JHS Journal of Historical Syntax
Volume 6, Article 19: 1–14, 2022

REVIEW OF GRESTENBERGER ET AL. (EDS), (2022), *HA! LINGUISTIC STUDIES IN HONOR OF MARK R. HALE*

Benjamin D. Suchard
KU Leuven/Leiden University

Abstract Laura Grestenberger, Charles Reiss, Hannes A. Fellner, and Gabriel Z. Pantillon (eds), *Ha! Linguistic Studies in Honor of Mark R. Hale*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 2022. xvi + 422 pp. Hardbound: ISBN: 978 37 520 0606 3 | € 110 · e-Book: ISBN: 978 37 520 0085 6 | € 110 https://doi.org/10.29091/9783752000856

This Festschrift collects twenty-nine papers dedicated to Mark Hale, known for his research on phonology and Indo-European syntax in particular. The front matter includes a preface by the editors (ix–x)—in which, among other things, they explain the title's *Ha!* as an exclamation of satisfaction or surprise as well as a reference to the Vedic particle *ha*—a bibliography of Hale's work (xi–xv), and a list of contributors (xvi). The papers are mostly devoted to questions of Indo-European linguistics, with some articles touching on questions of phonology, syntax, or historical linguistics in general or in other languages. As a historical linguist whose experience with Indo-European is limited to the undergraduate level and who has never gotten especially deep into the study of syntax, I will use this review to comment on a selection of the contributions rather than systematically evaluating every article as a whole.

Several papers focus on Tocharian, a booming field. Thórhallur Eythórsson's 'Accent Placement and Word Formation in Tocharian B: Resolving an Apparent Paradox' (31–41) argues that Tocharian B suffixed pronouns (such as plural object *-me* in *näkṣaṃ-me* 'destroys us/you/them' beside *nakṣäṃ* 'destroys') are accentual or internal clitics. By contrast, the so-called Secondary Case Endings (such as locative *-ne* in *lakle-ne* 'in suffering' besides *lakle* 'suffering') are affixal clitics, which explains their different effects on word accent and vocalism. Eythórsson states that the Secondary Case Endings are not postpositions, because they cannot be separated from their noun. Yet, he goes

©2022 Benjamin D. Suchard
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of a Creative Commons License (creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0).

on to cite examples where they are separated, like *te-k-sa* 'just because of that' with a particle *-k-* intervening, or where one Secondary Case Ending governs a series of nouns as in *kektseñ reki palsko-sa* 'with body, word (and) thought' (both on p. 35). Against Peyrot (2019)'s analysis of the suffixed pronouns as affixal agreement markers, Eythórsson argues that "the syntactic function of these elements is clearly that of personal pronouns in non-nominative case (accusative/dative/genitive), and hence they are in all likelihood to be considered independent arguments rather than object markers on the verb" (p. 36), an argument which does not seem compelling to me. Against the evidence from sentences where suffixed pronouns refer back to an explicit object, he writes that "at least some such cases can plausibly be analyzed as involving a syntactic operation known as left dislocation" (p. 37), but presumably this leaves the counterevidence of the remaining examples which cannot be analyzed in this way. Hence, it seems preferable to me to analyze the suffixed pronouns as object-marking suffixes proper (not clitics) and the Secondary Case Endings as enclitic postpositions, which explains the pronouns' greater phonological integration just as well. The following paper by Hannes A. Fellner, 'No Deviation from the Party(-ciple) Line' (p. 43–51), convincingly shows that Tocharian attests reflexes of all four "Inner" Indo-European participle formations: the active participles in *-(_o_)_nt-_, the non-active ones in *_-mh_$_1$_no-_, the perfect active participles in *_-uos-/-us-_, and the theme-oriented participles in *_-tó-_ and *_-nó-_. Tocharian is also the subject of Bernhard Koller's 'Tocharian A Indefinites as Wh-Words' (p. 217–231) and Melanie Malzahn's 'Tocharian *säl* "fly, throw"—Unsafe at Any Speed' (p. 249–261).

