

# LAWS AND RULES IN INDO-EUROPEAN

---

Edited by  
Philomen Probert and  
Andreas Willi

CLarendon • Press

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford ox2 6dp

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi  
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi  
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece  
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore  
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States  
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© 2012 editorial matter and organization Philomen Probert and Andreas Willi  
© 2012 the chapters their various authors

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted  
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,  
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate  
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction  
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,  
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover  
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India  
Printed in Great Britain  
on acid-free paper by  
MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

ISBN 978-0-19-960992-5

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

---

## Origins of the Greek law of limitation

PHILOMEN PROBERT

### II.1 Introduction

This chapter proposes a historical account of the Greek ‘law of limitation’, the restrictions on the distance from the end of the word where the accent may fall.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, the chapter proposes an origin for the behaviour of some word-final diphthongs as ‘short for accentuation’ and others as ‘long for accentuation’.

#### II.1.1 *The law of limitation*

Some languages have a word accent whose position is straightforwardly predictable: for example, the accent always falls on the word-initial syllable. In classical Latin, the position of the accent is likewise predictable, although it follows a more complex rule: the penultimate syllable is accented if this syllable is heavy, otherwise the antepenultimate; or, if the word is too short for these rules to apply ‘normally’, the initial syllable is accented. By contrast, the position of the ancient Greek accent is not predictable from the shape of a word alone, and yet there are some restrictions on its placement—some positions in the word where (with one limited group of exceptions) we can be sure not to find the accent. These restrictions are known collectively as the ‘law of limitation’, and may be stated as follows:

<sup>1</sup> It is a pleasure to offer John Penney a chapter that originated at the Oxford Comparative Philology Seminar, to which John has given so much over so many years. I am grateful for comments from participants in this seminar and its sister seminar in Cambridge; and to Eleanor Dickey and Andreas Willi, for discussion of the written version.

The accent does not fall further from the end of the word than the antepenultimate syllable, or the penultimate if the final syllable is heavy. For the purposes of this law, a single word-final consonant does not count towards syllable weight.

(An accent as far from the end of the word as the law of limitation allows is called ‘recessive’. Further restrictions regulate the occurrence of acute and circumflex accents: we shall return to these shortly.)

The law of limitation is common to all Greek dialects for which we have evidence, except possibly Thessalian (which would, however, have innovated vis-à-vis the other Aeolic dialects).<sup>2</sup> The law may well have arisen before the main dialect divisions of historical times, although caution is necessary because accentual phenomena can spread. The law of limitation has a small number of exceptions apparently resulting from Attic-Ionic quantitative metathesis having occurred *after* the limitation of the accent: πόλησ > πόλεως. Since there are metrically guaranteed examples of quantitative metathesis in Homer, the law of limitation predates the latest stages of the Homeric tradition, and may be considerably older still. It is clear that it is an innovation of Greek, not inherited from Indo-European.

#### 11.1.2 *The choice between acute and circumflex accent on a long vowel or diphthong*

Accented long vowels and diphthongs were accented either on their first half (first ‘mora’), or on their second; in the former case the accent is represented as a circumflex (*σοφοῦ*), in the second as an acute (*σοφούς*). Short vowels were simply accented or unaccented: an accent on a short vowel is represented as an acute (*σοφός*).<sup>3</sup>

On accented final syllables the choice between circumflex and acute is morphologically based: certain endings take a circumflex if accented at all (e.g. gen. pl. -ῶν), others an acute (e.g. acc. pl. -ούς). On non-final syllables the choice between circumflex and acute is phonologically determined: a long accented vowel or diphthong in the penultimate syllable takes a circumflex if the final syllable has a short vowel (*σωτῆρα*, *πολυπῖδαξ*); other accented long vowels in non-final syllables take an acute (*σοφώτατος*, *ἀνθρώπους*). But the scope of the rule prescribing a circumflex in words of shape *σωτῆρα* (the ‘*σωτῆρα* rule’) appears to differ from one dialect to another: neither Doric nor Boeotian applied the rule to all instances to which it applied in Attic and *koiné*. Nevertheless, it has been argued persuasively that, in some form and at some period,

<sup>2</sup> See Probert (2006: 72–4), with literature.

<sup>3</sup> The grave accent, a sandhi variant of the acute, is not relevant here.

the *σωτῆρα* rule operated in these dialects too (for Boeotian, see Hermann 1918: 274–5; for Doric, Hinge 2006: 124–8).

I remain agnostic as to how acutes and circumflexes were distributed on non-final syllables at an early stage, such as when the law of limitation came into existence. The *σωτῆρα* rule may have existed in some form already, or it may be a later development. Alternatively, the *σωτῆρα* rule and law of limitation arose together. In what follows I shall attempt to account for the origins of the restrictions as to the number of syllables from the end of the word where the accent might fall (the law of limitation as defined under 11.1.1), leaving aside the origins of the *σωτῆρα* rule.

### 11.1.3 Final diphthongs

Diphthongs count as long vocalic nuclei for the purposes of poetic metre,<sup>4</sup> and in general they are treated as long vowels by the accentuation rules. But in absolute word-final position, in Attic and *koiné* (on Doric see section 11.4.1), the diphthongs -*ai* and -*oi* ‘count as short’ *for the purposes of the accentuation rules only* in indicatives, subjunctives, imperatives, infinitives, and nominatives plural. In optatives, locative adverbs, and some interjections, final -*ai* and -*oi* ‘count as long’. Thus *βούλομαι* ‘I want’ (indicative), *βούλωμαι* ‘I might want’ (subjunctive), *παιδεύσαι* ‘educate!’ (imperative), and *ἄνθρωποι* ‘people’ (nominative plural) allow an acute on the antepenultimate syllable. The forms *παιδεύσαι* ‘to educate’ (aorist infinitive) and *οἶκοι* ‘houses’ (nominative plural) allow a circumflex on a long vowel in the penultimate syllable. By contrast, the acutes on the -*eu-* of *παιδεύοι* ‘may he educate’ (present optative) and *παιδεύσαι* ‘may he educate’ (aorist optative) show that the final diphthong ‘counts as long’, as does the circumflex on the final diphthong of the locative adverb *Μεγαροῦ* ‘at Megara’ and the interjection *aīaī*.

## 11.2 Historical accounts of the law of limitation

There have been many attempts to formulate the law of limitation, in synchronic terms, in such a way that it emerges naturally from some simple and plausible principle.<sup>5</sup> The problem is inherently tricky and there is still little or no agreement on the details of the phonological analysis from which the law

<sup>4</sup> A complication not immediately relevant (but see the appendix) is that in Homer any word-final long vowel or diphthong may be treated as light before a word-initial vowel, and the diphthongs -*ai* and -*oi* especially favour this treatment, evidently because the -*i* may be interpreted as consonantal between vowels. See Hartel (1874), Chantraine (1958: 88–9).

<sup>5</sup> For discussion, see Probert (2006: 108–12, 120–3).

of limitation should follow. Considerably less attention has been devoted to uncovering the historical processes that might have given rise to the law of limitation, but the question has been approached especially by Lucidi (1950) and Kurylowicz (1968: 86).

Among earlier suggestions, one might mention Hermann's view (1923: 88–9) that the law of limitation arose in two stages: first a restriction to the last three syllables (irrespective of any vowel quantities or syllable weights), then a second restriction to the last three vocalic morae in words with heavy final syllable.<sup>6</sup> While this account breaks the law of limitation down into two simpler innovations instead of one complex one, we are not told what motivated the initial restriction of the accent to the last three syllables, or the subsequent further restriction.

Like Hermann, Lucidi (1950) regards the law of limitation as arising in essentially two steps, but his first step (1950: 82) is the restriction of the accent to the last three vocalic morae (so πόλεμος, πολέμου, ἀνθρώπου, but \*ἀνθρῶπος not ἀνθρωπός, \*λεγῆτον not λέγητον). At this stage Lucidi assumes the continued existence of forms such as \*δώρον, with inherited acute accent on the penultimate. After this first step, he takes processes of compensatory lengthening to have given rise to forms such as φέρουσα (< \*φέρονσα), so that some words with a long vowel in the penultimate syllable now had the accent four vocalic morae from the end (1950: 84, 86).

Lucidi then posits a second step for Attic-Ionic and Aeolic (but not Doric): in every word with a short vowel in the final syllable and a long accented vowel in the penultimate, the accent was retracted by one vocalic mora. Thus, words such as \*ἀνθρῶπος and \*λεγῆτον became ἀνθρωπός and λέγητον, while \*δώρον became δῶρον (1950: 85–6). This second step thus produced both the law of limitation in its eventual form and the σωτῆρα rule. Aeolic, Doric, and Attic subsequently underwent further innovations, which need not concern us here.

Lucidi proposes several possible motivations for his second step. Firstly, he suggests that there was a tendency for the length of the vowel in a final syllable to be confused with the weight of the syllable, and that this confusion led to a wider reinterpretation of the restrictions on the accent as based on syllable weight rather than vowel quantity (1950: 83–4, 86). If so, forms like \*ἀνθρῶπον might have come to follow those like λέγοντα (with a heavy penultimate syllable providing no obstacle to an accent on the antepenultimate). Secondly, the appearance of forms such as φέρουσα would have contributed to the loss of the perception that a long vowel in the penultimate syllable prevented the accent falling on the antepenultimate (1950: 86). Thirdly, Lucidi (1950: 88 n. 1) allows the possibility of some substrate influence.

<sup>6</sup> A somewhat similar account already in Pedersen (1905b: 340–1).

been devoted to  
use to the law of  
by Lucidi (1950)

ew (1923: 88–9)  
to the last three  
(s), then a second  
y final syllable.<sup>6</sup>  
impler innovations  
initial restriction  
restriction.

on as arising in  
on of the accent  
, but *\*ἀνθρώπος*  
es the continued  
on the penulti-  
y lengthening to  
ome words with  
ur vocalic morae

ut not Doric): in  
cented vowel in  
ra. Thus, words  
*v*, while *\*δώπον*  
both the law of  
Doric, and Attic  
concern us here.

step. Firstly, he  
n a final syllable  
infusion led to a  
sed on syllable  
s like *\*ἀνθρώπον*  
ultimate syllable  
. Secondly, the  
d to the loss of  
ented the accent  
(: 88 n. 1) allows

Kuryłowicz (1968: 86) gives a different account, appealing to an idea that with the rise of the acute/circumflex distinction (which Kuryłowicz takes to be a Greek innovation) a syllabic sequence *x U* had become equivalent to —. A trisyllabic word of the form *᷑ x ᷑* (e.g. *λέγομεν*, *ἀνθρωπός*) might then be reanalysed as accented on the syllable immediately preceding the ‘end-complex’ *x U* (equivalent to —). The idea that words were accented either on the end-complex or on the preceding syllable was then generalized from words of shape *x x U*.

Both Lucidi’s account and Kuryłowicz’s still suffer from somewhat inadequate motivation. As motivation for his initial three-mora rule, Lucidi (1950: 92) suggests that early Greek had a secondary accent on the antepenultimate vocalic mora, but independent evidence for this secondary accent is lacking. Kuryłowicz assumes that the law of limitation was due to reanalysis of words of shape *x x U*. But why should words of this shape have been so influential? In addition, Kuryłowicz’s account requires an equivalence between the syllabic sequences *x U* and —, for which the only evidence appears to be the details of the law of limitation (see Kuryłowicz 1968: 84).

Both Lucidi’s account (in its second step) and Kuryłowicz’s, however, appeal to the fact that some words ‘obeyed’ the law of limitation before this law came into effect. This point is worth taking seriously, since a promising model for many types of linguistic change is the reanalysis of existing forms, followed by the extension of a new regularity extracted from these forms.<sup>7</sup> The suggestion offered here retains and extends the point that some words already ‘obeyed’ the not yet existing law of limitation.

### 11.3 A new suggestion

We might expect early Greek to have had approximately the second-declension noun paradigm shown in Table 11.1, with an accent on the first syllable throughout.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Cf. (on syntactic change) Harris and Campbell (1995: 61–119).

<sup>8</sup> The stage represented is one in which the nom. pl. ending is already *-οι* (not *\*-οῖς*), and Osthoff’s Law has already taken place (hence dat./instr. pl. *-οῖς*, not *\*-οῖσ*). Different decisions on these points would not affect the argument much (but on the nom. pl. ending see section 11.4), and I do not mean to claim that the replacement of nom. pl. *\*-οῖς* by *-οι*, or Osthoff’s Law, can necessarily be brought into a relative chronology with the law of limitation. I do not attempt a reconstruction of the dual forms, the old ablative, the old instrumental singular, or the old dative plural; but such forms as one might reconstruct for these slots (e.g. abl. sg. *Foίκω*) would not affect the argument.

Table 11.1 Early Greek paradigm of *Foîkos* ‘house’ (cf. Skt *véśa-* ‘house’)

	Singular	Plural
Nom.	<i>Foîkos</i>	<i>Foîkoi</i>
Acc.	<i>Foîkov</i>	<i>Foîkovs</i>
Gen.	<i>Foîkoio</i>	<i>Foîkow</i>
Dat./Instr.	<i>Foîkw</i>	<i>Foîkois</i>
Loc.	<i>Foîkou</i>	<i>Foîkois</i>

Note: In this paradigm and further paradigms below, the distribution of acutes and circumflexes shown is guided by the historically attested forms; no claim is made about any prehistoric distribution of acute and circumflex accents.

