JIES Reviews

Language

H. Bichlmeier, 2011. *Ablativ, Lokativ und Instrumental im Jungavestischen.* Ein Beitrag zu altiranischen Kasussyntax. Hamburg: Baar (Studien zur historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft, Bd.1). 437pp., ISBN 978-3-935536-59-2, ISSN 2192-0133, 78.00 EUR

In contrast to phonology and morphology, syntax has so far received relatively little scholarly attention in the study of Old Iranian grammar. The most complete presentation is still Reichelt (1909), who, however, did not distinguish systematically between Older and Younger Avestan and relied on an even older work, Hübschmann (1875: 147–288), for Avestan case syntax. As far as Old Avestan is concerned, Reichelt has largely been replaced by Kellens & Pirart (1990: 3–52), to which West (2011) can now be added. For Younger Avestan, Reichelt still offers the most complete treatment, although shorter summaries have been published by Hewson & Bubenik (2006: 131–159), surveying case syntax from Old to Modern Iranian languages and, especially, Skjærvø (2009: 103–116), who illustrates the most important syntactic functions with selected examples.

The book under review is therefore a welcome, indeed much-needed contribution to Avestan grammar. Offering an exhaustive and systematic treatment of the syntactic use of the ablative, locative and instrumental cases in Younger Avestan, it is the revised version of a PhD thesis supervised by Professor Heinrich Hettrich and submitted to the University of Würzburg in 2010. The work begins with a detailed Table of Contents (pp. 9–17), which to some extent doubles up as an otherwise absent subject index and facilitates navigation through the book, and an Introduction outlining not only its aims and method but also the problems of YAv. chronology and case syncretism (pp. 18–53). The three core chapters on,

respectively, the ablative (pp. 54–145), locative (146–260) and instrumental (pp. 261–318) offer a (nearly) full inventory of the YAv. uses of those particular cases. They are then followed by studies both of agent marking in passive (or ergative) constructions (pp. 319–339) and of competing nominal constructions which express time (pp. 340–387). The work concludes with a summary of the main results (pp. 388–397), a list of abbreviations (p. 399), an extensive bibliography (pp. 400–422) and, finally, indices of Vedic, Old Persian, Older Avestan and Younger Avestan text passages (pp. 423–437).

The orientation of this investigation is chiefly synchronic with a view to diachronic developments within Younger Avestan. Moreover, the latter is examined not only in comparison with Old Avestan but also with Vedic and their common prehistoric ancestor, Proto-Indo-Iranian. Following the model of Hettrich's work on Rigvedic case syntax, Bichlmeier's general approach is semasiological since he proposes to establish the ways in which the three cases function and contrast with one another. However, he applies an onomasiological approach to the investigation of how time is represented (p.32). Special attention is paid to functional overlaps between the three cases, on the one hand, and with other cases, especially the accusative, on the other. Furthermore, he aims at establishing both functional differences and overlaps of case constructions with and without local particles (pp. 27–29).

This monographic treatment of the three cases has a predecessor in Delbrück's 1867 comparative study of the syntax of the ablative, locative and instrumental in Vedic, Latin, Greek and German. Bichlmeier justifies the joint treatment of the three cases by locating them all at the "concrete" end of a functional continuum that extends from there to "abstract". The latter is occupied by the nominative, with the accusative and genitive nearby, while the dative takes a middle position between the two extremes. The verb assigns the syntactic function to the "abstract" cases within its valency frame, while that of the "concrete" cases is independent of the verb. However, Bichlmeier rightly points out that the boundaries between

the "concrete" and "abstract" cases are fluid, because, apart from the nominative, every one is in principle capable of participating in the roles of both agent and circumstance. The accusative, genitive and dative in particular may denote both agent (e.g. object, part of the object and indirect object) and circumstance (e.g. acc. of extension, gen. of time, pp. 18–19).

