



PROJECT MUSE®

The collected writings of Warren Cowgill (review)

Alfred Bammesberger

Language, Volume 85, Number 1, March 2009, pp. 220-223 (Review)

Published by Linguistic Society of America

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0085>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/262992>

'Child word stress competence: An experimental approach' by WIM ZONNEVELD and DOMINIQUE NOUVEAU reveals a similar sensitivity to an underlying default even where the language admits a variety of stress patterns. While Dutch stress is not entirely predictable (e.g. *róbot* 'robot' vs. *schavót* 'scaffold'), certain patterns are preferred. In experiments in which three-year-old and four-year-old Dutch-speaking children were asked to imitate nonsense words, children made more errors on words with stress patterns that were either prohibited or uncommon in the Dutch lexicon, and their errors were often in the direction of regularizing stimuli with irregular or prohibited stress patterns. To account for the variation in word stress patterns, the authors argue for an analysis in which the grammar includes cophologies differing in their rankings of particular constraints, with individual lexical items associated with particular ranking patterns. This provides another case in which the data force an elaboration of the simplest model, with potential implications for the theory of learnability.

Most of the papers in this volume were written at a relatively early period of OT research, and provide a clear picture of the theory at that point. Nearly every paper is meaty, and several are destined to be classics.

REFERENCES

- ALDERETE, JOHN; JILL BECKMAN; LAURA BENUA; AMALIA GNANADESIKAN; JOHN MCCARTHY; and SUZANNE URBANCZYK. 1999. Reduplication with fixed segmentism. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30.327–64.
- BOERSMA, PAUL, and BRUCE HAYES. 2001. Empirical tests of the gradual learning algorithm. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.45–86.
- DAVIDSON, LISA. 2006. Phonotactics and articulatory coordination interact in phonology: Evidence from non-native production. *Cognitive Science* 30.837–62.
- JUSCZYK, PETER; PAUL SMOLENSKY; and THERESA ALLOCCO. 2002. How English-learning infants respond to markedness and faithfulness constraints. *Language Acquisition: A Journal of Developmental Linguistics* 10.1.31–73.
- KIRCHNER, ROBERT. 2000. Geminate inalterability and lenition. *Language* 76.509–45.
- MCCARTHY, JOHN, and ALAN PRINCE. 1994. The emergence of the unmarked: Optimality in prosodic morphology. *North Eastern Linguistic Society* 24.333–79.
- PATER, JOE, and JESSICA A. BARLOW. 2003. Constraint conflict in cluster reduction. *Journal of Child Language* 30.487–526.
- PATER, JOE; CHRISTINE STAGER; and JANET WERKER. 2004. The perceptual acquisition of phonological contrasts. *Language* 80.361–79.
- SMOLENSKY, PAUL. 1993. Harmony, markedness, and phonological activity. Handout of keynote address, Rutgers Optimality Workshop–1, October 23. Rutgers Optimality Archive 87. Online: <http://roa.rutgers.edu>.
- TAKAGI, NAOYUKI, and VIRGINIA MANN. 1994. A perceptual basis for the systematic phonological correspondences between Japanese loanwords and their English source words. *Journal of Phonetics* 22.343–56.
- TESAR, BRUCE, and PAUL SMOLENSKY. 1998. Learnability in optimality theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29.229–68.

Department of Linguistics
Stony Brook University
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4376
[ellen.broselow@stonybrook.edu]

The collected writings of Warren Cowgill. Ed. by JARED S. KLEIN. Ann Arbor: Beech Staff Press, 2006. Pp. Iviii, 578. ISBN 0974792713. \$85 (Hb).

Reviewed by ALFRED BAMESBERGER, *The Catholic University of Eichstätt*

Warren Crawford Cowgill was born December 19, 1929, near Grangeville, Idaho, and died of cancer June 20, 1985, in New Haven, Connecticut. Other than two visiting appointments, one at the University of Illinois (1961), the other at the University of London (1966), he spent his whole professional life at Yale. More than twenty years after C's untimely death, his *Collected writings* have been made available to the discipline of Indo-European studies in an edition

prepared by Jared Klein. The edition deserves highest praise, and Indo-Europeanists are certainly grateful for the editor's labors. The volume contains all of C's published articles and reviews and a selection of previously unpublished work. Not included is C's introduction to Mayrhofer's Indo-European phonology; the reason for this is clearly that the text is otherwise readily available (Mayrhofer 1986:11–85). Also not included in C's 1957 dissertation, a fully acceptable decision because C himself did not think that the monograph was in a publishable stage.

