

Recent Work from St. Petersburg, I
(Classical and Indo-European Linguistics, Celtic Studies)

Brent Vine

Thanks to the kindness and generosity of Professor Nikolaj N. Kazanskij, the UCLA Program in Indo-European Studies has recently received copies of a number of new publications in Classics and Indo-European studies from St. Petersburg, mainly from the Institute of Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. It is good to see that despite the often difficult circumstances under which scholarship must still be conducted in Russia, important work continues to be produced from St. Petersburg, which has a long and distinguished history in the annals of linguistic science. Especially since some of these publications may not be readily available (some of them have been brought out in extremely limited editions), the Program in Indo-European Studies takes pleasure in presenting the following brief annotated survey, which focuses on material of particular interest to Indo-European studies. (See also the immediately following note by V. Ivanov on two recent works in the areas of Balkan studies and Slavic linguistics and ethnolinguistics.)

1. Klassičeskie jazyki i indoevropskoe jazykoznanie. Sbornik statej po materialam čtenij, posvjaščennyx 100-letiju so dnja roždenija professora Iosifa Moiseviča Tronskogo [*The Classical Languages and Indo-European Linguistics. Papers commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Prof. Iosif Moisevič Tronskij*] N. N. Kazanskij et al. (eds.); Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Linguistic Studies; St. Petersburg, 1998. 287 pp. [ISBN 5-88141-038-6]

Pride of place in the present survey belongs to this volume dedicated to the memory of the distinguished Russian philologist I. M. Tronskij (1897-1970), who authored a series of fundamental handbooks of Classical and Indo-European linguistics and philology (e.g. Tronskij 1953, 1960, 1962, 1967), as well as numerous articles on these and other subjects. It is not an exaggeration to

claim, in the words of the blurb characterizing the volume, that Tronskij's work served as the foundation for a whole generation of subsequent scholarship.

The volume contains 35 contributions, of which 33 are in Russian (one with summary in French); an article on a passage in Horace is in German, and the volume includes a touching fourteen-line poem in Latin elegiacs, composed for the 40th wedding anniversary of Tronskij and his wife Marija Lazarevna. The latter piece is one of seven items of "Memorabilia" that open the collection, including an informative tribute to Tronskij's work on Greek and Latin literature by N. A. Čistjakova, who rightly insists (p. 40) that Tronskij "was neither a linguist nor a literary scholar; he was a philologist".

Most of the remaining papers address issues focused chiefly on Greek and Latin language and literature, including areas of special interest to Tronskij, such as the history of Greek and Roman grammatical thought, the nature of the Greek accent, and problems of Latin lexicography. As properly indicated, however, by the title of the volume, a number of the papers range beyond Greek and Latin to topics that include a broader Indo-European perspective. Of the latter, and of those papers on the Classical languages with a historical linguistic emphasis, the following may be singled out:

- N. N. Kazanskij contributes a lengthy and compelling position piece on the importance of "Theoretical grammar of Greek and Latin and its place in contemporary Classical philology" ["Teoretičeskaja grammatika drevnegrečeskogo i latinskogo jazykov i ee mesto v sovremennoj klassičeskoj filologii", 110-123]. Kazanskij laments the lack of adequate training in theoretical linguistics at the upper levels of instruction in Greek and Latin, describing a situation in Russia with a sadly familiar ring to it here in the States. Those engaged in the training of scholars in Indo-European linguistics, in Russia or anywhere else, will surely applaud Kazanskij's eloquent argumentation about the value of linguistic theory (he singles out such areas as variation theory, linguistic typology, dialectology, phonetics and phonological theory, syntactic analysis) for the study of Greek and Latin.

- Latin and Italic linguistics occupies a prominent place in the volume, in keeping with Tronskij's significant contributions in this area. There are two papers on historical and historical/comparative morphology:

In “K predystorii glagol’noj sistemy v italijskix jazykax (vtoričnoe okončanie 3 lica edinstvennogo čisla -d)” [“Towards the prehistory of the Italic verbal system (the secondary ending 3 sg. -d)”, 130-134], B. B. Xodorkovskaja argues (partly on the basis of data from Lycian and Luvian) that the Italic 3 sg. secondary ending *-d* (Osc. **kahad**, OLat. FECED etc.) is an archaism. The situation has recently been examined in much more detail, and with a similar conclusion, by D. Ringe (1997:135-8), who shows that “no phonemic contrast between word-final **-t* and **-d* can be reconstructed for PIE” (135, comparing already Schwyzer 1939:409), and that the Italic and Anatolian data (together with other facts) lead to the conclusion that the secondary ending normally reconstructed as “**-t*” was already **-d* in PIE.

