

diese bewundernswerte Arbeit das Studium der indogermanischen Dichtersprache einen riesigen Schritt vorwärts.

#### Literatur

- Polomé, Edgar C., 1991. Inspiration, connaissance, magie ou voyance: La fonction fondamentale du dieu germanique \**Wōðan(az)* et l'étymologie de son nom, *Incognita* 2, 32–47.
- Schröder, Franz-Rolf, 1951. Erce und Fjörgyn, in: *Festschrift für Karl Helm*, Tübingen, 25–36.
- Watkins, Calvert, 1987. How to kill a dragon in Indo-European, in: *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill*, Berlin, 270–299.

2701 Rock Terrace Drive  
Austin TX 78704-3843  
U.S.A.

Edgar C. Polomé

Adrados, Francisco R.: Laryngale mit Appendix?. Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1994, 8°, 30S. (IBS. Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften, 60.) Brosch. 160öS.

Adrados begins this essay with a caustically worded complaint that his previous work on this topic has been either misunderstood, misrepresented, summarily dismissed, or, worst of all, simply ignored. He finds this behavior especially lamentable because he feels that the topic of laryngeals in general and that of PIE 'natural' long diphthongs in particular have not in recent years received the attention they deserve. He then briefly recapitulates his theory alluded to in the title, concluding with a few remarks about some opposing views and allusions to consequences of his theory for PIE morphology (which he has fully elaborated elsewhere).

That much remains to be explained regarding PIE 'roots' of the traditional shape \**sē(i)-* or \**lā(u)-* is undeniable. However, if A. truly wishes to initiate a scholarly dialogue on the topic, this essay is ill-designed for the purpose. First, it is more than mildly disingenuous for A. to assert that laryngeals have lately been neglected and then to ignore totally the most important recent book on the subject, the anthology *Die Laryngaltheorie*, edited by Alfred Bammesberger (Heidelberg, 1988). Likewise, A.'s probably well justified complaint regarding treatment of his own work is undercut by his disdainful one-line dismissal of Peter Schrijver's *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin* (Amsterdam/Atlanta, 1991). A discussion of PIE "god" and "cow" without even a mention of 'Stang's Law' is also ipso facto inadequate and seriously misleading.

A.'s presentation of his own theory is also problematic. The treatment of data from various IE languages is, to use a polite word, eclectic: individual words and word classes are discussed atomistically, with little or no regard for the larger context of which they are a part (in phonological or morphological terms). I restrict myself here to illustrative examples from Hittite:

*tannattawwanzi/dannattabhūwanzi* are implied to be examples of different outcomes of \**H<sup>w</sup>* (16). But the *-(u)wanzi* here is part of the general infinitival ending *-wanzi* and has nothing to do with the final laryngeal of the verbal stem! Furthermore, the stem of the first example is *tannattā(i)-* (type of *armā(i)-* beside *armabh-* "impregnate"). This should be by A.'s system surely point to \**-H<sup>y</sup>*, not \**-H<sup>w</sup>*. The same conflict appears in the preterite of the type of *armabhūn*, which A. would attribute to \**-H<sub>2</sub><sup>w</sup>* (see 14), but again *armā(i)-* suggests \**-H<sub>2</sub><sup>y</sup>*.

The same insuperable contradiction arises for *šēhur* "urine", which A. analyzes as *\*seH<sub>2</sub><sup>w</sup>r* to the root of Latin *sēmen* "seed". But Gothic *saian* and Lith. *sėjū* "to sow" etc. point rather by his system to *\*seH<sub>1</sub><sup>r</sup>-*. The problem can, of course, be resolved by taking one or both variants as containing a suffix, but this is tantamount to adopting a form of the approach which A.'s entire system is intended to replace.

In his unjustified rejection of 'lenition' in Hittite (18) and in his stubborn perpetuation of a Hittite ghost-word *muhur* "at once" (garbled somehow from Sanskrit *muhur*?), A. merely confirms his glaring ignorance of the current state of knowledge of the Anatolian languages.

In sum, the purpose of this book remains obscure to me. A. presents no new evidence or arguments for his theory. If he seeks to engage others in genuine debate, he must first offer a more sound basis for discussion. At a minimum, one would like to see an exhaustive and systematic treatment of a single widely attested 'naturally' long PIE base such as *\*se(i)-* "sow", in which A. shows how his system accounts for all the data in a way superior to those approaches which operate with a suffix or 'enlargement' *\*-i-*.

It is tempting to say that this work's only virtue is that it wastes very little space in saying nothing, but this would be merely an empty witticism. A more accurate evaluation is that it should either have been far longer, with a more fully developed argument, or should never have been written at all.

The University of North Carolina  
Department of Linguistics  
CB no. 3155, 318 Dey Hall  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3155  
U.S.A.

H. Craig Melchert

Bird, Norman: The Roots and Non-Roots of Indo-European. A Lexicostatistical Survey. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag (in comm.), 1993, gr.-8°, [V], 82 S. Brosch. 64 DM.

Die vorliegende Untersuchung stellt die überarbeitete Fassung einer Arbeit dar, die bereits 1982 unter dem Titel The distribution of Indo-European root morphemes (A checklist for philologists) beim gleichen Verlag erschienen war (vgl. Rez., Germanistik 26, 1985, 789 f.). Zielsetzung und Aufbau der Arbeit sind gleich geblieben: der Autor legt eine statistische Auswertung von Julius Pokornys Standardwerk (Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Bern/München 1959) vor. Dies geschieht in drei verschiedenen Abschnitten:

Zunächst werden Pokornys Wurzelansätze in alphabetischer Reihenfolge aufgelistet und mit englischer Bedeutungsangabe versehen. Dabei wird jeweils angegeben, in wievielen und in welchen indogermanischen (idg.) Sprachzweigen die betreffende Wurzel belegt ist. Die Ergebnisse dieses ersten Abschnittes werden im zweiten weiter ausgewertet, indem die Wurzeln nach der Anzahl der Sprachzweige, in denen sie bei Pokorny nachgewiesen sind, angeordnet werden. Ein dritter Abschnitt schließlich gibt an, wieviele idg. Wurzeln den verschiedenen möglichen Sprachgruppenpaaren gemeinsam sind; B. will also eine Art lexikostatistischer Gruppierung vornehmen oder besser vorbereiten, wobei „it is hoped that these calculations will be of value within the fields of lexicostatistics and glottochronology in which hitherto there has been a tendency to base theories on a small number of basic cultural words rather than, as has been implied here, on a larger number of root morphemes“ (5).

Weswegen sah sich nun der Autor zu dieser Neuauflage einer Arbeit ge-