What is of interest here is not only that all these forms of a root-accented noun with fairly short stem already ‘obey’ the law of limitation. They do so in a non-trivial way. Most of the forms in the paradigm are disyllabic, but the trisyllabic forms (*Foîkoio* and *Foîkois*) happen to have a light final syllable and therefore also ‘obey’ the law of limitation. If one reckons the position of the accent from the end of the word, the accent falls on the penultimate syllable in all forms with a heavy final syllable, and on the antepenultimate only in trisyllabic forms with a light final syllable.

In the verbal system, underived thematic verbs such as *τρέπω* behave remarkably similarly. It is normally assumed that finite verbs were unaccented in some syntactic positions in early Greek and accented in others, as in Vedic (see e.g. Sihler 1995: 238–9, Meier-Brügger 2002: 184; but cf. section 11.5 below). In accented positions, the present indicative active of *τρέπω* would have been accented on the non-ablauting *e*-grade root throughout, and would have ‘obeyed’ the law of limitation in the same non-trivial way as the forms of *Foîkos*: sg. 1. *τρέπω*, 2. *τρέπεις*, 3. *τρέπει*, du. 2. *τρέπετον*, 3. *τρέπετον*, pl. 1. *τρέπομεν*, 2. *τρέπετε*, 3. (early Greek) *τρέποντι*. Not only the present indicative active, but most of the originally root-accented finite forms and infinitives—those built on the thematic present stem *τρεπελο-* or the sigmatic aorist stem *τρεψ-*—would have behaved in the same way. These forms are shown in Table 11.2, approximately as they would have looked in accented position, with an accent on the root. An asterisk indicates that the relevant form does not have the accent in its historical position, i.e. does not already ‘obey’ the law of limitation. The singly and doubly underlined forms end in *-αι* or *-οι*, and will be discussed in due course. Unaugmented forms of the imperfect and aorist indicatives are shown, since I assume that the augment was an independent particle until relatively late in the prehistory of Greek, and was often absent at an early period.<sup>9</sup> The future optative is omitted, as this is not attested until the fifth century (Schwyzer and Debrunner 1950: 337).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the total or almost total absence of the augment from Mycenaean, and the preponderance of unaugmented past indicatives in Homer (see Chantraine 1958: 483–4, with important caveats) and the *Rgveda* (Macdonell 1916: 122).

Skt *véśa*- 'house')

Plural

*Foīkoi*

*Foīkovs*

*Foīkaw*

*Foīkois*

*Foīkouī*

cutes and circumflexes  
about any prehistoric

-accented noun with  
in a non-trivial way.  
llabic forms (*Foīkolo*)  
e also 'obey' the law  
he end of the word,  
heavy final syllable,  
ht final syllable.

*έπω* behave remarkably  
unaccented in some  
as in Vedic (see e.g.  
on 11.5 below). In  
would have been  
would have 'obeyed'  
ms of *Foīkos*: sg. 1.  
τρέπομεν, 2. τρέπετε,  
ive, but most of the  
uilt on the thematic  
ld have behaved in  
ately as they would  
an asterisk indicates  
al position, i.e. does  
y underlined forms  
mented forms of the  
at the augment was  
of Greek, and was  
fitted, as this is not  
(O: 337).

and the preponderance of  
important caveats) and

Table 11.2 Early present and aorist active and middle finite forms and infinitives of *τρέπω* 'turn', shown with root accentuation

(pres. ind. act.)				(fut. ind. act.)			
Sg.	Du.	Pl.		Sg.	Du.	Pl.	
1. <i>τρέπω</i>		τρέπομεν		τρέψω		τρέψουμεν	
2. <i>τρέπετε</i>		τρέπετον		τρέψετον		τρέψετε	
3. <i>τρέποτε</i>		τρέπετον		τρέψετον		τρέψοτε	
(pres. subj. act.)				(pres. opt. act.)			
Sg.	Du.	Pl.		Sg.	Du.	Pl.	
1. <i>τρέπω</i>		τρέπωμεν		τρέπομεν		τρέπομεν	
2. <i>τρέπης</i>		τρέπητον		τρέποτον		τρέποτε	
3. <i>τρέπῃ</i>		τρέπητον		τρέποτον		τρέποτε	
(aor. subj. act.)				(aor. opt. act.)			
Sg.	Du.	Pl.		Sg.	Du.	Pl.	
1. <i>τρέψω</i>		τρέψωμεν		τρέψαιμεν		τρέψαιμεν	
2. <i>τρέψης</i>		τρέψητον		τρέψατον		τρέψατε	
3. <i>τρέψῃ</i>		τρέψητον		τρέψατον		τρέψατε	
(unaugmented impf. ind. act.)				(unaugmented aor. ind. act.)			
Sg.	Du.	Pl.		Sg.	Du.	Pl.	
1. <i>τρέψω</i>		τρέψωμεν		τρέψαιμεν		τρέψαιμεν	
2. <i>τρέψεις</i>		τρέψετον		τρέψατον		τρέψατε	
3. <i>τρέψῃ</i>		τρέψετον		τρέψατον		τρέψατε	
(pres. ind. mid.)				(fut. ind. mid.)			
Sg.	Du.	Pl.		Sg.	Du.	Pl.	
1. <i>τρέπομαι</i>		*τρέπομεθα		τρέψομαι		*τρέψομεθα	
2. <i>τρέπεσθαι</i>		*τρέπετον		*τρέψατον		*τρέψατον	
		τρέψεσθαι		τρέψατον		τρέψατον	

(continued)

Table II.2 Continued

3. <u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha</math></u>		<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha</math></u>		<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\alpha\theta\alpha</math></u>		<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha</math></u>		<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\eta\alpha\theta\alpha</math></u>	
(pres. subj. mid.)									
Sg.	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$	<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\alpha\theta\alpha</math></u>	<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha</math></u>	<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\eta\alpha\theta\alpha</math></u>				
1. <u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\mu\alpha\iota</math></u>			Pl.	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$	Pl.			
2. <u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>				$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$				
3. <u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\pi\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>				<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\eta\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>	<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\eta\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>				
(aor. subj. mid.)									
Sg.			Du.			Du.			
1. <u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\mu\omega\alpha\iota</math></u>			Pl.	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\omega\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\omega\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$	Pl.			
2. <u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\eta\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>				$\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$				
3. <u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\eta\pi\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>				<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\omega\eta\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>	<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\omega\eta\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>				
(unaugmented impf. ind. mid.)									
Sg.			Du.			Du.			
1. $\ast \tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\mu\eta\tau$			Pl.	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$	Pl.			
2. $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\omega$				$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$				
3. $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\pi\tau\alpha\iota$				<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\eta\pi\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>	<u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\omega\eta\pi\tau\alpha\iota</math></u>				
(pres. ipv. act.)									
Sg.			Du.			Du.			
2. $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\pi\epsilon$			Pl.	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$	Pl.			
3. $\ast \tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\pi\tau\alpha\iota$				$\ast \tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\tau\alpha\iota$	$\ast \tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\tau\alpha\iota$				
(pres. ipv. mid.)									
Sg.			Du.			Du.			
2. $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\omega$			Pl.	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$	Pl.			
3. $\ast \tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$				$\ast \tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$	$\ast \tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\eta\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$				
(infinitives)									
	$\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\omega$ , $\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\epsilon\omega$ , $\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\alpha\iota$ , <u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota</math></u> , <u><math>\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota</math></u>								

<sup>a</sup> The alternative classical form  $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  appears too late to be relevant (see Chantraine 1961: 270). Likewise the alternative  $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  (pres. ipv. mid.  $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ) and  $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  (pres. ipv. mid.  $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ) are attested by the Classical period.

As the  
limitat  
likely  
(\*  $\tau\rho\acute{e}\pi$   
and a  
third  
(\*  $\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi$   
(\*  $\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi$   
forms  
and t  
(\*  $\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi$   
Altho  
in cer  
heavil  
the la  
A s  
cated  
Ringe  
 $\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu$

Table

show  
(pres.  
Sg.  
1.  $\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tau$   
2.  $\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tau$   
3.  $\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tau$

(pres.  
Sg.  
1.  $\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tau$   
2.  $\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tau$   
3.  $\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tau$

Apa  
root  
orig  
other  
end

As the asterisks show, not all of these forms already ‘obey’ the law of limitation. But some of the exceptions are very rare in attested Greek and likely to have been rare at every period: third person dual optatives (\**τρέποιτην*, \**τρέψαιτην*, \**τρέποισθην*, \**τρέψαισθην*), third person dual imperfect and aorist indicatives (\**τρέπετην*, \**τρέψατην*, \**τρέπεσθην*, \**τρέψασθην*), and third person dual imperatives (\**τρέπετων*, \**τρέψατων*, \**τρέπεσθων*, \**τρέψασθων*). The remaining exceptions are first person plural middle forms (\**τρέπομεθα* (pres.), \**τρέψομεθα*, \**τρέπωμεθα*, \**τρέψωμεθα*, \**τρέψαμεθα*, \**τρέψομεθα* (impf.), \**τρέψαμεθα*), first person singular middle forms with secondary ending (\**τρέποιμην*, \**τρέψαιμην*, \**τρέπομην*, \**τρέψαιμην*), and third person singular and plural imperatives (\**τρέπετω*, \**τρέποντων*, \**τρέψατω*, \**τρέψαντων*, \**τρέπεσθω*, \**τρέψασθων*, \**τρέψασθων*). Although the first person forms, in particular, will have been fairly frequent in certain kinds of discourse (such as first-person narrative), these forms are heavily outnumbered, at least in their paradigm, by forms that already ‘obey’ the law of limitation.

A similar point could be made about other common paradigms. If reduplicated presents were originally accented on the reduplication, as in Vedic (cf. Ringe 2006a: 37–8, 40), the present and imperfect indicative paradigms of *ἴστημι* ‘set up’ would have looked roughly as shown in Table 11.3.

Table 11.3 Early present and imperfect indicative forms of *ἴστημι* ‘set up’, shown with accent on the reduplication

(pres. ind. act.)			(unaugmented impf. ind. act.)		
Sg.	Du.	Pl.	Sg.	Du.	Pl.
1. <i>ἴσταμι</i>		<i>ἴσταμεν</i>	<i>ἴσταν</i>		<i>ἴσταμεν</i>
2. <i>ἴστᾶς</i>	<i>ἴστατον</i>	<i>ἴστατε</i>	<i>ἴστᾶς</i>	<i>ἴστατον</i>	<i>ἴστατε</i>
3. <i>ἴστατι</i>	<i>ἴστατον</i>	<i>ἴσταντι</i>	<i>ἴστᾶ</i>	* <i>ἴστατην</i>	<i>ἴσταν</i>
(pres. ind. mid.)			(unaugmented impf. ind. mid.)		
Sg.	Du.	Pl.	Sg.	Du.	Pl.
1. <i>ἴσταμαι</i>		* <i>ἴσταμεθα</i>	* <i>ἴσταμην</i>		* <i>ἴσταμεθα</i>
2. <i>ἴστασαι</i>	<i>ἴστασθον</i>	<i>ἴστασθε</i>	<i>ἴστασο</i>	<i>ἴστασθον</i>	<i>ἴστασθε</i>
3. <i>ἴσταται</i>	<i>ἴστασθον</i>	<i>ἴστανται</i>	<i>ἴστατο</i>	* <i>ἴστασθην</i>	<i>ἴσταντο</i>

Apart from sigmatic aorists (accented on the root, as discussed), and some other root-accented (or ‘Narten’) paradigms, most other athematic verbal paradigms originally accented the syllable before the ending in singular active forms, otherwise the ending (see Ringe 2006a: 35–6, 40). The shape of Greek verbal endings ensures that most such forms will not even have been ‘recessive’ when

(pres. ipv. mid.)		
Pl.		
Du.	<i>τρέπεσθων</i>	
Sg.	2. <i>τρέπετο</i>	* <i>τρέπεσθων</i>
	3. * <i>τρέπεσθων</i>	
(infinitives)		
	<i>τρέπειν</i> , <i>τρέψειν</i> , <i>τρέψαιν</i> , <i>τρέψασθων</i>	

<sup>a</sup> The alternative classical form *τρέπτωσαν* appears too late to be relevant (see Chantraine 1961: 270). Likewise the alternative 3pl. aor. ipv. act. *τρέψάσθων*, 3pl. pres. ipv. mid. *τρέπτεσθων*, and 3pl. aor. ipv. mid. *τρέψισθων*.

accented,<sup>10</sup> let alone ‘violated’ the law of limitation (so e.g. 1sg. \*δαμνᾶμι, 1pl. \*δαμναμέν). The same is true for most suffixed thematic present forms, since most thematic suffixes were accented on the thematic vowel (see Ringe 2006a: 28–9, 39–40).<sup>11</sup>

In order to show that a high proportion of early Greek words ‘obeyed’ the law of limitation *avant la lettre*, however, we require not only that the majority of forms in some common nominal and verbal paradigms already ‘obeyed’ the law of limitation, but that the majority of forms in actual early Greek discourse did so. We do not, of course, have a wide variety of early Greek texts, and we cannot always reconstruct prehistoric accentuation, but we do have some early Greek, especially the Homeric poems, and internal or comparative evidence often shows where the attested accentuation is due to one of the main Greek accentual innovations: the law of limitation or the recessive accentuation of most finite (and some non-finite) verb forms. The following extract from the *Iliad* shows an attempt to reconstruct the pre-law-of-limitation accentuation, with particular attention to the forms whose attested accentuation is most likely to be innovated: forms attested with recessive accent, if the recessive accent does not fall on the word-initial syllable, and all recessive verb forms. Asterisks show where the reconstructed position for the accent is not the historically attested one. No attempt has been made to reconstruct unaccented verbs, since it is doubtful whether we really know their distribution in early Greek (cf. also section 11.5); the distribution found in Vedic would make \*éā (line 2), τρέπεν (line 3), τρέπεν (line 7), and ἔέλπετο (line 8) unaccented.

