

REVIEWS — COMPTES-RENDUS

H. HARTMANN, *Das Passiv. Eine Studie zur Geistesgeschichte der Kelten, Italiker und Arier*. Heidelberg 1954, C. Winter.

In this book Dr. Hartmann takes upon himself the task of re-considering the origin and function of the passive verbal category in some of the most important ancient Indo-European languages. In so doing he starts from the assumption that, if it is possible to trace any connections between the psychic structure of a definite type of men with definite characteristics of their languages, it must be also possible to substantiate a theory to that effect by contrasting some characteristic syntactic devices of Aryan and Italo-Celtic with the corresponding procedures of the Greek language which has always been considered one of the typically central idioms of the I.E. family. During a prolonged stay in Ireland the author came to the conviction — which generally speaking is shared by the present reviewer — that the Irish with regard to the psychical assimilation of their experience are more related to the ancient Italian peoples, the Indians and the Iranians than, for instance, to the Greeks and the Germans. In this volume he endeavours to show that these points of resemblance must be attributed to a comparatively young Indo-European development or influence starting from a dialectal area, in casu the Celtic regions in the very West of the Indo-European territory, rather than the well-known phenomenon of remnants surviving in marginal areas. In this the reviewer without however completely adopting the opposite view confesses to being unable to follow him. It is no pleasant duty to combat Professor Hartmann who has, in a consistent, but unconvincing argumentation, defended his thesis with a considerable amount of philological facts which for the greater part are borrowed from Celtic texts with which the reviewer is not particularly familiar.

According to Professor Hartmann the linguistic phenomenon of the passive as a special category can only be understood from the belief in the "Allkraftbegriff" which, being known(?) to the Irish as *nert*, is so to say the reservoir by drawing from which the waning strength of the individual can always be restored. As individual acts were

largely regarded as functions of a representative, or materialization or individual "Ausprägung" of this force, the idea of personality was not much developed. Hence the comparatively important part played, in the opinion of the ancient Celts, by cosmic and natural phenomena, by influences outside the immediate personal sphere. The outstanding significance of this *next* concept appears, from a great many linguistic facts referring to natural phenomena, divine power, health and physical strength, welfare, nobility, kingship, victory and defeat, illness, strength of mind. The author endeavours to show that as soon as there is question of these topics, and in addition to these birth, death and all occurrences pertaining to "Heilige Ordnung" — cult, funeral rites, royal law, assemblies, meals, education, marriage etc. etc., — the passive construction is usual, because speakers and writers describe human acts determined, or at least influenced or predisposed by the above fundamental power. In the first of the five main sections into which the book is divided the author attempts to show that this tendency is regular in ancient Irish. The reader however hardly escapes the conviction that this concept of ancient Irish is taken here in a rather extended sense, that the Christian character is sometimes overlooked in favour of an interpretation by means of the pre-Christian *next*, that the "passive character" of the relevant passages is not rarely unduly emphasized, a point to which we shall have to revert. In the other sections, dealing with Breton, Latin, the Iranian idioms, and Sanskrit, the same tendency is, in Professor Hartmann's opinion, to be recognized, and must, as he would have us believe, be interpreted in the same way. Besides, the preference for passive constructions has, in all these territories and especially in the East, in the course of time, gradually increased. This exact harmony between the use of this category in Italo-Celtic on the one hand and in Indo-Iranian on the other can only be explained by the hypothesis that the passive construction has ultimately originated in the specific psychological structure which centres in the *next* belief. Being foreign to the other Indo-European peoples this common belief can only be explained from the influence of the "megalithic tradition" of Western Europe — the country of the Basques who largely prefer "Passivismus" was the most important centre of this "megalithic culture" — which must have radiated and spread, through an Italo-Celtic-Aryan priesthood (p. 153), over the above other provinces of the ancient Indo-European

