

de Gruyter Textbook

Michael Meier-Brügger

Indo-European Linguistics

In cooperation with Matthias Fritz and Manfred Mayrhofer

Translated by Charles Gertmenian



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York
2003

Michael Meier-Brügger holds the Chair in Comparative and Indo-European Linguistics at the Free University of Berlin, Germany.

Matthias Fritz is Research Fellow in the Department of Comparative and Indo-European Linguistics at the Free University of Berlin, Germany.

Manfred Mayrhofer is Emeritus Professor of Comparative and Indo-European Linguistics at the University of Vienna, Austria.

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

ISBN 3-11-017433-2

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <<http://dnb.ddb.de>>.

© Copyright 2003 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Cover design: Hansbernd Lindemann, Berlin

Printing and Binding: WB-Druck, Rieden am Forggensee

Printed in Germany

Contents

| | |
|---|-------|
| Contents..... | V |
| Preface to the Seventh German Edition (2000) | IX |
| Preface to the Eighth German Edition (2002) | XIII |
| Preface to the English Translation of the Eighth German Edition..... | XV |
| | |
| Terminology, Symbols, Abbreviations | XVII |
| 1. Terminology | XVII |
| 2. Symbols, Writing Conventions, Citing Conventions | XVIII |
| 3. Abbreviations | XXI |
| | |
| I. Introduction..... | 1 |
| A. The Field and its Study..... | 1 |
| B. Indo-European Linguistics in the Age of the PC and the Internet | 6 |
| C. A Word on the History of Indo-European Linguistics | 9 |
| D. Overview of the Indo-European Languages and their Sources | 17 |
| 1. General Information..... | 17 |
| 2. The Individual IE Language Families and their Sources..... | 18 |
| E. The Reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European..... | 41 |
| 1. Examples of Reconstruction | 41 |
| 2. Fundamentals of Reconstruction | 56 |
| 3. The Time, Place, and Culture of the Proto-Indo-Europeans | 63 |
| | |
| II. Proto-Indo-European Phonology | 71 |
| A. General Information..... | 71 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| B. Proto-Indo-European Vowels..... | 75 |
| 1. Vowels..... | 75 |
| 2. Semivowels..... | 85 |
| 3. Diphthongs..... | 91 |
| C. Proto-Indo-European Consonants..... | 96 |
| 1. Liquids and Nasals..... | 96 |
| 2. Continuants s (and þ?)..... | 102 |
| 3. Laryngeals..... | 106 |
| 4. Occlusives..... | 124 |
| 5. Dentals..... | 126 |
| 6. Labials..... | 128 |
| 7. Tectals..... | 129 |
| 8. Assimilations and Dissimilations..... | 136 |
| D. Larger Phonetic Unities..... | 140 |
| 1. Word, Sentence, Text..... | 140 |
| 2. Accent; Word-initial, Word-final and Sandhi Phenomena..... | 141 |
| 3. Syllable..... | 142 |
| 4. Ablaut..... | 144 |
| 5. Accent..... | 152 |
| | |
| III. Proto-Indo-European Morphology..... | 159 |
| A. General Information..... | 159 |
| B. Verbs..... | 163 |
| 1. General Information..... | 163 |
| 2. Verbal Stem Formation..... | 164 |
| 3. The Verb Ending..... | 178 |
| 4. The Augment..... | 182 |
| 5. Verbal Accent..... | 183 |
| 6. Infinitive Verb Forms..... | 184 |
| 7. Paraphrastic Constructions..... | 186 |
| C. Nouns and Adjectives..... | 187 |
| 1. General Information..... | 187 |
| 2. Nominal Stem Formation..... | 193 |
| 3. Nominal Endings..... | 195 |
| 4. Inflection Paradigms and their Ablaut Classes..... | 201 |
| 5. Formal Characteristics of the Adjective..... | 218 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| D. Pronouns | 224 |
| 1. General Information..... | 224 |
| 2. Personal and Possessive Pronouns | 225 |
| 3. Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns | 227 |
| 4. Relatives, Demonstratives, and Pronominals | 228 |
| 5. Correlative Pronouns..... | 231 |
| E. Numerals..... | 231 |
| 1. General Information..... | 231 |
| 2. Cardinal Numbers..... | 232 |
| 3. Ordinal Numbers | 236 |
| 4. Numerical Adverbs..... | 236 |
| | |
| IV. Proto-Indo-European Syntax, prepared by M. Fritz..... | 238 |
| A. General Information | 238 |
| B. Sentence Syntax..... | 242 |
| 1. General Information..... | 242 |
| 2. Parataxis and Hypotaxis..... | 244 |
| 3. Verbal and Nominal Phrases | 247 |
| C. Verbal Morphosyntax..... | 251 |
| 1. General Information..... | 251 |
| 2. Person and Number | 251 |
| 3. Tense-Aspect and Mood..... | 252 |
| 4. Diathesis..... | 259 |
| D. Nominal Morphosyntax..... | 261 |
| 1. Nominal Properties..... | 261 |
| a) Case | 261 |
| b) Number..... | 274 |
| c) Gender | 275 |
| | |
| V. The Proto-Indo-European Lexicon | 277 |
| A. General Information | 277 |
| B. Word Formation..... | 280 |
| 1. General Information..... | 280 |
| 2. Word Formation Using Suffixes; Suffix Systems | 281 |
| 3. Word Formation by Composition..... | 291 |

C. The Lexicon of Names294

- 1. General Information.....294
- 2. Names of Persons and Deities.....295
- 3. Formation of Place Names.....298

VI. Bibliography and Key to Reference Citations.....301

VII. Index374

Preface to the Seventh German Edition (2000)

The field of Indo-European linguistics has been represented in the Sammlung Götschen (SG)¹ for a long time. Rudolf Meringer, author of the first treatise, was a professor at the University of Vienna at the time of the first edition and at the University of Graz at the time of the third. The first edition² comprised the following parts: Section 1, “The Science of Language and its Developments”; Section 2, “The Indo-European Languages”; Section 3, “The Proto-Indo-European Language” (with accentuation, phonology and morphology); and Section 4, “Culture and Geographical Origin of the Indo-Europeans.” Pages 1 through 66 were printed in Fraktur. The second edition,³ was not altered. For the third revised edition,⁴ in the second main section, a subsection *n* on rules of pronunciation was added and the fourth chapter evolved into one of the main sections. Further, a section on abbreviations was added to the end.

Soon after the Second World War, Hans Krahe was engaged as a new author at the publishing house. He had been a professor at the University of Würzburg at the time of the publication of his first edition; at the time of the publication of the second edition, he was a professor in Heidelberg. Since the publication of his third edition, he has been at the University of Tübingen. The first Krahe edition⁵ includes: Part 1, “The Indo-European Language Group”; Part 2, “Phonetics”; and Part 3, “Morphology.” The second edition⁶ was unchanged. The third edition was revised in two volumes. The first of these, *Introduction and Phonology*,⁷ includes: Part 1, “General Information” and Part 2, “Phonology.” The second volume⁸ treats *Morphology*. The fourth edition was a revision of these volumes:

¹ First located in Leipzig, then in Berlin.

² 1897 (SG 59) 136 pages.

³ 1899 (SG 59) 136 pages.

⁴ 1903 (SG 59) 151 pages.

⁵ 1945 (SG 59) 134 pages.

⁶ 1948 (SG 59) 134 pages.

⁷ 1958 (SG 59) 106 pages.

⁸ 1959 (SG 64) 100 pages.

Volume I. *Introduction and Phonology*,⁹ Volume II. *Morphology*.¹⁰ The two volumes of the fifth edition (1966 and 1969) were unchanged. In its sixth edition the work remained unchanged, though issued in a single volume¹¹.

Krahe's volume is now more than fifty years old. Although the sixth edition has the external appearance of a new volume of the *Sammlung Götschen*, the content remains a child of the third edition of the 1960s. Typical of the state of research at that time is Krahe's comment on laryngeals (vol. I p. 101): "A number of Indo-European scholars have recently represented the so-called laryngeal theory, according to which, in addition to the phonemes included here, the basic Indo-European language included certain laryngeals (glottals and schwas), which are not taken into account in this short work. The author is of the opinion that in a work that is primarily conceived for students and as an introduction to a field, only the most proven research should be presented. The laryngeal theory has been affirmed neither in its methodology nor in its technique." The last sentence is decidedly incorrect: The common expression 'laryngeal theory' is historically conditioned and can be misleading, but this should not lend credence to the idea that the laryngeals are only vague and theoretical. Today laryngeals are part of the attested body of phonemes of the Indo-European language.¹² One often finds in Krahe's book information and reconstructions, about which we either know more, or have acquired more adequate insights today.

In the middle of the 1980s, the publisher retained Heiner Eichner and Manfred Mayrhofer to write a new *Indo-European Linguistics* for the *Götschen* series. By 1985 Dr. Mayrhofer had written the section on phonology; Dr. Eichner was to provide the introduction and the section on morphology. A 1988 publication date was announced, but the volume was never published. A number of difficulties hindered publication, particularly on the side of Dr. Eichner. Dr. Eichner and his manuscript, which in the meantime had grown, were faced with space and time constraints, including that difficulty, known to every author, of putting one's own name on something less than completely perfect, which hindered him finally, from bringing the project to completion.