For the nominal system, Ju. V. Otkupščikov (“Iz istorii latinskogo sklonenija” [“From the history of Latin declension”, 134-138]) disputes the alleged influence of *i*-stem inflection on consonant stems in the history of Latin, arguing that the replacement of nom. pl. **-ēs* by **-ēs* in consonant stems owes less to *i*-stem nom. pl. **-ej-es* (> *-ēs*) than to influence from acc. pl. *-ēs* (citing also other nom./acc. interactions in the history of each of the other Latin declensional classes).

The two remaining linguistically-oriented papers on Latin are as follows:

A. I. Solopov contributes a brief note on the “Etymology and original meaning of Lat. *culpa*” [“Ètimologija i pervonačal’noe značenie lat. *culpa*”, 183-5]; his solution, while semantically attractive (originally ‘debt, obligation’, cf. the **(s)kel-* of Go. *skulan*, OE *sculan* ‘schuldig sein’, Li. *skel(i)ù* ‘id.’, OHG *scyld* ‘Schuld’ etc., with *s*-less forms in Baltic), raises interesting questions about the nature of the suffixation or enlargement via **-p-* in Lat. *culpa*, for which Solopov compares Lat. *pulpa* ‘lean meat, flesh’ beside *poliō* ‘polish’ (a connection which Solopov has defended elsewhere) and variations of the sort Gk. μέλος/μολπὴ ‘song’.

T. A. Karaseva’s “Principy rekonstrukcii i tolkovanija drevnejšix latinskix nadpisej” [“Principles of the reconstruction and interpretation of the oldest Latin inscriptions”, 200-212] contributes a detailed analysis of some aspects of the Archaic Latin “Lapis Satricanus” of about 500 B.C. (CIL I² 2832a). Karaseva challenges the reigning view that the initial sequence]IEISTETERAI contains a 3 pl. perf. verb form STETERAI ‘steterunt’; I have long felt, likewise, that this by now

standard interpretation is not as ironclad as it is generally made out to be. But Karaseva's bold suggestion to reinterpret the sequence TERAÍ as (Greek) ΓΕΡΑΙ (i.e. dat. of γέρας 'prize, gift', hence equivalent to Lat. [dat.] DONO) faces, in my view, serious difficulties, paleographical and otherwise, though her argumentation is incisive and the piece contains a number of interesting observations.

- Finally, three papers address topics in Indo-European poetics and mythology. K. G. Krasuxin, in "O nekotoryx morfosintaksičeskix arxaizmax (na materiale gomerovskix i vedičeskix formul)" ["On some morphosyntactic archaisms (based on Homeric and Vedic formulaic material)", 139-148], erects a great deal of theoretical apparatus in order to explore, in a way that is by now rather conventional, the formulaic behavior of Hom. δῶ 'house'. Setting aside certain lapses,¹ and granting the archaism of the morphosyntactic behavior associated with this word in Homer (which Krasuxin ably demonstrates), his ultimate claim (143) that "genitive + δῶ can be considered a direct continuation of an Indo-European attributive syntagm and that we can assume for the protolanguage the availability of formulas" of the sort *diuós dom, *ṛ-uidós dom (etc.) rests on very little indeed: not every Homeric formula can be retrojected *tel quel* into the Indo-European past. The most interesting part of the discussion, however, concerns Krasuxin's suggestions (143-4) as to how such formulaic behavior (at some pre-Homeric stage) might help to explain the longstanding problem of the anomalous circumflex accentuation of δῶ.