world. As a natural consequence of this assumption it follows that at a given period the Italo-Celtic and the Indo-Iranian groups had come into a presumably short, but at any rate intimate and intensive, direct contact. Here the reader misses a critical discussion of the prehistoric relations between these provinces of Indo-European resulting in an argumentation tending to show the inadequacy of the arguments brought forward in favour of the prevailing theories from which this standpoint diverges to a considerable degree; see e.g. W. Porzig, *Die Gliederung des Indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*, 1954, p. 214 ff. The other Indo-European dialects remained, according to Hartmann, typically "indogermanisch-griechisch", that is to say: they show few or no traces of the influence of power concepts like the Celtic *nert*. The present reviewer "in attributing a comparatively insignificant influence to this impersonal power on the use of the Sanskrit passive" (see: J. Gonda, *Remarks on the Sanskrit Passive*, Leiden, 1951, esp. p. 76 f.) was therefore, like Meillet, *Ling. hist. et ling. gén.* I, p. 195 f., in Professor Hartmann's opinion wrong, because he liked to follow the "indogermanische-griechische Gedankengänge" (p. 185). It must be observed at the outset that the author of the *Remarks*, as may appear from p. 76 f. did not subscribe to Meillet's opinion that the passive presents the process "sans aucune notion étrangère", and further that in an article which no doubt escaped Professor Hartmann's attention ("Universele tendenzen in de Indonesische syntaxis", *Bijdragen Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 100 (1951) p. 185 f.) the same author had, for instance in connection with Lat. *piget me*; Skt. *krpāviṣṭah*; Gr. οὐ τοι ἐπι δέος etc. and αἰρεῖ with χόλος, λήθη etc. explicitly affirmed the influence of such an attitude of mind on the language of prescientific communities.

The author of the book under review has indeed onesidedly neglected any way of explaining the use of passive verbs other than the "Allkraft" belief. The polite, deferential or respectful character of the passive construction, which often is obvious, is considered to be of a secondary character (p. 165); it seems to have escaped the author that it is often used instead of the ancient aorist in order to express the actual past beside active forms of the present and future. One cannot help wondering how the rule formulated on p. 166: "wir finden einen steten Wechsel zwischen Aktiv und Passiv, je nachdem ob Überlegenheit und Freiheit der Entscheidung oder Nachgeben und Sichfügen in

den Zwang einer Kraft (i.e. the "Allkraft" or at least a "power-concept") ausgedrückt werden soll" can be substantiated. The question whether the reverse of the author's thesis is true — is in Sanskrit as well as in the other languages under consideration the active category consistently used when subjects other than cult, births, deaths, law, customs and the other "spheres of power" come up for discussion? — is very inadequately dealt with. The main reason why for instance in Nala 2, 9, *anubhūyatām ayaṃ vīrāḥ svayaṃvaraḥ* "O heroes, let it come to your notice that a svayaṃvara ceremony is going to be held" (formal invitation); 4, 17, *tathā bhadre vidhīyatām* "so also do you, O gentle one, act" (Nala speaking respectfully and persuasively to Damayantī) the passive imperative is used, is a stylistic one: the person speaking chooses a verb, a form, a fixed phrase which is adequate and allows him to hint at the special social relations between the hearer and himself. The active imperative *śṛṇu* "listen" used 2, 20 by Nārada in addressing Indra and *praṇayasva* "manifest your affection" 4,1, *kuru praṇayam* 4,2 without being impolite, have no such implications. It is however difficult to see why the passages mentioned first should in contradistinction to the others be regarded as an example of the influence of the "Allkraft" on human speech. It is true that the main reason why the passive constructions as opposed to the active ones can be formal and deferential is their neutrality with regard to the category of person. But this does not mean that they necessarily imply the logical contrary of the idea of "individuality", i.e. "Allkraft". Under some circumstances they may be a means of expressing that in the opinion of the speaker such an impersonal and vague and omnipresent "idea" exerts its influence upon the events under discussion or must be considered the "agens proper" concerned in a process. But it can also — and even in milieus in which the existence of, and belief in, supranormal and impersonal powers was generally accepted and fully developed — indicate that for some reason or other — for particulars the reader may be referred to the reviewer's above-mentioned "Sanskrit Passive" — the person speaking wishes to avoid referring to the first or second person without consciously or unconsciously attributing the process to an "Allkraft". This is especially clear in the many cases of the absolute locative: the poet of the Nala episod after relating how Nārada informs the god Indra about the svayaṃvara of Damayantī continues 2,24:

etasmin kathyamāne tu lokapālāḥ . . . ājagmuḥ “while this was being related, the guardians of the quarters came . . .”: it is perfectly evident who is the one who relates, but, as is equally clear, the poet has refrained from repeating Nārada’s name. Does this mean that he wishes to have us believe the “Allkraft” to be the subject proper of this sentence? Does the existence of the passive construction always and everywhere imply that there is, apart from the subject and the agents, a non-individual and non-specific power in the background which is the originator proper? There can of course be no denying that 4,3 *tvatkrte hi mayā vīra rājānaḥ samnipātītāḥ* (Damayantī speaking to Nala) “it is for you indeed, O hero, that I have caused the kings to assemble”, Damayantī refers to a ceremony which is based on tradition and as such belongs to the category of events styled by Hartmann “Kultus und Brauchtum”; but 2,9 where her father formally convenes the same svayaṃvara the active is used. Why? In the reviewer’s opinion mainly because 2,9 the passage is narrative, the subject being in the third person, whereas 4,3 where direct speech is quoted, the logical subject being in the first person, the so-called passive construction like the Vedic aorist emphasizes, in a more or less vivid way, the actual character of the process, that is to say it indicates that the person speaking refers to an activity which though taking place in the past is still of interest, or to phrase it otherwise: the chief interest in the process is not in the past but in the present, the speaker referring mainly to its present result. Similarly, 6,4; 7 as opposed to 5,28. The last mentioned passage is especially interesting, because the verb which relates to “Brauchtum” is in the active — a point not mentioned by Hartmann — and the verb which expresses a “psychischer Vorgang” (Hartmann, p. 182) is in the passive: *varayāmāsa caivainam patitve . . . toto hāheti sahasā muktaḥ śabdo narādhipaiḥ* “and thus she chose him as her husband . . . thereupon the princes suddenly uttered the word “alas””. The active *varayāmāsa* needs no discussion; the transition to the passive construction seems to become intelligible if we notice the construction of the words quoted: *devaiḥ . . . tatra sādhu sādhu iti . . . vismitair īritāḥ śabdaḥ* “the gods then became struck with amazement and uttered the cry: “excellent, excellent””: here the cry “alas” uttered by the human princes which is antithetically (chiasmus) opposed to the “excellent” of the celestials, is the thema or starting-point of the utterance. Although

this initial position of "alas" need not necessarily have determined the passive voice of the verb, the vivid character of the whole sentence no doubt contributed to the same effect: by using in a narrative passage the construction with the verbal adjective the speaker suggests possible present results of the action; by intimating that the chief interest is not in the past he makes so to say his audience witness to the events described. Such late passages as Vetālap. 36, 26 ff., quoted on p. 171 f. must be considered in a similar way, although the increasing preference for passive expression must be taken into account. Here also Professor Hartmann has failed to show on the one hand that the request addressed to the father to look for a wife for his son has nothing to do with "heilige Ordnung" and "Zwang der Sitte", on the other hand that there are no active counterparts of *vadhūr ānīyatām* "the young woman (bride) is conducted home". Anyhow, the passive form *ānīyatām* is very frequently used in passages which have nothing to do with the conceptual categories adopted by Hartmann, e.g. Kathās. 5, 92, where a king on hearing that a man is still alive says: "let him be brought quickly": *drutam ānīyatām*; and if Hartmann himself would enter this example under the heading "königliches Recht, Beschluss" attention may be drawn to passages such as Pañc. 1, 9 where the same expression is attributed to a tortoise and to Nala 8, 10; 13, 49 where queens use the active imperative *ānaya* in giving orders to inferiors.

A few other random examples may suffice to show that tendencies of a syntactic character have not been taken into account: p. 176 it is true that Vetālap. 87, 11 expresses "Auflehnung des Königs gegen die Sünde", but *aham + na + active verb* is, in a great variety of circumstances, a very frequent device for expressing an uncompromising refusal (see Gonda, Acta Orientalia 19, p. 227 ff.; La place de la particule négative, Leiden 1951, p. 49 etc.).

It seems at least debatable whether the author is right in assuming a widespread passive verb type expressing meteorologic phenomena on the strength of Irish phrases such as *teasaladh soillse gréine* "the sunlight was warmed" and the more or less crucial Latin instances such as Plautus, Captivi 80 *quasi, cum caletur* (during the dog days), *cocleae in occulto latent*, of which the hyper-archaism *qua pluitur et ninguitur* in Apuleius has no demonstrative force whatever. Here Wackernagel's observation: "deutlich gewahren wir hier wieder die

