The work under review displays a well-argued investigation within the systematic framework of a consistent overall structure, thereby testifying to the zeal and critical acumen of its author. Nevertheless, there are a few inaccuracies and superficial treatments of the material, some of which are mentioned in what follows (with reference to the respective page number in the master’s thesis).

p. 14: The reasons for a distinct representation of labiovelars in palatal environment are not sufficiently exposed, and major research literature has not been considered (see below, point 2.). In some cases the quotation is misleading: Beekes does not count among those who recognize distinct reflexes of labiovelars as against velars (see below, point 1.), but like Kortlandt he assumes the same palatalisation for both series. And Olsen does not reconstruct the root underlying Arm. ęogan ‘they went’ as *kʃiəy- with labiovelar, but like Beekes and the majority of researchers as *kʃeəy- (against this reconstruction see below, point 3.).

p. 15: A non-existent present form lowcʰem ‘I kindle’ (also with inconsistent use of ow instead of transcription with /u/, as practised in the other parts of the work under review) is adduced, but the respective paradigm shows pres. lowcʰ-anem, aor. lowcʰe- with 1.sg. lowcʰ-i etc. And the reasons for the reconstruction with *ky are not expounded (on lowcʰ-e- ‘to kindle’ < *lôyk-je/o/- see below, point 3.). But on p. 26 the respective example is ranged under the items presenting the outcome of *kʃy, which cannot be the underlying consonant combination inherited from PIE and might only be defended as an intermediate stage (in the position after /u/) within Armenian, but it has to be considered that in the case of the development of PIE *kʃy we are confronted with an assimilation process in a cluster with a palatal affection of *k stronger than in the position before the vowels e and i. On the other hand, an item containing the reflex of the combination of an inherited PIE palatal *k with suffixal *i is provided by Arm. arʃ ‘bear’ (see below, point 4.).

p.15: Arm. ačʰ-kʰ ‘eyes’ (pl. of akn) from *acʰh is both compatible with a reconstruction of the prior development as *acʰa < *okʰia < PIE *h₃kʰ-ih₁
(similarly to Gk. ὀσσε < *okʰье) or as *acʰi < *okʰί < PIE *h₂ékʰ-ih₁ (similarly to Slavonic očí). Therefore there is no necessity for an alternative reconstruction, based on an alleged gen. sg. *h₃kʰ-ih₁-s from *h₃kʰ-ih₁, because the base form is a dual formation in *-ih₁, which has no corresponding form of the gen. sg. based on the dual formant *-ih₁ (as grammatical nom.-acc. dual ending of neuter and feminine).

p. 20: The formulation of the conditions of the palatalization of labiovelars in Armenian (at the beginning of 2.3.) gives the impression as if in Greek the labiovelar media *gʰ wasn’t palatalized either, but here in fact both the labiovelar media *gʰ and aspirate *kʰ < *gʰ were palatalized before e, in contrast to the labiovelar tenuis *kʰ, which was palatalized both before i and e (cf. Rix 1976: 87).

p. 23: The Arm. adjective aǰ ‘right’, reconstructed here as *seh₂dʰ-ú-, is compared to Ved. sādhu-, which for its Greek cognates should be reconstructed as *seh₁dʰ-u-, however (Mayrhofer 1996: 722f. with further ref.). So besides the mobile paradigm *sēh₁dʰ-u-/ *sh₁dʰ-éu- there must have been a (probably post-PIE) zero-grade formation *sh₁dʰ-īo- as base form for Arm. aǰ (de Lambarterie 1990: 295).

The following remarks refer to the above-mentioned points of critique in a more systematic and detailed manner:

1. With regard to the regular delabialization of labiovelars in Armenian as a Satem language, the evidence for reflexes of labiovelars in Armenian distinct from those of pure velars in the palatal environment before e, i and į, as assumed by the majority of researchers, has not yet been generally recognized and in Kortlandt’s (1975) vein has recently been denied/ ignored by Beekes (2003: 176ff., 200f.).

