

## BOOK REVIEWS

Kümmel, Martin, *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen* [Historische Sprachforschung, Ergänzungsheft 39]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996. X + 185 pp. ISBN 3-525-26228-0. DM 64.

This book, which goes back to a thesis submitted for the degree of Magister Artium at the University of Freiburg, is to be seen as a further monographic contribution to the study of the Indo-Iranian – and Indo-European – verbal system. It investigates function and form of two relatively small but – at least as far as the first one is concerned – archaic categories of the Indo-Iranian verb:

- i.) middle presents with 3.sg. in IIr. *\*-ai*, 3.pl. in *\*-rai*, such as Ved. *śáy-e* ‘lies’, plur. *śe-re* ‘they lie’ (= stative).
- ii.) 3.sg. in *\*-i* and 3.pl. in *\*-ram/n* with special ablaut and partly patientive function, such as Ved. *(a)jáni* ‘was slain’ (= so-called passive aorist).

While there is evidence for statives also outside Indo-Iranian, in particular in Anatolian and perhaps in Old Irish, the *i*-passive is a morphological category confined to Indo-Iranian languages.

The material basis of the investigation is derived from the Avesta and the Rigveda, although post-Rigvedic texts up to the Brāhmaṇa prose are also considered. The presentation follows a well-tested pattern: the main body of the work, entitled *Spezieller Teil* (pp. 22–155), is constituted by a ‘dictionary’ and discusses forms and contexts of stative and *i*-passive forms of individual verbal roots, which are arranged in the usual order of the Sanskrit alphabet. The Vedic (pp. 22–142) and Avestan (pp. 143–155) materials are studied separately. This is a convenient arrangement, which makes the book easy to consult. The results of this investigation are presented in the first section, entitled *Allgemeiner Teil* (pp. 1–21). A brief summary (*Zusammenfassung*, pp. 156–161) at the end of the book includes a useful table listing the examined Vedic and Avestan verbal roots, with indication of whether those roots form also a root present or aorist besides their stative and/or *i*-passive forms. The work is concluded by a



bibliography (pp. 161–171), an index locorum (pp. 172–181) and an index of words (pp. 181–185).

The individual monographic entries constituting the main part of the book follow a basic pattern in discussing a particular root's attestations of stative and passive aorist forms. Different chronological layers within the Vedic literature are hereby taken into consideration. As a result, each entry offers a morphological mini-history of the stative and *i*-passive forms within the individual verbal system of a particular root. For example, the entry of the Vedic root *īś* 'to be lord over' informs the reader that, while statives of this root are attested in the Rgveda (3rd sg. *īśe*, 3rd pl. *īśire*), they start to be replaced by regular middle forms already in the RV, a process which is complete in the younger Brāhmaṇa prose (pp. 23–24). Whenever necessary, forms are quoted in their full contexts together with a translation, usually the author's own.

While these monographic discussions of forms and text passages offer a useful collection of the material and numerous interesting and occasionally thought-provoking interpretations, they do not always give a full account of the attestations. For example, the form *ādṛśran* 'they have appeared' is attested seven and not, as stated by M.K., six times (RV 7.76.2 is missing, p. 65). Another instance is the form *ādarśi*, attested 16 times according to Grassmann 627, but 12 times according to M.K. 64–65, who, however, lists 14 attestations (a reference to RV 1.124.3 is lacking). It is obviously impossible for the reviewer to check all forms, but it is somewhat irritating to find that the inventory of the Rigvedic attestations of two forms of the same verbal root is incomplete.

