that he started to write on in this period, was the subject of further work in the 1980s, during which time his interests (at least as reflected in his publications) became increasingly diverse, ranging from general issues in linguistic methodology and theory to South and Southeast Asian linguistics to language contact phenomena. All the while he continued his research into Germanic linguistics and mythology. In the last decade of his life, he published again mainly in the realm of Indo-European mythology and linguistics, but with an admixture of work on Celtic and Baltic religious vocabulary (e.g. 1995).

Much of P.’s later life is associated with The Journal of Indo-European Studies (JIES), of which he was Mythology Editor beginning at its founding in 1973 and later managing editor (1987–99). To the journal he contributed countless book reviews and notices, most of them in his mammoth “Book Chronicles” that became a regular feature of each issue beginning in 1995. The sheer quantity of books on which he wrote was testament to his famous indefatigability in reading. The subjects that the journal has tended to be concerned with the most—Indo-European culture and religion (often analyzed from a Dumézilian perspective) and archaeology—partly reflect the stamp of P’s own intellectual focus.

P. was legendary during his lifetime for furthering the field of Indo-European studies, disseminating its findings to others, and fostering his students. Revered by countless colleagues and several generations of students (many of whom are now professors), P. was the recipient of two festschrifts (1988, 1991–22) and a four-part Gedenkschrift.


Benjamin W. Fortson IV


P. was born to Russian-speaking parents who emigrated from the Crimea and settled in Germany. From an early age he was well versed in Classical languages, esp. in Greek, and studied hieroglyphic Egyptian and Hebrew. In the universities of Berlin and Göttingen he studied Egyptology (with K. Sethe), Semitic languages (with M. Lidzbarski), Iranian (with F. C. Andreas) and Turkic (with W. Bang). He also specialized in late Greek. During his studies and afterwards, P. was engaged in the Septuagint project directed by A. Rahlfis, and took active part in the study and publication of the Coptic Manichaean texts. His comprehensive article on “Manichäismus” (1935), based on the synthesis of all the sources in the various languages, has remained the most important research paper on the subject and P.’s only non-linguistic study. (It was translated into Italian and appeared sixty years later with updated notes [1996]). After the rise of Nazism P. left Germany, and in 1934 began teaching at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where he became Professor of Egyptian and Semitic Linguistics and founded the Department of Linguistics and the Department of Egyptian. He was elected a member of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, the Hebrew Language Academy, and the British, Danish, and Dutch academies, was awarded the Israel Prize, other prestigious prizes, and the gold Lidzbarski medal of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, as well as some honorary doctorates.

In Jerusalem P. taught General Linguistics, Egyptian and Coptic, Comparative Semitics, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Amharic, Tigrinya, Neo-Aramaic, Turkish and Post-Classical...
Greek. His research became purely linguistic and, in addition to Egyptian and Coptic, centered on Ethiopic, Neo-Aramaic, Amharic, Tigrinya and Gurage dialects, as P. took advantage of the opportunities to work with native speakers of those tongues.

In the 1950’s, P. founded, alongside the Department of Linguistics of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, an autonomous Department of Egyptian—perhaps the only one in the world to specialize in the linguistics of Egyptian. From the 1920’s until his death, he published a series of studies on Egyptian and Coptic grammar that amount to a masterly, almost single-handed, grammatical charting of these languages (his Collected Papers of 1971 include only works published up to 1965).

P.’s greatest achievement in Middle Egyptian and Old Egyptian grammatical description—with considerable theoretical implications for general linguistics—was the structuralist establishment of the verb-category identity and distinction—by means of substitution (paradigms) and compatibility (syntagmatics). The functional resolution of the Coptic second tenses and Egyptian so-called “emphatic” sdm.f and sdm.n.f forms in a series of studies (1934, 1940, 1944 and 1957c), through the identification of their cleft-sentence construction and conjoint realization of their “that”-form substantive nature, proved to be a key to unlocking the functional essence of the entire verbal systems of all phases of Egyptian, from the conversion mechanism of Coptic (to be fully developed in “The Coptic Conjugation System” of 1960a) to the systemic tension between substantive, adjectival (relative and participial) and adverbial tense forms, a tension informing a sophisticated system of patterning (1944, 1964, 1965 [an Egyptian counterpart of the “Coptic Conjugation System” as a synthetic esquisse de grammaire of the verb], 1957c, 1969, 1976 [here presented as transformations of a basic verbal predicate clause]). P.’s distinction of nominal/substantival role forms from the adverbial verbal substitution class is in essence an analytically-based synthesis. It is based not on semantic content (which is to say, the rendering into a European language) but purely on syntactical slotting and word-class definition, mainly within the pivotal nasal matrix “SUBSTANTIVE + ADVERBAL”27, which contains the rhematic circumstantial or converbal forms—sdm.f, sdm.n.f and the Stative—following a nominal element, including the grammaticalized and still mysterious jw(f). This means that the Middle-Egyptian verb occurs largely in periphrastic conjugations, but by no means implies that the verbal attributes, such as tense and aspect, are not represented in the verb or that the verb is non-verbal in any way; it simply denotes the important role played by conversbs and “that”-forms or nexus substantivizations (infinitives, in later phases), a role familiar in other African languages. The absence of vocalic graphemes in the Egyptian script, Hieroglyphic to Demotic, far from being a deprivation and an obstacle to understanding grammatical systems, turns out to be a blessing: we are forced from the “superstition de la forme” (De Boer), and, conceiving “form” as “class form”, defined structurally at the junction of syntagmatic and paradigmatic environments, we achieve a definition of grammatical category that is richer in significance and indeed more genuine. P.’s heuristic analytic methodology is especially adapted to the study of written corpora and dead languages.