The volume opens with a very competent introduction by the editor, who lays out his principles of presenting the material. With his characterization of C as a scholar one fully agrees: 'Exactitude, methodological thoroughness, clarity of thought, complete command of the data, lucidity of style, common sense: these are words and phrases which come most easily to mind when one attempts to characterize the scholarly writings of Warren Cowgill' (vii). Klein rightly points out that C's work amounts to a historiography of Indo-European studies in the areas that he dealt with in his research: 'although he never set out to write a history of the discipline, he has left in his writings a broad outline of some of the most important ideas that antedated him' (xiv).¹ This is followed by 'Reminiscences' written by Stanley Insler (xxvii–iii), Anna Morpurgo Davies (xxix–xiii), Henry Hoenigswald (xxxiii–iv), Jay Jasanoff (xxxiv–v), Alan Nussbaum (xxxv–vii), Calvert Watkins (xxxvii–ix), Stephanie W. Jamison (xli–ii), and Alexander Lehmann (xliii–vi). These pieces are warm tributes to a great scholar and a fine man. One detail may be picked out. Nussbaum reports a conversation in which the topic of learning Old Irish came up, and everybody complained how difficult it all was, and how elusive Old Irish grammar was in every conceivable respect. Of course all participants in the conversation well knew that C had a wonderful command of all intricacies of Old Irish. In his typically slow way he then threw in the observation: 'Learning Old Irish is like mowing the lawn'. Understandably the listeners were baffled by this curious statement, and of course Warren enjoyed seeing that nobody understood what he meant to say. After a while he offered the solution: 'It's not something you do just once'. This is a splendid example of his profound humor.

Particularly welcome is the piece 'Cowgill on Cowgill' (xlvi–iii). This autobiographical letter to the LSA archives is dated June 6–7, 1984, and represents a condensed account of the major stages in C's life and career. The essay offers valuable information on the academic life in the Yale Linguistics Department from the 1950s onwards. C found his 'first interview with Bernard Bloch rather overwhelming' (li). He calls Paul Tedesco 'the person who immediately became my guru at Yale' (li). Tedesco was also the supervisor of C's 1957 dissertation.² The essay contains miniature portraits of Konstantin Reichardt and Albrecht Götze, then professors of Germanic linguistics and Hittite, respectively, at Yale.

The book consists of work published in various places, and it is most useful to have the pieces that appeared in a variety of journals and monographs within the covers of one solid book.³ The

¹ Klein gives a full bibliography of C's publications with further indications of the numerous papers he read at conferences. In the list of dissertations supervised by C it may be added that Sihler's 1967 dissertation is now accessible in Sihler 2006.

² Paul Tedesco was born May 5, 1898, in Vienna, Austria. He was Jewish. He studied linguistics at Vienna University. No copy of his probably handwritten 1920 dissertation on *Das iranische Partizipia-Präteritum* can be located. The only information on the thesis that we still have is the report written by Bernhard Geiger, who had supervised the dissertation project. In 1925 Tedesco submitted *Dialektologie der westiranischen Turfantexte* as part of his habilitation project. He was rejected. From 1924 to 1936 he taught in various secondary schools in Vienna. In 1938 he was able to leave Austria and emigrate to the United States. Both his mother and his brother fell victims to Nazi persecution. From 1941 until his retirement in 1966 Tedesco was attached to Yale University—from 1960 onwards in the function of Edward E. Salisbury Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology. Paul Tedesco died December 17, 1980, in New Haven. Schmitt 2003–2004 offers an account of Tedesco's biography together with a very competent presentation and scholarly assessment of his publications and a full bibliography of his writings.

³ C spent hours and hours answering his correspondence world-wide, and this is of course at least part of the reason why he published relatively little. C's letters were models of concise and absolutely trenchant argumentation; not a word was superfluous. Whoever brought any question to his attention could be assured of competent criticism: 'the amount of time which Cowgill would spend reading carefully and commenting

editor took great pains at finalizing the texts. Although C was a notoriously meticulous proof-reader, Klein still detected a few misprints (listed on p. xviii). In some instances C revised an interpretation he had given earlier, and Klein carefully notes such cases. Thus the derivation of Lat. *maximus* (205) (originally published in 1970) is slightly modified in the paper on Lat. *stāre* (published in 1973): 'the form of *maximus* immediately before syncope was **magezemos*' (240, n. 36). Similarly Klein notes (228) that C later reconsidered his interpretation of Old Prussian *postasei*, as can be gathered from the posthumous paper (561). Klein appends a note because the wording in C's text is not absolutely clear (524, n. 4a). The volume is concluded by full indices of the material dealt with in C's papers. All of the articles here have been typeset so that the book has an absolutely uniform shape and presents C's views in a very coherent way.

The volume also contains two papers that were so far not available in print in this shape. 'The z-cases of Germanic pronouns and strong adjectives' (519–34) concerns the paradigm of some pronominal forms in Germanic. 'The personal endings of thematic verbs in Indo-European' (69–76) is an expanded version of his paper read at the 'Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft' in Berlin in 1983 and published in 1985. Although this is most certainly not the occasion to discuss or possibly criticize C's scholarly oeuvre, one detail may nevertheless be pointed out that certainly deserves further exploration. Most of C's observations are persuasive and quite acceptable, but his derivation of the marker for first person singular of the primary endings in the thematic paradigm is difficult to defend from the viewpoint of historical phonology: C contends that IE *-ō (> Greek -ω, etc.) resulted from *-o-mi. While the posited form IE *-o-mi is definitely likely within the grammatical system of the proto-language, the development of *-o-mi to *-ō is hardly acceptable. The historical development must be a good deal more complicated. In this as in many other respects, C's views on Indo-European now republished will certainly stimulate further research.

