

Hilfe bei der Beschäftigung mit keltischer und im engeren Sinne späthallstatt- und latènezeitlicher Archäologie zu sein. Der interessierte Laie wird allerdings für die Erklärung von wichtigen und zentralen archäologischen Begriffen immer noch auf das bereits über 40 Jahre alte Handbuch von J. Filip (1966/69: *Enzyklopädisches Handbuch zur Ur- und Frühgeschichte Europas*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GmbH. Bd. 1: 1966, Bd. 2: 1969.) zurückgreifen müssen.

Langenzenn

Norbert BAUM

STÜBER, Karin, Thomas ZEHNDER & Ulla REMMER: *Indogermanische Frauennamen*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2009. 486 S., ISBN 978-3-8253-5600-2. € 72.

Despite quite a strong disapproval once voiced by Antoine MEILLET (1925: 42), the etymological study of Indo-European personal names started by August FICK (1874) continues to be an integral part of the general comparative-linguistic endeavour. There is an evident reason for this state of affairs: along with general studies of the reconstructed lexica, names provide a rare insight into the culture and worldview of the speakers of the PIE language. Indo-European, however, was a male-dominated patriarchal society with concomitant values; no wonder then that names of men are prevalent in the sources and that, consequently, most studies of PIE and archaic Indo-European onomasticon were heavily gender biased.

Still, there is certainly enough material to make possible an overview of the basic types of PIE female names and investigate their semantic and morphological makeup. That was the aim of the project *Die indogermanischen Frauennamen* (2002–2007) based at the University of Zurich and headed initially by Michael Janda and from 2004 on by Karin Stüber. The book under review is an outcome of this project. It is a collective monograph by Karin Stüber, Thomas Zehnder, and Ulla Remmer dealing with female personal names attested in the earliest written sources of all the major branches of the Indo-European language family.

In the collectively written introductory chapter, the scholars propose to view their book 'eher als Grammatik denn als Wörterbuch' (p.19). The main reason for the authors' diminishing the lexicological aspect of their work is the sobering fact that the number of soundly reconstructible PIE female personal names is very low: not more than five by all counts, and not a single compound name. Moreover, even those names that can be reconstructed either are theophoric (*\*B<sup>h</sup>r̥ǵ<sup>h</sup>ntih<sub>2</sub>*, *\*H<sub>2</sub>arǵunih<sub>2</sub>*), or can be regarded as derived from, or at least parallel to, male ones (*\*Neuāh<sub>2</sub>*, *\*G<sup>h</sup>ou-*). Consequently, the scholars could only provide a general comparison of the early IE female-naming conventions between several branches of the language family.

The presentation of the material in the book is branch oriented. Each major subgroup in the IE family – Anatolian, Indic, Iranian, Italic, Celtic, Germanic, Slavonic, Baltic, Tocharian, and such a-group-in-itself languages as Ancient Greek, Armenian, and Albanian – are described according a common plan: (1) general introduction (sources and the wealth of the available material; previous research used for the analysis; general outline of the naming system); (2) morphology; (3) semantics. General

(and dire) problems connected with female names as a component of the general PIE reconstruction project are expounded upon in the Introduction, where scholars also explain the conventions they use when dealing with language material.

The first convention concerns the morphological classification of names. Renouncing the old dogma that IE names are either compound or compound-derived (*Kurznamen* and hypocorisms) the scholars classify all the names into the following types: 1. Compound names. 2. Non-compound full names. 3. Compound-derived short names (*Kurznamen*). 4. Hypocorisms (derived from non-compound names or from short names by means of a special suffix). 5. Affectionate names (*Lallnamen*). In several cases, there is an additional section on expressive gemination in personal names.

Outlining the semantic classification of names the scholars follow with minor adjustments the blueprint provided by BECHTEL (1917: 477–617) and GARCÍA RAMÓN (2000: 467–9). Names are classified as denoting (1) age and manhood; (2) appearance and physical traits; (3) character and character traits; (4) living conditions, fortune, and dwelling place; (5) social standing; (6) war and peace; (7) a wish for a child granted (cf. Greek Προθείνη ‘craved for’, Russian *Ždana* ‘waited for’); (8) kinship ties; (9) birth circumstances; (10) relations with deities (theophoric); also present are (11) ethnonym-derived or toponym-derived names; (12) animal names; (13) plant names; (14) sweet dishes; (15) materials, natural elements, natural phenomena; (16) clothes, jewellery, implements; (17) locality-derived names; (18) semantically void or not unambiguously classifiable names; (19) foreign names.

