

branch of Indo-European. It is presumably with this in mind that the final sentence of the blurb reads 'Die Armenistik wird durch die vorliegenden Studien auf eine neue Grundlage gestellt'. Whilst it is somewhat dubitable whether Holst lays completely new foundations for research in Armenian historical linguistics, he does provide a host of interesting and often extremely plausible hypotheses, and some courageous new approaches to issues of previous scholarship.

His first chapter, entitled 'Vox armeniaca' in reminiscence of Allen's studies 'Vox latina'<sup>1)</sup> and 'Vox graeca'<sup>2)</sup>, is dedicated to the extrapolation<sup>3)</sup> of the synchronic phonetics of the classical language, i.e. *grabar*. This is a complicated endeavour since all evidence for the phonetic realities of an extinct language is by nature indirect, wherefore its general feasibility may be called into question. Holst's main argument concerns the nature of the various stop series, one of which he believes to consist of ejectives (28).<sup>4)</sup> He advocates the existence of a system consisting of ejectives, non-ejectives (common pulmonic-egressives) and voiced stops, as opposed to the traditional view, which postulates aspirated voiceless, non-aspirated voiceless and voiced stops, respectively. Expressly avoiding any particular opinion regarding the glottalic theory at this point, he adduces evidence from Modern Armenian as well as from Kartvelian phonetics; the existence of an ejective/non-ejective system in the latter languages may have provided the areal pressure required to create or preserve a similar system in classical Armenian (268). As for Modern Eastern Armenian, Holst maintains that the presence of ejectives in the later state of the language is a strong argument for their reality in *grabar* (29); it is curious, however, that this holds true not for the modern standard language, as described in Dum-Tragut's recent grammar,<sup>5)</sup> but for dialects alone. Based on his own extrapolations, Holst introduces a different transliteration: the former aspirated voiceless stops (p<sup>h</sup>, t<sup>h</sup>, k<sup>h</sup>, c<sup>h</sup>, č<sup>h</sup>) are rendered as non-ejectives (p, t, k, c, č), thus unmarked, whereas the former unaspirated voiceless stops (p, t, k, c, č) are transliterated as ejectives, thus with a superscript semicircle open on the left (p<sup>ʰ</sup>, t<sup>ʰ</sup>, k<sup>ʰ</sup>, c<sup>ʰ</sup>, č<sup>ʰ</sup>); a further alteration consists of the substitutions of j by ʒ and ĵ by ʒ̣, thus completing the adaptation of the transliteration to the kartvelological model. This addition to the existent overabundance of transliterations (Hübschmann-Meillet, Library of Congress, etc.) is sensible only in Holst's framework, which is cogently argued but lacks a diachronic perspective explaining e.g. the rise of the postulated ejectives, or, should they have persevered from Indo-European times, their ubiquitous development into different stop classes in all other language families.

In his second chapter, Holst expresses a number of remarkable and convincing views concerning the interrelation of

#### MIDDEN-OOSTEN

HOLST, J.H. — Armenische Studien. Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2009. (24 cm, 320). ISBN 978-3-447-06117-9.

The goal Holst has in mind for the present study is evident in its title: his *Armenische Studien* are to be seen in the tradition of Hübschmann's work of the same name from 1883, in which the latter gave convincing proof that Armenian was not a member of the Iranian language family, but an autonomous

<sup>1)</sup> Allen, W.S. (1965) *Vox latina: a guide to the pronunciation of classical Latin*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>2)</sup> Allen, W.S. (1968) *Vox graeca: a guide to the pronunciation of classical Greek*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>3)</sup> Holst chooses the word 'Erschließen' rather than 'Rekonstruieren' for the process of compiling the phonetics of an attested, if now extinct, language; reconstruction, according to him, is a term best reserved for the processes involved in discussing unattested states of a language.

<sup>4)</sup> Ejectives are voiceless stops articulated with simultaneous closure of the glottis; they occur widely in the Caucasus, e.g. in Kartvelian languages such as Georgian and Svan, and Ossetian, an Iranian language.

<sup>5)</sup> Dum-Tragut, J. (2009) *Armenian: modern Eastern Armenian*, Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co., 17-8.