Ζεὺς δὲ ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρῶάς τε καὶ Ἐκτόρα νησοὶ πέλασσεν<sup>12</sup>,  
τοὺς μὲν \*έā<sup>13</sup> παρὰ τῆισι πόνον τ' ἐχέμεν καὶ δίζυν  
νωλεμέως<sup>14</sup>, αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν τρέπεν<sup>15</sup> ὅσσε φαεινά

<sup>10</sup> Except for active singular forms such as unaugmented 1sg. aor. στῆν < \*steh<sub>2</sub>-m, which are technically recessive, but only because they are so short.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the sample Indo-European verb, noun, and adjective paradigms laid out by Ringe (2006a: 35–40, 47–52), in which the majority of forms already ‘obey’ the law of limitation.

<sup>12</sup> An old s-aorist built on an ε-grade root \*pehl<sub>2</sub>- (see Chantraine 1968–80, s.v. πέλας); old root accentuation is expected.

<sup>13</sup> The etymology and history of éāω are unclear. The verb may originally have had an athematic present stem éā- (cf. Chantraine 1958: 305, 1968–80, s.v. éāω), but the imperfect éā (with long ā) is most easily explained as contracted from thematic \*éā(y)ē. Since most \*ye-/iō- presents and imperfects were originally accented on the suffix \*ye-/iō-, the accentuation \*éā should tentatively be assumed here for early Greek.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. the related adverb νωλεμέσ (originally acc. sg. neuter of an s-stem adjective).

<sup>15</sup> An underived thematic present: root accentuation is expected. So also in line 7.

1sg. \*δαμνᾶμι, 1pl.  
esent forms, since  
(see Ringe 2006a;

words 'obeyed' the  
not only that the  
paradigms already  
ns in actual early  
e variety of early  
accentuation, but  
s, and internal or  
ntuation is due to  
limitation or the  
verb forms. The  
struct the pre-law-  
forms whose at-  
tested with reces-  
rd-initial syllable,  
nstructed position  
t has been made  
r we really know  
istribution found  
(line 7), and ἔέλπετο

νόσφιν, ἐφ' ἵπποπόλων<sup>16</sup> Θρηκῶν \*καθορωμενὸς<sup>17</sup> αἶν  
Μυσῶν τ' ἀγχεμάχων<sup>18</sup> καὶ ἀγανῶν Ἰππημολγῶν  
γλακτοφάγων<sup>19</sup> \*Ἄβιων<sup>20</sup> τε \*δίκαιοτατῶν<sup>21</sup> \*ἄνθρωπων<sup>22</sup>.  
ἔς Τροίην δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἔπι τρέπεν ὅσσε φαεινώ.  
οὐ γὰρ ὅ γ' \*ἀθανατῶν<sup>23</sup> τιν' ἔέλπετο<sup>24</sup> ὃν κατὰ θυμόν  
ἔλθοντ' ἦ Τρώεσσιν ἀργέεμεν ἡ Δαναοῖσιν. (*Iliad* 13, 1-9)

(The distribution of acutes and circumflexes is again guided by the historically attested forms and is not intended to be significant. No attempt has been made to reconstruct pre-law-of-limitation rules for the accentuation of words followed by enclitics; in the first line *Tρῶάς* is printed as attested, with a second accent due to *τε*, but no significance is to be ascribed to this accent.)

This extract contains 69 word tokens, or 46 if enclitics,<sup>25</sup> proclitics and monosyllabic pronoun forms,<sup>26</sup> and elided δ(ε) are excluded. Of these 46 full word tokens, only six have the accent somewhere other than its historical

<sup>16</sup> Accentuation on the second member of the compound is expected for a verbal governing compound in which the second member has active meaning. In Vedic, such compounds have the accent on the final syllable. In Greek, the accent appears on the penultimate syllable instead if this syllable is light. The divergence between Greek and Vedic is likely to be due to retraction of the accent in Greek, although the details have been disputed (see Probert 2006: 93-4). Thus the form *ἵπποπόλων* will have been preceded by an earlier \*ἵπποπολῶν. I do not claim to know which of these forms existed when the law of limitation came in, but the essential point is that neither would 'violate' the not yet existing law.

<sup>17</sup> Participles in -μενο- (IE \*-mh₁no-) are likely to have inherited an accent on the last syllable, as found in Vedic perfect participles in -ānd- (< \*-mh₁nō-) and some Greek present and aorist participles lexicalized as nouns: Σωζομενός, Ὄρχομενός, Στησαμενός, Φαμενός, δεξαμενή 'reservoir', and εἴαμενή 'meadow' (cf. Probert 2006: 92).

<sup>18</sup> In spite of the attested nom. sg. masc./fem. ἀγχέμαχος (for the accent see [Arcadius] 102, 5, 103, 15 Schmidt), inherited accentuation on the second member is expected for a verbal governing compound whose second member has active meaning; cf. n. 16. For the inconsistent accentuation of -μαχος compounds as attested, cf. Risch (1974: 207).

<sup>19</sup> An even older form will have been \*γλακτοφαγῶν (see n. 16).

<sup>20</sup> Historical Άβιων is due to the law of limitation; cf. nom. sg. Άβιος.

<sup>21</sup> It is difficult to reconstruct a pre-law-of-limitation position for the accent here, but the historical paradigm shows that the accent on the syllable -τα- is due to the law of limitation (cf. nom. sg. masc. δίκαιοτατος). Vedic superlatives in -tama- (the closest Vedic equivalents to the Greek superlatives in -τατο-) do not follow a simple accent rule, but are rarely accented on the suffix -tama- (see Macdonell 1916: 454).

<sup>22</sup> Historical ἄνθρωπων is due to the law of limitation; cf. nom. sg. ἄνθρωπος.

<sup>23</sup> Historical ἀθανάτων is due to the law of limitation (cf. nom. sg. masc./fem. ἀθάνατος); accentuation on the privative prefix is expected for a privative bahuvrihi compound.

<sup>24</sup> Probably not an augmented form but an unaugmented thematic imperfect, with the same prothetic vowel as in the Homeric present ἔέλπεται (see Lejeune 1972: 174-5). If so, the accent should already have been on the root. If, however, ἔέλπετο is an augmented form, the accent should have been on the augment at an early stage (\*ἔέλπετο).

<sup>25</sup> τ(ε), γ', τιν'.

<sup>26</sup> ἐπεί, καὶ, τούς, παρά, ἐφ', ἐσ, οὐ, ὅ, ὅν, κατά, ἦ.

position. Of these, only four actually 'violate' the later law of limitation: *\*Ἄβιων*, *\*δίκαιοτατῶν*, *\*ἀνθρωπῶν*, *\*ἄθανατῶν*. The other two (*\*έα* and *\*καθορωμένός*) will acquire recessive accentuation when this is generalized to most finite and some non-finite verb forms, but the prehistoric accentuation is nearer to the end of the word and therefore compatible with the later law of limitation.

Such evidence as we have thus suggests that a sizeable proportion of early Greek word tokens already 'obeyed' the law of limitation. The law of limitation might, therefore, have originated with a reanalysis of the situation as one where the law of limitation actually existed as an operative part of the grammar. For this reanalysis to survive and for the resulting regularity to be extended across the vocabulary, the law of limitation needed to be synchronically plausible or at least possible. This chapter will not explore possible synchronic analyses, but it is clear from the very existence of the law of limitation that a viable synchronic analysis was available to speakers.

We have so far left the double accentual treatment of word-final *-ai* and *-oi* out of the discussion. The next section proposes a historical explanation for this double treatment that would, if correct, provide further support for our reanalysis-based account of the law of limitation.

#### 11.4 Word-final *-ai* and *-oi*

In Table 11.2, the forms of *τρέπω* that end in *-ai* or (in one instance) *-oi* have all been underlined. All already 'obey' the law of limitation in its eventual form, but some (given double underlining) do so only by virtue of the fact that their final diphthong somehow 'counts short' for the purposes of accentuation: indicatives *τρέπομαι*, *τρέπεαι*, *τρέπεται*, *τρέπονται*, *τρέψομαι*, *τρέψεαι*, *τρέψεται*, *τρέψονται*; subjunctives *τρέπωμαι*, *τρέπηαι*, *τρέπηται*, *τρέπωνται*, *τρέψωμαι*, *τρέψηαι*, *τρέψηται*, *τρέψωνται*; and infinitives *τρέπεσθαι*, *τρέψεσθαι*, *τρέψασθαι*. Others (given single underlining) 'obey' the law of limitation just as if they ended in an ordinary long vowel or diphthong: optatives *τρέποι*, *τρέψαι*; aorist imperative middle *τρέψαι*; aorist infinitive active *τρέψαι*. What is striking here is that the words in the first list coincide almost entirely with the verbal forms whose final *-ai* counts as 'short' for the purposes of the accent. Of eight indicative, eight subjunctive, four infinitive forms and one imperative ending in *-ai*, all the indicative and subjunctive forms and three of the infinitives have the root as the antepenultimate syllable, so that the prehistoric root accentuation looks just like the historical recessive accentuation, with final *-ai* counting as 'short' for the purposes of the accent. The much shorter second list, by

contras  
diphtho

Alth-

diphtho

ment of

may be

Indicati

(-ομαι,

monos,

τρέψαι "

(-οι, -σα

subjunct

-εσθαι, i

Instead

all thes

for acc

interpre

the rear

vowel-p

Optativ

diphtho

receive

The  
locative  
add to t  
(as *Fōik*  
root th

<sup>27</sup> I us

whether

<sup>28</sup> In i

have gen

sequence

preconso

somewha

tively, th

recessive'

variants (

the law

'accentua

find it v

phonolog

law of limitation;  
two (\*éá and  
is generalized to  
ic accentuation is  
in the later law of

portion of early  
law of limitation  
tion as one where  
the grammar. For  
e extended across  
lly plausible or at  
cic analyses, but it  
viable synchronic

d-final -ai and -oi  
planation for this  
rt for our reanal-

(rance) -oi have all  
ts eventual form,  
he fact that their  
of accentuation:  
*τρέψεαι*, *τρέψεται*,  
*τρέψωμαι*,  
*τρέψται*, *τρέψωσθαι*.

on just as if they  
*τρέψαι*, *τρέψαι*; aorist  
is striking here is  
the verbal forms  
accent. Of eight  
imperative ending  
the infinitives have  
ic root accentua-  
final -ai counting  
r second list, by

contrast, includes both the optatives ending in -ai or -oi, the forms whose final diphthongs we are accustomed to consider 'long' for accentual purposes.

Although the match between the two lists and the two kinds of final diphthongs is not perfect, the striking correlation suggests that the 'short' treatment of indicative and subjunctive -ai, and the 'long' treatment of optative -ai/-oi, may be due to the terminations that happen to occur in verbal paradigms. Indicative, subjunctive, and infinitive -ai occur in disyllabic terminations<sup>27</sup> (-ομαι, -εαι, -εται, -ονται, -ωμαι, -ηαι, -ηται, -ωνται, -εσθαι, -ασθαι) as well as in monosyllabic terminations (e.g. *κείμαι* 'I lie', *κεῖται* 'he lies', *κείνται* 'they lie', *τρέψαι* 'to turn') while optative -ai/-oi occurs only in monosyllabic terminations (-oi, -σαι). One might have expected the plethora of root-accented indicatives, subjunctives, and infinitives in -ομαι, -εαι, -εται, -ονται, -ωμαι, -ηαι, -ηται, -ωνται, -εσθαι, and -ασθαι to have prevented our reanalysis of early Greek accentuation. Instead, the reanalysis was tailored to fit the evidence: a feature common to all these forms, namely the final diphthong, was interpreted as counting 'short' for accentuation. (The potential for -oi and -ai, however pronounced, to be interpreted phonologically as -οι and -αι may well have facilitated this aspect of the reanalysis, by allowing some final -oi and -ai diphthongs to be treated as vowel-plus-consonant sequences at some level of synchronic representation.<sup>28</sup>) Optatives in -ai and -oi, on the other hand, offered no evidence that their final diphthongs counted as 'short', and accordingly their final diphthongs did not receive such a 'short' analysis.

The accentually 'long' treatment of final -oi in locative adverbs—i.e. old locative singulars—becomes explicable on the same basis. These old locatives add to the basic stem only the syllable -oi, so that if the citation form is disyllabic (as *Foīkos*) the locative is disyllabic too (as *Foīkoi*), and so if the accent is on the root the locative is accented on the penultimate syllable, just like the optatives

<sup>27</sup> I use the word 'termination' here for the part of the verb following the root (regardless of whether this should be considered the synchronic 'ending').

