
Reviewed by Victor A. Friedman (University of Chicago)

Although not originally planned as a *Gedenkschrift*, this selection of papers from the Eighth Colloquium of the Societas Caucasianologica Europaeae has been dedicated to the memory of one of the great Caucasologists of the twentieth century, Georgij Andreevich Klimov, who died suddenly, at the age of 69, less than a year after the Colloquium. The loss is tragic, but our colleagues are to be congratulated on having produced this excellent volume in his memory. Included is an informative obituary by Ja. Testelec (1-4) and a complete bibliography of Klimov’s works (5-22). The volume also contains an English translation of Klimov’s last completed paper, a discussion of the external history of Svan (23-31). Using material from ancient sources and local toponymy, Klimov shows that Svan speakers were at one time more widespread. Taking into account current geographic and sociolinguistic factors, however, the current situation of the language appears to be stable and it is therefore likely to survive.

The volume as a whole represents an overview of a wide variety of issues in Caucasian linguistics. Aside from the obituary and bibliography of Klimov, the volume contains twenty-four articles evenly divided between the synchronic and the diachronic. In terms of the language groups treated, 7 are concerned with Kartvelian (5 of them Georgian), 9 with East Caucasian (3 Nakh, 3 Daghestanian, and 3 general), 5 with West Caucasian (2 Abkhaz, 1 Adyghe, and 2 general) and 2 with general Caucasian. One article treats Ossetian, and two of the articles on indigenous Caucasian languages also treat Indo-European languages (Ossetian and Armenian). The scholars represent institutions of higher learning in 9 countries of which Germany (7) and Holland (5) together make up half of the rest being 4 from the Russian Federation, including one from Daghestan, 2 from the US and one each representing the UK, Georgia, Israel, France, and Norway. Twenty of the papers are in English and the other four are in Russian with well-written, informative summaries by V. Chirikba. Because the field of Caucasian linguistics is as diverse as the languages of the Caucasus themselves, I will not attempt any further generalizations but rather comment on each contribution.
J. Gippert’s (31–44) paper is the second part of a study of comparatives in the history of Georgian. Here Gippert discusses the rise of the analytic comparative, which replaced the older synthetic comparative, whose prehistory he treated in part one. Gippert found an overwhelming preponderance of synthetic comparatives in the poetic texts from the medieval period (Vepxist’q’aisani, Abдумешиани, Тамараниани) as opposed to the prose Вацраманийц. His paper gives complete data from the texts and investigates the morphological and syntactic factors that favored the rise of the analytic over the maintenance of the synthetic. He shows that analytic comparison was most likely to occur in secondary adjectival formations. W. Boeder’s (50–59) study of attribution in Georgian, i.e. the coding of relationships within the noun phrase, is of a typological nature and includes comparisons with English, German, Chinese, Russian, Homeric Greek, and other languages (among those mentioned are Latin, Hungarian, and Turkish). He points to the decline of nominal agreement within the Georgian noun phrase as a possible source for the increasing use of derivational and participial strategies. V. Имнашивли (73–78) gives a typological classification of Georgian two-stem compounds. The system is based on the case-ending (if any) of the first stem.

M. Cherchi (60–72) examines the analogical spread of the suffix -ner (from earlier -er or -en) from non-indicative to indicative screes, arguing that a focus on the morphosyntactic notions ‘third person’ and ‘plural’ became more central to the language as it developed and thus facilitated the analogy. Beginning with a concise overview of the Old and Modern Georgian verbal systems, Cherchi provides a convincing account of how the analogy occurred, and indicates how these linguistic facts confirm and contradict various attempts to generalize about the workings of analogical processes. K. Lerner and R. Enoch (45–49) discuss the transition from an aspectual to a temporal-modal system in the Georgian verb. They conclude that the transition was structured by the Georgian system of screes (paradigmatic sets).