⁹ 1962 (SG 59) 110 pages.

¹⁰ 1963 (SG 64) 100 pages.

¹¹ 1985 (SG 2227).

¹² see below L 314 ff.

In December 1993, the publisher offered to me the role of Dr. Eichner. After exchanges with all concerned parties, a contract was signed with February 1996 as the agreed upon date of completion. The offer of a position to me at the Freie University in Berlin rendered the bold timeframe impossible. The change from Hamburg to Berlin brought everything with it except the necessary leisure to produce a manuscript. I am grateful to Brigitte Schöning, who, while showing kind understanding of my time constraints, was able to make sure the actual deadline of the publisher was met. Although I would like very much to have expanded and embellished my manuscript, I must now give it up to those who will publish it.

By fall 1998 I had covered only half the intended material but was informed that I had considerably exceeded the page allowance for one Göschen volume. Thus, a currently expanding series, the “de Gruyter Studienbücher,” was attractive. They offer greater spatial freedom. Further, they do not demand a particular format of proof. Hence, the manuscript, prepared with the help of Microsoft Word 7.0 for Windows 95, can be used directly for publication. No more galleys. On the part of the publisher, Ingeborg Klak took care that the typography does not come off too old-fashioned.

While Dr. Mayrhofer and Dr. Eichner, following the precedent set by Krahe, intended on only covering phonology and morphology, now syntax and vocabulary are receiving the recognition they deserve.

The explanations in the section on morphology are based on the text written by M. Mayrhofer in 1985, as Dr. Mayrhofer had given me complete freedom to determine the arrangement and the organization of the definitive version. I take sole responsibility for the present version of the section on phonology. Happily, I was able to have Matthias Fritz write the section on syntax. Further, he contributed to the part of the introduction on the history of Indo-European linguistics as well as the overview of Indo-European languages and their sources.

M. Fritz, M. Mayrhofer, Elisabeth Rieken, Bernfried Schlerath and Antje Schwinger read individual excerpts with a critical eye and shared their criticisms with me. Veronika Rittner and Thorsteinn Hjaltonson reviewed individual texts electronically. Mr. Hjaltonson and Ms. Schwinger helped me with certain data processing problems, Mr. Hjaltonson especially with the creation of particular symbols, and Ms. Schwinger with the layout. A sincere thanks to you all!

As is appropriate for a volume in the *Sammlung Götschen* and a “de Gruyter Studienbuch,” the book should offer an introduction to Indo-European linguistics. The textbook should provide an informative and comprehensive treatment of the issues and areas of focus from a contemporary perspective. I allow myself a special style in presenting both information on the field in general and on the course of study in the introduction. In the main text, on the other hand, I present inconclusive material in a usable way, to encourage possibilities of more in-depth study. The treatment proceeds according to good science and good conscience. Completeness is nowhere attempted. To keep this in the reader’s mind, the chapter titles begin often with “on.” Most of the examples in the sections morphology, syntax and vocabulary come from Latin, Ancient Greek and Indian (Indo-Aryan). In the section on phonology, the examples are intentionally more numerous and are taken from the entire realm of Indo-European languages, which include Hittite, Germanic and Slavic, in addition to the above-mentioned three. The index appended at the end should give support to the reader and facilitate his or her access to information. The state of research reflected in the text is that of September 1999. Last additions will be inserted after this deadline just before the definitive layout is made in December.

The current textbook is not without competition. Still good is Rix’s *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen* (1976). Starting from Greek, Rix presents pertinent information on all aspects of Proto-Indo-European phonology and morphology. But the treatment is done without any reference to discussion in the field. Recent works worthy of mention are Szemerényi, *Einführung*, fourth edition (1990), Beekes, *Introduction*, (1995), Schmitt-Brandt, *Indogermanistik*, (1998) and in a certain sense also Meiser, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, (1998) (compare pp. 27-46, the chapter “Grundzüge der urindogermanischen Grammatik”). All four titles have strengths and weaknesses, and so shall it be with mine. The comprehensive bibliographical information in Szemerényi is a treasure trove, but the skepticism regarding laryngeals is bothersome. Beekes’ book is illustrative and very readable, but in phonology and morphology he leans too much on views shared only by himself and F. Kortlandt. Schmitt-Brandt’s work is in a praiseworthy fashion aimed at beginners and concentrates especially in morphology on a broad argumentation that encourages creativity. However, his book cannot be recommended because he leads the reader into unsignaled idiosyncrasies that stray from the *communis opinio*. Meiser, like Rix, treats only phonol-

ogy and morphology. He grounds himself competently, but of necessity briefly (too briefly), on the realities of the Proto-Indo-European language. I should not speak of typographical errors. He who sits in a glass house is well advised to throw no stones.

I am thankful for any feedback and request that it be sent to the *Seminar für Vergleichende und Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft* at the Freie University in Berlin (FU), Fabeckstraße 7, D-14195 Berlin-Dahlem. Tel.: 030-838-55028; Fax: 030-838-54207; e-mail: drmeier@zedat.fu-berlin.de; internet site: <http://www.fu-berlin.de/indogermanistik>.

I dare try to create a rubric on our web site: “De Gruyter Studienbuch Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft: Addenda and Corrigenda.” I’ve resolved, starting with the appearance of the book, on the first weekday of each month, to note addenda and corrigenda as I learn about them.

Berlin-Dahlem, September 15, 1999

Michael Meier-Brügger

Preface to the Eighth German Edition (2002)

The occasion to publish the present eighth edition presented itself unexpectedly soon after the publication of the seventh edition.

I know that I am joined by M. Fritz and M. Mayrhofer in my gratitude for the responses of goodwill and for the positive reception of the previous edition, which appeared in March 2000. We are pleased that the text has found its place as an introduction to the current status of Indo-European linguistic research. It is encouraging that this text and E. Tichy’s depiction of fundamentals of Indo-European linguistics (Bremen 2001) complement each other wonderfully without any prior arrangement having taken place. E. Tichy sketches a concise treatment of the main characteristics, while the

present text fills them out with details. I can easily imagine that the interested reader would first consult Tichy's treatment, and then, given the page references from that text, would reach for the present text.

Happily, the requested feedback was furnished with intensity. On the other hand, my planned internet rubric, "Addenda and Corrigenda" did not come to be. Among the reasons for this are juridical problems that prevent one from presenting special characters that were created at the Seminar on the Internet. Other reasons include the ever-growing burden of tasks in teaching and administration: Constant reductions and transformations due the scarcity of public funds claim most of our energies.

I am happy about the positive feedback and thankful for having been sent entire lists of comments, inquiries, and tips about typographical errors and unclear points. The lists complemented each other wonderfully: Each person sees something different; no one sees everything. Imperfections, and the corresponding need for correction, were found mostly where generally accepted opinion does not apply: Hence, in the assessment of the role of the laryngeal *h*₃ in the Hittite language (see below L 334), or in the evaluation of the stative diathesis and its connection to perfect and medium diatheses (see below F 211), or in the case of genders, where one must likely draw the conclusion that the formation of three-way masculine/feminine/neuter took place only after the splitting off of Anatolian, thus in a phase that followed the phase of the original Indo-European language (see below F303), or in the earlier common assessment of the IE **g^wou-* 'steer' as an hysterodynamically declined noun. In contrast to this representation, **g^wóu-* must be categorized as primarily acrostatic with a strong stem **g^wóu-* and a weak stem **g^wéu-*. The adjustment to amphodynamically declined root nouns such as IE **d̥ieu-* 'sky, god of the sky, day' with the strong stem **d̥iéu-* and the weak stem **diu-* is secondary. The strong nominative singular **g^wóu-s* remains, but the weak genitive singular **g^wéu-s* is replaced by the new weak genitive singular **g^wou-és* (see below F 318 § 6). The eighth edition introduces modified content in such cases. The numbering of paragraphs from the seventh edition was conserved whenever possible. What I could not yet accomplish in the eighth edition includes the addition of a complete index of vocabulary, and the expansion of the rather brief treatment of vocabulary.

Altogether, as many as possible of the typographical errors and oversights were corrected. Imperfections were either eliminated, or at least clearly marked as such. As a result of such work, an eighth edition appeared which I can stand by with a good conscience. The responsibility

for all remaining mistakes lies with me. M. Fritz kindly agreed to correct the work, and thus took responsibility for the section on syntax.