Tendenz, den Agens zurücktreten zu lassen" (Vorlesungen über Syntax I², p. 145) may be amplified by the statement that in Plautus *calet* with a definite subject means ("he, she) is warm" (see Lindsay, on Capt. 80), so that the passive may also have found acceptance owing to the necessity of differentiating between "it is warm" and "he is warm". As regards Turp. 55 *patris me miseretur* it seems hardly possible to reject any influence of "contamination" (*miseret me, misereor*). It would also appear that the author has paid too little attention to those constructions from which the passive formations in the ancient Indo-European languages have arisen. If it is right that the ancient agensless "eventives" (see Remarks, p. 75 ff.) and such constructions with a middle form as for instance *λούομαι* "I bathe", *vardhete* "he, it grows", essentially expressed that some event or occurrence took place with regard to, or in the sphere of, the subject — or that some power or potency manifested itself in an object undergoing a process — the more or less incidental addition of an agens must have meant — thus far Professor Hartmann seems to be perfectly right (p. 79 ff., esp. p. 81) — that the speaker desired to indicate that there was a means, an instrument, a cause (whether this was a thing, a phenomenon, or a living being) by the influence of which that event took place. Is on the other hand such a statement as "the nominative in the passive sentence, like the accusative in the active sentence, must in the ancient language "wahrscheinlich weitgehend" have been the case of "Kraftlosigkeit" and "Kraftentleertsein" (p. 85 f.) not liable to be misunderstood? Does the author suggest that the nominative, being originally a "centre of power" lost that character as soon as it came to combine with a "passive verb"? What about the neuter where both cases are undistinguished? Or must the above statement be taken to mean that the subject of an active sentence is so to say a centre or source of power, whereas the subject of the passive sentence represents the being or object in the sphere of which, through a power which is left unmentioned, a happening occurs? One can only wonder that the author has not investigated a sufficient number of exceptions to the tendencies which he believes to be manifest in the literatures under discussion. Thus his statement that in the R̥gveda the passive forms of *anu-dā-* "to permit" and *dā-* "to give" "stark hervortreten" may lead to misunderstandings: the three cases of *anu-dāyi* quoted by him are the only instances of this

form in the whole R̥gveda; there are no cases of the simple *dāyi*, but far over 100 instances of active and middle forms.

In arguing that "psychische Vorgänge und gewohnheitsmäßiges Verhalten, Beschlus und Unrecht", military activities etc. are also in Latin often described by passive verb forms — Caesar B.G. 6, 18, 1 *Galli se omnes ab Dite patre prognatos praedicant idque ab druidibus proditum dicunt* — a phenomenon which should in his opinion be explained by the same theory — the author does not notice that a large number of the relevant verbs are also often used in "agensless passive" constructions: *decretum est; sic placitum est; sicut praeceptum est; donatus est* etc., part of them being even in more or less frequent use as substantives: *praeceptum, edictum placitum, malefactum* etc. And is it not quite natural that Latin, like Dutch and other languages, has a preference for eventive or agensless constructions in denoting customs, institutions, conditions, states of affairs resultant on creative acts and decisions of anonymous ancestors? That "bei den Verba des gewohnheitsmäßigen Verhaltens, besonders in der Sphäre von Kultus, Recht und Brauch, häufig vollständige Passiva vorkommen" (p. 134) may be explained by the tendency to extend usual agensless resultative constructions with an indication of the agens, in those cases when the agens is known and should be mentioned. Then we find beside *placitum est*: Plautus, Amph. 635 *ita divis est placitum*; beside *urbs condita, ab condita urbe, post Romam conditam* and similar phrases: *conditum est a . . .* Cases like *rude donatus*: Caesar B.G. 1, 47, 4 a . . . *Flacco civitate donatus erat*, drawing attention to a result of a process which is still continuing and to the person or object with regard to which this result or condition manifests itself, rather than to the originator of the process, who is not infrequently not or only vaguely known, may be put on a par. We also often express ourselves by similar constructions: *Hooghly, at which a factory had been established in 1642; long before the time of . . . the Fort of Satara was used as a State prison; according to tradition, a city called I. was founded by a king called Y*. Similar remarks might be made in connection with Avestan instances such as Y. 56, 3; "the good fortune which has been allotted to us" (cf. in Greek *πέπρωται*, Dutch *het is beschoren* etc.), to Nalā 14, 5 and 14 quoted on p. 181 etc. Cf. also such "fait accompli" phraseology as e.g. Atharvaveda 4, 6, 7 "they who . . ., they are all made impotent". In other cases the preference for a passive expression may be de-

terminated by factors connected with the structure of the sentence, e.g. by the tendency to persevere in a chosen construction: Caesar B.G. 1, 3, 4 *Castico . . . , cuius pater regnum . . . obtinuerat et ab senatu populi Romani amicus appellatus erat*. Elsewhere a narrative active focussing attention on the *dramatis personae* and their activities is at the end of the pericope, by way of recapitulation, followed by a resultative (periphrastic) passive emphasizing the occurrence and its consequences: thus in the passages of the Behistun inscription quoted on p. 157.