Adopting the working hypothesis developed by Hettrich for Vedic (and in contrast to Haudry (1977, 11)), Bichlmeier assumes that in ancient Indo-European languages each case has an autonomous, prototypical function which constitutes its semantic center (p.35). The individual cases are at their greatest possible distance from each other in their respective prototypical functions. The range of functions of a particular case is compared to a series of concentric circles which gravitate around the center constituted by the prototypical function, just like the ripples set in motion by a stone thrown into water. The effect of the prototypical function decreases towards the outer circles. Functional overlaps occur between different cases when their outer circles intersect with one another. In these overlapping zones two or even three cases may be involved, but the overlap never reaches a case's functional center (p.31).

The focus of Bichlmeier's work is the entire text corpus of the Younger Avesta. His method entails a reliance on Geldner's Avesta edition or, if available, on more recent editions, of which he offers a useful survey (pp. 24–27, 35). While being aware of the difficulties arising from the complex transmission of the Avesta, Bichlmeier generally refrains from engaging with the text-critical and philological problems which beset virtually every Avestan sentence. Considering the large quantity of text material under investigation, such an approach is understandable, and perhaps necessary in order to complete the task, but it remains a compromise which is at the expense of a more in-depth analysis of individual passages. There are occasions when it is simply not possible to dispense with a discussion of text-critical problems, especially when they affect a case form which is being adduced in order to illustrate a certain syntactic function.

For instance, among the examples of the accusative with the local adverb *aṇtarə* 'in between', Bichlmeier quotes without comment (p. 200) the expression *yim aṇtarə haēnaiiā̊ xrūišiieitiš* (Yt 15.49) as edited by Geldner in spite of the fact that the form *haēnaiiā̊* is clearly not an accusative, but a genitive and has been convincingly emended by Humbach to *haēnā̊ yā* (see Hintze 1994, 376 for references).

Conversely, on some occasions Bichlmeier proposes a new interpretation of a passage, but without always adequately taking the context into account. A case in point is Vd 6.27 *frašá fraiiōiṯ iristəm uzbarōiṯ āpō* which he translates as 'vorwärts soll er gehen und den Toten zu den Wassern hintragen', taking *āpō* as the acc. denoting the goal. He rejects earlier explanations according to which *āpō* here functions as an ablative 'from the water' because one would expect the YAv. athematic abl.sg. form to be re-characterized by means of the ending *-t* and thus distinguished from the gen.sg. (pp. 237, 60f. with fn. 143). While Bichlmeier's objection is justified, also by the fact, not mentioned by him, that Vd 6.29 and the following paragraphs attest the expected ablative *apaṯ haca* in parallel contexts, his proposal is difficult, if not impossible, to accept. This is because Mazdayasnians, with whom the passage is concerned, not only would regard putting a corpse into a stream as anathema, but also the context indicates that the dead body is removed from, rather than introduced into the water. For the preceding stanza states explicitly that the corpse is already in the water, a fact of which Bichlmeier is aware, since on p. 169 he lists the form *taci.apaiia* 'in running water' of Vd 6.26 as a loc.sg. with postposition *-ā*:

> Vd 6.26 *dātarə … ašā́um*
> *yaṯ aēte yōi mazdaiiasna*
> *pāδa aiiaṇtəm vā taciṇtəm vā*
> *barəmnəm vā vazəmnəm vā*
> *taci.apaiia nasāum frajasạn*
> *kuθa tē vərəziiạn*
> *aēte yōi mazdaiiasna*

> Creator, ... Truthful One,
> If these, the Mazdā-worshippers,
> while walking or running,
> riding or driving,
> come upon a corpse in running water,
> how shall these Mazdā-worshippers
> proceed?

In Vd 6.27 the form *āpō* occurs not just once but five times. The last four attestations, for which the context excludes an ablative function, could be either genitives of space or, more likely, acc.plur. forms denoting the goal. Each of them is governed by the verb *fraiiōiṯ* 'let him go forward', as also might be the first *āpō*:

> Vd 6.27 *āaṯ mraoṯ ahurō mazdå*
> *maṯ aϑranąm framuxti*
> *maṯ vastranąm niδāiti*
> *upa. mąnaiiən zaraϑuštra*
> *fraša fraiiōiṯ*
> *iristəm uzbarōiṯ*
> *āpō zaraϑuštra*
> *ā zaŋgaēibiiasciṯ āpō*
> *ā žnubiiasciṯ āpō*
> *ā maiδiianascit āpō*
> *ā nərəbərəzasciṯ āpō*
> *vīspəm ā ahmāṯ*
> *yaδōiṯ upa.jasōiṯ iristąm tanūm*