<sup>28</sup> In recent work, the words with accentually 'short' final diphthongs are sometimes taken to have generalized prevocalic sandhi variants in -οι and -αι, accented as if they ended in a -VC sequence (e.g. \*leikʷ etoj), while the words with accentually 'long' final diphthongs generalized preconsonantal variants in -οι and -αι (such as locative \*woikoi) (so Olander 2009: 68–9; somewhat differently Nagy 1970: 137–8; differently again Bonfante 1986: 375–6). Alternatively, the variants with -οι and -αι were not themselves generalized at any stage, but the 'hyper-recessive' accentuation of forms such as prevocalic \*léikʷ etoj was generalized to the preconsonantal variants (Jasanoff 2009: 56 n. 23). The suggestion I offer here does not allow for a stage at which the law of limitation was already in effect but the split (along morphological lines) between 'accentually short' and 'accentually long' final diphthongs had yet to be established. However, I find it very likely to be relevant that a high vowel as second element of a diphthong was phonologically interpretable as either consonantal or vocalic.

*τρέποι* and *τρέψαι*. In other words, the short o-stem nominals that provided evidence for the law of limitation did not provide any evidence against an ordinary ‘long’ treatment of the locative singular termination *-οι*.

This analysis does not explain the accentually ‘short’ treatment of nominative plural *-οι/-αι*, or of *-αι* in imperatives. We might note that *o-* and *ā-* stem nominative plural endings *-οι* and *-αι* are original only in pronominal forms, such as *τοί* and *ταί*—monosyllables for which it may be meaningless to ask whether the diphthongs counted as ‘long’ or ‘short’. In *o-* and *ā-* stem nouns and adjectives the endings *-οι* and *-αι* are secondary (although pre-Mycenaean) replacements for inherited *\*-ōs* and *\*-ās*. Conceivably the law of limitation was in place by the time *-οι* and *-αι* spread to nouns and adjectives, and nominative plural *-αι* then followed the majority of word-final *-αι* diphthongs in being counted as ‘short’ for the purposes of the accent. Nominative plural *-οι* would have been the first example of word-final *-οι*, as opposed to *-αι*, counting ‘short’ for the accent, but in view of the parallelism that Greek developed between the *o-* stem and *ā-* stem declensions it would not be surprising if this *o-* stem ending copied the word-final *-αι* of the *ā-* stem nominative plural. Furthermore, nominative plural *-οι* and *-αι* were treated as accentually ‘long’ in Doric (see Hinge 2006: 127), perhaps also a sign that the accentual treatment of nominative plural *-οι/-αι* was determined at a late stage and on a dialect-specific basis.

The origins of the aorist middle imperative in *-αι* are unclear; the form may be identical in origin to the aorist infinitive active (*τρέψαι*), and if so this original identity may account for the ‘short’ treatment of the final diphthong in both forms. At some stage, the recessive accentuation that was generalized through the verbal system would affect the middle imperative (cf. trisyllabic *βούλευσαι*) but not the active infinitive (cf. *βούλευσαι*) (cf. Chantraine 1961: 272).

Some accounts of the accentual treatment of final *-αι* and *-οι* suggest that there was at some relevant stage some prosodic difference, beyond the rules of accentuation, between the accentually ‘short’ and ‘long’ final diphthongs.<sup>29</sup> Hermann (1923: 101) suggested that it was worth investigating the prevocalic metrical treatment of accentually ‘short’ and ‘long’ final *-αι/-οι* before vowels

<sup>29</sup> So recently Olander (2009: 68–9), envisaging a stage at which a generalized prevocalic sandhi variant *-ai#-oi#* (giving the forms with ‘accentually short’ final diphthong) contrasted with the generalized preconsonantal variant *-ai#/oi#* (giving the forms with ‘accentually long’ final diphthong). If such a stage existed in the prehistory of the Homeric poems, one might expect to find the ‘accentually short’ final diphthongs treated as light before a vowel more often in Homer than the ‘accentually long’ ones.

in Homer, but did not investigate this question himself.<sup>30</sup> A brief treatment of this question is provided in the appendix; on the basis of the evidence summarized there, Homer does not appear to provide evidence for a difference in length or weight between accentually 'short' and 'long' final *-ai*-*oi*. While not proving that there was never any length or weight distinction, these Homeric data are certainly compatible with a morphological account such as is offered here.<sup>31</sup>

#### II.4.1 Two questions

Although no attempt is made here to account for the attested distribution of acute and circumflex accents, their eventual distribution raises two questions for the suggested origins of the double treatment of final *-ai* and *-oi*. These cannot be treated here in detail, but I sketch them briefly, with possible answers.

Firstly, why do nominatives plural with *accented* *-ai* or *-oi* (e.g. *σοφαί*, *σοφοί*) have an acute, while locatives singular with *accented* *-oi* (e.g. *Μεγαροῖ*) have a circumflex? Although some difference between two types of final diphthong might seem to be indicated, the accentuation of these endings is in line with that of other nominal endings: nominative and accusative endings with accented long vowels regularly have an acute accent (nom. sg. *-ά*, acc. sg. *-άν*, nom./acc. du. *-ά*, acc. pl. *-άς*; nom./acc. du. *-ώ*, acc. pl. *-όντος*), while endings of other cases with accented long vowels regularly have a circumflex (gen. sg. *-ᾶς*, dat. sg. *-ᾷ*, gen./dat. du. *-άντι*, dat. pl. *-άῖς*, dat. sg. *-ῷ*, gen./dat. du. *-όντι*, gen. pl. *-ών*, dat. pl.

<sup>30</sup> For the optative and nom. pl. endings Hartel (1874: 371) suggested that either no distinction, or even the opposite of the expected distinction (optative *-οι*-*αι* less readily treated as heavy), was observable, but also did not investigate the matter in detail. Hermann (1923: 100) claims that among all *accented* final long vowels and diphthongs, those with a circumflex are treated as heavy more readily than those with an acute, but apparently fails to control e.g. for the disproportionate incidence of the long diphthongs *-ῳ*, *-ῃ*, *-ᾳ* (genuinely prone to heavy treatment: see Hartel 1874) among circumflexed final long vowels and diphthongs.

<sup>31</sup> A survey of attempts to account for the double accentual treatment of final *-oi* and *-ai* cannot be attempted here; for literature see Meier-Brügger (1992: 285–6) and Olander (2009: 66–9), and add Jasanoff (2009: 56 n. 23). It is, however, worth noting that the morphological facts crucial to the present account resemble some that have long been noticed. Thus, paradigmatic pressure has been held to account for the accentuation of *κελεύοι* like *κελεύοις*, but *λείπεται* like *λείπει* (see Risch 1975: 473, Jasanoff 2009: 56 n. 23; the possibility of *λείπεται* in the first place is sometimes motivated in terms of a prevocalic sandhi variant *\*leikʷetoj*, accented *\*leikʷetoj*: see n. 29). For the account offered here the crucial point is rather the monosyllabic character of the termination *-oi* and the disyllabic character of *-εται*, combined with the overall tendency for Greek nominal and verbal terminations to be either (a) monosyllabic or (b) disyllabic with a light second syllable. But just these facts also give rise to paradigms in which *κελεύοι* stands beside *κελεύοις*, and *λείπεται* beside *λείπει*. A quite different account, due to Kiparsky (1967: 124–8), is summarized by Willi, this volume, p. 261.

*-oīs*). Whatever the ultimate reasons for this distribution,<sup>32</sup> its application included endings consisting of the diphthongs *-ai* and *-oi*.

Secondly, whatever the antiquity of the *σωτῆρα* rule, why does it treat the same final diphthongs as ‘short’ as does the law of limitation, if there is nothing really ‘short’ about these final diphthongs? Here the answer may lie in the way in which the double accentual treatment of final diphthongs came to be interpreted synchronically. Even if ‘accentually long’ final *-ai* and *-oi* were never actually longer than their ‘accentually short’ counterparts, their different treatment by the law of limitation could have come to be interpreted in terms of an abstract length distinction, with the distribution of acute and circumflex accents coming to be tied to vowel length on this abstract level. Moreover, one of the main dialect divergences in the application of the *σωτῆρα* rule lies in the treatment of final diphthongs. In Doric, the only final diphthongs to have been treated as ‘short’ by the law of limitation were the middle endings *-tau*, *-σθαι*, etc., but these were treated as ‘long’ by the *σωτῆρα* rule (hence e.g. *μαρτύρεται* but *δραμεῖται* < \**δραμέεται*: see Hinge 2006: 127). Conceivably both Attic-Ionic and Doric had, at one stage, (i) the law of limitation and (ii) a basic *σωτῆρα* rule tied to vowel lengths on the phonological surface. But then Attic-Ionic, but not Doric, adjusted the *σωτῆρα* rule to match the abstract vowel length distinction implied by the law of limitation.

### 11.5 A further suggestion: origins of recessive accentuation in the Greek finite verb

It was suggested in section 11.3 that most Greek verbal (as well as nominal) forms already ‘obeyed’ the law of limitation before this law was in force, either because they were already ‘recessive’ or because they were accented nearer to the end of the word than the position for ‘recessive’ accentuation. Furthermore, verb forms built on underived thematic present stems or sigmatic aorist stems were mostly ‘recessive’ already. From the earliest attested stages, thematic presents and sigmatic aorists are particularly well represented in Greek. One might, therefore, wonder whether the recessive accentuation of most finite verb forms arose as part of the same reanalysis of early Greek accentuation as the law of limitation itself.

<sup>32</sup> On this question, see Jasanoff (2004: 247–9 with 248 n. 2, 253 n. 15).

The standard explanation of recessive accentuation in the Greek finite verb is that old unaccented verb forms became recessive as a consequence of the law of limitation, with the law of limitation being interpreted as limiting the length of a word-final unaccented sequence (Wackernagel 1877). This explanation requires an Indo-European starting-point for the unaccented verb forms of Vedic. Recent work on Vedic, however, accounts increasingly for the distribution of accented and unaccented verbs in terms of Vedic itself (Klein 1992, Hock forthcoming), while retaining some element of Indo-European origin. The suggestion made here for Greek would, while not demonstrating either presence or absence of unaccented verbs for Indo-European, eliminate the Greek evidence for Indo-European unaccented verbs.<sup>33</sup>

### 11.6 Conclusion

The reconstructions of early Greek nominal and verbal morphology and accentuation presented here are, of course, subject to numerous uncertainties. If they are at least broadly correct, however, a large proportion, probably a majority, of early Greek word tokens 'obeyed' the law of limitation before this law was even in force. Not only did a large proportion of early Greek word tokens already 'obey' the law of limitation, but they did so in such a way that if the position of the accent was reckoned from the end of the word (perhaps because an accent affected primarily the pitch contour at the end of the word), the law of limitation was suggested especially strongly: the accent fell on the penultimate syllable in forms with a heavy final syllable, and on the antepenultimate in trisyllabic or longer forms with a light final syllable.

### Appendix: Homeric treatment of final -αι and -οι before vowels

The data summarized in Table 11.4 would appear to show a slightly greater preference for light treatment of 'accentually short' -οι and -αι.

<sup>33</sup> Hock's (forthcoming) account of ancient Greek as well as Vedic verbal accentuation is economical in a different way. I have not been able to take this article fully into account, and I am currently agnostic as to whether Hock's account is preferable to the one offered here, or even ultimately compatible with it.

Table 11.4 Words with accentually 'long' or 'short' final -οι/-αι<sup>a</sup>

	Treated as light before vowel	Treated as heavy before vowel
With 'accentually long' diphthong:		
Optatives in -οι/-αι	78 (92%)	7 (8%)
Locative οἴκοι 'at home'		
(Tokens from <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i> <sup>b</sup> )		
With 'accentually short' diphthong:		
Nom./voc. pl. forms in -οι/-αι	468 (94%)	30 (6%)
Infinitives in -αι, -μεναι		
1sg., 2sg., 3sg., and 3pl. forms in -μαι, -αι, -ται, -νται		
Imperatives in -σαι		
(Tokens from <i>Iliad</i> 1–4 and <i>Odyssey</i> 1, 1–4, 549 <sup>c</sup> )		

<sup>a</sup> Tokens collected are those found before vowels, including aspirated vowels but not vowels preceded by etymological *f*. Forms other than those listed in the left-hand column (e.g. καί, πότοι) are excluded, as are all monosyllabic pronoun forms including οἱ, αἱ, τοἱ, ταἱ, οῃ, αῃ. Many of the excluded forms are proclitics, enclitics, interjections, and words whose final -αι or -οι cannot be securely identified as accentually 'short' or 'long'. Word tokens with elided final diphthong (which are very infrequent) are disregarded.

<sup>b</sup> Collected from Prendergast and Marzullo (1962) and Dunbar and Marzullo (1962), and checked against West (1998–2000) and Von der Muehll (1962).

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of Odyssean to Iliadic lines in this sample equals the proportion of lines in the *Odyssey* to that in the *Iliad*. Any differences in occurrence or treatment of final diphthongs between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* should thus not affect comparison between the two rows of the table.