My particular thanks for criticism goes to: Augustinus Bal (Amsterdam), Irene Balles (Jena), Wolfgang Beck (Würzburg), Joachim Becker (Göttingen), Martin Braun (Vienna), Emilio Crespo (Madrid), Roberto Gusmani (Udine), Heinrich Hettrich (Würzburg), Katharina Kupfer (Freiburg), Christoph Landolt (Zürich), Gyula Mayer (Budapest), H. Craig Melchert (Chapell Hill), Peter-Arnold Mumm (Munich), Sergio Neri (Salzburg), Oswald Panagl (Salzburg), Bernfried Schlerath (Berlin), Diether Schürr (Gründau) and Stefan Schumacher (Halle and Freiburg). Klaus-Jürgen Grundner help with the corrections on this edition as well as with the seventh. Ms. Susanne Rade supported me kindly on the part of the publisher and guided me, such that the eighth edition could appear in the winter semester of 2002.

The addresses are the same as on page XIII.

Berlin-Dahlem, September 15, 2001

Michael Meier-Brügger

Preface to the English Translation of the Eighth German Edition

In recent years, the English language has attained a position similar to that enjoyed by Latin in the Middle Ages. While Indo-European linguistics has traditionally had a strong basis in the German-speaking world, the field is happily becoming ever more internationally and intercontinentally oriented. It is thus not surprising that I have received several inquiries regarding the possibility of an English translation of the original German-language edition.

But where could one find a suitable translator? Good fortune played a role: Charles Gertmenian attended my introductory course in the winter semester of 2000-2001. In the course of conversation, the idea arose of translating the textbook, then in its seventh edition, into English, thus making it accessible to a larger public. The 1000 copies of the seventh edition were sold quickly and the eighth edition sold equally well. Such success encouraged the publisher to give his support: H. Hartmann gave the green light following a publishing industry gathering in late autumn 2001. Mr. Gertmenian wrestled with the work for two years. The work was time-consuming and thorny; the difficulties of rendering scientifically formulated subtleties while retaining both precision and readability are well-known. Mr. Gertmenian solved the problem wonderfully. Reading his propositions I took the opportunity to reformulate some facts being presented in the German version in a too dense manner. It only remains for my co-authors M. Fritz and M. Mayrhofer, as well as myself, to express gratitude for the successful translation. A particular thanks for addenda and corrigenda concerning the eighth edition goes once more to Augustinus Bal (Amsterdam).

Indo-European linguistics is a science that is wonderfully alive. The eighth edition reflects the status of research as of summer 2001. In the two years that have since gone by, important new books and essays have appeared, of which I wish to mention: *The Luwians*, ed. by H. Craig Melchert, Leiden 2003; H. Rix, *Sabellische Texte*, Heidelberg 2002; J. H. Jasanoff, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*, Oxford 2003; *Indogermanische Syntax, - Fragen und Perspektiven -*, ed. by H. Hettrich, Wiesbaden 2002.

For practical reasons, we have agreed to abide by the text of the eighth edition. By the same measure, I shall make good on the promise made in the seventh edition by offering addenda and corrigenda concerning the various sections and paragraphs on our web site (<http://www.fu-berlin.de/indogermanistik>) on a regular basis. The first installment will be posted February 1, 2004. Existing reviews of the seventh and eighth editions shall then receive their due, including that of Ch. de Lamberterie in BSL 97/2 2002, p. 103-114. Feedback is welcome. The addresses are still the same as on page XIII.

Berlin-Dahlem, September 15, 2003

Michael Meier-Brügger

Terminology, Symbols, Abbreviations

1. Terminology

The terminology used in this textbook is without extravagances. It is that customary of textbooks in Indo-European linguistics. In individual cases more will be added on the subject, for example in the case of terms ablaut and declension patterns of the nouns (see below F 315 §3-4).

The Index at the back of the book provides an additional orientation, referring to relevant paragraphs and helpful literature. If a question should remain unanswered, for example in the domain of general linguistics, which is not further handled here, competent, informative reference works offering advice are available: → Bussmann *Lexikon d. Sprachw.* 2d ed. 1990; Lewandowski *Linguist. Wörterbuch* 1-3 1994; Metzler *Lexikon Sprache* 2000. In special terminological particularities in Indo-European phonetics, consult the glossary of Mayrhofer *Lautehre* 1986 p. 182-185. For terminological particularities in the system of Forms of the Proto-Indo-European verb, consult the foreword of LIV 1998 = *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben* 1998 p. 1ff. For questions about the formation of nouns, vocabulary and its problems, see the introduction to terminology in Kluge / Seebold 1995 p. XIVff. Further, the index of the *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, see below in the bibliography under the entry HS = *Historische Sprachforschung*. Last tip: → *Duden Grammatik* 1995 p. 828 ff. (Index of technical terms).

The terminology originates essentially from the Greeks. Theoretical-linguistic examination dates back to at least the 5th century B.C. The Grammar of Dionysius Thrax offers a good insight into the status of grammatical research in the hellenistic period: → Dionysios Thrax *Grammatik*. In the course of the 2nd century B.C. Roman intellectuals took up the Greek terminology and more or less latinised it: → Wackernagel *Vorlesungen* I 1926 p. 13ff.

The motives for naming terms are often for us Moderns at first glance no longer clear, for example the Greek term πτώσις, which as Latin *cāsus* and German *Fall* remains in use even today. The starting point for this

terminus technicus is probably the idea that each noun in its nominative form is like a pin in a vertical, straight position (hence *casus rectus*). The uses as accusative, genitive, etc. differ from the ‘straight’ position, and are thus not straight (= *casus obliquus*) and can be described in the comparison as variously slanted positions (πτῶσις) of the pin: → Wackernagel *Vorlesungen* I 1926 p. 15. In another tradition, the image of a die (“knuckle”) serves as a basis instead of a pin: → F. Murru in MSS 39 1980 p. 73ff. As a further example, compare the various terms Greek οὐδέτερον, Latin *neutrum*, German: *sächliches Geschlecht*. Behind these terms, one does not primarily find the idea of ‘neither, nor’, (neither masculine, nor feminine gender), but rather the idea of a third independent natural gender, in addition to masculine and feminine; a “male-female” gender: → K. Strunk “*Neutrum: zum antiken Benennungsmotiv eines grammatischen Terminus*” in *FS Untermann* Innsbruck 1993 p. 455ff.

One must always keep in mind the history of individual specialized terms in linguistics. All newer assessments are based as a rule on the so-called traditional grammar, which received its first systems through analysis of the classical Latin. But the application of traditional grammar in languages other than Latin is not without problems: → Bussmann *Lexikon d. Sprachw.* 2nd ed. 1990 p. 798f. Further, one must not overlook that in modern linguistics one and the same term may be used variously according to different theories: → Lewandowski *Linguist. Wörterbuch* 3 1994 under the heading ‘*Terminus*’.

2. Symbols, Writing Conventions, Quotations

a. Symbols

As a rule, the symbols used here speak for themselves. The meanings of the cover-symbols are not, however evident:

H = any particular laryngeal (h_1 , h_2 and h_3 stand for real laryngeals), see below, L 314

K = any particular consonant (d , d^h , t etc. stand, in contrast, for real consonants.)

R = any particular sonant (l , r etc. stand, in contrast, for real sonants)

V = any particular vowel (e , o etc. stand, in contrast, for real vowels)

\tilde{a} = long or short vowel a , etc.

= Beginning or end of a word
= Beginning or end of a sentence

**mon-uo-*, **k^wi-* etc. = - marks morphological segmenting
**mon.uo-*, **ra.í-* etc. = . marks syllabic segmenting

∅ or z = zero-step, - suffix, -ending
◦ = weak vowel, see below L 203
W = root
S = suffix
E = ending
W(*e*) = -*e*- full grade of the root
W(*ē*) = -*ē*- lengthened grade of the root
W(*o*) = -*o*- full grade of the root
W(*ō*) = -*ō*- lengthened grade of the root
W(∅) = zero grade of the root
W(◦) = reduced grade of the root with weak vowel, see L 203

accordingly:

S(*e*) = -*e*-full grade of the suffix, etc.
E(*e*) = -*e*-full grade of the ending, etc.

* = A purely reconstructed form, without an attestation (if known, the probable time of the reconstruction will be given with terms such as Proto-Germanic, Proto-Indo-European, and pre-Proto-Indo-European)

< = derived phonetically from
> = developed phonetically into
= = corresponds to, see below E 507 § 5
⇒ = is replaced by
+ for example Hom. + = Homer and later
→ The arrow refers to helpful literature (the key to reference citations is given below in section VI).

/a/ Forward slashes refer to the corresponding phonological value
[ŋ] Brackets refer to the corresponding phonetical value.
<z> Pointed brackets indicate graphemes

b. Writing conventions

1) For notation of Indo-European, see below L 100f.

2) In the cases of individual Indo-European languages, the accepted modes of writing are respected. I would like to call attention to a couple of details:

Latin <*c*> is always to be taken as /*k*/, and <*qu*> in contrast, as /*k^w*/, without regard for whether it represents /*k_u*/ or comes from /*k^w*/, see below E 506 § 3. Please note as well that a word, such as <*maius*> should be read as /*ma_ii_us*/ and a <*conicio*> as /*kon-_ii_ki_o*/: → Leumann LLFL 1977 p. 127f.