S. Starostin (79–95) etymologizes 35 basic vocabulary items in the indigenous languages of the Caucasus and, on the basis of his etymologies, concludes that East and West Caucasian languages form a single North Caucasian family, which split in the fourth millennium BCE and does not include Kartvelian. Starostin connects Kartvelian with the Nostratic macrofamily and North Caucasian with Sino-Tibetan and Yenissean. The material in this article presumes a familiarity with the author’s earlier work and methodology.

W. Schulze’s (96–111) careful discussion of the diachrony of true personal pronouns (i.e. 1st and 2nd) in East Caucasian is a masterful summary of both form and function, particularly the problem of the relation between ergative and absolutive. He documents a formal distinction between a pronominal and a nominal ergative in Proto-Nakh, Proto-Andian, and Proto-Lezgian, and moreover demonstrates that pronominal ergativity is connected to the semantics of singular number for personal pronouns. Schulze concludes that at least in these East Caucasian languages, the personal pronouns reflect an ergative system syntactically but an active one semantically. M. Alekseev (116–124) reconstructs the Proto-East Caucasian locative morphemes meaning ‘under’, ‘behind’, ‘near, together with’, ‘inside’, ‘near (in contact)’, ‘upon’, in a typical position’, and ‘directional’. He concludes that at least some of them originally had adverbial function and developed subsequently into case affixes and/or postpositions. G. Topuria (112–115) briefly surveys the types of conjunctive agreement found in Daghestanian languages. He concludes that the system based on agreement for class is oldest while person marking is most recent. The mixed person-class system as well as systems without any agreement represent intermediate stages.

B. Comrie and M. Polinsky (125–139) give an overview of the noun class system of Tsez, which is part of their larger project of a descriptive grammar of Tsez. In addition to presenting new empirical material, the authors seek to explain the restructuring of a noun class system in terms of simple conceptualization, morphophonemics, and frequency, rather than complex associative semantics and cultural scripts. The work thus involves both synchrony and diachrony. Tsez has four classes, marked by prefixation, one of which, class I, is strictly defined by natural gender (male sentient). Although female sentients are in class II and other animates (including devils) in class III, inanimates occur in classes II, III, and IV. Having contrasted a cognitive explanatory model utilizing cultural knowledge with an analysis based on superordinate categories and formal signals in order to account for both first language acquisition and the assignment of loanwords, the authors conclude that modern class II represents a merger of an earlier class II and a fifth class. The merger occurred because class V was the same marker in the singular (y) and, because class V members were characterized by final high vowels and the high-frequency old class II words enj’ ‘brother’ and baru ‘wife’ end in high vowels. They also argue, on the basis of comparative evidence, that proto-Daghestanian (and Proto-Tsez) had five classes, not four. They propose that ‘round object’ was the relevant category for class V (the categories for I, II, and III being male sentient, female sentient, and animal, respectively). They argue for the simplicity of their classification citing data from infant psychology. While recognizing that adult
usage affects language change, they conclude: "... to the extent that language change is driven by children, we should expect to see that the kind of information to which children have access plays a significant, if not dominant, role in language change." Recent sociolinguistic research, however, indicates that adolescent usage rather than child usage is the locus of significant language change. Child usage is more likely to be corrected than imitated, whereas adolescents forming a cohort are more likely to influence each other and display resistance to outsiders. This does not vitiate Comrie's and Polinsky's many persuasive arguments concerning both the specific and general issues they raise, but it is a problem that needs to be addressed.