The discrepancy seen here is, however, not statistically significant.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, it turns out that over half of our prevocalic word tokens with 'accentually short' final diphthongs are *only* usable in the hexameter if the final diphthong is treated as light (276 out of 498 prevocalic word tokens with 'accentually short' diphthongs, or c. 55%). By contrast, only 17 of the 85 prevocalic word tokens with 'accentually long' diphthongs (20%) require light treatment of the final diphthong. The difference here is due to the preponderance, among words with 'accentually short' final diphthongs *only*, of disyllabic terminations with light penultimate syllable, especially verbal -ομαἱ, -εαἱ, -εταἱ, third person plural -ταἱ, and Aeolic infinitive -μεναι. When these follow a heavy syllable, the word must be placed before a vowel, with the final syllable treated as light. This need to place many words with an 'accentually short' final diphthong before a vowel, with light treatment of the diphthong, in fact follows from precisely the tendency for words with 'accentually short' final diphthongs to be shaped differently from those with 'accentually long' final diphthongs.

<sup>34</sup>  $\chi^2 = 0.60$ ;  $p = 0.44$ .

If the metrical treatment of 'accentually short' final diphthongs is genuinely to be compared with that of 'accentually long' final diphthongs, words of the same metrical shape need to be compared. Table 11.5 shows the treatment of disyllabic word tokens in our sample beginning with a consonant (not including *h*, but including etymological *F*), and with light first syllable.

Table 11.5 Disyllabic words with initial consonant, light first syllable, and accentually 'long' or 'short' final -*ou/-ai*

	Treated as light before vowel	Treated as heavy before vowel
With 'accentually long' diphthong: Forms as in Table 11.4 (Tokens from <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i> )	37 (95%)	2 (5%)
With 'accentually short' diphthong: Forms as in Table 11.4 (Tokens from <i>Iliad</i> 1-4 and <i>Odyssey</i> 1. 1-4. 549)	26 (81%)	6 (19%)

This time the 'accentually long' final diphthongs appear to show a greater preference for 'light' treatment than the 'accentually short' final diphthongs: the opposite of the preference that might be expected if 'accentually long' final -*ai/-ou* were genuinely longer than 'accentually short' final -*au/-oi*. There are too few tokens now in the right-hand column of the table for a chi-squared test of statistical significance to be valid. However, it is at least clear that on the basis of the evidence examined here, there is no indication that 'accentually long' final diphthongs are more prone to metrically heavy treatment in Homer than 'accentually short' ones.

<sup>a</sup> Treated as heavy before vowel  
el 7 (8%)

ot vowels preceded by  
) are excluded, as are  
excluded forms are  
securely identified as  
e very infrequent) are

(1962), and checked  
f lines in the *Odyssey*  
between the *Iliad* and

<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, it  
tually short' final  
reated as light (276  
gs, or c. 55%). By  
long' diphthongs  
here is due to the  
ngs only, of disyl-  
-*ouai*, -*ea*, -*eta*,  
e follow a heavy  
yllable treated as  
iphthong before a  
isely the tendency  
erently from those

doctor says that's  
or your interest in  
ich you are so dear  
be able to do so in  
o for my own.'

y follow the same  
already observed;  
Cicero uses *quaeso*  
nds to be used to  
ting exception, in  
ase of *peto* Cicero  
t he never phrases  
on Tiro's behalf.  
he clinching evi-  
f these terms had  
n as unsuited to  
to 'Have a nice  
ake the addressee-  
ng such requests  
o because Cicero  
aim that he would  
recovering. Such  
n Cicero by using

n understanding  
acks, Brown and  
e to attain genu-  
are other usages  
nother theory is  
ict each other, in  
t how politeness  
l tell us, without  
several different  
y applied in the  
erstanding.

## References

- Ačařyan, H. (1909). *Classification des dialectes arméniens*. Paris: Champion.
- (1971–9). *Hayeren Armatakan bařaran* (4 vols). Erevan: Erevani Hamalsarani Hratarakč'owt'iwn.
- Adams, J. N. (1976). 'A typological approach to Latin word order'. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81: 70–99.
- (1984). 'Female speech in Latin comedy'. *Antichthon* 18: 43–77.
- (2007). *The regional diversification of Latin, 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ahlqvist, A. (ed.) (1982). *The early Irish linguist. An edition of the canonical part of the Auraicept na n-Éces*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Ahrens, H. L. (1839). *De Graecae linguae dialectis*, i: *De dialectis Aeolicis et Pseudaeolicis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1843). *De Graecae linguae dialectis*, ii: *De dialecto Dorica*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Alladina, S. (1993). 'South Asian languages in Britain', in G. Extra and L. Verhoeven (eds), *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 55–65.
- Allen, W. S. (1973). *Accent and rhythm: prosodic features of Latin and Greek. A study in theory and reconstruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alonso Déniz, A. (2008). *Estudios sobre la aspiración de /s/ en los dialectos griegos del I milenio* (Diss. Madrid, Universidad Complutense; cf. <http://sites.google.com/site/alcoracalonsodeniz/home/Publications>).
- (2009). 'Difusión de la aspiración de la /s/ intervocálica en el Peloponeso en el I milenio'. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 19: 9–27.
- (2010). 'ΔΙΟΗΙΚΕΤΑ ΔΙΟΛΕΥΘΕΡΙ[ ] ΙΓ V.1 700'. *Emérita* 78: 103–27.
- Amsterdamska, O. (1987). *Schools of thought: the development of linguistics from Bopp to Saussure*. Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster, and Tokyo: Reidel.
- Andersen, H. (1960). 'Opedalstenen'. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Språkvidenskap* 19: 393–417.
- (1986). 'On the noun *borg* and the so-called *a*-umlaut'. *North-Western European Language Evolution* 8: 111–28.
- Antonsen, E. H. (1965). 'On defining stages in prehistoric Germanic'. *Language* 41: 19–36.
- (1972). 'The Proto-Germanic syllabics (vowels)', in F. van Coetsem and H. L. Kufner (eds), *Toward a grammar of Proto-Germanic*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 117–40.
- (2002). *Runes and Germanic linguistics*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Arbeitman, Y. (1980). 'The recovery of an IE collocation', in J. A. Greppin (ed.), *First international conference on Armenian linguistics: proceedings*. Delmar, N.Y.: Caravan Books, 225–31.
- Arbuthnot, S. (ed.) (2005–7). *Cóir Anmann: A late Middle Irish treatise on personal names* (2 vols). Dublin: Irish Texts Society.
- Arnold, E. V. (1905). *Vedic metre in its historical development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arundale, R. B. (2008). 'Against (Gricean) intentions at the heart of human interaction'. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 5: 229–58.
- Atkins, S. D. (1968). 'The RV *dyaus* paradigm and the Sievers-Edgerton Law'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88: 679–709.
- Awetik'ean, G., Siwrmélean, X., and Awgerean, M. (1836). *Nor bargirk' haykazean lezowi*. Venice: Mechitarist Press.
- Baart, J. L. G. (2003). 'Tonal features in languages of northern Pakistan', in J. L. G. Baart and G. H. Sindhi (eds), *Pakistani languages and society: problems and prospects*. Islamabad and Horsleys Green: National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University, and Summer Institute of Linguistics, 132–44.
- Bahl, K. C. (1957a). 'Tones in Panjabi'. *Indian Linguistics* 17: 139–47.
- (1957b). 'A note on tones in western Punjabi (Lahanda)'. *Indian Linguistics* 18: 30–4.
- Ballard, R. (1994). *Desh Pardesh: the South Asian presence in Britain*. London: Hurst.
- Bammesberger, A. (1992). 'Griechisch *thés*, *hés* und *dós*', in B. Brogyanyi and R. Lipp (eds), *Historical philology: Greek, Latin, and Romance. Papers in honor of Oswald Szemerényi II*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 41–5.
- Bandle, O. (1973). *Die Gliederung des Nordgermanischen*. Basle and Stuttgart: Helbing & Lichtenhahn.
- Barnes, J. (2006). *Strength and weakness at the interface: positional neutralization in phonetics and phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Barney, S. A., Lewis, W. J., Beach, J. A., and Berghof, O. (2006). *The etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barrack, C. M. (2003). 'The glottalic theory revisited: a negative reappraisal. Part II: the typological fallacy underlying the glottalic theory'. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 108: 1–16.
- Bartholomae, C. (1883). *Handbuch der altiranischen Dialekte*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- (1904). *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strasbourg: Trübner.
- Bartonček, A. (1987). 'On the sources of juxtavocalic *s* in Mycenaean', in P. H. Ilievski and L. Crepajac (eds), *Tractata Mycenaea: proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Mycenaean studies*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 41–8.
- (2003). *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Barz, R. K., and Siegel, J. (eds) (1988). *Language transplanted: the development of overseas Hindi*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Bauer, B. (1995). *The emergence and development of SVO patterning in Latin and French: diachronic and psycholinguistic perspectives*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bazell, C. E. (1952). 'Phonemic and morphemic analysis'. *Word* 8: 33–8.
- Bechtel, F. (1923). *Die griechischen Dialekte*, ii: *Die westgriechischen Dialekte*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Beekes, R. S. P. (2003). 'Historical phonology of Classical Armenian', in F. Kortlandt, *Armeniaca: comparative notes*. Ann Arbor: Caravan Books, 133–211.
- Beeler, M. S. (1966). 'Proto-Germanic [i] and [e]: one phoneme or two?'. *Language* 42: 473–4.
- Benediktsson, H. (1967). 'The Proto-Germanic vowel system', in *To honor Roman Jakobson*, i. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 174–96.
- (1970). 'Aspects of historical phonology', in H. Benediktsson (ed.), *The Nordic languages and modern linguistics [1]*. Reykjavík: Visindafélag Íslendinga, 87–142.
- Bennett, W. H. (1952). 'The early Germanic umlauts and the Gothic migration'. *Language* 28: 339–42.
- Benveniste, É. (1935). *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Bermúdez-Otero, R. (2006). 'Phonological change in Optimality Theory', in K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd edn). Oxford: Elsevier, 9: 497–505.
- Bhardwaj, M. R. (1995). *Colloquial Panjabi*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bhatia, T. K. (1975). 'The evolution of tones in Punjabi'. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 5: 12–24.
- (1988). 'Trinidad Hindi: its genesis and generational profile', in Barz and Siegel (1988), 179–96.
- (1993). *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bhattacharya, D. (1997). *The Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume one, consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society.
- Blase, H. (1896–8). 'Zur Geschichte der Futura und des Konjunktivs des Perfekts im Lateinischen'. *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 10: 313–43.
- Blümel, W. (1982). *Die aiolischen Dialekte: Phonologie und Morphologie der inschriftlichen Texte aus generativer Sicht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bolinger, D. (1967). 'Adjectives in English: attribution and predication'. *Lingua* 18: 1–34.
- Bonfante, G. (1986). 'L'Intonation syllabique grecque, baltique, slave et védique'. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 81: 374–6.
- Bonnet, M. (1890). *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours*. Paris: Hachette.
- Bopp, F. (1837). *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litthauischen, Altslawischen, Gothischen und Deutschen: Dritte Abtheilung*. Berlin: Dümmler.

- Braune, W., and Heidermanns, F. (2004). *Gotische Grammatik* (20th edn). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Briscoe, J. (2008). *A commentary on Livy, Books 38–40*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brixhe, C. (1992). ‘Du “datif” mycéenien aux protagonistes de la situation linguistique’, in J.-P. Olivier (ed.), *Mykenaïka: actes du IX<sup>e</sup> Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens*. Paris: de Boccard, 129–57.
- (2006). ‘Préhistoire et début de l’histoire des dialectes grecs’. *Incontri Linguistici* 29: 39–59.
- Brown, P., and Levinson, S. C. (1978). ‘Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena’, in E. Goody (ed.), *Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 56–289.
- (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brugman, K. (1876). ‘Zur Geschichte der stammabstufenden Declinationen. Erste Abhandlung: Die Nomina auf -ar- und -tar-’. (*Curtius’*) *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik* 9: 361–406.
- Brugmann, K., and Thumb, A. (1913). *Griechische Grammatik: Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax* (4th edn). Munich: Beck.
- Brunner, K. (1965). *Altenglische Grammatik* (3rd edn). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Brunt, P. A. (1988). *The fall of the Roman republic and related essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buck, C. D. (1955). *The Greek dialects*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bugge, S. (1893). ‘Beiträge zur etymologischen erläuterung der armenischen sprache’. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 32: 1–86.
- (1897). *Lykische Studien*, i. Christiania: Dybwad.
- Burrow, T. (1975). ‘A new look at Brugmann’s Law’. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 38: 55–80.
- Calder, G. (ed.) (1917). *Auraicept na n-Éces: The scholars’ primer*. Edinburgh: Grant.
- Callebat, L., Bouet, P., Fleury, P., and Zuinghedau, M. (1984). *Vitruve, De architectura: concordance; documentation bibliographique, lexicale et grammaticale*, ii. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Olms-Weidmann.
- Campbell, A. (1962). *Old English grammar* (rev. edn). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carney, T. F. (1964). ‘The words *sodes* and *quaeso* in Terentian usage’. *Acta Classica* 7: 57–63.
- Chantraine, P. (1958). *Grammaire homérique*, i: *Phonétique et morphologie* (3rd edn). Paris: Klincksieck.
- (1961). *Morphologie historique du grec* (2nd edn). Paris: Klincksieck.
- (1968–80). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (2 vols). Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chatfield, C., and Collins, A. J. (1980). *Introduction to multivariate analysis*. London: Chapman and Hall.