Before turning to mythology, we may also mention that A. L. Verlinskij's long disquisition on "The source of the debate on the origin of language in early Greek literature" ["Načalo spora o vzniknovenija jazyka v drevnegrečeskoj literature", 47-79] concludes (77-8) with a rather superficial attempt to refute V. V. Ivanov's conception of the IE "myth" surrounding the well-known phrase reconstructable for PIE as *(H)nómṃ (or *h₁néh₃mṃ, etc.) d^heh₁- in its connection with early attempts to grapple with the origin of language (cf. Ivanov 1964, and Gamkrelidze-Ivanov 1984:833, the latter reference miscited by Verlinskij [78n83])

¹ Two examples: despite Krasuxin (142), Myc. *do-po-ta* does not authorize an inherited gen. *dóm-s; and in his discussion (143) of the two genitives (Ἄιδός and Ἄιδαο) of Ἄιδης, Krasuxin claims that the distribution of these forms together with their associated variants for 'house' (Ἄιδός δῶ# vs. Ἄιδαο δόμων/δόμων) has to do with the relative chronology of their morphological make-up, a claim that is undermined by a failure to consider the factor of meter.

as “p. 837”). Verlinskij’s criticism (78n84) that some of Ivanov’s data come from the 10th maṇḍala of the Rig-Veda merely betrays a lack of sophistication with this sort of material and with the methodology of Indo-European mythological/poetic reconstruction: the so-called “popular” hymns of the 10th maṇḍala, despite the lateness of their actual composition, often preserve material of great antiquity (as do documents in other IE branches from much later times); nor is the Rig-Vedic evidence, in any event, restricted to the 10th maṇḍala.²

In the area of mythology, T. V. Toporova (“Drevneislandskij Mimir v indoevropskoj perspektive” [“Old Icelandic Mímir in Indo-European perspective”, 254-267]) offers a detailed survey of the attributes and underlying nature of the Old Icelandic mythological figure Mímir (Mími, Mímr), drawing detailed comparisons with a variety of similar figures in Greek mythology (esp. Mormô, Lamia, and the Erinyes), with some associated etymological analysis and speculation. In a much shorter compass and in a still more speculative vein, V. P. Kalygin raises the question of a possible Old Irish-Rig Vedic onomastic comparison (“Dr.-irl. Fir Bolg i dr.-ind. Bhṛ̥ḡu-, Bhṛ̥ḡavaḥ: fragment indoevropskoj mifologiĉeskoj onomastiki?” [“Old Irish Fir Bolg and Old Indic Bhṛ̥ḡu-, Bhṛ̥ḡavaḥ: a fragment of Indo-European mythological onomastics?”, 267-270]).

² See now Ivanov 1998[1976]:606ff., with discussion (607-8) of Tronskij’s own contribution to the understanding of the Platonic and Presocratic reflections of this material.

2. Antičnyj mir: Problemy istorii i kul'tury. Sbornik naučnyx statej k 65-letiju so dnja roždenija prof. È. D. Frolova. [*The Ancient World: Problems of History and Culture. Scholarly papers collected for the 65th birthday of Prof. È. D. Frolov*] I. Ja. Frojanov et al. (eds.); St. Petersburg State University Press; St. Petersburg, 1998. 458 pp. [ISBN 5-288-02074-4]

This magisterial Festschrift contains thirty contributions, mainly on topics in Greek and Roman history and historiography and on the history of Classical studies. The first two papers, however, intersect with Greek historical linguistics/poetics, and can be sketched in more detail here.

N. N. Kazanskij, pursuing further his recent work on early Greek poetry,³ offers a wide-ranging study of the famous “ship of state” metaphor (“K predystorii metafory *gosudarstvo-korabl'* v grečeskoj kul'ture” [“Toward the prehistory of the metaphor *ship of state* in Greek culture”, 25-34]). The central and most original contribution involves a suggested reinterpretation of the Mycenaean name *O-ti-na-wo* (PY Cn 285.14) as /Orthi-nāwos/ ‘he who guides the ship’ (vs. the traditional /Orti-nāwos/ ‘he who impels ships [in(to) battle]’), thereby raising the possibility that the metaphor in question was already established by Mycenaean times. Although Kazanskij’s interpretation of *O-ti-na-wo* must be considered quite uncertain,⁴ his discussion of early Greek metaphor and onomastics remains valuable.