S. Maximov (222–235) gives a unified account of causative formation (both analytic and synthetic) in Rutul, a Daghestanian language that is among those to have been recognized as literary since the break-up of the former USSR. Extremly interesting from a typological point of view, Rutul causative constructions can have up to five objects, e.g. z-a Anuc-da rys-e-de pis-i-de tyly-e-s șyp xağu-s vy-s vy-rî (1-ergative Anuc-adessive girl-adessive sister-adessive dog-dative bread-absolutive throw-infinitive give-infinitive give-infinite give-past) ‘I made Anuc make the girl make her sister throw bread to the dog’ or Elij-e Qambar-da Saumyr-da Piri-j-y ñat-s vy-rî Ullîj-i-s xtilat (Elij-ergative Kambar-adessive Saxmur-adessive Piri-irsuperessive convey-infinitive give-past Ullîj-adessive [sic] reportabsolutive) ‘Elij made Kambar make Shakhmur to communicate to Piri the report for Ullîj.’ Rutul distinguishes active and passive diathesis within the causative, e.g. the English ‘to make someone walk’ has two possible Rutul translations — literally “to walk do” and “to walk give” — the former used when the object is the passive recipient of the subject’s help and the latter when the object acts alone but under orders from the subject. According to the author, this is an archaic distinction.

H. van den Berg’s (236–249) contribution is a linguistic analysis of a Dargi anecdote (17 sentences) from Axtakov and Xalilov’s 1976 collection of humorous stories in the literary languages of Daghestan. As van den Berg correctly points out, the lack of any bilingual dictionary with Dargi as the source language makes the study of this language especially difficult. Van den Berg gives the original Cyrillic, a morphemically segmented and glossed Latin transliteration with an idiomatic translation, and eight pages of grammatical annotations covering various aspects of Dargi phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, and discourse phenomena. This contribution has a maximally broad potential audience, from a general linguistics class to Caucasiologists seeking to expand their knowledge in their field of concentration.

A. Timiiev (140–151) examines iterative aspect formation in the three Nakh languages, comparing their characteristic ablaut alternations to the alternations that characterize the plural. He hypothesizes that the origin of both ablaut in the plural and in the formation of iterative aspect is in earlier phonetic changes conditioned by the plural marker ã (> w, y). B. Outier (251–253) discusses the morphology of the simple verb in Bats (Tsota-Tush), the smallest of the three Nakh languages. I. Heinecke (254–266) illustrates a Chechen-German morphological database. It is worth noting that Johanna Nichols of the University of California at Berkeley is also engaged in computerized projects involving Chechen and Ingush.

V. Chirikba’s (152–170) article is a critique of the West Caucasian materials in Nikolayev and Starostin’s North Caucasian Etymological Dictionary. After praising the authors for demolishing the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis — the assumption that Kartvelian is part of the same family as East Caucasian and West Caucasian — and likewise praising them for refraining from attempting to pursue further-ranging connections that they have proposed elsewhere (e.g. Sino-Caucasian or Dene-Caucasian), Chirikba notes that “a nearly total lack of preparatory etymological research on individual [north] C[aucasian] languages [...] had an obviously negative impact on some of the etymological solutions.” Among the problems he notes are the following. The authors give no examples to substantiate or illustrate their tables of sound correspondences, and therefore the reader cannot assess their validity. The reconstructed inventory of Proto-West Caucasian contains 168 consonants — itself a typologically dubious proposition — and includes such phonetically unlikely consonants as a labialized-palatalized voiced bilabial, a pharyngealized labialized-palatalized emphatic voiceless stop, etc. (Chirikba notes that pharyngealization and palatalization do not co-occur as features on a single phoneme in any attested system in which they co-occur as distinctive articulations.) The notation is inconsistent, in principle phonemic but mixing in the phonetic on occasion. The authors do not make use of internal reconstruction and therefore miss simple and better etymologies for some items. The authors occasionally mix temporal levels, including late loans (e.g. from Turkish) that do not belong in any proto-North Caucasian reconstructions. Chirikba also notes various misprints and omissions. As he observes, a work of this size and scope is bound to have some flaws. Chirikba’s notes are a useful corrective to problems in the West Caucasian material, but they leave open the question of corrections in the East Caucasian data and that of fundamental methodological issues. W. Lucassen (171–180) compares Proto-West Caucasian labialized reflexes with East Caucasian words
that have some sort of labial in them, at times taking issue with Starostin and Nikolayev's dictionary.

