clearly understand the Iranian influence on western Anatolia in the first millennium B.C. (further, see the attestation of Iranian elements in Lycian anthroponyms by R. Schmitt, “Iranische Wörter und Namen im Lykischen”, Fs. for G. Neumann, Innsbruck, 1982, 373–388).
†C. Carter reconsiders the 'Indo-Hittite' hypothesis recently mentioned by †W. Cowgill, and he also finds the IE hypothesis more convincing than the IH hypothesis, as at present most scholars do infer. Y. L. Arbeitman presents a note on an exchange of letters between Sturtevant and Kerns on the position of Armenian within IE in the 1940s. We learn that at that time Sturtevant considered Armenian as one of Anatolian languages but that he rejected this theory in 1951 (further, see J. A. C. Greppin's paper, "Concerning the Reply of Kerns and Schwartz to Austin", Gs. for J. A. Kerns, Amsterdam, 1981, 119-126).

Next, there are six papers on Italic languages, four of these concerning the lexicon and/or etymology.

J.-C. Billigmeier contributes a note on Latin lucabos "elephant". He recognizes this word as the transformation of Hit. laḥpaš "ivory" (for this meaning, see Chicago Hittite Dictionary, 12-3). But the semantic extension from "ivory" to "elephant" in Hittite is not yet confirmed (refer to Sum. ZÜ, Akk. šinnu "(lit.) tooth" in trilingual text at Ras Shamra). Further, we cannot attest a phonetic correspondence of Hit. vowel -a- to Latin -u- and -o-. Y. Duhoux in "A Propos des inscriptions osques dites iuvilas et du texte Vetter 94" reconstructs *dyewilā for the form iuvilas, and offers new interpretations on the terms flagiiù and ner in the inscription of Vetter 94. L. Isebaert considers the formation of Latin domāre and reconstructs PIE *domeH₂-e/o- for this word on the basis of Sanskrit and Germanic evidence. P. Swiggers offers a note on the form trutum in Oscan, which is considered as PIE *kʷt̚ur-t̚o/*kʷt̚e-t̚o "fourth". Thus we tend to regard this form as parallel to Hit. dya-nalli- "second" (formerly "fourth"!, cf. Skt. turiya-), but we cannot ignore the phonetic correspondence of PIE *kʷ-⇒ Hit. ku-.

L. D. Stephans finds that syntactic boundaries operate on blocking the shortening -ō > ō in iambic verbs in Classical Latin. And R. Wallace
is concerned with the position of Volscian language. Though it is generally claimed that Volscian and Umbrian form a separate subgroup, he does not support this view, arguing that Volscian appears to occupy a position which is linguistically 'intermediate' between Oscan and Umbrian.

The thirteen papers on other IE languages and PIE are discussed in the following order: phonology, morphology and lexicon/etymology.

Two contributions concern phonological problems. A. J. van Windekens points out the dissimilation *n-n > l-n in some words whose etymologies mostly remains obscure: i.e. ἀλκυὼν, λαγχάου, λυρός, λυρός, etc. He boldly reconstructs *n for l in these words, but his explanation is not convincing. For example, for λαγχάου he reconstructs *ναγχάου (<*enek-/*nek-: J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern, 1959, 316), but in comparison with aor. ἄλχαο, pf. ἄλογχα, etc., this form can surely be considered as the stem λάχ- with an infix -ν-. Thus it seems impossible that this ‘optional’ infix dissimilates initial l- of this basic stem. P. Vavroušek reconsiders the statistic approach of /l/ and /r/ in the Rigveda of which the relation is generally estimated at 1:7.

A. R. Bomhard comments on the prehistoric development of the athematic verbal endings in PIE. He reconstructs the athematic endings in earlier PIE, as sg.1. -m, 2. -t, 3. -s/-φ, pl.1. -we, 2. -tē, 3. -ən/-ər, which, though not positively, he regards as parallel to agglutinated personal pronouns in Proto-Uralic: e.g. 1st. -m, 2nd. -t, 3rd. -φ (indet.)/-se (det.). K. Shield discusses the origin of the IE optative and subjunctive bringing to bear some old-fashioned speculations by Brugmann and his own new ones with little evidence. Thus his view still remains obscure: cf. in verbal forms the contraction of *-e (=a deictic particle assumed by him) with reanalysis of *-φ-X > *-X-φ is not attested: *-e
J. Tischler sets forth a new concept for the relative chronology of PIE. He demonstrates the evolutionary stages of PIE by the analysis of archaic and innovative features, but in general the criteria between archaisms and innovations are not always clear: e.g. the position of feminine gender in Hittite.

Further, there are eight papers on lexical and etymological problems. D. Q. Adams discusses three non-denominative verbs in Tocharian B with some observations of PIE laryngeals: kalaŋ- “follow”, parak- “rejoice” and walak- “dwell” (sanap- “anoint”, which is indicated as a borrowing from pre-Khotanese *zänäf-, has been suggested by Windekens). He rejects previous etymologies of these three verbs by Windekens, and regards their roots as *kwolHg-, *bhorHg- and *welHg- (H = one laryngeal) respectively. Y. L. Arbeitman explores the relation between Minos and Great Zeus with reference to semantic motivation of the Greek stem δαρ-, in words such as δαριζω, δαριστής, δαριστός and δαρ. Ch. R. Barton in “PIE *sengw- (hurl, fall)” discusses the formation of Arm. ank- and Gr. ἔπιτω/ἔπιθη which may be derived from this root. T. Burrow comments on two ‘hapax’ verbs javate and smayate in Sanskrit. For javate in Tait. S.6.1.7.6., he reconstructs the homonymous root ju— “think” other than ju— “speed” (PIE *gena-), and for smayate in Tait. S. 6. 1. 3. 7., he points out another root *smei- “smear” (Pokorny, op. cit., p.966), not the homonymous root *smei- “smile”. But it should be noted that his translation for each verb is possible or probable only in one place. R. A. Fowkes discusses the semantic shades between polite (Lat. politus < poliō, polire “polish”) and politic (Fr. politique < Lat. politicus < Gr. πολιτικός < πόλις) in Armenian, Sanskrit and Welsh. E. P. Hamp comments on “spoon” in Northwest IE and reconstructs *lugā for this word. J. Hilmarsson is concerned with the formation of Tocharian B okt, A okāt “8”. He rejects the view that PIE *oktōu is assumed as a
preform of Tocharian "8", and acknowledges that Toch."8" is clearly derived from PIE *oktō (Common Toch. -*ō > Toch. A. B. -*u > -*u > -φ).

C. F. Justus makes assertions concerning IE decimal numerals and numeral systems on the basis of semantic motivation, not by morphophonological comparison (for another opinion, see J. D. Bengtson's paper, "Notes on Indo-European '10', '100', and '1000'", *Diachronica*, 4/1-2, 1987, 257-62). Notably she recognizes *kon-to- "unit of measurement" (Lyc. snta "unit") and *kom-yo- "all" (Lyc. cɪ́ima, Hit. humant- "all") as the Anatolian reflexes of *kντόμ "many, base unit, limit number". Though she agrees to Carruba's plausible interpretation on Lycian numerals (see Carruba's paper, "Sui numerali da "1" a "5" in anatolico e indoeuropeo", *Fs. for O. Szemerényi*, Amsterdam, 1979, 191-205), we should also note the comment by Bryce that the Lycian numerals are still unknown quantities (refer to *The Lycians* I, Copenhagen, 1986, p. 82, note 87).

In sum, it can be said that the papers in this volume manage to reflect the current state of research in Indo-European linguistics, though, of course, they have to be read and interpreted with care.