Ju. V. Otkupščikov’s “ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ (mifologo-ètimologičeskij ètjud)” [“ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ (a mythologico-etymological study)”, 35-42] seeks to defend a new etymology for the name “Apollo” (and especially its older Dor. form Ἀπέλλων) based on the present participle ἀπελῶν to ἀπελάω ‘drive away, expel, ward off’. There are, however, numerous difficulties with this account which Otkupščikov fails to address: he provides, for example, no explicit source for the

³ Cf. his *Principles of the Reconstruction of a Fragmentary Text (New Stesichorean Papyri)* (St. Petersburg 1997; in English, with extended Russian summary).

⁴ Despite Kazanskij (32n16), the lack of initial *w-* in the Myc. form is extremely troubling, even without Homeric evidence for digamma in ὀρθός (cf., however, Lac./Arc. φορθασία and similar dialectal forms, not to mention Myc. *Wo-ti-jo*, probably /Worthios/).

gemination,⁵ nor is it made clear how a participial form in *-ovτ-* could have developed *-ov/-ovos* inflection secondarily. There is again, however, some interesting associated discussion of Apollonian attributes and epithets, even if the etymological analysis itself is unsatisfying.

3. Jazyk i kul'tura Kel'tov. Materialy VI kollokviuma (Sankt-Peterburg, 16-17 nojabrja 1998 g.). [*Celtic Languages and Cultures. Materials from the VIth Colloquium; St. Petersburg, 16-17 November 1998*] A. I. Falileev (ed.); Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Linguistic Studies and Russian Association of Celtic Scholars; St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1998. 68 pp. [ISBN 5-02-028402-5]

This volume contains 23 contributions (nearly all of them short abstracts of conference presentations), organized alphabetically by author. (Four items are in English, one — by far the longest — is in German, and the rest are in Russian.) Most of the papers concentrate on “language” (14, vs. 9 addressing “culture” in various ways). In general, the titles of the papers provide an adequate indication of their contents, as follows.

- Among the linguistic items, the following involve Proto-Celtic and/or Indo-European concerns:

E. G. Vol'skaja, “Glagol'nye formy v tekste iz Botorrity” [“Verbal forms in the Botorrita text”, 8-10] (actually referring to “Botorrita I”);

N. N. Kazanskij and A. I. Falileev, “Obščekel'tsk. *klāro-, greč. κληρος: indo-evropejskoe obosnovanie” [“Proto-Celtic *klāro-, Gk. κληρος: the Indo-European basis”, 10-13];

N. A. Nikolaeva, “Spornaja ètimologija nekotoryx drevneirlandskix oboznačenij umiranija” [“The disputed etymology of some Old Irish terms for death and dying”, 32-3] (*bás, bath, at-bath, at-bail*);

A. I. Solopov and V. P. Kalygin, “Dr.-irl. laith ‘pivo’, lat. Latium i dr.” [“Old Irish laith ‘beer’, Lat. Latium and other forms”, 39-42] (Latium not from *stlā- ‘extend’, but from *lat-, as in various terms for liquids et sim.).

⁵ The inexact parallels he provides (40) as well as his ambiguous notation “*Ἀπέλλ(λ)ων*” do nothing to alleviate this problem.

- Most of the remaining language-oriented contributions involve word studies or other broadly philological concerns at the Celtic or einzelsprachlich levels, including contact phenomena:

O. I. Brodovič and S. V. Voronin, "(Fono)leksičeskoe gnezdo bogey: anglo-kel'tskie kontakty" ["The (phono)lexical word family of bogey: Anglo-Celtic contacts", 4-6] (in addition to *bogey*, also *boggard/boggart*, *pooka/pook/puck*, *bugaboo*, *boggle*, and others);

O. I. Brodovič and A. Davydova, "Anglijskie zaimstvovanija v vallijskom jazyke" ["English borrowings in Welsh", 6-8];

I. V. Krjukova, "Predposylki nekotoryx innovacij v sfere analitizma v irlandskom i drugix kel'tskix jazykax" ["The preconditions for certain innovations of the analytical type in Irish and other Celtic languages", 14-18];

V. V. Larin, "Simvolika ogama" ["The symbolic system of Ogam", 18-20];

V. I. Mažuga, "O priemax raboty irlandskix grammatikov v VII-VIII vekax: peredelka razdelka o gruppe latinskix nedostatočnyx glagolov v učebnike Xarizija" ["The working methods of Irish grammarians in the 7th-8th centuries: the revision of the section on Latin defective verbs in Charisius' grammar"];

A. R. Muradova, "Popytka opredelit' ponjatie 'Anaon'" ["An attempt to determine the notion of 'Anaon'", 29-32];

A. I. Falileev, "Drevnebretonskie glossy: nekotorye složnosti interpretacii" ["The Old Breton glosses: some difficulties of interpretation", 56-9].

