

CRITICA

FORTSON, B. W.: *Indo-European Language and Culture. An Introduction* [Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics 19]. Oxford 2004, pp. 468.

Until now,¹ contemporary Indo-European linguistics lacked a reliable introductory work based on the *communis opinio*: introductory works were either too short (and intended for, first of all, non-Indo-Europeanists),² out-of-date³ or highly idiosyncratic.⁴ Such a masterpiece, on the other hand, as M. Meier-Brügger's⁵ is too technical for an absolute beginner. B. W. Fortson's (University of Michigan) volume intends to fill this gap. It shall be anticipated: he splendidly solved this task.

The book consists of twenty chapters. Following an introduction (ch. 1: The Comparative Method and the Indo-European Family) and a description of PIE culture and archaeology (ch. 2) the main parts of PIE grammar are described (chs. 3–8: phonology, morphology [introduction, verb, noun, pronouns and other parts of speech] and syntax [!]), then all main branches of the PIE family (chs. 9–19), in chronological order of their appearance, completed by a chapter about the fragmentary languages (ch. 20).

Placing Phrygian in the chapter on “Fragmentary Languages” can be questioned because it is relatively well understood (better than, say, Lydian).⁶ – Illyrian known only from onomastic material has been

¹ This review was written with the support of the “MTA – Ryoichi Sasakawa Young Leaders Fellowship Fund”.

² TICHY, E.: *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen für Studierende sprachwissenschaftlicher Disziplinen*. Bremen 2004². (1st ed. 2000, cf. the review of P. SCHRIJVER in *Kratylos* 49 [2004] 164–167).

³ SZEMERÉNYI, O. J. L.: *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford 1996.

⁴ E.g. SCHMITT-BRANDT, R.: *Einführung in die Indogermanistik*. UTB 1506. Tübingen–Basel 1998.

⁵ MEIER-BRÜGGER, M.: *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. 8., überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage unter Mitarbeit von Matthias Fritz und Manfred Mayrhofer. Berlin – New York 2002.

⁶ The author himself also noted this (“Probably more is known about Phrygian than about any of the other languages in this chapter, and some outlines of its history are clear”, p. 402), but he remained inconsequent.

also included in the book, but the so-called *Ostalpenindogermanisch* – also known only from onomastic material, but on a firmer philological foundation⁷ – is not mentioned in the entire volume.

The book closes with a glossary of linguistic terms, a bibliography of cited and recommended works⁸ and a word-index.⁹ The chapters about the branches contain an introductory part with a map of the spread of the languages, a general survey of the main phonological and morphological changes until the proto-language of that branch, then the main languages are treated from a historical point of view (all fields again) after a short presentation. Every main language is also represented by a short text sample augmented by philological and linguistic comments. Another welcome feature is that the author discusses *all* branches in similar detail, i.e. even those that are more or less neglected by other introductory works, such as e.g. Albanian.¹⁰

Unfortunately, the maps are very schematic, some of them not without problems: Map 9.1. (p. 155) is a blend of Anatolian geography from the Late Bronze Age until Hellenistic times (where Lycia is given the much greater territory of Lukkā, its Late Bronze Age precursor), but the main problem is the location of Luwiya in the southern part of Tarhuntašša, because its exact position is a matter of serious debate.¹¹ – Map 11.2 (p. 218): Balochi is spoken not only in South Pakistan but also along the Iranian–Pakistani border and around the threefold border of these countries and Afghanistan (omitting the scattered populations).¹² – Map 20.1 (p. 401): Messapic was not spoken in whole South Italy (this was inhabited by Samnites)¹³ but only in Apulia and Calabria;¹⁴ Phrygian was spoken not only in extreme North-Western Asia Minor, but also in Central Anatolia (e.g. Gordion, Boğazköy, Kerkenes Dağ) and Cappadocia (Tyana).¹⁴

⁷ See the works of P. ANREITER: *Breonen, Genaunen und Fokunaten. Vorrömisches Namengut in den Tiroler Alpen* [Archaeolingua Series Minor 9]. Budapest 1997; Der Ablaut in “ostalpenindogermanischen” Namen. In ID. – JEREM, E. (eds.): *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag* [Archaeolingua 10]. Budapest 1999, 23–38; *Die vorrömischen Namen Pannoniens* [Archaeolingua Series minor 16]. Budapest 2000, esp. 10–21 (for criticism see B. ADAMIK in *Acta Antiqua* 43 (2003) 262–268).

⁸ The reviewer was glad to see that the author is far more familiar with scholarly literature written in German than many American experts (cf. ZIMMER, ST.: Comments on a Great Book. *JIES* 27 [1999] 106–107), although most of his oversights could have been avoided by consulting scholarly literature written in German. Such formulations as “Readers of German and Italian should also consult...” (p. 44), “For those who read French...” (p. 78), “Readers of French...” (p. 200) are at least strange, because every Indo-Europeanist has to be able to have at least a reading knowledge of German, English and French, and, in many cases, Italian and Spanish as well.

⁹ Although the author himself emphasised that the data should not be oversimplified or skewed by leaving out diacritics (p. xii), the Greek data were also transcribed, which is at least unusual (and makes a false impression on beginners, who will be surprised when encountering scholarly literature). Though the type-setting of such a book is not an easy task, the reviewer is happy to claim that there are extremely few typos in it (e.g. *hūmant-* instead of *hūmant-*, p. 104).

¹⁰ Cf. Fortson’s view (“Albanian may not, it is true, provide us with as much information about the proto-language as Sanskrit, but it does tell us some useful things, and in any event it has a maddeningly fascinating (or fascinatingly maddening) history that merits careful attention”, p. xiii) and E. TICHY’s (“Das Albanische wird hier nicht berücksichtigt, weil es nur mit besonderen Schwierigkeiten zur Rekonstruktion des Uridg. herangezogen werden kann”, [n. 2] 17).

¹¹ See the different views of H. CR. MELCHERT (Introduction. In ID. [ed.]: *The Luwians* [HdO 68]. Leiden–Boston 2003, 2), TR. BRYCE (History. In MELCHERT [ibid.g 31] and the present reviewer (SIMON, ZS.: [H. Craig Melchert (ed.): *The Luwians*]. *Acta Antiqua* 46 [2006] 314–315).

¹² See e.g. JAHANI, C. – KORN, A. (eds): *The Baloch and their Neighbours. Ethnic and Linguistic Contact in Balochistan in Historical and Modern Times*. Wiesbaden 2003, Map 9.

¹³ LAMBOLEY, J.-L.: *Recherches sur les Messapiens IV^e – I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.* Rome 1996, Fig. 2. (archaeological sites), Fig. 105 (Strabo), Fig. 106 (Pliny).

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. the collected Old Phrygian inscriptions in BRUXHE, CL. – LEJEUNE, M.: *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*. Paris 1984 and the supplements in *Kadmos* 41 (2002) 1–102 and 43 (2004)