> Then said Ahura Mazdā:
> "Let them stand by, O Zarathustra,
> while one (of them) is taking off his shoes,
> while one (of them) is shedding his clothes.
> Let him go forward,
> let him lift up the dead;
> (let him go forward) into the water, O Zarathustra,
> (let him go forward) into the water up to the ankles,
> (let him go forward) into the water up to the knees,
> (let him go forward) into the water up to the waist,
> (let him go forward) into the water up to a man's
>   height,
> (let him go forward into the water) so far
> till he can reach the dead body."

Vd 6.27 also offers a series of clear examples of the ablative denoting the goal, the so-called "inverted ablative" preceded by the local particle *ā*. According to Bichlmeier, such ablatives are "rare", but he records no attestations (pp. 144f.). Instead the reader is referred to his discussion of its use to denote time. There one finds the expression *vīspəm ā ahmāṯ yaδōiṯ* of Vd 6.27 interpreted in the temporal sense 'until' (p. 382). However, the context of the stanza just quoted rather suggests a local meaning for this and the four preceding inverted ablatives, the discussion of which is entirely lacking in Bichlmeier's book.

A further instance of an inverted local ablative which he does not record is Yt 13.49 *yā̊ vīsāδa āuuaiieiṇti* '(the Fravashis,) who fly to the dwelling' (cf. Hintze 1994, 144 with fn. 59). The fact that here the ablative is extended, rather than preceded by *-ā*, undermines Bichlmeier's statement that in all clear instances the adposition *ā* precedes the ablative denoting the goal (p.144). Other passages one looks for in vain in this connection include H 1.11 (*x^vafnāδa*; the form also occurs in H 1.13 with a different syntactic function) and Y 42.6, which one would have expected to find in the discussion of *dūrāṯ* (pp. 110f.).

Considering the large quantity of source material Bichlmeier has been working on, his work is liable to attract criticism of philological detail like the one just presented. However, such criticism, of which the above is merely one example, suggests that the reader would be well advised to examine the attestations in their respective contexts before building on Bichlmeier's results. The chief merit of his work lies in the fact that he has provided the scholarly world with a comprehensive inventory of the Younger Avestan attestations of the three cases under investigation, classified them according to their functions and presented them in a systematic order. Moreover, his work breaks new ground in the study of Avestan case syntax thanks to the use of a theoretical framework which goes well beyond the traditional approach of his predecessors. For these reasons his book will serve as a valuable tool for future work on Avestan case syntax. One

of its benefits is that it is now possible to assess the probability of individual syntactic interpretations on a quantitative basis. For instance, provided Bichlmeier's account is here reliable, it emerges that there are no parallels in Avestan for Bartholomae's view, which Bichlmeier p. 331 adopts, that the genitive in Yt 13.50 *kahe … āγairiiāṯ kahe … frāiieziiāṯ* denotes the agent of the finite passive verbal forms. The fact that such use is isolated lends plausibility to the interpretation, not discussed by Bichlmeier, that here *kahe* rather functions as a possessive genitive (Hintze 2000, 35–37).

As far as the diachronic perspective is concerned, Bichlmeier generally confirms what might previously have been assumed on rather impressionistic grounds, namely that Young Avestan case syntax takes a middle position between the archaic Vedic and Old Avestan stages, where the individual cases still have a large degree of autonomy and local particles nuance the sentence rather than modifying the case form, and the more advanced stage of development represented by Old Persian and characterized by a rigid valency frame of the verbs and the marking of cases by means of adpositions (pp. 396–398).

Some Avestan words have irritating typos, such as p. 61 Vd 8.80 (40) *kāhmāičiṯ* (for *kahmāičiṯ*), p. 200 Yt 14.47 (474) *rašta* (for *rāšta*), p. 278 par. 2 *āuua* (for *āiia*), p.331 Yt 17.55 (936) *aunupaēta* (for *anupaēta*). The passage quoted on p.182 (419) is Vd 13.49 (not Yt 13.49). A work one would expect to find in the very useful bibliography is Theodora Bynon, "Evidential, raised possessor, and the historical source of the ergative construction in Indo-Iranian." *TPS* 103, 2005, 1–72.