- Finally, three reports concern various Celtic "language questions", including a report on the "GPC":

H. L. C. Tristram, "Das Forschungsprojekt 'The Celtic Englishes' in Potsdam", 44-56;

D. Phillips, "The State of the Language", 59-62 (on Welsh);

A. Hawke, "Geriadur Prifysgol Cymru: A Dictionary of the Welsh Language", 62-4 (see the dictionary's web site at <http://www.aber.ac.uk/~gpcwww>, and note the additional updates at [UCLA] *Indo-European Studies Bulletin* 7.2 [May/June 1998] 16).

• The “cultural” pieces focus mainly on literature and folklore; they are as follows:

G. Bondarenko, “The significance of *geis* for the reign of Conaire Mór” (3-4);

K. R. Kobrin, “Kak sdelana tret’ja glava vtoroj knigi ‘Opisanija Uèl’sa’ Geral’da Kambrijskogo” [“How the third chapter of the second book of Giraldus Cambrensis’s ‘Description of Wales’ was composed”, 13-14];

T. A. Mixajlova, “‘Rokovoj čas’: Transformacija motiva *trojnoj smerti* v irlandskoj fol’klornoj tradicii” [“‘The fated hour’: The transformation of the *triple death* motif in the tradition of Irish folklore”, 27-9];

A. P. Owen, “The Poets of the Nobility — Beirdd yr Uchelwyr” (33-5);

E. A. Patrik and V. G. Bezrogov, “‘Odisseja’ Gomera v paradigme irlandskoj sagi” [“Homer’s *Odyssey* in the framework of the Irish saga”, 35-7];

A. S. Popenkov, “Byla li ‘glavnaja žena’ edinstvennoj ‘glavnoj ženoi’?” [“Was the ‘chief wife’ the only ‘chief wife’?”, 37-9] (on *cétmuintir*);

T. V. Toporova, “O dvux tipax znaniya u kel’tov i germancev” [“On two types of knowledge among the Celts and the Germanic peoples”, 42-4];

S. V. Škunaev, “Potustoronnij mir — edinstvo vremeni, mesta i dejstvija” [“The other world — a unity of time, space and action”, 64-5] (conceptions of the other world in medieval Ireland);

V. Èrlixman, “Keridven — ved’ma ili boginja?” [“Ceridwen — sorceress or goddess?”, 65-6].

References

Gamkrelidze, T. V. and V. V. Ivanov. 1984. *Indoevropskij jazyk i indoevropejcy*, vol. II. Tbilisi.

Ivanov, V. V. 1964. Drevneindijskij mif ob ustanovlenii imen i ego parallel’ v grečeskoj filosofii, in *Indija v drevnosti* (ed. V. V. Struve and G. M. Bongard-Levin), 85-95. Moscow.

----- 1998. *Izbrannye trudy po semiotike i istorii kul’tury*, t. I. Moscow.

Ringe, D. 1997. On the origin of 3pl. imperative *-vτον*, in D. Q. Adams (ed.),
Festschrift for Eric Hamp, vol. II, 129-143 (JIES Monograph 25; Washington,
D.C.).

Schwyzler, E. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik*, Bd. I. Munich.

Tronskij, I. M. 1953. *Očerki iz istorii latinskogo jazyka*. Moscow-Leningrad.

----- 1960. *Istoričeskaja grammatika latinskogo jazyka*. Moscow.

----- 1962. *Drevnegrečeskoe udarenie*. Moscow-Leningrad.

----- 1967. *Obščėindoevropejskoe jazykovoe sostojanie (Voprosy rekonstrukcii)*.
Leningrad.