One particular feature that is typical of C's work is perhaps best expressed in a short observation contained in his review of Krahe 1958 (469–72). Krahe glosses the Indo-European root **steygh-* as 'steigen' ('climb'); the same gloss is used for Sanskrit *stighnoti*. In Krahe's obvious source (Walde & Pokorny 1930:614, Pokorny 1959:1079) the IE root is glossed 'schreiten, steigen'. If we include the evidence of Old Irish *tiagu* 'I go', Lithuanian *staigýtis* 'hasten', but also the nominal formation Gothic *staiga* 'way, path', it is likely that the basic meaning of **steygh-* was 'go, step', and 'climb' represents a specific development in Germanic. In reconstructing structural elements of Indo-European the interpretation of the available evidence requires great attention. With regard to the comparative method in linguistics C offers the following wise observation: 'the application of this method [reconstruction] to any but the simplest problems is of course tremendously difficult; it is what makes comparative linguistics an art, refractory (so far) to codification as a set of mechanical procedures' (471, n. 5).

The *Collected writings of Warren Cowgill* will certainly be a major item in every library with a collection of Indo-European material. With loving care and high competence Klein has erected a lasting monument for an excellent scholar and a wonderful man. The volume can rightly be considered as a landmark in Indo-European studies.

REFERENCES

- COWGILL, WARREN C. 1957. *The Indo-European long-vowel preterits*. New Haven, CT: Yale University dissertation.
- KRAHE, HANS. 1958. *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft I: Einleitung und Lautlehre*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

extensively on the work of others, primarily in the form of letters, is legendary' (xv). Klein also stresses 'another side to the man's teaching, reserved only for the fortunate few who had the opportunity to learn directly from him in the classroom' (xiv). Obviously much of C's thinking lives on with his students. Many interesting details can now be gathered from Sihler 1995.

- MAYRHOFER, MANFRED. 1986. *Indogermanische Grammatik. Vol. 1: Einleitung von Warren Cowgill ins Deutsche übersetzt und bibliographisch bearbeitet von Alfred Bammesberger und Martin Peters. Vol. 2: Lautlehre [Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen] von Manfred Mayrhofer*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- POKORNY, JULIUS. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- SCHMITT, RÜDIGER. 2003–2004. Paul Tedesco, einer der Pioniere iranistischer Turfanforschung. *Iranistik* 3/4.5–20.
- SIHLER, ANDREW L. 1967. *Proto-Indo-European post-consonantal resonants in word-initial sequences*. New Haven, CT: Yale University dissertation.
- SIHLER, ANDREW L. 1995. *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SIHLER, ANDREW. 2006. *Edgerton's Law: The phantom evidence*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- WALDE, ALOIS, and JULIUS POKORNY. 1930. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

The Catholic University of Eichstaett
 D85072 Eichstaett
 Germany
 [Alfred.Bammesberger@ku-eichstaett.de]

The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances. Ed. by YARON MATRAS and PETER BAKKER. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. Pp. 331. ISBN 9783110177763. \$157 (Hb).

Reviewed by DONALD WINFORD, *The Ohio State University*

The study of language contact and its outcomes has expanded greatly over the last few decades, going far beyond its earlier focus on such areas as creole formation and bilingual code switching, to include a much wider range of contact phenomena. Among the latter are the class of contact languages referred to variously as ‘bilingual mixed languages’, ‘intertwined languages’, and ‘split languages’. This book is devoted exclusively to these outcomes of contact, and reflects the increasing attention that scholars have paid to them in recent times.

A very broad range of such mixed languages is represented here—from the ‘classic’ and most studied cases like *Media Lengua*, *Michif*, *Ma’á*, and *Mednyj Aleut*, to less well-known cases such as *Para-Romani*, *Sri Lanka Portuguese*, and *Sri Lanka Malay*, to somewhat controversial cases such as *Chamorro* and *Maltese (Malti)*. The book consists of ten chapters. The introductory chapter, written by the editors, is an excellent discussion of the main issues addressed in the book, with rich illustrations drawn from several mixed languages. The central concerns of the book reflect those of contact linguistics in general. The most important of these include questions of definition and classification, the linguistic processes that gave rise to mixed languages, the social contexts of their formation, and the relevance of all this to our understanding of contact-induced change in general. This review is organized around these central questions.

The chapters written by SARAH G. THOMASON, PETER BAKKER, CAROL MYERS-SCOTTON, and THOMAS STOLZ are all concerned with the issue of definition and classification. The key problem here is how to delineate the class of contact languages that have been referred to as ‘bilingual mixed languages’ (BMLs), and distinguish them from other products of language mixture, especially given the fact that all languages are mixed to varying extents. Thomason, appealing to a historical linguist’s conception of genetic relationship, offers the classic definition of a BML as ‘a language whose grammar and lexical subsystems cannot all be traced back primarily to a single source language’ (21). This by and large corresponds to the conventional view of a ‘prototypical’ BML as ‘showing a split between the source language of the grammar and that of the lexicon’ (151). But the careful reader will note that hedges such as ‘cannot all’ and