In the examples from Mycenaean Greek, the instance of a word is given as a rule first, just as it is represented in Mycenaean Greek Linear-B. The probable phonological interpretation is then given equally in Latin script, but not in Greek script. (Graphemically indicated phonetic transitional sounds are taken into account as well, and often a modern morphological segmenting follows.) Compare *i-je-ro-wo-ko* i.e. *hi_iero-u_orgos* ‘priest’. For the sake of simplicity, the symbols < > and // are not written here. — Where an aspiration is probable, it is marked with an *h*, such as in the preceding example. — In the interpretation of the *z*-series, either a *k^j*, a *g^j*, a *t^j* or a *d^j* will be inserted according to etymological origin, for example: *to-pe-za* i.e. *torped_ia* ‘table’ < **(k^w)tr-ped-_ia* ‘(thing) having four-legs’. — The sources of quoted forms are not cited, but they can easily be found in Aura Jorro *DMic.* I 1985 II 1993. — Examples from Greek dialects are represented without accents.

The model for Ancient Indian (Vedic) is Mayrhofer *EWAia*. As is common practice in IE linguistics, Vedic and Old Indian nominal forms are cited as a rule as stems without an ending (thus, for example, the Vedic *ávi-* ‘sheep’). Older manuals often cite the nominative singular in the sandhi form with *-h* (so-called Visarga), cf. a reference such as Latin *ovis* ‘sheep’ = Vedic *ávi_h*. For more information see below L 309 § 3. — The cited form for Vedic and Old Indian is the third person singular (see *bhárati* ‘carries’), also on the subject the full grade verbal root (e.g. Vedic *bhar-* ‘carry’). Accents are used in finite verb forms only when they are textually attestable.

In the case of Avestan, I follow the example of → Hoffmann / Forssman *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre* 1996.

In Anatolian (Hittite) *ḫ* should be written in transliteration from cuneiform as well as in the transcription, but *š* should be written in the transliteration, and not in the case of the transcription, compare, for example,

pa-aḥ-ḥu-e-na-aš i.e. *paḥḥuenas*. The *z* that was introduced in the transliteration is given as *ř*. Further, apparently stressed syllable marks such as *ták* in *ták-na-a-aš* do not refer to the place of the accent. In accordance with the conventions of Ancient Oriental Studies, the mark *á* is merely suggests that in addition to the usual form *tak* (= *tak* number one) a second form of symbol (= *tak* number two) is in use.

On Gothic: → Binnig *Gotisch* 1999.

c. Citing Conventions

Note that methods of citing are not handled in the same way in all ancient Indo-European languages, compare for example the verbal forms of Latin and Greek, in which the first person singular is cited, whereas in Vedic the third person singular is the traditionally cited form.

In Mayrhofer KEWA, the verb forms are listed according to the third person singular form, whereas in Mayrhofer EWAia they are indexed by their full-grade verbal roots, compare KEWA p. III 562f. the entry *svárati* ‘gives off a sound, sounds, sings’, with EWAia II p. 792f., the corresponding entry under *SVAR* ‘giving off a sound, sounding, singing’. The citing convention of nouns as well varies from the KEWA to the EWAia, compare in the KEWA *svargáh*, while the EWAia lists *svargá-*.

3. Abbreviations

Certain of the most common abbreviations have been omitted from the following list. As a rule, the abbreviations that are used are long established or clear in their context.

N.B.: Abbreviations of periodicals are found in the bibliography.

| | | | |
|-------|-----------------|--------|------------------|
| § | paragraph | Arm. | Armenian |
| abl. | ablative | AV | Atharva Veda |
| acc. | accusative | Avest. | Avestan |
| act. | active voice | col. | column |
| adj. | adjective | coll. | collective |
| ad l. | <i>ad locum</i> | dat. | dative |
| adv. | adverb | encl. | enclitic |
| aor. | aorist | etc. | <i>et cetera</i> |

| | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| ex. gr. | <i>exempli gratia</i> | OHG | Old High German |
| f. | (genus) feminine | OHitt. | Old Hittite |
| FS | Festschrift | OL | Old Latin |
| fut. | future | ON | Old Norse |
| gen. | genitive | OPers. | Old Persian |
| Gr. | Greek | opt. | optative |
| GS | <i>Gedenkschrift</i> | OSax. | Old Saxon |
| <i>H</i> | laryngeal, see L 314 | p. | page |
| Hell. | Hellenistic | pass. | passive |
| Hitt. | Hittite | perf. | perfect |
| Hom. | Homeric | pers. | person |
| ibid. | <i>ibidem</i> | pl. | plural |
| i.e. | <i>id est</i> | plpf. | pluperfect |
| ind. | indicative | poss. | possessive |
| inf. | infinitive | pres. | present |
| inj. | injunctive | pron. | pronoun |
| instr. | instrumental | PY | Pylos |
| intr. | intransitive | <i>R</i> | sonant |
| <i>K</i> | consonant | refl. | reflexive |
| KN | Knossos | RV | Rgveda |
| KS | <i>Kleine Schriften</i> | ŚB | Śatapatha Brahmana |
| Lat. | Latin | sc. | <i>scilicet</i> |
| LAv. | Later (Younger) Avestan | sg. | singular |
| Lith. | Lithuanian | str. | strong |
| loc. | locative | subj. | subjunctive |
| m. | (genus) masculine | subst. | substantive |
| MHG | Middle High German | <i>s. v.</i> | <i>sub voce</i> |
| mid. | middle voice | TB | Taittiriya Brahmana |
| Myc. | Mycenean | TS | Taittiriya Samhita |
| n. | (genus) neutral | TH | Thebes |
| N.B. | <i>nota bene</i> | them. | thematic |
| NHG | New High German | Toch. | Tocharian |
| nom. | nominative | tr. | transitive |
| OAv. | Old Avestan | <i>V</i> | vowel |
| OCS | Old Church Slavic | vs. | <i>versus</i> |
| OE | Old English | w. | weak |

I. Introduction

A. The Field and its Study

E 100. The field of Indo-European linguistics is established at German-speaking universities under various names, for example *Indogermanistik* (Friedrich-Schiller-Universität, Jena), *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft* (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich), *Indogermanische and Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg im Breisgau), *Allgemeine and Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft* (Georg-August-Universität, Göttingen), *Historisch-Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* (Universität zu Köln), *Historisch-vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft/Indogermanistik* (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin), *Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* (Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg), *Vergleichende Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft* (Universität Zürich), and *Vergleichende and Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft* (Freie Universität, Berlin).

Among the programs offered in the English-speaking world are: *Historical linguistics and Indo-European* (Harvard University), *Comparative Philology* (Oxford University). The French-speaking realm includes: *Linguistique comparative* (Lausanne), *Grammaire comparée* (Paris, École Pratique des Hautes Études IV^e Section), *Étude comparative des langues indo-européennes* and *Méthode comparative en linguistique historique* (thus Antoine Meillet in his publications, see the bibliography).

The web site, → <http://www.fu-berlin.de/indogermanistik>, prepared by our institute at the Freie Universität in Berlin, offers a continually updated list of internet links to departments and institutes in Europe and North America. The site features information on all areas of the field.

One must be aware that the structure of curricula, establishment, and interrelationship of Indo-European linguistics with other fields in the Romance language-speaking countries Italy, France, and Spain differ greatly from corresponding aspects in Germany, Austria, and German-speaking

Switzerland. Within the German-speaking realm there are also fine differences that can have to do with local tradition or teachers. In its information on curricula in Indo-European linguistics, the following account concentrates on the situation in Germany. Additionally, the local circumstances in Berlin may occasionally shine through.

The field of Indo-European linguistics is represented at every major university. The “*Indogermanische Gesellschaft*” represents the interests of the field as a professional association, see below E 201 § 2. It organizes a conference every four years, see the bibliography under the heading ‘*Fachtagung*.’ In addition, there are individual colloquia, see the bibliography under the heading ‘*Kolloquium*.’

E 101. There is a whole series of positions taken regarding the nature and aim of Indo-European linguistics: → Arbeitsausschuß der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft in *Kratylos* 13 1968 p. 222f. (= *Linguistische Berichte* 9 1970 p. 78-80); Szemerényi *Einführung* 1990 p. 32-36; R. Lühr *Indogermanistik am Wendepunkt? “Thesen zur zukunftsorientierten Ausrichtung einer Disziplin”* in the *Gießener Universitätsblätter* 25 1992 p. 77-90; G. Neumann “*Zur Interdisziplinarität der Geisteswissenschaften. Ein Beispiel: Die Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*” in the *Gießener Universitätsblätter* 29 1996 p. 61-67; G. E. Dunkel “*Zürcher Indogermanistik zwischen Vergangenheit and Zukunft*” in the *Informationsblatt der Universität Zürich* 6 1990 p. 10-12.

In this context it is further worth taking a look at the definitions of the field that appear in increasing numbers on the web sites of departments and institutes for Indo-European linguistics. Examples from Cologne, Munich and Würzburg are printed here as examples. As of March 1999 they were obtainable under their corresponding addresses and are still worth reading today. As is characteristic and typical of today’s fast-moving world, the texts from 1999 are, as a rule, no longer the same as texts of 2001. I encourage the interested reader to visit these web sites and consult the most current information.