If the passive category really is to such a high degree dependent on, or even a product of, a complex of ideas entertained by an ancient priesthood (p. 153) and so inextricably associated with the "Allkraft" concept, why is it that the words denoting power-substances are so often connected with a verb in the active voice? Cf. e.g. R̥gveda 1, 165, 11 "the brahma has filled me with delight"; 3, 53, 12 "Viśvāmitra's brahma protects this people". Thus it appears that the author too often fails to take purely linguistic, and especially stylistic, factors into account, which may in the reviewer's opinion furnish a satisfactory explanation of the use of passive forms without resorting to a onesided theory. Any attempt to marshal the linguistic facts of a remote and obscure past into a simple coherent pattern and to explain them by non-linguistic factors and influences exerted by mysterious peoples who have left nothing but megalithic monuments leads inevitably to the dangers of simplification and a premature statement of general conclusions.

In discussing (p. 185) the comment given in the "Remarks on the Sanskrit passive", p. 93, upon the Skt. verb *mriyāte* (the asterisk before which must be deleted) Professor Hartmann expresses the opinion that this word for dying is a pure passive because the Indians had "eine sehr deutliche Vorstellung von dem dabei tätigen Agens". If he wishes to consider Yama as the agens in the background, it must be observed that the available evidence only allows of the conclusion that Yama originally was a mythical first father and ruler of the deceased; only in the course of time did he come to be more closely associated with the terrors of death. It may readily be conceded that this idea fostered by the ancient Indians with respect to the process of dying was widely different from those held by modern atheists, but does it follow that they in speaking always referred to the powers and deities which were concerned in this event? What linguistically matters is not

a religious idea in the background, but linguistic form and context. In contradistinction to the author's remark on p. 137, al. 3 and p. 186 it must be maintained that the accent (*mriyáte*), which is traditional, cannot prove the verb to be a pure passive, because the intransitives or eventives belonging to the so-called passive category (e.g. *tvijyáte* "to flee frightened", *vidyáte* "to be found, to exist") have also *-yá-*; this must be the original place of the accent. According to what has been said in the Remarks, p. 77 on the character of these *-yá-* forms, the starting-point of the process lies outside the subject, but it is either left out of account or kept in the background, not sufficiently known, irrelevant etc. How far the speakers were conscious of the existence of a power, powers, deities or spirits which were supposed to have a hand in the matter does not appear from the speech-form used. Although we occasionally encounter *mriyate pipāsayā* "he dies of thirst", a construction with a pure instr. agentis is unknown to me (cf. also L. Renou, *Grammaire védique*, § 349n; W. D. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 773). There is, moreover, no difference perceptible between *mriyáte* and *márate* (cf. e.g. *Ṛgveda* 1, 162, 21 *na . . . mriyase na riṣyasi* "you do not die, suffer no wrong"; 10, 86, 11 *jarasā m.* "he dies of old age"). So *mriyáte* can from a linguistic point of view hardly be considered a passive proper, expressing "echte und starke Passivität", that is to say the idea of "he is killed by . . .", which indeed is expressed by *māryate*. There is no more reason for rejecting the view that many so-called passive verbs are essentially "eventive" or "agensless passive" in function, than there is for avoiding the term impersonalia. The eventive or agensless use of these verbs does no more deny the existence of a belief in powers interfering with human life and activities than the impersonal use of *ῥεῖ* may be made an argument against the fact that Zeus was believed to regulate rainfall. The present reviewer would be the last man to deny the influence of religion and "Weltanschauung" on the language of a people, but he has serious doubts about the correctness of the assumption that this influence was so intense, so direct, so absolute, so exclusive and so steadfast as the author would have us believe. Proceeding along the path taken by Professor Hartmann (cf. also p. 148 ff.; 198), we run the risk of ending with the conviction that the English "he dies" is passive too because of the Christian belief in God's omnipotence. The study of syntactic phenomena and the functions of

morphological categories should not be made an appendix of the comparative study of religions or cultural anthropology.