- Chomsky, N., and Halle, M. (1968). *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Clackson, J. (1994). *The linguistic relationship between Armenian and Greek*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- (2007). *Indo-European linguistics: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- and Horrocks, G. C. (2007). *The Blackwell history of the Latin language*. Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Clements, G. N., and Hume, E. V. (1995). 'The internal organization of speech sounds', in J. Goldsmith (ed.), *The handbook of phonological theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 245–306.
- Collinge, N. E. (1985). *The laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Coseriu, E. (1958). *Sincronía, diacronía e historia: el problema del cambio lingüístico*. Montevideo: University Press.
- (1974). *Synchronie, Diachronie und Geschichte: das Problem des Sprachwandels*, tr. H. Sohre (translation of Coseriu 1958). Munich: Fink.
- Cowgill, W. (1959). 'The inflection of the Germanic ō-presents'. *Language* 35: 1–15.
- (1965). 'Evidence in Greek', in Winter (1965a), 142–80.
- (1970). 'Italic and Celtic superlatives and the dialects of Indo-European', in G. Cardona, H. M. Hoenigswald, and A. Senn (eds), *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans: papers presented at the 3rd Indo-European Conference at the University of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 113–53.
- (1979). 'Anatolian hi-conjugation and Indo-European perfect: instalment II', in E. Neu and W. Meid (eds), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 25–39.
- (1985a). 'The personal endings of thematic verbs in Indo-European', in B. Schlerath (ed.), *Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 99–108.
- (1985b). 'PIE \*duyo "2" in Germanic and Celtic, and the nom.-acc. dual of non-neuter o-stems'. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46: 13–28.
- (2006). 'The personal endings of thematic verbs in Indo-European' (extended version of Cowgill 1985a), in J. S. Klein (ed.), *The collected writings of Warren Cowgill*. Ann Arbor and New York: Beech Stave Press, 535–67.
- Cruttenden, A. (1997). *Intonation* (2nd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuny, A. (1943). *Recherches sur le vocalisme, le consonantisme et la formation des racines en 'nostratique'*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Curtius, G. (1873). *Das Verbum der griechischen Sprache seinem Baue nach dargestellt*, i. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Dal, I. (1971). *Untersuchungen zur germanischen und deutschen Sprachgeschichte*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Davis, K. (1994). 'Stop voicing in Hindi'. *Journal of Phonetics* 22: 177–93.

- de Melo, W. D. C. (2010). ‘Possessive pronouns in Plautus’, in E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds), *Colloquial and literary Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 71–99.
- de Sutter, M. (1986). ‘A theory of word order within the Latin Noun Phrase, based on Cato’s *De agri cultura*’, in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history*, iv. Brussels: Collection Latomus, 151–83.
- de Vaan, M. (2003). *The Avestan vowels*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- (2008). *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Debrunner, A. (1954). *Jacob Wackernagel: Altindische Grammatik*, ii.2. *Die Nominal-suffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1957). *Jacob Wackernagel: Altindische Grammatik. Nachträge zu Band I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Delamarre, X. (2003). *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise* (2nd edn). Paris: Éditions Errance.
- Demiraj, B. (1997). *Albanische Etymologien: Untersuchungen zum albanischen Erbwortsschatz*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Deniaux, E. (1993). *Clientèles et pouvoir à l'époque de Cicéron*. Rome: École française de Rome.
- DerkSEN, R. (2008). *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Devine, A. M., and Stephens, L. D. (2006). *Latin word order: structured meaning and information*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dickey, E. (2002). *Latin forms of address*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2012). ‘How to say “please” in classical Latin’. *Classical Quarterly* 62.
- Dik, S. (1978). *Functional grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Ditrich, T. (2010). ‘The variety of expressions for Heaven and Earth in the Rgveda’. *Crossroads* 5(1): 35–44.
- Dobson, E. (1962). ‘Middle English lengthening in open syllables’. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 61: 124–48.
- (1969). ‘Notes on sound-change and phoneme theory’. *Brno Studies in English* 8: 43–8.
- Dresher, B. E., and Lahiri, A. (1991). ‘The Germanic foot: metrical coherence in Old English’. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 251–86.
- Dryer, M. (1988). ‘Object-verb order and adjective-noun order: dispelling a myth’. *Lingua* 74: 185–217.
- Dunbar, H., and Marzullo, B. (1962). *A complete concordance to the Odyssey of Homer* (2nd edn). Hildesheim: Olms.
- Durante, M. (1976). *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*, ii. Rome: Edizioni dell’Ateneo.
- Düwel, K. (2008). *Runenkunde* (4th edn). Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler.
- Edgerton, F. (1934). ‘Sievers’ Law and Indo-European weak grade vocalism’. *Language* 10: 235–65.

- in E. Dickey and Cambridge University
- n Phrase, based on rature and Roman
- k: Rodopi.
- languages. Leiden:
- ii.2. *Die Nominal-*
- u Band I. Göttingen:
- dn). Paris: Éditions
- zum albanischen
- ome: École française
- ed lexicon. Leiden:
- ctured meaning and
- city Press.
- arterly 62.
- arth in the Rgveda'.
- Transactions of the
- Studies in English 8:
- al coherence in Old
- dispelling a myth'.
- to the Odyssey of
- a, ii. Rome: Edizioni
- Metzler.
- vocalism'. *Language*
- (1943). 'The Indo-European semivowels'. *Language* 19: 83–124.
- (1962). 'The semivowel phonemes of Indo-European: a reconsideration'. *Language* 38: 352–9.
- Eelen, G. (2001). *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Egetmeyer, M. (2010). *Le Dialecte grec ancien de Chypre* (2 vols). Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Elbourne, P. (1998). 'Proto-Indo-European voiceless aspirates'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 111: 1–30.
- (2000). 'Plain voiceless stop plus laryngeal in Indo-European'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 113: 2–28.
- (2001). 'Aspiration by /s/ and devoicing of mediae aspiratae'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 114: 197–219.
- (2011). 'ē̄nīppōθos'. *Glotta* 87: 37–57.
- Elenbaas, N., and Kager, R. (1999). 'Ternary rhythm and the lapse constraint'. *Phonology* 16: 273–329.
- Ellsworth, M. (2011). 'The first palatalization of Greek', in S. W. Jamison, H. C. Melchert, and B. Vine (eds), *Proceedings of the 22nd annual UCLA Indo-European conference*. Bremen: Hempen, 13–31.
- Euler, W. (1979). *Indo-iranisch-griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren indogermanische Grundlagen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Exon, C. (1906). 'Medial vowel-syncope in Latin'. *Hermathena* 32: 117–43.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1990). 'From ESSES to AITCHES: identifying pathways of diachronic change', in W. Croft, S. Kemmer, and K. Denning (eds), *Studies in typology and diachrony offered to Joseph Greenberg*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 59–78.
- Fernandez Alvarez, M. P. (1981). *El argolico occidental y oriental en las inscripciones de los siglos VII, VI y V a. C.* Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Fick, A. (1905). Review of R. Meister, *Dorer und Achäer* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1904). *Wochenschrift der klassischen Philologie* 22: 593–99.
- Frisk, H. (1960–72). *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3 vols). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Fudge, E. (1977). 'Long and short [æ] in one southern British speaker's English'. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 7: 55–65.
- Gallée, J. H. (1910). *Altsächsische Grammatik*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- García Ramón, J. L. (1999). 'Griechisch Ζητίρ· Ζεύς ἐν Κύπρῳ, vedisch yātár- "Rächer" und die Vertretung von \*i- im Griechischen', in H. Eichner and H. C. Luschützky (eds), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Praha: Enigma Corporation, 77–96.
- Garrett, A. (1999). 'A new model of Indo-European subgrouping and dispersal', in S. S. Chang, L. Liaw, and J. Ruppenhofer (eds), *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 146–56.
- (2006). 'Convergence in the formation of Indo-European subgroups: phylogeny and chronology', in P. Forster and C. Renfrew (eds), *Phylogenetic methods and the prehistory of languages*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 139–51.

- Geldner, K. F. (1951). *Der Rig-Veda* (3 vols). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Gignac, F. T. (1970). 'The pronunciation of Greek stops in the papyri'. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 101: 185–202.
- (1976). *A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*, i: *Phonology*. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica.
- Gildersleeve, B. L., and Lodge, G. (1895). *Gildersleeve's Latin grammar* (3rd edn). London: Macmillan.
- Gill, H. S., and Gleason, H. A. (1963). *A reference grammar of Panjabi*. Hartford, Conn.: Department of Linguistics, Hartford Seminary Foundation.
- Giusti, G., and Oniga, R. (2006). 'La struttura del sintagma nominale latino', in R. Oniga and L. Zennaro (eds), *Atti della 'Giornata di Linguistica Latina'*, Venezia, 7 maggio 2004. Venice: Cafoscarina, 71–99.
- Godel, R. (1975). *An introduction to the study of Classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Good, J. (ed.) (2008). *Linguistic universals and language change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gould, S. J. (2001). 'Requiem eternal', in *The lying stones of Marrakech*. London: Vintage, 227–9.
- Gratwick, A. S. (1982). 'Latinitas Britannica. Was British Latin archaic?', in N. Brookes (ed.), *Latin and the vernacular languages in early medieval Britain*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1–79.
- Greppin, J. (1972). 'The Armenian reflexes of IE \*w and \*y'. *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 9: 69–78.
- (1978). 'On Greek zeta'. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 6: 141–2.
- Griffiths, A. (2009). *The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda Kāṇḍas 6 & 7*. Groningen: Forsten.
- Grønvik, O. (1983). *Die dialektgeographische Stellung des Krimgotischen und die krimgotische cantilena*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- (1998). *Untersuchungen zur älteren nordischen und germanischen Sprachgeschichte*. Frankfurt am Main and Berlin: Lang.
- Gwynn, E. J. (ed.) (1900). *Poems from the Dindshenchas*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
- (ed.) (1903–35). *The metrical Dindshenchas* (5 vols). Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
- Haag, O. (1898). *Die Latinität Fredegars*. Erlangen: Junge.
- Haas, W. (1978). *Sprachwandel und Sprachgeographie: Untersuchungen zur Struktur der Dialektverschiedenheit am Beispiele der schweizerdeutschen Vokalsysteme*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Hackstein, O. (2000). 'Archaismus oder historischer Sprachkontakt. Zur Frage westindogermanisch-tocharischer Konvergenzen', in G. Meiser and O. Hackstein (eds), *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel: Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 169–84.

- (2002). *Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen. Faktoren morphologischer Variabilität in literarischen Frühformen: Tradition, Sprachwandel, sprachliche Anachronismen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Hajnal, I. (1994). 'Das Brugmannsche Gesetz in diachroner Sicht und seine Gültigkeit innerhalb der arischen *a*-Stämme'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 107: 194–221.
- Hale, K. (1983). 'Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 5–47.
- Hall, J. (2009). *Politeness and politics in Cicero's letters*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, T. A. (2007). 'Segmental features', in P. de Lacy (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 311–34.
- Halla-aho, H. (2010). 'Requesting in a letter: context, syntax, and the choice between complements in the letters of Cicero and Pliny the Younger'. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108: 232–247.
- Halle, M. (1992). 'Phonological features', in W. Bright (ed.), *International encyclopedia of linguistics*, iii. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 207–12.
- and Stevens, K. (1971). 'A note on laryngeal features'. *Quarterly Progress Reports, MIT Research Laboratory of Electronics* 101: 198–213.
- and Vergnaud, J.-R. (1987). *An essay on stress*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Hamm, E.-M. (1957). *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Hamp, E. P. (1966). 'Three Armenian etymologies. (1. Armenian *ner* "wife of husband's brother", 2. *ayr*, gen. *airn*, 3. Armenian *gišer*, Latin *uesper*)'. *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 3: 11–15.
- Hardarson, J. A. (1993). *Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelaorist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Harding, E. (1937–49). *Språkvetenskapliga problem i ny belysning [1–99]*. Lund: Blom.
- Harris, A. C., and Campbell, L. (1995). *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hartel, W. (1874). 'Homerische Studien, ii'. *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (in Wien)* 76: 329–76.
- Hassall, M. W. C., Wilson, D. R., and Wright, R. P. (1972). 'Roman Britain in 1971'. *Britannia* 3: 299–367.
- Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (1990). *Generalized additive models*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Hayden, D. A. (forthcoming). 'Natural and artificial language in *Auraicept na nÉces* revisited'.
- Hayes, B. (1995). *Metrical Stress Theory: principles and case studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heidermanns, F. (1986). 'Zur primären Wortbildung im germanischen Adjektivsystem'. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 99: 278–307.