The Italic branch of Indo-European, including Latin and its Romance descendants, is represented by four papers. Alan J. Nussbaum's 'Classical Latin *iūdicāre* and Corcolle IOUOSDICA-: Can You Get Here from There?' (p. 285–297) is a very enjoyable investigation of the morphology of the mentioned Classical and Very Old Latin forms as well as the intermediate, Old Latin form *ioudic-*, together with the relevant sound laws. Similarly detailed topics and clear writing are found in Brent Vine's 'Latin *glaciēs* "ice"' (p. 395–400), in which the author cautiously suggests that the word in the article's title derives from *gelī aciēs* 'cold's sharpness', and Michael Weiss's 'A Venetic Sound Change' (p.401–412), which discusses the etymology of the river name *Piave* (Latin *Plavis*). Michelle Troberg & John Whitman's 'Syntactic Glosses and Historical Syntax' (p. 369–393) asks what we can learn from glosses noting the order in which to read the words of Latin texts copied in medieval Occitania. These syntactic glosses point to a reordering of the text to match Old Occitan word order: by reordering the Latin words to match the alphabetic sequence of the glosses, a sentence like *ecce*^{h} / *crispin*us^b *minimo*^{d} *me*^{c}

provocat^{a} 'see, Crispinus challenges me at long odds' (with a line break after *ecce* prompting the glosses to start over from *a*) yields *ecce*^{h} *provocat*^{a} *Crispinus*^{b} *me*^{c} *minimo*^{d} with the word order that would have been most natural to the scribes (p. 383). This supports the view that texts like these were converted to the Romance vernacular for oral performance, a finding that has interesting implications for scholars studying other situations of diglossia.

With regards to the proto-language of the Indo-European family, Markus A. Pöchtrager employs an analysis developed for Arabic in his 'Why e/o in Proto- Indo-European?' (p. 310–326). Like other Semitic languages, Classical Arabic possesses different verb classes which show characteristic vowel alternations in the perfective and imperfective stems. The verb classes are *a*/*i* as in *ḍarab-a* : *ya-ḍrib-u*'to hit' ; *i*/*a* as in *labis-a* : *ya-lbas-u* 'to wear' (not "[to] dress", p. 312); *a*/*u* as in *katab-a* : *ya-ktub-u* 'to write'; and *u*/*u* as in *kabur-a* : *ya-kbur-u* 'to be great'. Guerssel & Lowenstamm (1996) note that the vowel alternations can be represented as a kind of chain shift: $\emptyset \rightarrow i \rightarrow a \rightarrow u \rightarrow u$, with *u* folding back on itself and thereby terminating the chain. This chain is referred to as the Apophonic Path. Crucially, this analysis can only be maintained if the verbs like *ḍarab-a* : *ya-ḍrib-u* are assumed to have an underlying null vowel in the alternating slot in the perfective, which then is filled in with a due to the preceding a vowel: *ḍar_b-a* → *ḍarab-a*. However, there is no indication whatsoever that this is the case: verbs like *ḍarab-a* do not behave as if they have a null vowel in any other way. The assumption of the null vowel is made purely for the sake of the Apophonic Path, making this a very questionable analysis to begin with. Pöchtrager uses a modified version of the Apophonic Path that has been adapted to Government Phonology (and, later on, Government Phonology 2.0). It now no longer applies to surface vowels, but to underlying vocalic elements written as capital letters: $\emptyset \rightarrow I \rightarrow A \rightarrow U \rightarrow U$. This way, it can be applied to languages with ablauting mid vowels, such as German and, as promised, Proto-Indo-European; yet, once again, ad hoc assumptions are required to make this work. Thus, German patterns like *bergen* → *barg* → *geborgen* can be fit into the Apophonic Path by assuming the presence of a 'parasitic' A element together with the apophonic, ablauting one: I $(+A=e) \rightarrow A$ $(+A=a) \rightarrow U$ $(+A=o)$. In Proto-Indo-European, on the other hand, the *e*/*o* ablaut is explained by two apophonic elements: $I+A=e \rightarrow A+U=o$. It is unclear to me what arguments, if any, determine whether a vocalic element is apophonic or parasitic, other than making whatever assumptions are needed to salvage the Apophonic Path—whose ontological status is also left unexplained.