A few words must be said on section G in which the author attempts to show that the use of passive constructions in Malay — and other Indonesian languages — has a close resemblance to that in the “Italo-Celtic-Aryan” languages. Here he has drawn his material from too few and too inadequate sources: Blake’s Grammar of the Tagalog Language and a small Malay primer. Referring for a more ample discussion of the relevant facts to my observations in vol. III of this review (p. 24 ff.), to my papers “Over Indonesische werkwoordsvormen” I and II in the *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* vol. 105, p. 333 ff. and 381 ff., and to M. G. Emeis’ *Vorm en functie in klassiek en modern Maleisch*, Thesis Utrecht 1945, it may be recalled here that, mainly owing to the time-honoured tendency of Western grammarians to classify Indonesian “verbal forms” in a rigid system of active and passive “voices” after the Latin variety and to an almost complete lack of modern investigations, there is much confusion and uncertainty with regard to the precise function of the relevant category. The Malay *di*-form, which seems to have arrested Professor Hartmann’s special interest, appears in Malay to form a mainly narrative category, stating that there is a process, a *patiens* which, however, is far from being always in the foreground, and as a rule also an *agens*, which is often indefinite. The alternation of the verb forms is dependent on a very subtle and intricate composition of forces and tendencies; to the relevant factors belong the choice of a *thema* or starting-point in formulating an utterance, its being introduced by particular elements or its referring to definite elements of the preceding sentence, the wish of the speaker to express what tentatively might be called aspectual nuances. In many cases no choice whatever is possible; the forms *tiba*, *menangis*, *menumbuk* etc. in the episod quoted on p. 191 have therefore no conclusive force. The so-called passives contained in that text cannot, on the other hand, be regarded as evidence of the more or less direct influence of the “Allkraft” or *mana* concept on Malay syntax. The construction *uang itu diberikannya kepada si Ahmad* “he gave that money to Ahmad” has nothing to do with *mana*; the “logical object” *uang*, which occupies the first place in the sentence because it anaphorically refers to the same idea in the preceding sentence, carries in its wake the *di-nja* form.

The definition of "passive" proposed by the author (p. 13) "das zur Wirkung Gebrachtwerden und das zur Auswirkung Gelangenlassen von Kraft durch einen Agens sowie das Betroffenwerden von einer Kraft" is also open to criticism because "Kraft" — which moreover is, too often, even in late documents, identified with *nert*, *numen*, *mana*, *chvarenah*, *brahman* (p. 190) which, by the way, cannot be identified without comment — is too general, too "primitive", and on the other hand, too positive a concept to guide us to the solution of the problem why a passive is, beside active and sometimes also other forms, used in so many languages and why it remained in use. There may be a considerable element of truth in the thesis that the "origin" of the passive voice and its use in "primitive" cultures had something or even much to do with the belief in "powers" — the whole complex of problems may be reserved for further consideration in a longer article which is in course of preparation —, there can be no doubt that in medieval Sanskrit, in 17th century Irish, and in modern Malay the occurrence of "passive" verbs was, and is, a traditional element of syntax, the actual use of which was or is, to a certain extent, a matter of "style". As Professor Hartmann rightly points out, the original Indo-European did not possess a passive category, and the passives arisen in the course of history of the individual idioms did not attain to the same degree of development and popularity everywhere. It is indeed a problem of considerable importance why, for instance, Sanskrit has had such an unmistakable preference for this category whereas Greek has often been reluctant to make good use of it. But in making a sharp distinction between the Greek and Indo-European mentality — "in der griechischen Sprache haben wir vielleicht den reinsten Ausdruck des indogermanischen Geistes zu erkennen" (p. 15; cf. also p. 39) — which did not want "dem Gefühl des Betroffenwerdens durch Kräfte in nennenswertem Masse nachzugeben" (p. 14) — and the Italo-Celtic-Indo-Iranian mode of thinking which accepting the "Allkraft" concept and the belief in forces and powers was in urgent need of a full-grown passive the author seems to overshoot his mark ¹⁾. It would be