- Heidermanns, F. (1993). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektive*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hempel, C. G. (1942). 'The function of general laws in history'. *Journal of Philosophy* 39: 35–48.
- and Oppenheim, P. (1948). 'Studies in the logic of explanation'. *Philosophy of Science* 15: 135–75.
- Hermann, E. (1918). 'Die böötische Betonung'. *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 273–80.
- (1923). *Silbenbildung im Griechischen und in den andern indogermanischen Sprachen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Heselwood, B., and McChrystal, L. (1999). 'The effect of age-group and place of L1 acquisition on the realisation of Panjabi stop consonants in Bradford: an acoustic sociophonetic study'. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 7: 49–68.
- Hill, E. (2004). 'Das germanische Verb für "tun" und die Ausgänge des germanischen schwachen Präteritums'. *Sprachwissenschaft* 29: 257–303.
- Hinge, G. (2006). *Die Sprache Alkmans: Textgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Hock, H. H. (1973). 'On the phonemic status of Germanic *e* and *i*', in B. B. Kachru et al. (eds), *Issues in linguistics: papers in honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 319–51.
- (1991). *Principles of historical linguistics* (2nd edn). Berlin, New York, and Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (forthcoming). 'Vedic verb accent revisited', in J. Klein and E. Tucker (eds), *Proceedings of the XIIIth World Sanskrit Conference: linguistics*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsi-dass.
- Hockett, C. F. (1965). 'Sound change'. *Linguage* 41: 185–204.
- Hodot, R. (1990). *Le Dialecte éolien d'Asie: la langue des inscriptions*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Hoeningwald, H. M. (1944). 'Internal reconstruction'. *Studies in Linguistics* 2: 78–87.
- (1960). *Language change and linguistic reconstruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1978). 'The *annus mirabilis* 1876 and posterity'. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 76: 17–35.
- (1986). 'Some considerations of relative chronology: the Greek thematic present', in A. Etter (ed.), *o-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 372–5.
- (1997). 'Analogy in Cyrene and elsewhere', in D. Q. Adams (ed.), *Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp*, i. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 93–8.
- (1999). 'Secondary split, gap-filling, and bifurcation in historical phonology', in E. C. Polomé and C. F. Justus (eds), *Language change and typological variation: in honor of Winfred P. Lehmann on the occasion of his 83rd birthday*, i. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 201–6.

- Hoffmann, R. (1997). *Lateinische Verbalperiphrasen vom Typ amans sum und amatus fui: Valenz und Grammatikalisierung (Primäres Textkorpus: Ovid)*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Lang.
- Hofman, R. (1993). 'The linguistic preoccupations of the glossators of the St Gall Priscian', in V. Law (ed.), *The history of linguistic thought in the early medieval ages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 111–26.
- (ed.) (1996). *The Sankt Gall Priscian commentary*, Part 1 (2 vols). Münster: Nodus.
- Hofmann, J. B., and Szantyr, A. (1965). *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Munich: Beck.
- Hollifield, P. (1980). 'The phonological development of final syllables in Germanic'. *Die Sprache* 26: 19–53, 145–78.
- Holst, J. H. (1998). 'Ein bisher unentdecktes Lautgesetz im Albanischen und damit im Zusammenhang stehende Betrachtungen'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 111: 83–98.
- Holtz, L. (ed.) (1977). *Grammatici Hibernici Carolini aevi*, i. Turnhout: Brepols.
- (ed.) (1981). *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IVe–IXe siècle) et édition critique*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Hombert, J.-M., Ohala, J. J., and Ewan, W. G. (1976). 'Tonogenesis: theories and queries'. *Report of the Phonology Laboratory, Berkeley* 1: 48–77.
- Horowitz, F. E. (1974). *Sievers' Law and the evidence of the Rigveda*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Horrocks, G. (2010). *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers* (2nd edn). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hübschmann, H. (1883). *Armenische Studien*, i: *Grundzüge der armenischen Etymologie. Erster Theil*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- (1897). *Armenische Grammatik, Erster Teil. Armenische Etymologie*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- (1899). 'Hübschmann, H. Armenische Grammatik'. *Anzeiger für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde. Beiblatt zu den Indogermanischen Forschungen* 10: 41–50.
- Huxley, T. H. (1866). 'On the advisableness of improving natural knowledge'. *Fortnightly Review* 3: 626–37.
- (1887). 'Science and pseudo-science'. *Popular Science Monthly* 31: 207–24.
- Isaac, G. (2007). 'The reflexes of the Celtic diphthong \*au'. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 11: 23–47.
- Issatschenko, A. V. (1973). 'Das Suffix -chen und der phonologische Status des [ç] im Deutschen'. *Deutsche Sprache* 3: 1–6.
- Jackson, K. H. (1953). *Language and history in early Britain: a chronological survey of the Brittonic languages, first to twelfth century AD*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- (1967). *A historical phonology of Breton*. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Jacobs, H. (2000). 'The revenge of the uneven trochee: Latin main stress, metrical constituency, stress-related phenomena and OT', in A. Lahiri (ed.), *Analogy, levelling,*

- markedness: principles of change in phonology and morphology*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 333–52.
- Jacobs, H. (2003a). ‘The emergence of quantity-sensitivity in Latin: secondary stress, iambic shortening, and theoretical implications for “mixed” stress systems’, in E. Holt (ed.), *Optimality Theory and language change*. Dordrecht, Boston, and London: Kluwer, 229–47.
- (2003b). ‘Why preantepenultimate stress in Latin requires an OT-account’, in P. Fikkert and H. Jacobs (eds), *Development in prosodic systems*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 395–418.
- (2004). ‘Rhythmic vowel deletion in OT: syncope in Latin’. *Probus* 16(1): 63–89.
- Jahowkyan, G. B. (1967). *Očerki po istorii dopis'mennogo perioda armjanskogo jazyka*. Erevan: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Armjanskoy SSR.
- (1982). *Sravnitel'naja grammatika armjanskogo jazyka. Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanowt'yown*. Erevan: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Armjanskoy SSR.
- Jakobson, R. (1931). ‘Prinzipien der historischen Phonologie’. *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 4: 247–67 (tr. J. Cantineau with slight revisions as ‘Principes de phonologie historique’, in N. S. Trubetzkoy, *Principes de phonologie*, Paris 1949, 315–36; repr. in Jakobson 1962: 202–20).
- (1937). ‘Über die Beschaffenheit der prosodischen Gegensätze’, in *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie offerts à J. van Ginneken*. Paris: Klincksieck, 25–33 (repr. in Jakobson 1962: 254–61).
- (1949). ‘The phonemic and grammatical aspects of language in their interrelations’. *Actes du sixième congrès international des linguistes*. Paris: Klincksieck, 5–18 (repr. in Jakobson 1971: 103–14).
- (1962). *Selected writings*, i: *Phonological studies*. The Hague: Mouton.
- (1971). *Selected writings*, ii: *Word and language*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Jamison, S. W. (1983). *Function and form in the -áya-formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1986). ‘Brāhmaṇa syllable counting, Vedic *tváć* “skin”, and the Sanskrit expression for the canonical creature’. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 29: 161–81.
- Jasanoff, J. H. (2004). ‘Acute vs. circumflex: some notes on PIE and post-PIE prosodic phonology’, in A. Hyllested, A. R. Jørgensen, J. H. Larsson, and T. Olander (eds), *Per aspera ad asteriscos: studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 247–55.
- (2009). ‘Notes on the internal history of the PIE optative’, in K. Yoshida and B. Vine (eds), *East and West: papers in Indo-European studies*. Bremen: Hempen, 47–67.
- Jaski, B. (2003). ‘“We are of the Greeks in our origin”: new perspectives on the Irish origin legend’. *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 46: 1–53.
- Joffre, M.-D. (1995). *Le Verbe latin: voix et diathèse*. Louvain and Paris: Peeters.
- Joseph, B. D., and Janda, R. (eds) (2003). *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Joseph, L. S. (1982). ‘The treatment of \*CRH- and the origin of CaRa- in Celtic’. *Ériu* 33: 31–57.

- Joshi, S. S. (1973). 'Pitch and related phenomena in Panjabi'. *Pakha Sanjam* 6: 1–62.  
— and Gill, M. S. (eds) (1994). *Punjabi-English dictionary*. Patiala: Punjabi University.
- Kaster, R. A. (2005). *Emotion, restraint, and community in ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kellens, J. (1995). *Liste du verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kelly, P. (1997). 'The earliest words for "horse" in the Celtic languages', in S. Davies and N. A. Jones (eds), *The horse in Celtic culture: medieval Welsh perspectives*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 43–63.
- Kenstowicz, M. (1994). *Phonology in generative grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kimball, S. E. (1999). *Hittite historical phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Kiparsky, P. (1967). 'A phonological rule of Greek'. *Glotta* 44: 109–34.  
— (1973a). 'Abstractness, opacity, and global rules', in O. Fujimura (ed.), *Three dimensions of linguistic theory*. Tokyo: TEC, 57–86.  
— (1973b). 'On comparative linguistics: the case of Grassmann's Law', in H. M. Hoeningwald and R. E. Longacre (eds), *Diachronic, areal and typological linguistics*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 115–34.
- Klein, J. S. (1992). *On verbal accentuation in the Rigveda*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.  
— (1998). 'Rigvedic syá-/tyá-', in J. H. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver (eds), *Mír Curad: studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 362–72.
- Klingenschmitt, G. (1982). *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008). *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kock, A. (1898). 'Der a-umlaut und der wechsel der endvokale a : i (e) in den altnordischen sprachen'. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 23: 484–554.  
— (1910). 'Kritiska anmärkningar til frågan om a-omljudet'. *Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi* 26: 97–141.
- Koerner, E. F. K. (1999). 'The authors of the idea of a language as a system où tout se tient', in E. F. K. Koerner, *Linguistic historiography*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 183–200.
- Kölligan, D. (2006). 'Armenian o(v)', in D. Kölligan and R. Sen (eds), *Oxford University working papers in linguistics, philology and phonetics*, xi. Oxford: University of Oxford, 110–21.
- Kortlandt, F. (1997). 'Arm. nér "sister-in-law"'. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 18: 7–9.  
— (1998). 'The development of \*y in Armenian'. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 19: 15–18.
- Kovács, F. (1971). *Linguistic structures and linguistic laws*, tr. S. Simon. Amsterdam: Grüner.

- Krause, W., and Jankuhn, H. (1966). *Die Rumeninschriften im älteren Futhark* (2 vols). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kretschmer, P. (1896). *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1909). ‘Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte’. *Glotta* 1: 9–59.
- (1910). ‘Sprache’, in A. Gercke and E. Norden (eds), *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, i. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 129–229.
- Kruszewski, N. (1885). ‘Prinzipien der Sprachentwicklung (Fortsetzung)’. (Techmers) *Internationale Zeitschrift für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 2: 258–68.
- Krzanowski, W. J. (1988). *Principles of multivariate analysis: a user’s perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kühner, R., and Stegmann, C. (1912–14). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, ii: *Satzlehre* (2 vols) (2nd edn). Hanover: Hahn.
- Kümmel, M. (2000). *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kuryłowicz, J. (1927). ‘Les Effets du en indo-iranien’. *Prace Filologiczne* 11: 201–43.
- (1947). ‘La Nature des procès dits analogiques’. *Acta Linguistica* 5: 17–34.
- (1952a). *L’Accentuation des langues indo-européennes* (1st edn). Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- (1952b). ‘The Germanic vowel system’. *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 11: 50–4.
- (1956). *L’Apophonie en indo-européen*. Wrocław: Polska Akademia Nauk.
- (1964). *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- (1967). ‘Phonologie und Morphonologie’, in J. Hamm (ed.), *Phonologie der Gegenwart*. Graz, Vienna, and Cologne: Böhlau, 158–72.
- (1968). *Indogermanische Grammatik*, ii: *Akzent, Ablaut*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Labov, W. (1994). *Principles of linguistic change*, i: *Internal factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- (2001). *Principles of linguistic change*, ii: *Social factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ladd, C. A. (1964). ‘The nature of sound-change’, in H. G. Lunt (ed.), *Proceedings of the ninth international congress of linguists*. The Hague: Mouton, 650–7.
- (1965). ‘The status of sound-laws’. *Archivum Linguisticum* 17: 91–110.
- Ladd, R. (1996). *Intonational phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lamberterie, C. de (1988/9). ‘Introduction à l’arménien classique’. *LALIES: Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature* 10: 234–89.
- Langslow, D. R. (2000). *Medical Latin in the Roman empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lass, R. (1984). *Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laughton, E. (1964). *The participle in Cicero*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lazzeroni, R. (1967). ‘Su alcune correnti dialettali nel Peloponneso antico’. *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 7: 63–75.
- Lebreton, J. (1901). *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron*. Paris: Hachette.
- Lech, P. C. (2010). *Gender, social status, and discourse in Roman comedy* (Diss. Brown University).
- Ledgeway, M. M. (1992). *Romance Romance* (forthcoming). Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lehmann, R. G. G. (1994). *4th International Conference on the History of the English Language*. Lejeune, M. (1992). *Klincksieck*. Lentz, A. (1992). *Hirzel*. Leskinen, A. (1992). *Zigzag*: Hirzel. Leumann, M. (1992). *Tidsskrift*. Lindsay, W. (1992). *stems, an*. — (1907). Levin, J. (1992). Lindeman, J. (1992). *Tidsskrift*. — (ed.) (1992). (2 vols). Lisón Hugo (1992). Zaragoza. Lloyd-Jones (1992). Gwasg Prif. Lobel, E. (1992). Löffstedt, B. (1992). *frühmittel*. — (ed.) (1992). Lubotsky, A. (1992). European. — (1997). Sanskrit. — (2002). Lucidi, M. (1992). Luick, K. (1992). Tauchnitz. Lüttel, V. (1992). *hang mit*. McCarthy, J. (1992). 79–153.