E 102. The *Institut für Sprachwissenschaft* at the Universität zu Köln (→ Link on our web site [see above E 100] see the heading for Indo-European linguistics in Europe) offered the following definition in March 1999:

“The focus of historical-comparative linguistics are languages, which through systematic similarities in declension, word formation, syntax,

and vocabulary are recognizable as ‘related.’ The comparison of these languages yields information about the history, pre-history, and origins and development of individual traits of each of them that could otherwise never be obtained. Historical-comparative linguistics concerns itself empirically and theoretically both with processes of linguistic history, such as the splitting of originally unified languages into different descendent languages, and with language-inherent and extra-lingual circumstances for linguistic development. In addition, it investigates what historical linguistic description is capable of saying about cultural transformation. — Historical-comparative linguistics has developed most fully in the area of the so-called Indo-European languages, which include great European and Asian languages of cultural importance (Indian, Iranian, Greek, Slavic, Latin, Germanic and Celtic languages), and since its founding at the beginning of the 19th century it devotes the greater part of its interest to these languages.”

E 103. The web site of the *Institut für Allgemeine and Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft* of the Ludwig-Maximilians Universität in Munich (→ Link on our web site [see above E 100] under the heading Indo-European linguistics in Europe) offered in March 1999 the following description of the field:

“Indo-European linguistics is an empirical-historical, theoretically oriented discipline. The goal of its research is manifold: On the one hand, through comparisons of individual Indo-European languages (particularly their earliest available stages, such as Old High German, Vedic, Hittite), it aims to gain knowledge about language and culture of the common predecessor of these languages, namely of Proto-Indo-European. Meanwhile, the grammatical system of this mother language and its various changes after the moment of splitting off of the individual languages is in the foreground. On the other hand, Indo-European linguistics contributes to the better understanding of historical phenomena in the language and culture of all Indo-European peoples through knowledge of established rules that is acquired in the above-mentioned processes. As a connector of philologies, Indo-European linguistics includes the cultural realms from northern Europe, the Mediterranean of classical antiquity and the ancient and modern Orient, reaching all the way to India and central Asia. The most important language groups, or rather individual languages are Old Indian, and Greek, as well as Old Iranian, Latin, Germanic, Celtic, Slavic, Baltic,

Hittite, Armenian, Tocharian, and Albanian. — In the context of its outlined research objective, the field is additionally concerned with general linguistic problems, such as those of linguistic change and the relationship between historical and typological linguistic comparison. — By its nature, Indo-European linguistics is interdisciplinary, with natural connections with neighboring linguistic, philological, and cultural-historical fields (for example, pre- and early history).”

E 104. On the web site of the *Lehrstuhl für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* of Julius-Maximilians Universität in Würzburg (→ Link on our web site [see above E 100] under the heading Indo-European linguistics in Europe) the field was defined as of March 1999 as the following:

“Comparative Indo-European linguistics is an empirical-historical, theoretically based discipline. It has several research goals: It compares the individual Indo-European languages (particularly their earliest known stages of development, for example, Latin, Ancient Greek, Old Indian, Gothic, Hittite, among others, but also the more recent stages) and gains, through processes of reconstruction, knowledge about grammar and vocabulary of earlier, non-written stages of language, and of the common predecessor of all these languages, Proto-Indo-European. Through the background of comparison furnished by the large number of languages and their diachronic perspectives, comparative linguistics contributes to a deeper understanding of grammar and vocabulary of the individual Indo-European languages. — Thorough research on these languages leads both to knowledge about the cultural background of a given language community (including history, social structure, religion, philosophy, poetry, etc.), to the theoretical study of general linguistic objects (e.g. the structural organization of language systems, phenomena of language development, relationship between genetic and typological language comparison.) — Comparative linguistics is an interdisciplinarily oriented field and is seen as a connecting member between the cultural regions of northern Europe over the Mediterranean and the ancient Orient through India and central Asia.”

E 105. There is nothing more exciting and creative than historical-comparative linguistics. I am not alone in making this assertion.

But first a warning: The way to academic employment in the realm of linguistics is rocky and full of thorns. Whoever sets out to do this can win,

but can also lose. Those who would like a large amount of money in their account ought to choose another route.

The fundamental prerequisite of promising studies in the field is a lively personal interest in languages and speech. A preference for a historical perspective must also be present. In addition to the general maturity expected at the university level, knowledge of Latin and Greek (preferably learned in school) are also important. Where today's school curricula have not provided this option, the necessary knowledge of Latin (to the extent of the so-called *kleines Latinum*) and Greek can be acquired in the first years of university education. Knowledge of English, German, and French is imperative for the reading of literature in the field. Spanish, Italian, and Russian are also helpful.

Latin, Greek, and Vedic are the pillars of Indo-European linguistics, if only because discussion in the field since its beginnings has referred to problems in terms of these languages. Only appropriate language ability allows independent assessment.

Along with the study of the three languages mentioned above, it is recommended that one acquire good knowledge of Anatolian Hittite, as well as an Old Germanic language (such as Gothic, Old High German, or Old Saxon) and Old Church Slavic or Lithuanian.

Nothing can replace the reading of primary texts. It is also a personal gain to read, not just partially and according to immediate need, but really from A to Z, works and essays in Indo-European linguistics that have become classics. I enjoy thinking back to when I read Wackernagel (*Kleine Schriften* I / II 1969 III 1979, and *Vorlesungen* I 1926 II 1928) and Schulze (*Kleine Schriften* and *Nachträge* 2nd ed. 1966) during my own years at university. The texts read like detective novels.

It is worthwhile setting high personal standards and looking around to see how other linguists have become what they are: → *Autobiographische Berichte* 1991 and *Portraits* I / II 1966.

Like every other field, Indo-European linguistics has its unwritten rules of the guild. Thus, it is the duty of each and every researcher to keep new developments "in dialogue" with past research and to pay homage to prior accomplishments through frequent citation. The constantly growing quantity of data that one must master for this purpose is problematic. But the dealings with, and the reverence for what has preceded ought not to block new insights into the future.

E 106. At the time of my own studies (1967-1973), the study of Indo-European linguistics was still very simply structured. One was educated

by attending lectures, lower-level seminars, and upper-level seminars; one engaged in individual reading, wrote papers, and after five or six years, chose a dissertation topic and completed his studies directly after the dissertation with doctoral exams.

Studies of Indo-European linguistics have become ever more reglemented due to dramatic changes in European universities (in view here are particularly the German ones). Today, following as a rule four semesters each of *Grundstudium* and *Hauptstudium*, and a semester of exams, one attains the *Magister* (M.A.) degree. But only the completion of a dissertation allows one to think of a career in Indo-European linguistics. Whoever chooses Indo-European linguistics as an occupation learns for a lifetime.

And new changes continue to threaten courses of study: The latest form of this threat is the introduction of a *Bachelor's degree* (B.A.) after only six semesters. Indo-European linguistics cannot be conveyed with sufficient thoroughness in three years. While the Bachelor candidate can obtain a good Indo-European linguistic education, he still needs at least an M.A. and a dissertation as qualifications in the field.

B. Indo-European Linguistics in the Age of the PC and the Internet

E 200. Indo-European linguistics, like any other science, can no longer make do without computers and the internet. While PCs are indeed variously used, (the palette of uses ranges from those of a simple typewriter, to professional use in the word-processing of texts in a variety of languages), the potential uses of the internet lead to an ever-greater density of information: → *Studia Iranica, Mesopotamica et Anatolica* (i.e. SIMA) 2 / 1996, published by J. Gippert and P. Vavroušek. Prague 1997. Here, one finds the files of the fourth *Internationale Arbeitstagung für Computereinsatz in der Historischen Sprachwissenschaft* 1995 in Vienna, edited by H. Eichner and H. C. Luschützky.

Today, good, practically oriented introductions for PCs and the internet are available. Examples include those of the *Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft*: → H. Schröder, I. Steinhaus *Mit dem PC durchs Studium*.

Darmstadt 2000; D. Kaufmann, P. Tiedemann *Internet für Althistoriker and Altphilologen*. Darmstadt 1999.

E 201. I would like to call attention to three institutions specializing in Indo-European linguistics and the information that they offer. Their web sites include further information and a large variety of links. It should be clear to each user that the information on web sites changes constantly (The information included here is current as of March 1999.) and that many departments and institutes (and I include our department at the Freie University among these) are in the course of creating better, more informative web page.