References

Delbrück, B.
    1867   *Ablativ, Localis, Instrumentalis im Altindischen, Lateinischen, Griechischen und Deutschen. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Berlin.

Haudry, J.
    1977   *L'emploi des cas en védique. Introduction a l'étude des case en indo-européen.* Lyon.

Hewson, J. & V. Bubenik
　2006　　*From case to adposition. The development of configurational syntax in Indo-European languages.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia.

Hintze, A.
　1994　　*Der Zamyād-Yašt.* Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Wiesbaden (Beiträge zur Iranistik 15).
　2000　　*'Lohn' im Indoiranischen.* Eine semantische Studie des Rigveda und Avesta. Wiesbaden (Beiträge zur Iranistik 20).

Hübschmann, H.
　1875　　*Zur Casuslehre.* München.

Kellens, J. & E. Pirart
　1990　　*Les textes vieil-avestiques.* Vol.2. Répertoires grammaticaux et lexique. Wiesbaden.

Reichelt, H.
　1909　　*Awestisches Elementarbuch.* Heidelberg.

Skjærvø, P. O.
　2009　　Old Iranian. In: G. Windfuhr (ed.), *The Iranian Languages.* London & New York, 43–195.

West, M.
　2011　　*Old Avestan Syntax and Stylistics. With an edition of the texts.* Berlin & Boston (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Neue Folge, vol. 13).

<div align="right">

Almut Hintze
SOAS, London

</div>

Culture

Elizabeth Boyle and Paul Russell, (eds.), *The Tripartite Life of Whitley Stokes (1839-1909).* Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011. ISBN 978-1-84682-278-0. 252 + xiv pages.

　　This volume presents, in fourteen chapters written by fourteen different scholars, and an Introduction (by the editors) the career of one of the premier students and practitioners of comparative (mainly but not entirely Celtic) linguistics and manuscript-source-editing in 19th century Ireland, a figure whose work in the early Irish sources is still usable – and used – today. Readers of a Dumézilian bent will soon discover that the "tripartite" reference has nothing to do with any theory of Indo-

European tripartition; it involves three aspects of Stokes'
life: his life as a private person, with marriage and
fatherhood and his personal interactions with others, then
his linguistic and textual work as a Celticist, and finally his
legal work in India, as the complier and creator of a
massive, coherent work unifying the multiform practices of
Indian civil law – as a trusted servant, in fact, of the Raj.
The exemplar, then, would be Stokes' own work, *The
Tripartite Life of Patrick.*

The Introduction assures us that the collection will
not be "a work of hagiography"; in fact the elements that
make up simple biographical detail are more than a little
disjointed or scanted in these selections. The essence of
Whitley Stokes, detached from scholarship? Rather hard to
say from what is presented here. We are given several
photographs of the man himself; unfortunately Stokes
opted for one of those beards too often boasted by the
late-Victorian male, beards that look as if they were applied
to the front of the subject's face by an incompetent
makeup artist, and manufactured, it seems, from yak hair.
What we *will* learn, though, is that behind the foliage
lurked a formidable, acerbic, rather intolerant intelligence,
an intelligence that was harnessed to a prodigious and
productive energy.

The chapters arranged here follow, more or less, the
parabola of a life, beginning with Stokes' grandfather, also
named Whitley; Jacqueline Hill ("Whitley Stokes senior
(1763-1845) and his political, religious and cultural
milieux") informs us that the grandfather was a convinced
(Church of Ireland) Christian and clergyman, a friend of
Theobald Wolfe Tone, a United Irishmen supporter, a
tolerant exponent of Catholic Emancipation. What his life
and set of opinions had to do with the younger Whitley is
not quite clear, for that the younger man lived in a
different world, one in distinct contrast to the elder
Whitley Stokes (Stokes' father, Arthur, is barely a presence
here, save that he convinced his son to become a lawyer
and to seek his fortune in Britain).