Moreover, problematic forms and the relevant secondary literature are not always discussed in as much detail as one might wish. Entirely missing is a discussion of the Old Avestan form Y 44.18 *apiuuaitī*, which Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1343 and others interpret as a passive aorist of the root *vat* (see Hintze 2000, p. 257(32) with references). Another instance is the Old Avestan hapax legomenon *mraoī* in Y 32.14. M.K. interprets the form as a 3rd sg. passive aorist without referring to Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1193, who saw in it a 'Präteritum Passivi', cf. *GIP* I.1, p. 209 §365. M.K. argues that the paradigmatic integration of *mraoī* as the passive aorist of *mrū* 'to speak' could pre-date the suppletion of its aorist by *vac* 'to speak'. However, since *mrū* and *vac* actually form a paradigm in the Older Avesta with the *i*-passive supplied by *vac* (Y 43.13 *vācī*, Y 36.6 *auuācī*), Humbach's objections [*WZKSO* 1, 1957, p. 91(26), followed e.g. by Kellens 1974, p. 325; 1984, p. 232 and 356, 357(12); Kellens/Pirart II 289 and Hoffmann/Forssman p. 228] against Bartholomae's view are valid. Humbach's own preference for identifying the underlying root as *mrū* 'to

maltreat' is supported by his observation that both in the Gathic passage Y 32.14 and in Younger Avestan the words *gauu-* 'ox, cow' and *jan* 'to slay' are found in the immediate context of forms or derivatives from *mrū* 'to maltreat'. The interpretation of *mraoī* as an *i*-passive from *mrū* 'to speak' would accordingly require the assumption that the form belongs – just as YAv. *jaini* 'was slain' (which, M.K. 147f., however, categorizes as an aorist) – with the present stem, which is identical with the root. In any case, however, whichever of these two roots *mrū* is seen in *mraoī*, be it *mrū* 'to speak' or *mrū* 'to maltreat' (in *mrū-ra-* 'cruel'), the form does not agree with the Avestan sound law according which IIr. *\*au̯* before syllabic *i*, *ī* should become *əuu* (Hoffmann/Forssman p. 70). One would expect OAv. *\*mrəuuī* < IIr. *\*mraūH-i*, cf. – the only other instance of *-əuuī* in word final position – YAv. *səuuī* Yt 1.15 < *\*saūHī*, nom.sg. of *səuuin-* adj. 'strong'. M.K.'s claim that *mraoī* would show a regular sound development from older *\*-au̯Hi* (p. 19) is entirely based on an *ad-hoc* assumption, since the sound law IIr. *\*au̯i* > OAv., YAv. *əuuī* operates with *seṭ*-roots, too, cf. OAv. *zəuuīm* (three-syllabic) Y 31.4 'to be invoked' < IIr. *\*j<sup>h</sup>au̯H- ijam* (Ved. *hávīyam*). It must therefore be assumed that original *\*mrəuuī* was corrupted to *mraoī*, perhaps under the influence of forms from *mrū* 'to speak', such as 1 sg. *mraomī*, which is actually the reading of the Pahlavi Yasna manuscript J2 in Y 32.14.

Even if some forms and attestations are lacking and even if some of M.K.'s interpretations of individual forms are less certain than they might appear, taken altogether, the monographic entries offer a fair presentation of the Vedic and Avestan material. This constitutes the basis of the more general reflections in the first part of the book, entitled *Allgemeiner Teil*. M.K.'s summary of the history of the problem ('Der Stativ: Problem und Forschungsgeschichte', pp. 2–5) presents basically two different views on the origins of the Vedic verbal forms in *-e* and *-re*. One group of scholars, including C. Watkins and J. Jasanoff, interpret them as archaic forms of the middle. Others, including H. Eichner, N. Oettinger and H. Rix, pose a separate Indo-European verbal category 'stative'. The latter is also M.K.'s own stance. Within that group, however, there is difference of opinion as to whether statives were formed only in the third persons or also in the first and second ones. The problem arises from the fact that stative forms are attested only in the third persons singular and plural, and in the imperative. Oettinger 1976, 110 reconstructs accordingly only third persons while H. Rix 1977, p. 135 and esp. 1988, pp. 104–110 postulates a fully-fledged separate Indo-European voice 'stative' besides active and middle. The personal endings of the stative are taken as being basically identical with those of the perfect which would accordingly be a reduplicated stative.