1) TITUS (*Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien*) Begun by J. Gippert, the goal of this institution, based for the moment in Frankfurt, is to process all linguistic materials that are relevant in questions of Indo-European linguistics into digital form that may easily be analyzed: → <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de>. A constantly growing quantity of data is available under the headings “Actualia,” “Didactica,” “Textus” and “TITUS.” J. Gippert offers an overview in the above-mentioned (E 200) SIMA-volume p. 49-76. He also offers further descriptions of his project as of March 1999 under the heading “TITUS” as *Beschreibung A* (called “TITUS, *Das Projekt eines indogermanistischen Thesaurus in LDV-Forum*” [i.e. *Forum der Gesellschaft für Linguistische Datenverarbeitung*] Band 12 / 1 1995 p. 35-74) and *Beschreibung B* (which refers to “TITUS: *Von der Keilschrift zur Textdatenbank*” in *Frankfurter Forschung* 4 1995 p. 46-56). A more detailed text may be found under the title *Beschreibung C*: C.-M. Bunz “*Der Thesaurus indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien (TITUS) ein Pionierprojekt der EDV in der Historisch-Vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft.*” — J. Gippert describes his comprehensive vision of the future in the Frankfurt research as the following:

“Beyond the archiving of field-specific data, the project, which since the third conference on ‘The use of computers in historical-comparative linguistics’ in Dresden (October 1994) has been led under the succinct name “TITUS” (*Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien*), should be extended increasingly to other areas of linguistic research. A comprehensive bibliographical information system should play a central role, featuring new material in all areas that touch upon the field with a claim to the greatest possible timeliness. The internet will perform a decisive function here as well: The aspired-to timeliness may only be obtained

if the information is not printed, but rather only processed online; and the compilation of individual pieces of information, which an individual institute could scarcely accomplish, should be distributed as quickly as possible to many partners whose common contact is the internet. There already exist firm agreements among colleagues at the universities of Prague, Vienna, Copenhagen, Leyden, Maynooth, among others. (A 'test-run' of the bibliography is was being conducted from Frankfurt at the time of publication.) Under the same prerequisites (participation of as many partners as possible in order to assemble complementary information), a couple of other areas of application of the TITUS project are emerging that should allow it to mature into a comprehensive field-specific information system. Thus, current regular notifications about events in the field (congresses, and conferences, as well as university programs), open positions and offers, projects, research plans, etc. can all be viewed. The assembly of all such information requires, thanks to the internet, only a very small amount of space and time on site. In order to call attention to a conference that will take place at an American university, the address of the invitation text must merely be entered on the given internet page –provided, naturally, that event organizers place their text on the internet.”

2) The *Indogermanische Gesellschaft*, which is momentarily located in Halle (see link on our web site [see above E 100] under the heading, Indo-European linguistics in Europe): Up to date news from the *Indogermanische Gesellschaft* (about, among other things, the nature and goal of Indo-European linguistics and work with media) is offered, as well as addresses and general information. The *Hallisches Institut für Indogermanistik, Allgemeine and Angewandte Sprachwissenschaft* is currently responsible for maintenance of the page.

3) The Institute for Linguistics at the University of Cologne. The rubrics “*Sprachen and Schriften der Welt*,” “*Indogermanisch allgemein*,” “*Antike allgemein*” among others, and the links to individual Indo-European languages are available through the thankfully provided thematically organized links. There is a link to the University of Cologne on our web site (see above E 100 under the heading Indo-European linguistics in Europe).

C. A Word on the History of Indo-European Linguistics

E 300. It is not at all uninteresting to look up the entries under the heading ‘Indo-European linguistics’ in a general encyclopedia.

1) The *große Knauer* (Munich / Zürich 1967) offers an astonishingly competent treatment, which is given below without changes (the citations in this paragraph [→] refer to the encyclopedia; information about particular researchers is provided in the index of this volume):

“Indo-European linguistics, a science that explores the Indo-European languages. Following the recognition, already in the 18th century, by W. Jones (1786) of the relatedness of Sanskrit to European languages, R. Rask (1814), F. Bopp (1816), and J. Grimm (1819) founded Indo-European linguistics. Rask and particularly Grimm (*Deutsche Grammatik*, 1819 ff.) researched the historical stages of the Germanic languages (see Consonant shift) in an exemplary manner. Whereas Bopp (*Vergleichende Grammatik* 1833ff.) analyzed and compared forms, A.F. Pott provided underpinning →etymology (*Etymologische Forschungen*, 1833-36) through exact comparisons of phonetic equivalences. Working with fixed rules of phonetic development, the first to try to attain an original Indo-European language was A. Schleicher (*Compendium der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 1861/62); he was also the first to bring Slavic and particularly Lithuanian into consideration. Researchers next tried to define methods and phonetic rules more clearly: 1863 H. G. Grassmann’s Law (dissimilation of aspirates), 1877 K. Verner’s Law (→Grammatical change), 1876-78 *Ausnahmslosigkeit der Lautgesetze* (A. Leskien, H. Osthoff and F. K. Brugmann; →Neogrammarians). Amelung, Brugmann, H. Collitz, F. de Saussure, J. Schmidt resolved the problem of the Indo-European ‘a’ (European *a, e, o*); G. I. Ascoli discovered the two Indo-European guttural series; Brugmann (*Nasalis sonans in der indogermanischen Grundsprache*, 1876), the syllabic *m* and *n*; de Saussure (*Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indoeuropéennes*, 1878/79) formed the vowel theory of Proto-Indo-European through systematic representation of ablaut degrees of short and long vowels, discovery of and of two-syllable →Roots. H. Paul (*Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, 1880) contributed the theory of Analogy, the effect of which Brugmann and Osthoff

treated in their '*Morphologische Untersuchungen*' (1878 ff.). H. Hübschmann recognized the →Armenian language as a separate language group. B. G. G. Delbrück contributed his *Syntax* (1893-1900) to Brugmann's '*Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*' (1886 ff.).

Significant investigations into the philology of individual languages were provided by: Ch. Bartholomae (Indo-Iranian), J. Wackernagel, W. Schulze, and later P. Kretschmer (Greek), Fr. Kluge, H. Paul, E. Sievers, and still later W. Streitberg (Germanic), R. Thurneysen (Celtic). H. Hirt contributed in the areas of →accent (1895) and →ablaut (1900) as well as to those of the original homeland and language of Indo-Europeans ('*Die Indogermanen*,' 1905-07; '*Indogermanische Grammatik*,' 1921-37). Tocharian and Hittite were discovered at the beginning of the 20th century and worked on by W. Schulze, E. Sieg, W. Siegling, W. Krause (Tocharian), and F. Hrozný, F. Sommer, J. Friedrich (Hittite), H. Pedersen (both). Along with Hittite, Luwian and Palaic were also revealed; Phrygian, Lycian, and Lydian were also researched. Krahe analyzed the remains of the →Illyrian language. Indo-European linguistics became increasingly focused on questions of detail and individual philologies. Since de Saussure's demand for a synchronized, systematic linguistics ('*Cours de la linguistique générale*,' 1916), Indo-European linguistics, which is historically ('diachronically') oriented, has been replaced by various movements in modern →linguistics, particularly abroad (Geneva, Prague, Copenhagen, USA)."

2) Meyer's *Enzyklopädisches Lexikon* (Mannheim/Wien/Zürich. 9th ed. 1974) offers a comparably competent overview under the heading. Disappointing, on the other hand – yet for this day and age, perhaps typical – is a newly conceived reference such as Haremborg, *Kompaktlexikon in 3 Bänden*. Dortmund 1996. The field of Indo-European linguistics is no longer mentioned; one is rather summarily referred to the "Indo-European language group" and the "Indo-Europeans."

3) An exhaustive treatment of the history of Indo-European linguistics from its beginning is lacking to this day.

Helpful literature: — a) On the subject of the history of Indo-European linguistics, with a particular focus on its beginnings and on the subject of the history of linguistics in general: → Benfey *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 1869; Delbrück *Einleitung* 1904; Windisch *Sanskrit-philologie* I 1917 II 1920; *Portraits* I / II 1966; Neumann, *Indogermanistik* 1967; Koerner, *Practicing Linguistic Historiography*

1989; Einhauser *Junggrammatiker* 1989; Szemerényi *Einführung* 1990 p. 1ff.; Bartschat *Methoden der Sprachwissenschaft* 1996; Morpurgo Davies *Ottocento* 1996. — b) with focus on the 20th century (until 1960): → Szemerényi *Richtungen der modernen Sprachwissenschaft* II 1982.

4) A couple of important steps of development from § 1 are clarified in the following.

E 301. Similarities and relationships in vocabulary between European languages such as Latin and Greek and Sanskrit have been increasingly studied since the eighteenth century. → Thumb / Hauschild *Handbuch des Sanskrit* I / 1 1958 p. 168ff. (The work concerns Sanskrit studies in Europe). On Sir W. Jones: → p. 173f.; *Portraits* I 1966 p. 1-57; *Lexicon Grammaticorum* 1996 p. 489f.; Mayrhofer *Sanskrit and die Sprachen Alteuropas* 1983.