Chapter 2, "'A shadowy but important figure': Rudolf
Thomas Siegfried," by Pól Ó Dochartaigh, really launches
WS on his scholarly career, by way of the influence of

Siegfried, a young German scholar imported to Dublin (TCD) from Tübingen. Siegfried's special concerns were Sanskrit and Welsh texts, but his most potent influence was in "the academic discipline of Celtic philology," as an offshoot of the new, German-centered discipline of comparative philology (Siegfried could interpret Johann Kasper Zeuss's very important *Grammatica Celtica*, published in 1853). He died young – at the age of 32 – and left little published work. He was, however, a good friend of WS's, and it was the "German discipline" carried to Ireland by Siegfried that Stokes advanced against the "fantastic speculation" that had previously dominated Celtic-Irish language studies, especially etymology.

Chapter 3, Elizabeth Boyle's "'The impiety of the intellect': Whitley Stokes and the Pre-Raphaelites" takes us in a rather odd direction; one could almost speak of a dialectical relationship with the stern Germanic *regula* already dominating comparative philology, and yet WS seems to have responded to the aesthetic sensibility of this group (he knew Dante Gabriel Rosetti), and his earliest publications (translations of certain "Danish ballads") reflected this interest in popular literature ("full of force, vividness and reality", p. 47 – though Stokes did not carry this interest into the Irish demotic area). One of WS's translations, of the poem "Hellalyle and Hildebrand" is appended here, in two versions, one distinctly more Pre-Raphaelite (more 'medieval,' archaic, rich – perhaps over-rich – in description) than the second – which this author even calls "more 'philological'" (p. 57). But WS was only in his twenties at this point.

Nigel Chancellor's "'Patriot hare or colonial hound?': Whitley Stokes and Irish Identity in British India, 1862-81" (Chapter 4) follows WS to India, and takes up, I think fruitfully, a "paradox of identity," that is, how Stokes was able to both serve the Raj – and serve it faithfully and productively – and simultaneously establish a reputation as the coming man in studies of the treasures of the early Irish language, coming from an Ireland which was itself "colonized." This chapter is the pivot of the volume; in India WS escaped a career as a poor lawyer scraping along in London, picked up an important benefactor (Sir Henry

Maine), and managed to simultaneously work most productively at his Celtic scholarship (at extreme long range) while professionally – as a lawyer – engaged in an immense codification of Indian civil law, using as a model Sanskritic (Vedic) texts and the techniques of comparative philology (p. 65). Stokes met and married his wife in India (and later lost her and one small son – India extracted its price from him). Irish expatriates were thick on the ground in the Indian Civil Service, and this author sees a congruence between the view they developed of the Indian peasantry and what they had left behind in Ireland (p. 72). In any event, Stokes left India richer but sadder; he had "shaken the pagoda tree" and emerged with a considerable fortune, and yet had his doubts – for one, about the very sense of "making laws for this vast country" (he was not sanguine about the salvific effect of Christian proselytizing, either)

Chapter 5, "Reading between the lines: Whitley Stokes, scribbled and scholarly apparatus," by Ananya Jahanara Kabir, is an entry both intriguing and irritating. The writing styles and approaches of the other contributors naturally vary, but only Professor Kabir is willing to scale the crumbling (but always re-created) edifice of jargon and throw herself, and us, into the void. A sentence that introduces "my (de)construction of this philological meta-epistemology through the interstices and marginalia of Stokes' scholarly apparatus" (p. 80) might bring us to a halt; "a macaronic visualization of interlinearity" (p. 91) does not instill much confidence. A wise mentor writes "readers should never be required to retrace their steps, however short the journey." Still, and nevertheless, there are some nuggets of sense amid the high-falutin phraseology and the echoes of the densest theorizing. Stokes' "interlinear mind" is a subject worth examining and cogitating on; as is "medieval imperialism," so this is not simply an exercise in rampant neologism. But many readers might be impelled to move on rather quickly.