When the voice ‘stative’ disappeared, possibly still during the common IE period, the perfect was integrated into the active while the stative was associated with the middle (pp. 8–9).

However, one is left wondering about how the ablaut which characterized the original statives relates to that of the perfects, a problem not addressed by M.K. As to the ablaut of the statives, M.K. p. 2 endorses Watkins’ reconstruction of two original types, an oxytone ( $*d^hug^h-é/ó >$  Vedic *duhé*) and a barytone one ( $*kél̥-o/e >$  Ved. *śáye*). The perfects, however, differ from the statives not only by reduplication but also by the *o*-grade of the root in the singular. Moreover, there seems to be also an unreduplicated type with *o*-grade in the singular and no reduplication, represented by  $*uoid-e$  ‘he knows’, which would have to be considered as an original stative according to M.K.’s reconstruction.

In his discussion of the stative in Indo-Iranian (pp. 9–14), M.K. categorizes the Vedic and Avestan statives on the basis of their contextual meaning and their position within the individual verbal system of a particular root. He identifies three types of statives in Vedic and two in Avestan. Most statives belong to the first group, which M.K. calls ‘Oppositionsstativ’. They have a passive meaning and contrast both formally and functionally with middle forms of agentive-reflexive meaning, such as stative *duhré* ‘they give milk’ (semantically from older ‘they can be milked’, p. 63) besides middle Ved. *duhaté* ‘they milk for themselves’, or stative IIr.  $*mlu\bar{u}-ái$  (Ved. *bruvé*, Av. *mruiiē* ‘he is said’) besides middle  $*mlū-tāi$  (Ved. *brūté*, Av. *ni-mrūite* ‘he predicts for himself’, cf. p. 76, 150). M.K. derives the patientive function of the statives from their earlier stative function. The second type, which he calls ‘Stativa tantum’, such as Vedic *īse* ‘is lord’, Av. *sōire* ‘they lie’, are isolated within the verbal system, lacking a contrasting middle and active. Thirdly, only in Vedic there are a few statives which have agentive meaning and are used just like middle forms, e.g. *ví ṛṇvire* ‘they open for themselves’. Since statives of that function are always derived from characterized present stems, M.K. argues convincingly that they are younger formations. The loss of the functional difference between (patientive) statives and (agentive-reflexive) middle eventually leads to the merger of the two categories and the complete disappearance of statives, which have been entirely replaced by middle forms in the Younger Brāhmaṇa prose.

In his discussion of the passive aorist (pp. 14–20), M.K. concludes that both the Vedic and the Avestan attestations point to an original resultative function of this formation. He accepts the old view (p. 15) that the *i*-passive goes back to an *i*-stem adjective with *o*-ablaut grade and resultative meaning, as continued e.g. in Greek τρόφις ‘well-fed, stout, large’, from

τρέφω ‘to cause to grow, bring up, rear’. While it has already been noted by other scholars that 3rd plurals in *-ran/-ram* belong paradigmatically with the 3.sg. passive aorist in *-i*, M.K.’s merit is to provide a full inventory of the forms on which this observation is based (pp. 15–18). With regard to their function he concludes that the passive aorists of transitive verbs have patientive meaning while those of intransitive verbs have fientive or agentive meaning, e.g. *áyoji, áyujran* ‘has, have been yoked’ (Hintze 2000, p. 80(5) is to be corrected accordingly) vs. *ábodhi, ábudhram/n* ‘is, are awoken’. Thus the passive aorists exhibit the same functional distribution as the verbal adjective in *-ta-*, an agreement which M.K. derives from the original resultative function of both formations (p. 18f.).