Compared with this rather strict and exhaustive scheme covering the presentation of onomastic material, the scholars allow themselves much more freedom in selecting this material. The most difficult question here is the choice between the oldest and the best preserved (or most representative, or simply most easily comprehensible) onomastic corpora. Thus, the chapter on Iranian female names concentrates mostly on Achaemenid-period onomastic data gleaned from epigraphic sources and Greek texts with some additional material from the Avesta, whereas the Greek chapter nearly completely dispenses with Linear B texts in favour of later alphabetic sources. These choices sometimes may seem arbitrary, but they are always justified.

A bit harder to justify is the general outline of the book. We have before us a kind of comparative grammar of female personal names in various IE languages with a particular focus on inherited name-formation mechanisms (foreign names and even calques are enumerated rather than analysed). Why then include the traditions where these mechanisms had been lost? The reader has to go through several pages of source critique just to find out that we have no more than eight Baltic and seven Armenian female names amenable to a type of description used in the monograph, and it is a real luxury compared to two Tocharian ones and zero (!) in the Albanian department. The evidence from the Italic branch is also rather scarce.

Leaving this aside, though, we can say that the book is very competently and thoroughly written, with a rather slight degree of simplification (as to the problem of the internal classification of Celtic languages, for instance) perfectly acceptable in this kind of descriptive work. Despite the traditional outlook of the problem at hand the book can be readily described as a novel synthesis of previous research, which highlights several important points. Thus, the extent of uniformity of female-name semantics and female-naming practices across various IE branches is shown beyond

any doubt, and the deviations from general trends (especially in the Germanic branch) seem all the more striking and intriguing.

What cannot be said with any certainty, however, is whether we stand any chance of significant future developments in this field. Given the paucity of the relevant onomastic material and the high quality of the description provided, *Indogermanische Frauennamen* may become the first and the last groundbreaking book on the subject.

### References

- BECHTEL, Friedrich, 1917: *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle: Niemeyer.
- FICK, August, 1874: *Die griechischen Personennamen: nach ihrer Bildung erklärt mit den Namenssystemen verwandter Sprachen verglichen und systematisch geordnet*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- GARCÍA RAMÓN, José Luis 2000: *Die historischen Personennamen des Mykenischen*, *Minos* 35, 461–472.
- MEILLET, Antoine, 1925: *La méthode comparative en linguistique historique*, Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co.
- Moscow Dmitry NIKOLAYEV

SUKAČ, Roman & Ondřej ŠEFČÍK (ed.): *The sound of Indo-European 2. Papers on Indo-European phonetics, phonemics and morphophonemics*. (LINCOS Studies in Indo-European Linguistics 41) München: Lincom Europe 2012. Gebunden, 313 S. ISBN 978-3-86288-379-0. Preis: 139 €.

Der hier kurz vorzustellende Sammelband ist aus einer Tagung in Opava/Troppau in der Tschechischen Republik im November 2010 hervorgegangen. Die Beiträge repräsentieren ein breites Spektrum an Forschungen zur Phonologie und Morphologie des Urindogermanischen und der daraus hervorgegangenen Einzelsprachen. Da das Keltische aber in diesen Beiträgen kaum eine Rolle spielt, sondern allenfalls in Einzelfällen gestreift bzw. Einzelformen aus keltischen Sprachen angeführt werden, sollen im Weiteren nur einige wenige Beiträge kurz vorgestellt werden, die nach Meinung des Rezensenten größeren Widerhall oder Widerspruch erfahren dürften, also in irgendeiner Weise als interessanter für die Indogermanistik im Ganzen (bzw. für nicht ausschließlich an Keltologischem Interessierte) eingestuft werden können. Dies soll keine Abwertung der anderen Beiträge implizieren, diese können für Spezialisten des einen oder anderen Teilgebiets der Indogermanistik durchaus wichtig sein und Neues bringen, scheinen dem Rezensenten nur im hiesigen Kontext nicht vorrangig zu sein.

Der Sammelband umfasst nach einem Vorwort (S. 3f.) 24 Beiträge, fünf in deutscher, 19 in englischer Sprache. Leider wurde dem Band keinerlei Register beigegeben.

Einer der längeren Beiträge ist der von G.-J. PINAULT, *Sound laws and the suffix of the PIE 'middle' participle* (S. 227–251). Er bietet in gewohnt materialreicher Darstellung einen neuen Vorschlag zur Erklärung des meist als uridg. \*-mh<sub>1</sub>no- ange-