Maxim Fomin's "The Sanskrit Legacy of Whitley Stokes" (Chapter 6) addresses, first, the parallels he located between Sanskrit and the Celtic languages, and where Stokes moved off from what he had taken from

Siegfried, to establish a commonality in linguistic parallels and congruences, in literary themes, and in cultural practices (p. 101). Stokes worked assiduously in all of these areas; one of his signal discoveries was in the prosimetrial (prose-and-verse) tradition common to the literature of each area; another insight was on the influence of monastic austerities in the pursuit of "truth". Stokes did nod, especially in his "wilder" explanatory explorations (or concatenations) of mythology-and-etymology, but in the main, according to Fomin, he usually was a trustworthy path-marker.

Chapters 7 and 8 are lighter if not minor fare, dealing as they do, first, with Stokes' appreciation of the Fitzgerald edition of Omar Khayyam's *Rubáiyát* (John Drew, "Whitley Stokes and the *Rubáiyát of 'Omar Khayyám*" and then Bernhard Meier's "Comparative philology and mythology: the Letters of Whitley Stokes to Adalbert Kuhn." The edition of the quatrains that came into Stokes' possession was, in fact, pirated; from it came some quatrains of Stokes' own devising – he seems to have been a part of a "cult of Rubaiyatism," and perhaps warrants the title of "the most respectable of pirates" (p. 118). Meier's contribution spreads out from the topic of the letters exchanged between scholars (Kuhn was a Great Name in philology; unfortunately only Stokes' letters to him survive), to the many difficulties inherent in long-distance publication in the 19th century, and to the question of why *German* publication of Celtic researches was so important to Stokes (he felt that Ireland was too priest-ridden and unreceptive: p. 127), and finally, the ways in which comparative linguistics and comparative mythology could unlock the pre-history of the Indo-European peoples. And at the last, a slightly fuller picture of a "human" Stokes emerges from his correspondence with Kuhn and others.

With Alderik H. Blom's "Whitley Stokes and the study of Continental Celtic" (Chapter 9) we turn to another focus of his scholarly interest. Gaulish was the only Continental Celtic tongue known to the early 19th century, and that mainly through references found in the ancient writers, but now archaeology and paleography increasingly was responsible for the discovery of a growing

treasury of inscriptionary material. WS took up this new store of data, and concerned himself especially with declensional morphology (Gaulish then being re-connected to other Celtic tongues), but his triumph was the identification of a Celtic language in the so-called Todi Inscription, a bi-lingual artifact found in northern Italy (in Latin and what had, in error, been called Umbrian, certainly not a Celtic but an Italic tongue, and not everyone in the Germanic contingent was convinced by Stokes' contention at the time). We can see him, then, as a significant pioneer in the study of the corpus of newly-revealed Continental Celtic inscriptions and a brilliant investigator of the morphology of "old Celtic."

Chapter 10, Paul Russell's "Grilling in Calcutta: Whitley Stokes, Henry Bradshaw and Old Welsh in Cambridge" adds another tessera to the tale. The "grilling" identifies WS as still laboring in India, sweating in Kipling's "City of Dreadful Night" (though he had some time on leave, back in the British Isles) and here it is Old Welsh and Old Breton texts that concerned him, and a major problem (and opportunity) involved the named Bradshaw, the Cambridge University Librarian, a gifted amateur in manuscript researches, and a really rotten correspondent. Still, Bradshaw had identified a "treasure," consisting of Old Welsh glosses on the author Martianus Capella, a "raw material" that occupied WS for a time, and Russell can see Stokes' analytic techniques in process and show Bradshaw's aid in constructing these techniques. An appendix lists WS's work in Old Breton and Old Welsh, and again demonstrates his polymathic energy, though this was his first and last foray into this particular part of the Celtic linguistic field.

In Chapter 11, Thomas Charles-Edwards' "Whitley Stokes and early Irish law" we come to what we might call the well-marked Hibernian section of this collection, four chapters that both celebrate and raise certain questions about this decorated hero of Celtic scholarship. Charles-Edwards makes the point that WS was touted as someone who, given his wide and broad legal expertise, *should* have worked on editing the *Ancient Laws of Ireland*, but did not. In fact, he mounted a vigorous, even vicious attack on

those who had attempted this project (though excusing the earliest editors) – the terms "misleading gibberish and guesswork" are used by him (p. 162). Some of WS's criticisms have held up; some have not (this author remarks that Stokes was, while in India, engaged in Celtic scholarship as "a part-time activity," a denigratory, or at least dismissive claim which is not supported by other scholars included in this volume – Chancellor for one).