L. Kulikov (209–221) uses agreement patterns in Akhvaz masdars (infinitive-like forms) to argue for a mixed hierarchy of agreement patterns in that language. While the basic agreement type in Akhvaz conforms with a hierarchy of grammatical relations (S > DO > IDO), the primacy of indirect object agreement in masdars is conditioned by a pragmatic hierarchy of the type Agent > Dative/Benefactive > Patient that interacts with person and animacy hierarchies but not much (or at all) with a grammatical relations hierarchy. G. Hewitt (197–208) discusses some specific problems of Akhvaz verb morphology.

M. Höhlig (267–278) discusses "the threat to Adyghe language maintenance caused by the presence of a Russian speaking majority in the Autonomous Republic of Adyghya in the Northwest Caucasus." Although most of the article is concerned with Russification and efforts at language maintenance, and as such is of interest mainly to scholars of language shift, just before the two-sentence conclusion (whose message is that we'll have to wait and see) there is a tantalizing two-paragraph section suggesting that scholars interested in identity formation as well as language planning can find interesting material in the Adyghe case. Höhlig notes the proposal for a unified literary language combining Adyghe and Kabardian, which is apparently supported by Kabardians and some Adyghe but resisted by others. Since at one time these West Caucasian speech communities were considered to speak dialects of a single language, Circassian (Adyghe being designated "West" or "Lower" and Kabardian "East" or "Upper"), the situation hinted at by Höhlig suggests comparisons with political and sociolinguistic processes underlying efforts at unity and differentiation across the Black Sea, in the Balkans.

T. Meier's paper addresses the typological question of phonological markedness on the basis of glottalized consonants in the languages of the Caucasus, both indigenous (primarily Georgian, Lezgi, Avar, and Akhvaz, but with data from Hunzib and Budukh) and Indo-European (Armenian). The author's brief history of markedness does not agree in its details with that given in Edna Andrews' Markedness Theory (Duke University Press, 1990, pp. 13–19), and it is not so much a brief history as a fragment of relevant background that suffices for the purposes of the article. The characterization of (phonological) markedness as being determined by statistical frequency accurately reflects the presence in the literature of a "myth of markedness" (Andrews 1990: 136–65). Already in 1930 Trubetzkoy wrote (in Russian): "Statistics has nothing to do with it. The crux of the matter rests in the so-called 'intrinsic content' of the correlation." (cited in Andrews 1990: 136–37, her translation). Although Meier's treatment reflects some authors' equation of statistical frequency with markedness, the article is extremely useful for its wealth of clear empirical data that refutes claims about glottalization based on statistical frequency. After presenting the data, Meier briefly discusses neutralization, child language acquisition, and the adaptation of loanwords as criteria for markedness, with a couple of examples. The author concludes that while markedness remains a useful concept, it can only function in language-specific terms, and therefore, while it is in principle possible for language-specific markedness to show universal tendencies for specific features of phonemes, at present the evidence does not suffice to support such a thesis.

F. Thordarson (279–285) discusses various lexical borrowings between Georgian and Ossetian. J. Cheung (286–292) gives a useful summary of accentuation in the two main Ossetian dialects, Iron and Digoron, comments on their historical reconstruction, and addresses questions of external influence, which he concludes is rather minimal.

This collection has something of interest for any linguist and quite a bit for any Caucasologist. It is well worth reading.

Howe, Stephen. The Personal Pronouns in the Germanic Languages. A study of personal pronoun morphology and change in the Germanic languages from the first records to the present day. [Studia Linguistica Germanica, 43]. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996. (xxii + 390 pp.)

Reviewed by Michael Cyson (Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin)

This book is originally a PhD thesis written at the University of London in 1995. The main goal of this study is to present a survey of all that is known about the historical developments of the personal pronouns in the Germanic languages. The result is an impressive encyclopaedic collection of data on the Germanic pronouns in different stages of their history. This collection is indispensable for anyone who wants to put forward any generalisations, be it diachronic or synchronic, involving the Germanic pronouns.

The book consists of 18 consecutively numbered chapters (and a short introduction and conclusion, which are not numbered), yet these chapters can