¹⁾ The author's conviction that the "primitive" belief that a name and the person or object bearing it are closely connected, "gewisz schon seit unvordenklichen Zeiten bei den Indogermanen aufgehört hat so lebendig zu sein, dasz er sprachlichen Ausdruck erlangt hätte" will not be generally accepted and seems to be contrary to the evidence (cf. the reviewer's *Stilistische studie over Atharvaveda I—VII*, Wageningen 1938, p. 81 ff.; L. Ph. Rank, *Etymologiseering. . . . bij Homerus*, Thesis Utrecht 1951, p. 35 ff.).

more accurate to hold that an agensless passive or "eventive" (see the above "Remarks on the Sanskrit passive", *passim*) was not only in ancient and prehistoric Indo-European idioms, but also in non-Indo-European languages spoken in semi-primitive milieus, and is, even in modern Indo-European popular usage, dialects and non-standard speech, a device of considerable spread and popularity; that, further, the spread of the complete passive construction was, and is, mainly a matter of cultural development, that the preference for it in certain styles, milieus or languages resulted from a composition of general and special factors, that, in the third place, the belief in powers was only one of the reasons why this category was incidentally chosen; that, lastly, we have no good grounds for believing that the original Indo-European mode of thinking was in the main "Greek", i.e. classically Greek (for the last point see also the reviewer's "Aspects of early Viṣṇuism", Utrecht 1953, ch. I): the Celts and ancient Italians may have preserved some ancient traits of the common original Indo-European intellectual character — which no doubt bore a close resemblance to the picture we can form of pre-scientific mentality by a comparative study of a variety of cultures —, the Indian no doubt not only preserved, but even cultivated and developed them, but there can be no denying that in Greece, at least among those who for us are the typical "Greeks", they were largely abandoned and superseded. In constructing oppositions between "das typisch indogermanische, auszerordentlich stark ich-bezogene Denken" and the belief in "Allkraft" (cf. p. 39; 44) which being of megalithic origin overflowed the South-western and South-eastern areas of the Indo-European world, Professor Hartmann sometimes seems to lose sight of the well-known fact that communities which believe in a metaphysical reality in which there is ample room for power-substances and potent deities, in practical life — and in a way in magic — often think and act in a rational manner, or to phrase this otherwise: that „ich-bezogenes Denken" (corresponding to the linguistic category of the active) and belief in power (if this corresponds to the passive) are not necessarily mutually exclusive (cf. however also p. 80). So the author's thesis that the preference for passive constructions was even at a late period mainly due to religious belief, "weltanschauliche" convictions and priestly or theological influences can hardly be substantiated. Even if one is, like the present reviewer, ready to

admit the far-reaching consequences of the belief in forces, power-substances, *Daseinsmächte* etc. (see e.g. Gonda, *Ancient Indian ojas*, Utrecht 1952), and to recognize the influence of this belief on syntax and on the use and functions of morphological categories, it does not appear to be an imperative necessity to conclude that the use of passive verb forms was in these languages and in these periods exclusively determined by this sole factor — albeit that it manifested itself in many aspects — and never, or only incidentally or secondarily, by those factors which lead to passive constructions in more modern epochs and in the other Indo-European languages (see *Remarks on the Sanskrit passive*, p. 1 ff. and *passim*). Nor does it seem to be an improvement that the author practically rejects the suggestion made by other writers on this subject to attach value to the differentiation between agensless passives and complete passive constructions. In the former case the agens is simply not expressed: it may, under certain circumstances, be a “power-substance”; but there is no reason whatever to explain passages such as *Nala* 5, 5 *tatra sma pīnā drśyante bāhavaḥ* “there muscular arms were (to be) seen” as having been inspired by a belief in an “Allkraft”.

Utrecht

J. GONDA

PETER HARTMANN, *Nominale Ausdrucksformen im wissenschaftlichen Sanskrit*. Heidelberg 1955, C. Winter, 258 pp.

In this valuable study Dr. Hartmann deals with a feature of Sanskrit prose style which has repeatedly attracted the attention of grammarians and historians of Indian literature, but which up to the present time, has never been made the subject of a monograph. Whereas Vedic and epic Sanskrit show a form of speech closely akin to the cognate languages one of the most outstanding characteristics of the classical prose style is — apart from the preference for compounds which however is also an essential feature of classical poetry — the marked predilection shown for nominal forms. The use of participles and gerunds is carried to excess, great stress is laid on case relations as expressing the meaning usually implied in verbal phrases, long and complicated compounds serve to replace subordinate clauses. In the later scientific style this practice results in the occurrence of conti-