2. Therefore this problem should be embedded in a broader context, considering distinct labiovelar reflexes also in other environments, especially after *n/ *ŋ in the interior of a word, as exemplified by Arm. awj ‘snake’ = Lat. anguis, Arm. awc-an-em ‘anoint’ = Lat. unguō, -ere. In order to analyse the entire complex, a number of still actual or recent contributions advocating distinct labiovelar reflexes in palatal and other environments should be systematically consulted for material and phonetic or phonological details, e.g. Clackson (1994: 54f., 108), Stempel (1994), Job (1995), Bolognesi (1997: 152ff., 157ff.), Olsen (1999: 805ff.), Hajnal (2003: 138ff.), Lipp (2009a: 20f. with nn. 32-37 containing numerous further references) and the systematic study by R. Kim (2018).
3. One of the items advocated by the partisans of an Armenian palatalization indistinct for velars and labiovelars has been the root underlying Arm. č’og an ‘they went’, č’ow ‘departure’, which for the assumed relation to Greek κίνεω ‘set into motion, move’, med. κίνοντι ‘move (itr.)’, Latin cieō, -ēre ‘set into motion’ traditionally has been reconstructed as *kiye- with initial velar. But Harðarson (1993: 192f.) and García Ramón (1994: 69f.) could demonstrate that the root underlying these Greek and Latin forms was *keĩh2-/*kih2- (LIV 346). As such it is incompatible with Arm. č’og an ‘they went’ and Gk. σεόμαι ‘move fast, rush’, aor. ἔσσω as its remaining relative. Taking into consideration that nowhere else in PIE pure velars are found as initials of roots of the structure *KIVC- with pertaining *KiC- as zero-grade (since in PIE the velar would have become palatal in all paradigmatic environments without exception), Lipp (2009a: 93-96, already in LIV 394f. n. 1) has drawn the conclusion that Arm. č’og an and Gk. σεόμαι must be based on PIE *kwey- with initial labiovelar – a result which is backed by the fact that in Armenian also in word-internal position the cluster *k designate delivers the same result as in č’og an with č’ = /čʰ/, in contradistinction to the outcome of word-internal *k designate leading to Armenian č’ = /čʰ/, cf. Arm. goč’em ‘shout’ < *uokʰ-ē/’ (denominative of the root noun *uokʰ-/*yekʰ- ‘voice’ = Ved. vác-, Av. vác/- vac-, Gk. ὀν-, Lat. vōx, vōc-is), in contrast to Arm. aor. loweč-e- ‘to kindle’ < *lōuk-ie/o- (= Lith. láukia, láuki ‘expect, look for’, the causative of *leyk- ‘to become bright/ light’ with root final velar; for the analysis of the Armenian form Klingenschmitt 1982: 194, 265, correspondingly LIV 418f. with n. 7).

4. Considering that Arm. aor. loweč-e- ‘to kindle’ < *lōuk-ie/o- does not provide an example for the representation of PIE *ki (despite Godel 1975: 82), another example has to be sought. It can be found in the Armenian form arž ‘bear’, which acc. to Winter (1997) continues a feminine form (like Arm. mi ‘one’ < *smʰ-ia = Gk. μία f.) corresponding to the Epic Sanskrit attestation yksī- ‘she-bear’, which is based on Vedic īkṣa- ‘bear’ (< Hīṣa-) from PIE *h₂tiko- ‘bear’, as continued by Hittite ĕrtagga- = /hartka/-, Greek ἄρκτος (with regular inner-Greek metathesis *TK > KT) etc. Thus the development can be reconstructed as follows (cf. Lipp 2009b: 181-186): Arm. arž (sonorization after r) < *arčʰ < Proto-Armenian *arčʰ ia = *[arćʰ ia] < *arštʰ ia = *[arštʰ ia] < *arčʰ ia = *[arštʰ ia] (with feminine suffix *i a < *-ih₂ ~ *-iāh₂- and regular segmental representation Arm. s < *č = *[čʰ] < PIE *k without metathesis in *TK like Arm. č’in = [čʰ’in] ‘kite’ < *tʰsin < *tkino- < PIE *tkih₂-inó- = Gk. ἱκτίνος with regular inner-Greek metathesis *TK > KT). In this example we have therefore the special case of the representation of a complex cluster *-tki-.
Assessment: For the candidate’s high qualification in General and Comparative Linguistics and the above-average presentation of the topic in the Master’s thesis, it is to be expected that the defence will be feasible on the two highest evaluation levels, i.e. level 2 = very good (známka: velmi dobře) or level 1 = excellent (známka: výborně).

Freiburg, 28 August 2017

Dr. Reiner Lipp, M.A.
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