Albanian, Greek and Armenian (49-98). Therefore, the term ‘Balkanindogermanisch’ is applied to these three languages, as well as to a number of smaller ‘Trümmersprachen’, mainly Phrygian and Ancient Macedonian, which amongst themselves share 32 isoglosses according to his reckoning (96). The discussion includes, but is not limited to, lexical correspondences in words with ‘prothetic’ vowels (67-71); the verbal augment (70); loss of intervocalic \*-s- (73-8). A particularly interesting observation is made concerning the paradigm of *\*h<sub>1</sub>es-* > Ved. *ásmi*, Gk. *εἶμί*, Lat. *sum* ‘to be’; Holst points out that Albanian, Greek and Armenian do not partake in the same ablaut pattern as exemplarized in both Ved. 3.Sg.Prs. *ásti*: 3.Pl.Prs. *sánti* and Lat. *est*: *sunt* < *\*h<sub>1</sub>es-ti*: *\*h<sub>1</sub>s-nti*, but instead retain the full grade stem in all forms of the paradigm, thus Arm. *ē*: *en*, Gk. *ἐστί*: *εἶσι* (86).

A further part of the second chapter deals with the language contact between the Caucasian languages, mostly Kartvelian, and potential consequences for Armenian (99-120). Not all of his statements here can stand without comment, however. The question whether the signs of morphological ergativity shown in classical Armenian are due to external influence is debatable (103; for a different view, cf. Stempel’s view on the genesis of the Armenian participles in *-eal*).<sup>6)</sup> Similarly, some of the lexical connections he sees may be contested: relating Arm. *aĵ* (he writes *až*) ‘right’ to Geo. *maržvena* ‘id.’ (104) by means of borrowing seems less plausible than the traditional connection to Skt. *sādhati* ‘to succeed, reach the goal’, *sādhú-* ‘straight, effective’ < *\*seh<sub>2</sub>d<sup>h</sup>-io-* favoured by Martirosyan and others.<sup>7)</sup> In contrast, however, the topic of sibilant harmony, as he calls it in reference to a paper by Winter,<sup>8)</sup> is treated at some length, yielding interesting results. It explains succinctly the relation between the present tense form *čanač’em* ‘I know, recognise’ and its aorist *caneay* (*č’anač’em* and *c’aneay* in his transliteration) as one of sibilant harmony; the series of hushing sibilants (*č č’ ž š ž*), also called shibilants, dominates its counterpart series (*c c’ j s z*). If members of both series occur within one word, the ordinary sibilant will therefore be assimilated. This phenomenon seems to occur in Georgian as well, but has not been studied comprehensively as yet (114).

In chapters three and four, new views concerning the phonological (121-94) and morphological (195-264) development of classical Armenian are discussed; Holst does not aim at a general overview, but dedicates himself to ‘ausgewählten lautgeschichtlichen Themen’ (121), which allows for a thorough treatment of topics such as the question of unexpected *h-* in the anlaut of certain words (121-141), the development of *\*-o-* > Arm. *-a-* in unaccented position (141-160) and the provenance of Arm. *x*, e.g. in *xnjor* ‘apple’ (170-5). His analysis of the few words containing what has been termed ‘unetymologische h-’, i.e. those which cannot be satisfactorily explained on a comparative basis, emphasizes the number of loanwords amongst them and the general rarity of their occurrence (137); his explanation of the phenomenon as related to derivative alternations such as *het*

‘track’: *otn* ‘foot’ and *hariwr* ‘hundred’: *erk-eriwr* ‘two hundred’ is promising (139).

Some of Holst’s views concerning the historical morphology of Armenian are very original; in two instances he argues for univertation processes of nouns and numerals. Secondary n-stems such as Arm. *akn* ‘eye’ and *jowkn* ‘fish’ have previously been explained as reflexes of the paradigmatically leveled acc.sg. marker *\*-n̄*. Holst, however, argues that the numeral ‘one’, Arm. *mi*, was the origin of the nasal; this genesis seems to align better with the fact that in the words in question, the *-n* is spread throughout the paradigm (195-202). In the case of the plural marker, Arm. *-k’*, which traditionally but not without problems has been interpreted as the reflex of the inherited plural marker *\*-(e)s*, he proposes a similar process, in this instance with the numeral ‘two’, Arm. *erkow* < *\*d<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>3</sub>-* (202-12). Whilst the development of dual into plural morphology is typologically not unheard of, as he rightly underlines (209), it is curious that instead of inherited dual markers Armenian should have resorted to creating new ones. Still, Holst’s arguments for both developments are inherently cogent; whether the latter holds up to closer typological scrutiny and is preferable to its rival explanation remains to be seen. Equally interesting yet less controversial are his ideas regarding diminutives (222-44); particularly the analysis of Arm. *kin*, pl. *kanayk’* ‘woman’ as a ‘teildeminutives Paradigma’, i.e. a paradigm in which the stem is extended by a diminutive suffix in a few but not all forms, has explanatory force in view of Gk. *γυνή*, pl. *γυνᾶίκες* ‘id.’.