In his German-language work, J. Klaproth (*Asia polyglotta* Paris 1823 p. 42ff.) refers commonly to the language group that joins Europe and India as “*indo(-)germanisch*.” But this term is clearly not Klaproth’s invention. He uses the word as an established term, that at the time competed with the term ‘Indo-European’ and was employed by Bopp. Before Klaproth, the Danish geographer K. Malte-Brun had evidently used the term “*langues indo-germaniques*”: → Thumb / Hauschild *Handbuch des Sanskrit* I / 1 1958 p. 42f.; F. R. Shapiro “*On the Origin of the term ‘Indo-Germanic’*” in HL 8 1981 p. 165-170; K. Koerner “*Observations of the Sources, Transmission, and Meaning of ‘Indo-European’ and Related Terms in the Development of Linguistics*” in IF 86 1982 p.1-29; by the same author, *Practicing Linguistic Historiography* 1989 p. 149-177; Szemerényi *Einführung* 1990 p. 12f. note 1; G. Bolognesi “*Sul termine ‘indogermanisch’*” in FS Belardi I 1994 p. 327-338; F. Bader in *langues indo-européennes* 1994 p. 23.

While the term ‘Indo-European’ established itself in English and in the Romance languages, the term ‘*indo-germanisch*’ has become accepted in the German-speaking world: → Committee of the *Indogermanische Gesellschaft* in *Kratylos* 27 1982 [1983] p. 221f. (Position with regard to the juxtaposition of ‘Indo-Germanic’ and ‘Indo-European’: “*Eine Abkehr von dem eingebürgerten wissenschaftlichen Terminus ‘indogermanisch’ ist also nicht geboten*”). A consciously anti-West German development, the term ‘*indoeuropäisch*’ was the term of choice in the German Democratic Republic: → E. Seidel in *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* XVIII 1969 p.297 (“In dealing indirectly with West German servants of

imperialism, I see no reason to avoid using the term ‘*indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft* ... Nonetheless, I shall respect the wishes of the editor and use ‘*indoeuropäisch*.’”)

E 302. The actual history of Indo-European linguistics begins with Franz Bopp (1791-1867). In 1816 he proved the relationship of the Indo-European languages. The foreword of his fundamental work, “*Über das Conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache in Vergleichung mit jenem der griechischen, lateinischen, persischen and germanischen Sprache*” is dated 16 May, the date on which Bopp celebrated the birth of Indo-European linguistics. Whereas earlier suppositions were only supported by comparisons of words, Bopp proved the existence of relationships through grammatical comparison. Bopp’s study of Vedic was prompted by Friedrich Schlegel’s “*Ueber die Sprache and Weisheit der Indier*” (Heidelberg, 1808). For more information on Bopp: → B. Schlerath *Berlinische Lebensbilder - Geisteswissenschaftler* 1989 p. 55-72; Szemerényi *Einführung* 1990 p. 6f.

Along with Bopp, Jacob Grimm (1785-1863) is of great significance in the history of Indo-European linguistics. With his *Deutsche Grammatik* (1819ff.), he introduced the historical dimension in linguistic research: linguistic comparison and history constitute the foundation of Indo-European linguistics: → Szemerényi *Richtungen* I 1971 p. 13ff.

E 303. The institutionalization of the field began with the appointment of Bopp in 1821, on the recommendation of Wilhelm von Humboldt, to the then new Berlin University. Bopp received the newly created chair for “*Orientalische Literatur und Allgemeine Sprachkunde*.”

In its first decades, the field remained closely associated with Sanskrit studies, given that familiarity with Sanskrit rendered the discovery of the Indo-European language group possible. Because of this tight connection to Sanskrit studies, Indo-European linguistics in its beginnings was closest to oriental studies, such that professors at the time usually carried the words ‘Sanskrit’ and ‘oriental’ in their titles. Yet the descriptions ‘Indian studies’ and ‘oriental studies’ have just as little to do with their present meanings as Bopp’s chair of ‘*allgemeine Sprachkunde*’ had to do with today’s understanding of general linguistics. August Wilhelm Schlegel received the first chair in Indian Studies in 1818 in Bonn.

Chairs in Indo-European linguistics without particular ties to Sanskrit were created starting only in the 1870’s. Thus, for example, Karl Brugmann’s chair in Leipzig was created by simply renaming the chair for Clas-

sical Philology occupied by his teacher, Georg Curtius, who had been a student of Bopp in Berlin.

E 304. Bopp's circle of students was very large. For example, Friedrich Rückert, who held a chair for oriental studies in Erlangen and taught in Berlin, is significant beyond the confines of Indo-European linguistics. The circle included Wilhelm von Humboldt, August Wilhelm Schlegel and many representatives of Indo-European linguistics and Indian studies, such as August Friedrich Pott, Theodor Aufrecht, Otto von Böhtlingk, Adalbert Kuhn, Adolf Friedrich Stenzler, and Albrecht Weber, who became Bopp's successor.

In 1872, Hermann Ebel received the first chair for comparative linguistics in Berlin. In 1876, Johannes Schmidt, a student of August Schleicher, became his successor. Hermann Ebel founded the "*Berliner Schule*" of philological Indo-European linguistics, which is to be distinguished from the "*Leipziger Schule*" of systematic "neogrammarians."

E 305. The introduction of various new methods is associated with the names Pott, Schleicher, and Schmidt: Thus, with A. F. Pott from Halle is associated a more rigorous observation of consonant shift in the study of etymology (→ *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen mit besonderem Bezug auf die Lautumwandlung im Sanskrit, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen and Gothischen*. Lemgo 1833-1836); with A. Schleicher from Jena, reconstruction and theories of linguistic lineage; (→ *Compendium der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Weimar 1861); with J. Schmidt from Berlin, the wave theory (→ *Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse* 1872). The name Adalbert Kuhn calls to mind both Indo-European mythology as well as the founding of a review in the field of Indo-European linguistics, a review which, with only minimal changes in the title, has appeared from 1852 to the present day, and is still referred to as "*Kuhns Zeitschrift*": HS (previously ZVS or KZ). See the bibliography.

E 306. Representatives of different philological disciplines belonged to the group of so-called neogrammarians, which included for example, the slavist August Leskien and the germanist Hermann Paul. Literature: → Einhauser *Junggrammatiker* 1989.

The principle that phonetic rules are without exceptions (which includes the consonant shift as a phonetic rule) can be traced to the neogrammarians. Numerous durable phonetic rules were discovered by researchers

from this circle: Jacob Grimm's Law (*Germanische Lautverschiebung*, see below L 336 § 4); Karl Verner's Law (see below L 421); Karl Brugmann's Law (see below L 412; On his discovery of the *nasalis sonans*, see below L 305); Hermann Osthoff's Law (a long diphthong before a consonant becomes a short diphthong); Hermann Grassmann's Law concerning dissimilation of aspirates (see below L 348); Christian Bartholomae's Law concerning aspirates (see below L 347 § 2).

E 307. A decisive place in the history of Indo-European linguistics belongs to Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913). Not only did he enrich Indo-European phonetics with his discovery of laryngeals, he also founded modern synchronic linguistics. (Common headings include: synchronic vs. diachronic, langue vs. parole, signifiant vs. signifié.) → Szemerényi *Richtungen I* 1971 p. 19-52; for further information, see the bibliography under Saussure *Cours* (1916) and Saussure *Mémoire* (1879); further, see below, L 315.

As a rule, synchronic linguistics and general linguistics are considered to be one and the same. Since de Saussure, the field has gained impetus and diversified widely: → Szemerényi *Richtungen der modernen Sprachwissenschaft II* 1982.

At some universities, general linguistics has outstripped Indo-European linguistics. This is equally true in the cases of the large philologies, such as Germanic studies, Latin language studies, and English studies, where historically interested linguists are in the minority and are threatening to become lone voices in the desert. With its higher numbers of students, general linguistics has a trump card that cannot easily be overcome. But even general linguistics needs the historical dimension. A juxtapositioning of general and historical-comparative linguistics is the only appropriate approach. When the general linguist, who for the most part has only English as a foreign language and finds all of his examples in that language, the one-sidedness becomes egregious.

E 308. The contribution of new ideas and addition of new linguistic material has changed the state of research in Indo-European linguistics repeatedly: → Szemerényi *Richtungen der modernen Sprachwissenschaft II* 1982 p. 107ff. Following is a list of the individual Indo-European languages in the order of their incorporation into the group of Indo-European languages: Albanian (→ Bopp *Albanesisch* 1855); Armenian (H. Hübschmann 1875, see below E 424); Tocharian (E. Sieg, W. Siegling, W. Schulze 1908, see below E 408); Hittite (F. Hrozný 1915, see below E

410); Mycenaean / Linear B (M. Ventris and J. Chadwick 1953, see below E 418); Celtiberian (first Botorrita inscription found 1970, see below E 431 § 1c); Carian (See below E 415: → *Historia de la investigación* in *Adiego Studia Carica* 1993 p. 101ff.).

E 309. How Indo-European linguistics will evolve in the next millenium remains to be seen.

Indo-European linguistics has never been so well-documented as it today. Precision of description and argumentation have never been so good. One must continue on this path and examine our linguistic past with ever greater precision and adequacy. Openness to new approaches is of great importance.