K. Sethe was P.’s main teacher, but A. Erman was in many ways his chief inspiration. Sethe had assembled in his Verbum (1899–1902) such morphology of the Egyptian suffix conjugation as there was, and attempted a synchronic and diachronic account of the verbal system. For P., a → Saussurean → Hjelmslevian structuralist, any differentiation on the formal (signifier) plane implies, as a matter of course, a differentiation on the content (signified) plane; his great achievement was the blending of the consonantal morphological data with the syntactical idiosyncrasies of the individual forms (the scope for his grammatical inquiry is macro-syntactic and textual); Sethe’s view of the Egyptian Suffix Conjugation was largely syntactical and a-priori Semitic-referred.

P.’s theory of a substantival mrr.f (used strikingly in the topic constituent of a cleft sentence) strongly clashes with A. H. → Gardiner’s statements about the difference between the “mrr.f” gminating sdm.f form in the Egyptian Grammar (§438ff.) Gardiner’s view, that the mrr.f form is marked as expressing imperfective aspect, “repetition and continuity” (“Imperfective sdm.f form”) is a reversion, since it implicitly rejects A. Erman’s discovery of its “emphatic” focalization role, which, following its structural resolution as substantival, resulted in the final identification by P. of the ancestry of the Coptic second tenses). Gardiner’s mention of P.’s theory (1950; 1957: 359), while unreservedly accepting P.’s account of Coptic and even Late Egyptian as correct, rejects rather stubbornly his view of the mrr.f form. Gardiner’s stance is evocatively echoed even today by such Egyptologists as A. Loprieno and P. Vernus, who see aspectual characteristics as primary, opposing mrr.f to a “simple” or unmarked sdm.f, a simplistic view
that unfortunately proves attractive to non-
Egyptological linguists who seek typological
formulations of Egyptian grammar.

P. wrote little on Late Egyptian (only 1972, a
brief overview of features), and his only discus-
sion of Demotic concerns the Demotic “em-
phatic” and focalizing conversion, as part of a
diachronic presentation; see 1944).

While maintaining a typologically sensitive
view of synchronic phases (esp. Coptic), P. was
an ardent diachronist, seeing the span of four
millennia of continuous attestation as a unique
opportunity for observing language evolution.
He constantly protested and warned against
divorcing Coptic linguistics from the linguistics
of the pre-Coptic phases of Egyptian, a rift that
is, unfortunately, by now nearly complete. This
stand was rhetorically taken in his brilliant

P.’s work on Coptic is very different from his
pre-Coptic contribution. The grammatical sys-
tem and patterns of Coptic were known in west-
ern orientalistic, Egyptological and general-lin-
guistic typological scholarship, in general out-
line since the 18th century and in detail since
the latter half of the 19th and first decades of
the 20th century. However, the Coptic verbal
system was conventionally conceived of as
“normal” in European terms, that is, as a rep-
ertory of irreducible forms. P.’s main contribu-
tion was to see the elegant modular analytic
structure of the Coptic verb (1960a, 1987–90
etc.).

Many of P.’s insights on numerous features
of Coptic, from lexicon to syntax, are closely
packed in brief, condensed descriptive state-
ments and terse formulations—a veritable gram-
matical treasure trove hidden away in reviews of
ditions, grammars and of Crum’s Dictionary
(see esp. 1930, 1934, 1939, 1957a, 1957b, 1959,
1962). Here is a thematic listing of P.’s discus-
sions of Coptic grammar:

(1) juncture, prosody and phonemics/orthog-
raphy of Coptic (1931, 1933, 1949, 1957b, 1961a:
the Jinkim, superlinear stroke; enclitics and their
environment; syllabic structure; stress and its
manifestations; (2) word-order in Coptic (1961a):
the placement of enclitics; (3) the nom-
inal sentence in Coptic (1962a; 1987:ch. I): a
precise account of noun predication patterns and
their information structure; also noun/pron-
noun focalization patterns (cleft sentences with
relative topic form); (4) focalization in Coptic;
the cleft sentence (for nominal/pronominal foci)
and the Coptic second tenses or — in Bentley
Layton’s term — focalizing conversion (1934,
1940, 1944, 1960a, 1962a, 1987 ch. Ib); in Egyp-
tian (1940, 1944, 1957c) the structure and func-
tion of the “Second Tenses” is synchronically
established and then diachronically delineated
retrospectively for all phases of Egyptian; (5)
the structure and function of tenses in Coptic
(1950, 1960a, 1990 chs. IV, V, VI); (6) the Coptic
circumstantial conversion (1990:ch. VII); (7) the
Coptic Relative constructions (1987: chs. IIa–b); (8)
the causative conjugation in Coptic (1944,
1950; 1987: ch. III); (9) Coptic/Greek contras-
tive statements (1944, 1950, 1987–90: passim); (10)
determination and possessive constructions in

Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbau (1987–
90), P.’s most extensive study of Coptic grammar,
is not a summation of his Coptic opus but rather
a novel, boldly deviating conception of the Cop-
tic verbal System. This is in part the Coptic
counterpart to his Egyptian “Transpositions”
(1976), consisting of a schematic view of Coptic
conversion as falling into the three part-of-
speech categories of adverb, substantive, and ad-
jective, and these three as transformations of the
basic—in fact, hierarchically underlying—verbal
nexus. The account of these transformations is
minutely detailed, and combined with profiles of
the nominal-sentence patterns and their struc-
ture, an updated and much expanded version of
1962a, and of the causative conjugation.

The considerable general linguistic (and
General-Linguistic) import of P.’s work, mani-
fested in teaching and research, lies (1) in the
structuralist heuristic procedure of his studies
up to the 1970’s, applying the paradigmatic
tools of commutation, the textual-syntagmatic
notion of macro syntactically conceived slot and
the paradigmatic-syntagmatic concept of pattern;
(2) in the functional and macro syntactically
formal conception of the grammatical cat-
cory (in Old and Middle Egyptian); (3) in the
clarification of the structure and function of the
cleft sentence and the nominal sentence (here
and elsewhere doing away with the concepts of
“grammatical” subject and predicate, clarifying
the concept of “copula” and generally correlat-
ing information and syntactic structures; (4) in
the application of the terms and concepts of
‘conversion’ and ‘converter’, later applied by
P.’s disciples to other languages (the term used
explicitly by P. only in 1960a), in effect over-
ruling and to a degree replacing both tradition-
al notions of subordination and conjunctural
clause in Coptic and Egyptian; and (5) gener-
ally in the painstakingly, minutely detailed, al-
tways text-based approach to grammatical inves-
tigation, the harmonic and cross-fertilizing si-
multaneous work on several typologically kin-
dred or relevant languages, illustrated didacti-
cally in his 1964/65 seminar on “General Syn-
tax”: Classical, West European and Slavonic,
Ethiopian and Semitic languages.
P’s main contributions to Semitic linguistics were mostly concerned with explicating the niceties of Amharic syntax (e.g., 1937, 1983) and of the indirect attribute in Arabic (1978), uncovering the hidden principles underlying the structure of Gurage by defining the morphological reflexes of former gemination and vowel-length and analyzing the special impersonal forms (1938, 1951), and elucidating the reshaped verbal system of Neo-Aramaic as a system of complexes in which the principal parts are inflected for person by three sets of pronominal suffixes formally constant (‘nominative’, ‘objective’, ‘genitive’), but whose inherent meanings (actor, undergoer, ‘gift’, recipient, etc.) are modular and determined by the nature of the base to which the suffix happens to be attached (1961a, 1979, 1986, 1994). His approach is characterized by synchronic analysis in typological, areal and historical contexts, with closer attention to intrinsic typological affinity than to genetic-genealogical comparison (except for 1964c). In Semitic as elsewhere, P. regarded word-forms, phrases and clauses with emphasis on their syntactical equivalence according to their function, and employed typological parallels in other languages, Eastern and Western, for expounding the essence of their structural value. Such was in particular his comparison of Amharic and Turkish syntax (1960c). In the study of Gurage, synchrony and diachrony were combined to clarify the structure of the morphological system and the sense it makes. P. investigated all aspects of language but his main interest was grammatical description and analysis, and his effort and ideal in linguistics were mostly directed to what A. → Meillet defined as “ordonner les faits linguistiques au point de vue de la langue même”.