Pádraic Moran's disquisition, "'Their harmless calling': Whitley Stokes and the Irish linguistic tradition" (Chapter 12) continues what we might call a reevaluation of the (ambiguous?) nature of WS's Irish-centered scholarship. Stokes took up the editing of the medieval material (especially the glossaries) and worked on them with the intention, it appears, of reinforcing Zeuss's seminal comparative opus on Celtic philology, intending to firmly establish the I-E roots of the Irish Celtic material. At the same time he criticized both the older and the more modern attempts at glossarial etymology as "foolish," "fanciful" or with harsher words. He worked with and respected John O'Donovan – who had a wide knowledge of the modern Irish language and folk life – but kept his distance from "the tradition," seeing no value (sociological, historical, or other) in the old documents other than as etymological "fodder."

Chapter 13, "Whitley Stokes, Standish Hayes O'Grady and *Acallam na Senórach*" (Geraldine Parsons) centers on this most important early Irish source, and on a bifurcation in the scholarly approach to it. And we have a newly apparent political agenda in the Irish academy. Stokes' edition of the *Acallam* remains an imposing work, but we see that it was created in response to what he considered an inferior (in comparative linguistic terms) effort, the edition undertaken by O'Grady. A friendship between the two men (scholars of similar backgrounds) was eventually broken, but the main difference between them was a marked one and involved quite dissimilar personalities, training, and perceptual fields: WS always was the academic, the "philologist," O'Grady the "instinctive" editor, a native Irish speaker who was very aware of WS's deficiencies in this area. O'Grady had no patience with

"the continental scholars," and Stokes fired back. There was some mutual respect, but the difference between their approaches is striking.

The last chapter (14), "Whitley Stokes and Modern Irish," by Nollaig Ó Muráile, gets personal to a degree, beginning with an invidious comparison between Stokes and the senior WS, his grandfather, the United Irishman and friend of Wolfe Tone and a friend and booster of a living, demotic language which the younger man seems to have disdained, as he was tied "to pen and paper." His work on sources in modern Irish was miniscule, not even 1% of his total, and this author sees no "heart" in the work he did do, though his productions, as always, were scrupulously worked out. The chapter ends with a round of polemical gunfire from Fr. Paul Walsh (1885-1941), an Irish scholar and cleric who called WS "among the wretched crowd who always despised Ireland" and "a great scholar but a very patronizing person" (p. 209). Stokes may have written (as several of the authors included here repeat) "Hibernus sum, non anglus" but Walsh, for one, didn't seem to believe him.

If there is a problem with this volume, admirable as the effort is, it is in the design or conception. The collection intends to create a portrait of a great scholar as a mosaic, so that while the entries are lavishly footnoted, the Bibliography is compendious, and the Index certainly acceptable, I think that in the end we see Whitley Stokes in bits and pieces (appropriate to a mosaic, but raising certain obvious objections). Some of these bits and pieces are more important or impressive than others, larger in scope or ambition, but the organization by chapters weighs or weights each equally. The rhythms of his life are glimpsed intermittently, and usually emerge from behind the immense, intricately detailed screen of his scholarship. We do see, I think, a prickly, judgmental, almost too-professionally-engaged scholar – one of immense and unquestioned gifts (gifts which Stokes himself wanted acknowledged; *this* violet did not shrink). There are repetitive passages and references, as would be expected in this sort of endeavor, and some contradictions as well. The question of his essential "Irishness" – is this

important? it appears to be – seems to persist as a perpetual subtext, and this impression builds as the book progresses. The reader has to be impressed with the scholarly thoroughness and dedication of the entries, but also to wonder if there isn't more of a life there somewhere, more of a Stokes lurking behind that extraordinarily, even dramatically lavish beard and moustache. At one point there in India Stokes called himself "a salamander," and perhaps there *is* more fire to be discovered in his long life.

Dean Miller