The final chapter five (265-290) functions both as a summary and contextualization of the various ideas Holst has put forward in the previous chapters, and a (usually brief) consideration of more programmatic and theoretical matters. It is here that he discusses the glottalic and laryngeal theory (267-70, 270-74); unfortunately for the reader, however, Holst makes no particularly strong pronouncements concerning his views on either of them and generally keeps reconstructions on a Proto-Indo-European level to a minimum. The latter, especially, would have added considerably to the clarity of some of the finer points (but see his justification on p. 279). His statement that ‘das Fachgebiet der relativen Chronologie im Armenischen noch immer in Fluß ist’ (275) is certainly true; yet, given his references to Kortlandt’s and Ravnæs’ work on this matter,<sup>9)</sup> a more thorough discussion of questions of relative chronology (as opposed to three pages of remarks, 275-278) would have been very welcome, particularly in view of his new derivations.

A small number of inconsequential errata must be corrected: p. 91, l. 33 ‘entstanden so auf der Krim’; p. 98, l. 19 ‘wie wenige Worte’; p. 249, l. 7 ‘das Präfix *\*po-*’; p. 275, l. 8 ‘*\*nm* > *mn*’; p. 279, l. 2 ‘die Erforscher des Armenischen’. Whilst these do not diminish either the quality of Holst’s research nor his fluid and readable style, some of his comments and stylistic tendencies are idiosyncratic; remarks such as ‘Geradezu schauerhaft is Vaux (1998). ... Es bleibt unklar, ob der Autor [Vaux] überhaupt weiß, was Ejektive sind’ (31) and ‘Clackson sieht den Wald vor lauter Bäumen

<sup>6)</sup> Stempel, R. (1983) *Die infiniten Verbalformen des Armenischen*, Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 82-3.

<sup>7)</sup> Martirosyan, H.K. (2010) *Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon*, Leiden: Brill, 100.

<sup>8)</sup> Winter, W. (1999) ‘Consonant Harmony in Armenian’, in Polomé, E.C. & Justus, C.F. (eds.) *Language change and typological variation. In honor of Winfred P. Lehmann on the occasion of his 83<sup>rd</sup> Birthday. Band I*. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man, 313-319.

<sup>9)</sup> Kortlandt, F. (1983) ‘On the relative chronology of Armenian sound changes’, in Greppin, J.A.C. (ed.) *First International Conference on Armenian Linguistics: Proceedings*, Delmar, N.Y.: Caravan, 97-106. Ravnæs, E. (1991) *The chronology of the sound changes from Proto-Indo-European to Classical Armenian*, Oslo: Ph.D. thesis.

nicht' (54) are simply unnecessary. The inclusion of indices of Armenian words occurring in the book and of key words is both laudable and very helpful. Surprising, on the other hand, is the apparent restriction to bibliographical material composed in English, French and German, since the works of Armenian, Russian and Italian scholars are so prominent in this particular field.

Not all of Holst's arguments and hypotheses are fully convincing, either due to his overly synchronic approach or because of his striving for innovative explanations. Since it is meant not as an introduction to the field but rather as an elucidation of burning questions within Armenian historical linguistics, this contribution is nonetheless extremely valuable to those well acquainted with the existent literature for its analysis of the 'Balkanindogermanische' roots of Armenian and its isoglosses as well as the discussion of a number of Kartvelian influences. His pursuit of 'Natürlichkeit' (284) is preserved throughout his writing, and improves upon the common algebraic methodology used in Indo-European studies.

Wolfson College, Oxford  
December 2012

Robin MEYER

\*  
\* \*