One of P.’s more interesting works is his dialogues Aegidius and Actius (1943). He relates the problem of speech to divine creation. On the one hand, he points out the divine nature and the creative aspect of speech, and on the other, he identifies speech with God. Speech, by its very nature, justifies the indivisibility of res and verbum (quia sunt cuncta quidem verbo creasse; 1943: 269). This is the basis for P.’s thoughts on poetry, the original form of language, through which man emerges from the ‘dark woods’ in an attempt to form a community. Because of this, P. claims that poetry is ‘the most fruitful mother of all sciences’ (doctrinarum omnium mater foecundissima; 1943: 239).


Donatella Di Cesare


After completing school in Odense, P. studied theology at the University of Copenhagen. He traveled to Holland and France in 1641 on a royal stipend and returned to Denmark in 1643 to finish his university studies. After several positions as pastor various places in Denmark, P. accepted an offer from the king to become bishop in Trondheim, Norway in 1673, a post he held until his death. P. was awarded the degree of doctor of theology by the king of Denmark in 1675.

P.’s major work is his extensive Grammatica Danica, published in 1668, but apparently begun much earlier. This grammar, which fills almost 600 pages, is the first grammar of the Danish language intended for a native audience. Like L. → Kock, P. wrote his Danish grammar
in Latin. Although he questions the usefulness of providing grammatical rules for the vernacular, quoting the German humanist Johannes Manlius, since every child can learn to speak correctly, and as a rule, eventually learn to write correctly by imitation and practice, he still maintains, again quoting Manlius, that the Greeks and Romans made a concerted effort to teach their native languages, while many Germans who spoke publicly in an official capacity used the language in an improper and obscure manner because they had not perfected it through grammatical studies.

Although P.’s grammar was modeled on Latin grammars, he also relied heavily on the German vernacular grammars, particularly Albert Oelinger’s Vinderricht der Hoyc Teutschen Sprach (1573) and Justus Georg von Schottelius’ Tutsche Sprach-kunst (1641) who had already undertaken the task of adapting a Latin grammar to a Germanic language.

P.’s grammar is divided into three sections: Observationes orthographicæ presenting pronunciation and spelling, Observationes etymologicæ dealing with the parts of speech and inflection, the largest section, and Observationes syntacticæ discussing word order with reference to the parts of speech. P. operates with five parts of speech that are subject to inflection (variabiles & flexibles: articles, nouns, pronouns, verbs, and participles) and four that are not (invariabiles inflexibles: adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections). Thus, in contrast to Latin grammar, but following the tradition of his German predecessors, he introduces the article as one of the parts of speech and shows an awareness that there are only two cases for nouns since they only have two possible inflections: Casus Rectus and Casus Obliquis. P.’s view of syntax is clearly positional and relational.

In addition to his grammar, P. wrote poems in Latin and poetry and ballads in Danish. He also wrote a number of psalms and translated M. → Luther’s catchism into Saami. P. left behind several manuscripts, among them word lists comparing Danish with Icelandic and Old German, a Saami word list, an etymological dictionary, and a dictionary of rhymes, Vocabularium Danico-Rhythmicum (Gl. kgl. saml. 3605, 8th).


Pop, Sever. b. July 27, 1901, Poiana-Ilvei, Romania, d. Feb. 17, 1961, Herent (Louvain), Belgium; Romance scholar and dialectologist, founder of the Centre international de dialectologie générale (CIDG).

P. studied Romance philology at the University of Cluj, where he was appointed a professor in 1923, after having worked at the Cluj Museum of the Rumanian language. He went to Paris to study dialectology, linguistics and Romance philology with J. → Gilliéron, A. → Meillet, M. → Roques and J. → Vendryes. In 1927 he conducted fieldwork in France, Switzerland, Spain, and Italy, in collaboration with dialectologists such as L. → Gauchat, J. → Jud, A. → Griera, U. Pellis and P. Scheuermere. Inspired by the work of Gilliéron and H. → Schuchardt, and in the context of the rise of the idealistic trend of neolinguistica, P. felt attracted to the study of dialects in their relationship to social and cultural history. In P.’s view dialectology was to be conceived as the study of Wörter und Sachen, and it was his conviction that innovation in linguistics depended on the gathering and analysis of new data from fieldwork. During his professorship at Cluj (which lasted until 1939), he carried out extensive fieldwork for the Atlasul lingvistic roman in Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece. P. developed extensive questionnaires for the Rumanian atlas, which was innovative for its method and remarkable for the wealth of linguistic (and ethnographic) information. The methodological aspects and the principal conclusions reached (with respect to linguistic innovations and their direction, the role of peripheral areas, the diversification of Imperial Latin in the eastern part of the ‘Romania’, the specificity of women’s speech) were discussed by P. in a series of methodologically important articles (1931, 1933, 1947).

After two short professorships in Cernăuți and Bucharest, in 1939 and 1940, P. became the head of the Rumanian Academy in Rome. Having refused to return to his country in the post-war years, he became an exile. In 1947 he was