Finally, the relationship between the 3rd plural imperfect stative (which is not attested in Avestan) and passive aorist is discussed (pp. 20–21). Both formations are characterized by identical personal endings *-ram/ran*, but they are never found with roots which form both a stative and a passive aorist. M.K. derives the 3rd plural passive aorist from the 3rd plural stative by the assumption that 3rd plural statives were re-interpreted as 3rd plural passive aorists due to a shift of focus from the state to the event. For example, the semantic focus of an (hypothetical) stative injunctive IIr. *\*dṛ́crá* ‘they are visible’ would have shifted to the preceding event. The form could thus also be understood as ‘they have become visible, have appeared’. As a consequence, M.K. argues, it would have been interpreted as a 3rd plural belonging paradigmatically to the 3rd sg. passive aorist *\*dáŕci* ‘he has been seen, has appeared’. Whether or not one accepts this particular explanation, the emergence of the 3rd plural passive aorists should probably be seen in connection with the development of the patientive function of the statives.

This book by Martin Kümmel is a valuable contribution to Indo-Iranian verbal morphology for three major reasons. First, by providing an inventory and discussion of (nearly) all relevant forms and their contexts in Vedic and Avestan, he makes the Indo-Iranian material of the two categories easily available. Second, he has achieved a categorization of the different meanings of the statives and passive aorists in Vedic and Avestan. Third, he has firmly established that there are in Vedic 3rd plurals in *-ram/ran* and in Avestan 3rd sg. imperatives in *-qm* both of which belong paradigmatically with the *i*-passive aorists within the synchronic systems of the two languages. For these reasons, this book will remain an important monograph on the Indo-Iranian statives and passive aorists for years to come.

## REFERENCES

- Chr. Bartholomae, *AirWb.: Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Straßburg: Trübner, 1904, repr. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1979.
- Chr. Bartholomae, *GIP: 'Vorgeschichte der iranischen Sprachen: Awestasprache und Altpersisch'*. In: W. Geiger and E. Kuhn (eds.), *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie*, vol. I.1. Straßburg: Trübner, 1895–1902, 1–248.
- A. Hintze 2000: '*Lohn*' im Indoiranischen. Eine semantische Studie des Rigveda und Avesta. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2000 (Beiträge zur Iranistik 20).
- K. Hoffmann/B. Forssman: *Avestische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 1996 (IBS 84).
- J. Kellens 1974: *Les noms-racines de l'Avesta*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- J. Kellens 1984: *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- J. Kellens/E. Pirart: *Les textes vieil-avestiques*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. Vol.I: Introduction, texte et traduction, 1988. Vol.II: Répertoires grammaticaux et lexique, 1990. Vol.III: Commentaire, 1991.
- N. Oettinger 1976: 'Der indogermanische Stativ'. *MSS* 34, 109–149.
- N. Oettinger 1993: 'Zur Funktion des indogermanischen Stativs'. In: G. Meiser (ed.), *Indogermanica et Italica*. Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 341–361.
- H. Rix 1977: 'Das keltische Verbalsystem auf dem Hintergrund des indo-iranisch-griechischen Rekonstruktionsmodells'. In: K.H. Schmidt (ed.), *Indogermanisch und Keltisch*. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft am 16. und 17. Februar 1976 in Bonn. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- H. Rix 1988: 'The Proto-Indo-European Middle: Content, Forms and Origin'. *MSS* 49, 101–119.

Clare Hall  
Herschel Road  
Cambridge CB3 9AL  
England

ALMUT HINTZE

Pandey, Shyam Manohar, Bhojpuri Loriki: The Hindi Oral Epic Tradition. Allahabad: Sahitya Bhavan 1995, pp. VIII, 80, 778, 5 plates.

The ancient story of Lorik, his wife Mainā and his mistress Candā has proved much more durable as a folk tale than as used in the sufi Maulānā Dāūd's literary version, *Candāyan* (fourteenth century). The present volume continues Dr Pandey's work to publish the eight Avadhī and Bhojpurī versions of the folk story which he collected in field work during the 1960s and 70s. It is the fourth volume of the series, and the second to present a version in substantially unmixed Bhojpurī language. This version, the longest in Pandey's collection, was recorded in the Ballia