The other paper that touches directly on Proto-Indo-European is David Goldstein's 'There's No Escaping Phylogenetics' (p. 71–91). In this article, the author argues against several common heuristics used to establish the Proto-Indo-European status of a given feature or form, namely the attestation in three separate branches, majority rule, and the attestation in Anatolian as well as another branch. As the title suggests, Goldstein problematizes the uncertainty surrounding the Indo-European family tree: which branches split off from which others in which order. In order to deal with this uncertainty, he argues for the use of Bayesian methods, which provide an estimated probability of a certain form or feature occurring in Proto-Indo-European instead of a black-and-white yes or no answer. Based on a forest of family trees with various probabilities, Goldstein calculates such probabilities for two features: the clitic *=$k^{w}e$ ‘and’ and the verbal past tense augment *h_1*é-*. Indo-Europeanists agree that the former existed in Proto-Indo-European, while the age of the second feature is debated. The Bayesian model yields a probability of over 95% for *=$k^{w}e$ being Proto-Indo-European (p. 79) and 56% for *h_1*é-* (p. 82). The author concludes that “these results make it clear that the Bayesian methods provide a powerful and exciting addition to the Indo-Europeanist’s toolkit” (p. 87), but one may wonder how much this analysis really contributes. The conclusions are that Proto-Indo-European almost certainly had the particle *=$k^{w}e$ while it is quite uncertain whether it made use of the augment, just as other scholars had long concluded based on traditional methods. Goldstein also implicitly discounts the possibility of an early Indo-European dialect continuum, which would make the search for one true family tree with only binary splits a hopeless endeavor. Given his insistence on the importance of intermediate nodes in the family tree, it is striking that the paper contains no mention of either Balto-Slavic or Italo-Celtic, two intermediate nodes which enjoy broad to moderate support and which are also clearly visible in the tree diagrams generated through Bayesian methods (p. 83–86).

As noted above, not all papers concern Indo-European. Patrick Honeybone’s ‘Unnecessary Asterisks and Realism in Reconstruction: Underspecified is Still Real’ (p. 153–170) makes a more general point on the historical linguistic convention of indicating reconstructed forms and sounds with an asterisk. He argues that this * is tautological when referring to phonemes in particular, because all phonemes are (re)constructed: they do not present themselves in the data but are inferred from it. Like reconstructed phonemes, synchronic phonemes may be underspecified for certain features, so there is no need for an asterisk to mark the absence of those features. Footnote 12 on p. 165 features a convincing objection by volume editor Charles Reiss, which Honeybone phrases as “[i]n [reconstructed phonemes], specifications are absent because we don’t know what they are (an epistemological issue), while in [synchronically underspecified phonemes] there is intentional ontological absence". Honeybone's response that "[w]e, as phonologists, may grasp this distinction, but the representations don't know if they are 'intentionally' or 'unintentionally' underspecified" endows phonological representations with a bit more consciousness than many readers may be comfortable with. Another objection that can be made is that the historical data that Honeybone contrasts with the pre-historic, reconstructed sounds written with an asterisk are often not phonological at all, but orthographic. In expressions like Honeybone' s Example (1), "PGmc **gastiz* 'guest' nom. sg. > PWGmc **gasti* > OE *ġiest*, OHG *gas*" (p. 155), the forms like Old English *ġiest* are not phonological representations, but (normalized) orthographic forms. While the author's point stands that phonological forms (both contemporary and historical) are always reconstructed, it does not apply here: the written forms *ġiest* and *gast* are empirically attested in a way that reconstructed **gastiz* and **gasti* simply are not, justifying the use of * for the latter but not for the former. Nevertheless, this is certainly a well-written and thought-provoking chapter. Two other chapters with a more general scope I would like to mention are Charles Reiss's own 'Plastics' (p. 327–330), in which he very concisely supports an argument that Universal Grammar must describe all computationally possible human languages, and Sarah G. Thomason's 'Safe and Unsafe Language Contact' (p. 339–350), a reworked version of a thoughtful 2010 LSA Presidential Address on contact situations in which neither of the contact languages endangers the other. Both of these articles touch on fundamental issues in two quite different domains of linguistics and are nevertheless easy to follow.

Besides the articles discussed above, the volume contains contributions on Hittite, (Vedic) Sanskrit and Old Iranian, Greek, Gothic, Icelandic, Aluan (Caucasian Albanian), Turkish, Telugu, and experimental phonetics. This broad range of topics, with a focus on ancient Indo-European but including forays into other families and fields, makes this a fitting tribute to Hale, who has devoted his career to a similarly diverse range of subjects.

References

Guerssel, Mohand & Jean Lowenstamm. 1996. Ablaut in Classical Arabic measure I active verbal forms. In Jaqueline Lecarme, Jean Lowenstamm & Ur Shlonsky (eds.), *Studies in Afroasiatic grammar*, John Benjamins.

Peyrot, Michaël. 2019. The deviant typological profile of the Tocharian branch of Indo-European may be due to Uralic substrate influence. *Indo-European Linguistics* 7(1). 72 – 121. doi:https://doi.org/10.1163/22125892-00701007. https://brill.com/view/journals/ieul/7/1/article-p72_3.xml.

Benjamin Suchard
KU Leuven
Research Unit of Biblical Studies
Charles Deberiotstraat 26 – box 3101
3000 Leuven
Belgium
………
benjamin.suchard@kuleuven.be
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5688-4488