It is a social responsibility to call attention to the historical dimension in all discussions of language and languages, and not to allow it to be forgotten. And this is all the more true today, as knowledge of the ancient Indo-European cultural languages Latin and Greek is threatened by suppression and marginalization.

Indo-European linguistics devotes itself to the linguistic past and, in so doing, makes the future intelligible. The motto, 'Without a past, no future' comes to mind. But Indo-European linguistics and historical linguistics must never be misused for political goals. (See index, under the headings 'Celts' and 'National Socialism.')

E 310. Indispensible to any perspective of the future is financial support of chairs for Indo-European linguistics at universities. In the present age of empty coffers in the public sector, so-called minor fields like Indo-European linguistics are often confronted with the crucial question of social relevance and called into question. Responsible faculties and university administrations are sometimes even willing to refuse the appointment of an Indo-European specialist in favor of material needs in other fields with greater numbers of students, and keep the field of Indo-European linguistics more or less alive through temporary teaching contracts. Thus has been the case recently in Basel, Fribourg (Switzerland), Giessen, Heidelberg, and Tübingen.

R. Wachter of the University of Basel offered a flaming appeal in March 1999 in favor of our fine, but small, field on the internet (link to Basel from our web site [see above E 100] under the heading Indo-European linguistics in Europe) entitled: "*Orchidee Indogermanistik: zähe Wurzel, zugkräftige Stammbildung, zerbrechliche Endungen.*" In the following excerpt, "*Wozu Indogermanistik heute?*" the reader will easily recognize

the statements that regard issues specific to the situation at the University of Basel and Switzerland in general.):

“Here I should, in conclusion, accommodate today’s utilitarianism by naming several additional factors that in my opinion clarify a well-grounded historical-comparative, and particularly an Indo-European curriculum as something useful, even outside of the more narrow area of classical philology and Indology, factors that can relativize the orchid-status of Indo-European linguistics: — Firstly, Indo-European linguistics can like no other science mediate between most languages of Europe, and particularly between the four languages of our country: It guides the regard to the common linguistic fund and the differences that have grown over time. It helps us to be familiarized ourselves, likewise archeologically, with the confusion of different historical layers, to keep them distinct from one another, and to be mindful of the historical context of inherited linguistic material, influences of languages of classical antiquity and the renaissance, exchanged linguistic material from the Roman-Germanic symbiosis of the early middle ages, scientific terms of the high middle ages that originated in Arabic, borrowings from the courtly culture of France, Anglo-Saxon technological-commercial vocabulary of the last hundred years, and much else. The historical-comparative perspective could, and furthermore should be made once again increasingly fruitful in language studies in the sense of applied linguistics. This is particularly useful for the Romance languages, of which three are official languages in Switzerland, and a fourth is among the most widespread languages of the world, further in the area of European common cultural vocabulary, which in many cases is common to all four official languages of Switzerland, as well as to English and the other European languages, and finally more or less in the structure of sentences and the typological changes of the last 2000 years, which likewise in nearly all of Europe reveal more commonalities than differences. And not least, the historical-analytical perspective, as I see it, encourages individual linguistic competence, trains sensitivity to style and broadens available linguistic resources. — Secondly, historical-comparative linguistics can help general linguistics to regain dimensions that the latter has for some time neglected, namely the historical and comparative dimensions. Lately, a convergence has been discernible, and here in Basel the signs of fruitful collaboration seem to me particularly promising. — Thirdly, Indo-European linguistics contributes greatly to the color of a university, for it brings its own bases of research and is at the same time a helpful field for many others, is cen-

trally important for classical philology among other fields, and meaningfully complementary to most other philologies, and it broadens significantly the selection of available fields through the inclusion of languages that would otherwise never be taught or researched. Through its multilingual integrating effect, Indo-European linguistics creates, along with history and comparative literature, an additional, particularly linguistically-oriented network of the most diverse fields. As an etymological science *par excellence*, it is particularly capable of finding a broader audience. — Last but not least, Indo-European linguistics does not cost very much: This is true in absolute terms, because it requires, aside from a minimum to assure continuity, very little personnel; books, reviews and other resources as well are required, commensurately with the breadth of the field, in modest quantity. But also considered relatively, the cost-benefit relationship is not at all bad, because here not only are the numbers of students relevant, but also just as much the qualitative aspect of the contribution of Indo-European linguistics to the functioning of many other fields and of the broadening of the choice of fields ... — It is a particularly desirable and effective reinforcement of the successful functioning of this small field that is full of tradition that the many other fields actually take advantage of its capacity to help. To achieve this, the field, or rather its representative, must contribute his part in his teaching, in his relations to students and representatives of the other fields, among others, as well as – today more than ever – toward the general public.”

D. Overview of the Indo-European Languages and their Sources

1. General Information

E 400. Attestation and extent of documentation of the Indo-European languages varies from language to language. This is dependent on when the individual groups of IE language speakers found their way from the spoken word, originally prevalent in all of them, to the written one.

As a rule, this development took place at the time of contact with an established culture that employed writing. Compare for example the

Anatolian Hittites, who may be integrated in the Mesopotamian cuneiform tradition (cf. E 410 below), or the Mycenaean Greeks, who borrowed Linear B from the Cretan family of scripts (cf. E 418 below), or the Celts, who, depending on the region, wrote their inscriptions with the Greek, Latin, Etruscan, and even Iberian alphabets (cf. E 431, §1 below), or the Tochari, who, through their participation in the life marked by the Buddhism of the Tarim Basin of the sixth century AD, created language monuments of their own (see below E 408).

The earliest attestations of some language branches are translations of Christian content. These include Gothic, Old Church Slavic, and Armenian. A table of entry dates of individual languages into the world of written language is offered in Benveniste *Institutions* II 1969 in the opening text to the “*note bibliographique*.”

In the best of all cases, the age of the language is consistent with that of those who created its records, as is the case with contemporary inscriptions. In other cases, the documents originate at a much later date, such as is the case as a rule with manuscripts. Thus, there is a period of oral tradition, or also of written tradition between the attested linguistic phase and the point at which the physical document can be dated.

Some languages have only come to be known in the last century, whether it be because they had remained undiscovered, or because the written documents could only then be deciphered.

The capacity to decode the languages concerned here varies both according to whether or not the given language has a modern descendent, and according to the length of its philological tradition.

E 401. General overviews of the individual representatives of the Indo-European language families are available in: → Cowgill *Einleitung* 1986 p. 17ff.; Lockwood *Überblick* 1979; *Lingue indoeuropee* 1994 = *Indo-European languages* 1998; *langues indo-européennes* 1994; Beekes *Introduction* 1995 p. 17ff.; *Convegno Udine (Restsprachen)* 1981 [1983].

2. The Individual Indo-European Language Families and their Sources

E 402. A short initial enumeration follows here in the order of the earliest attestation of the individual language. In each case, I shall mention the earliest evidence, and in the case of datable records the actual evidence shall also be mentioned. Further, an indication is given of an indirectly

transmitted text if it is significant for the particular language because of age or size.

The current order is as follows: — Anatolian (Old Hittite, original documents from the 16th century BC, copies of texts from the 17th century BC); — Greek (Mycenaean original documents of the 17th and 14th/13th centuries BC); — Indian (13th century BC: the handing-down of the Rigveda must have taken place purely orally until far into the last millennium, but the creation of individual verses and of some philosophical content dates probably from the 13th century BC; further, material transmitted through secondary sources, including some names of deities and terms dates back to the Hurrian Mitanni empire of the 16th to 14th centuries BC.); — Iranian (the core of the Old Avestan text corpus dates back to Zoroaster, founder of zoroastrianism, and thereby to the 10th century BC, but after a long period of oral transfer, the conserved texts were only preserved in written form starting in the 13th century AD, in the Middle Persian period); — Italic (perhaps the so-called *fibula praenestina* [if it is even authentic, and not a forgery: → Wachter *Altlateinische Inschriften* 1987 pp. 55-65] with its inscription can be dated to the first half of the 7th century BC; whereas other Latin monuments, such as the so-called Duenos inscription, only date from the 6th century); — Celtic (continental celtic inscriptions date from the 2nd century BC); — Germanic (Wulfila's Bible translation in Gothic is dated c. 350 AD; Germanic names on coins and in indirect records are attested from the 1st century BC); — Armenian (5th century AD); — Tocharian (6th century AD); — Slavic (9th century AD); — Baltic (14th century AD); — Albanian (15th century AD).

E 403. The following somewhat more thorough enumeration proceeds generally from geographical east to west, and follows, within each region, the order of first attested occurrence. References to helpful literature are kept quite brief.

1) Indian subcontinent and Chinese Turkestan: Indo-Iranian with Indian and Iranian (which adjoins from the west) ; Tocharian.

2) Asia Minor, Greece, and the Balkan peninsula: — From the 2nd century BC Anatolian in the east, Greek in the west. — From the 1st millennium BC Phrygian in Asia Minor. — Armenian in the east and Albanian in the Balkans beginning after Christ.