- Ledgeway, A. (2011). 'Syntactic and morphosyntactic typology and change', in M. Maiden, J. C. Smith, and A. Ledgeway (eds), *The Cambridge history of the Romance languages*, i: *Structures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 382–471.
- (forthcoming). *From Latin to Romance: morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lehmann, C. (1991). 'The Latin nominal group in typological perspective', in R. G. G. Coleman (ed.), *New studies in Latin linguistics: selected papers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 203–32.
- Lejeune, M. (1972). *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Lentz, A. (1867). *Herodiani technici reliquiae*, i. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Leskien, A. (1876). *Die Declination im Slavisch-Litauischen und Germanischen*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Leumann, M. (1921). 'Part. perf. pass. mit *fui* im späteren Latein'. *Glotta* 11: 192–4.
- (1977). *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich: Beck.
- Levin, J. (1988). 'Generating ternary feet'. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 29: 97–113.
- Lindeman, F. W. (1965). 'La Loi de Sievers et le début du mot en indo-européen'. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvitenskap* 20: 38–108.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1894). *The Latin language: an historical account of Latin sounds, stems, and flexions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1907). *Syntax of Plautus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (ed.) (1911). *Isidori Hispanensis episcopi etymologiarum sive originum libri XX* (2 vols). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lisón Huguet, N. (2001). *El orden de las palabras en los grupos nominales en latín*. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Lloyd-Jones, J. (1931–63). *Geirfa barddoniaeth gynnar Gymraeg* (2 vols). Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Lobel, E. (1932). 'P. Bouriant 8, περὶ αἰολίδος'. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 10: 1–4.
- Löfstedt, B. (1961). *Studien über die Sprache der langobardischen Gesetze: Beiträge zur frühmittelalterlichen Latinität*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- (ed.) (1977). *Grammatici Hibernici Carolini aevi*, ii. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Lubotsky, A. (1988). *The system of nominal accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden: Brill.
- (1997). Review of Volkart (1994). *Kratylos* 42: 55–7.
- (2002). *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Kāṇḍa Five*. Cambridge, Mass.: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University.
- Lucidi, M. (1950). 'L'origine del trisillabismo in greco'. *Ricerche Linguistiche* 1: 69–92.
- Luick, K. (1914–40). *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Tauchnitz.
- Lüttel, V. (1981). *Kás und καί: dialektale und chronologische Probleme im Zusammenhang mit Dissimilation und Apokope*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- McCarthy, J., and Prince, A. (1993). 'Generalized alignment'. *Yearbook of Morphology* 79–153.

- McCone, K. (1991). *The Indo-European origins of the Old Irish nasal presents, subjunctives and futures*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- (1996). *Towards a relative chronology of ancient and medieval Celtic sound change*. Maynooth: Department of Old Irish, St Patrick's College.
- Macdonell, A. A. (1916). *A Vedic grammar for students*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Madvig, J. N. (1842). 'De locis quibusdam grammaticae Latinae admonitiones et observationes', in J. N. Madvig (ed.), *Opuscula academica altera: ab ipso collecta, emendata, aucta*, ii. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 206–41.
- Mahandru, V. (1991). 'The Panjabi speech community', in S. Alladina and V. Edwards (eds), *Multilingualism in the British Isles*. London: Longman, 115–27.
- Maltby, R. (2009). 'Priscian's etymologies. Sources, function and theoretical basis: "Graeci, quibus in omnia doctrinae auctoribus utimur"', in M. Baratin, B. Colombat, and L. Holtz (eds), *Priscien: transmission et refondation de la grammaire de l'antiquité aux modernes*. Turnhout: Brepols, 239–46.
- Mańczak, W. (1958). 'Tendances générales des changements analogiques'. *Lingua* 7: 298–325, 387–420.
- (1978). 'Les Lois du développement analogique'. *Linguistics* 205: 53–60.
- (1992). 'Les Désinences de grec φέρεις et φέρει', in B. Brogyanyi and R. Lipp (eds), *Historical philology: Greek, Latin, and Romance. Papers in honor of Oswald Szemerényi II*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 67–75.
- Mariès, L., and Mercier, C. (1989). *Eznik de Kołb: De Deo. Traduction française, notes et tables*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Mariotti, I. (ed.) (1967). *Victorinus, Ars grammatica: introduzione, testo critico e commento*. Florence: Le Monnier.
- Marouzeau, J. (1922). *L'Ordre des mots dans la phrase latine*, i: *Les Groupes nominaux*. Paris: Champion.
- (1953). *L'Ordre des mots en latin: volume complémentaire*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Martirosyan, H. K. (2010). *Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Matthews, P. H. (1991). *Morphology* (2nd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mawet, F. (1986). 'Les Développements fonctionnels de arménien (*e*)*t'e*', in M. Leroy and F. Mawet (eds), *La Place de l'arménien dans les langues indo-européennes*. Leuven: Peeters, 76–89.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1986). *Indogermanische Grammatik*, i/2: *Lautlehre [Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen]*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- (1986–2001). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (3 vols). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Mažiulis, V. (1988–). *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- Meier-Brügger, M. (1992). 'Relative Chronologie: Schlüsse aus dem griechischen Akzent', in R. S. P. Beekes, A. Lubotsky, and J. Weitenberg (eds), *Rekonstruktion und*

- relative Chronologie: Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 283–9.
- (2002). *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft* (8th edn). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Meillet, A. (1903a). *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Paris: Hachette.
- (1903b). *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique* (1st edn). Vienna: Imprimerie des P. P. Mekhitharistes.
- (1920). ‘Les Noms du “feu” et de l’“eau” et la question du genre’. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 21: 249–56.
- (1925). ‘Des Présents grecs en -vā-/va-’, in *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. J. Vendryes par ses amis et ses élèves*. Paris: Champion, 275–85.
- (1931). ‘Caractère secondaire du type thématique indo-européen’. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 32: 194–203.
- (1936). *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique* (2nd edn). Vienna: Imprimerie des P. P. Mekhitharistes.
- Meiser, G. (1998). *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Melchert, H. C. (1994). *Anatolian historical phonology*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. (1996). ‘Can weakening processes start in initial position? The case of aspiration of /s/ and /f/’, in B. Hurch and R. A. Rhodes (eds), *Natural phonology: the state of the art*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 97–106.
- Menge, H., Burkard, T., and Schauer, M. (2000). *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Mester, R. A. (1994). ‘The quantitative trochee in Latin’. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 1–61.
- Meyer, G. (1892). *Albanische Studien*, iii: *Lautlehre der indogermanischen Bestandtheile des Albanischen*. Vienna: Gerold.
- Meyer, K. (ed.) (1912). *Sanas Cormaic*. Halle: Niemeyer (repr. with Meyer's corrections added to the text, Felinfach: Llanerch Press, 1994).
- (ed.) (1919). ‘Cormacs Glossar nach der Handschrift des Buches der Uí Maine’. *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (Phil.-hist. Klasse)*, 290–321.
- Miller, D. G. (1977). ‘Was Grassmann's Law reordered in Greek?’ *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 91: 131–58.
- Minon, S. (2000). ‘Sifflantes géminées anomales. À propos des formes éléennes ἀνταποδιδώσσα et θεοκολέοσσα et des anthroponymes en -φῶσ(σ)α’, in L. Dubois and É. Masson (eds), *Philokypros: mélanges de philologie et d'antiquités grecques et proche-orientales dédiés à la mémoire d'Olivier Masson*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 229–43.
- (2007). *Les Inscriptions éléennes dialectales (VI<sup>e</sup> – II<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.)* (2 vols). Genève: Droz.
- Minshall, R. (1955). ‘“Initial” Indo-European /y/ in Armenian’. *Language* 31: 499–503.

- Moran, P. (2007). *Sacred languages and Irish glossaries: evidence for the study of Latin, Greek and Hebrew in early medieval Ireland* (Diss. NUI Galway).
- (2011). ‘A living speech?’ The pronunciation of Greek in early medieval Ireland. *Ériu* 61: 29–57.
- (forthcoming). ‘Greek in early medieval Ireland’, in A. Mullen and P. James (eds), *Multilingualism in the Greco-Roman worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morani, M. (1981). ‘In margine a una concordanza greco-armena’. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 66: 1–15.
- Morgenstierne, G. (2003). *A new etymological vocabulary of Pashto*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1988). ‘Problems in Cyprian phonology and writing’, in J. Karageorghis and O. Masson (eds), *The history of the Greek language in Cyprus*. Nicosia: Pierides Foundation, 99–130.
- (1992). ‘Mycenaean, Arcadian, Cyprian and some questions of method in dialectology’, in J. P. Olivier (ed.), *Mykenaïka: actes du IX<sup>e</sup> Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens*. Paris: de Boccard, 415–31.
- (1998). *History of linguistics*, iv: *Nineteenth-century linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Morris Jones, J. (1913). *A Welsh grammar: historical and comparative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moulton, W. G. (1960). ‘The short vowel systems of northern Switzerland: a study in structural dialectology’. *Word* 16: 155–82.
- (1961a). ‘Zur Geschichte des deutschen Vokalsystems’. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 83: 1–35.
- (1961b). ‘Lautwandel durch innere Kausalität: die ostschweizerische Vokalspalzung’. *Zeitschrift für Mundartforschung* 28: 227–51.
- (1967). ‘Types of phonemic change’, in *To honor Roman Jakobson*, ii. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1393–1407.
- (1970). ‘Contributions of dialectology to phonological theory’, in A. Graur (ed.), *Actes du dixième congrès international des linguistes*, ii. Bucharest: Éditions de l’Académie de la République Socialiste de Roumanie, 21–6.
- Muller, H. F. (1924). ‘The passive voice in Vulgar Latin’. *Romanic Review* 15: 68–93.
- Mulvany, C. M. (1896). ‘Some forms of the Homeric subjunctive’. *Classical Review* 10: 24–7.
- Nagy, G. (1970). *Greek dialects and the transformation of an Indo-European process*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Neubourg, L. de (1977). ‘Sur le caractère analogique de la place de l’adjectif en latin’. *Orbis* 26: 395–403.
- (1978). ‘Arguments supplémentaires en faveur de l’analogie dans l’ordre des mots en latin’. *Orbis* 27: 352–72.
- Niedermann, M. (1997). *Précis de phonétique historique du latin* (5th edn). Paris: Klincksieck [1st edn, 1906].

- Nolan, F. (1998). 'Phonological representation and phonetic interpretation in intonation analysis'. Manuscript of conference paper presented at Laboratory Phonology VI, York.
- Nooten, B. A. van, and Holland, G. B. (1994). *Rig Veda: a metrically restored text with an introduction and notes*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Núñez, S. (1995). 'Materiales para una sociología de la lengua latina: Terencio y los modificadores de imperativo'. *Florentia Iliberritana* 6: 347–66.
- Nussbaum, A. J. (1997). 'The "Saussure Effect" in Latin and Italic', in A. Lubotsky (ed.), *Sound law and analogy: papers in honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 181–203.
- Nyberg, H. S. (1974). *A manual of Pahlavi*, ii: *Glossary*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ó Néill, P. P. (2000). 'Irish observance of the three Lents and the date of the St Gall Priscian (MS 904)'. *Ériu* 51: 159–80.
- O'Donovan, J., and Stokes, W. (eds) (1868). *Cormac's glossary*. Calcutta: Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society.
- Oakley, S. P. (2005). *A commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*, iii: *Book IX*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Okasha, E. (1993). *Corpus of early inscribed stones of South-West Britain*. London and New York: Leicester University Press.
- Olander, T. (2009). *Balto-Slavic accentual mobility*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Oldenberg, H. (1909–12). *Rgveda: textkritische und exegetische Noten* (2 vols). Berlin: Weidmann.
- Olsen, B. A. (1988). *The Proto-Indo-European instrument noun suffix \*-tlom and its variants*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- (1999). *The noun in Biblical Armenian: origin and word-formation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Orel, V. (1998). *Albanian etymological dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Osthoff, H., and Brugman, K. (1878). 'Vorwort', in H. Osthoff and K. Brugman, *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen: Erster Theil*. Leipzig: Hirzel, III–XX.
- Paniagua Aguilar, D. (2006). *El panorama literario técnico-científico en Roma (siglos I–II D.C.): «et docere et delectare»*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad.
- Paul, H. (1909). *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (4th edn). Halle: Niemeyer.
- Pedersen, H. (1905a). 'Zur armenischen Sprachgeschichte'. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 38: 194–240.
- (1905b). 'Die Nasalpräsentia und der slavische Akzent'. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 38: 297–421.
- (1906). 'Armenisch und die Nachbarsprachen'. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 39: 334–485.
- (1922). 'Deux étymologies latines'. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 22: 1–12.

- Penney, J. H. W. (1976/7). 'The treatment of Indo-European vowels in Tocharian', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 75: 66–91.
- (1977). 'Weak and strong *i*-verbs in Old Irish'. *Ériu* 28: 149–54.
- (1978). Review of H. Rix, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976). *Classical Review* 28: 290–2.
- (1988a). 'Cities and founders in antiquity', in J. H. W. Penney (ed.), *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford*, 19/2. Special issue on names and their uses to mark the retirement of Godfrey Lienhardt. Oxford: Anthropological Society of Oxford, 170–80.
- (1988b). 'The languages of Italy', in J. Boardman, N. G. L. Hammond, D. M. Lewis, and M. Ostwald (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, iv: Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean, c. 525 to 479 BC (2nd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 720–38.
- (1988c). 'Laryngeals and the Indo-European root', in A. Bammesberger (ed.), *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Heidelberg: Winter, 361–72.
- (1989). 'Preverbs and postpositions in Tocharian'. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 87: 54–74.
- (1999). 'Archaism and innovation in Latin poetic syntax', in J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer (eds), *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 249–68.
- (2002). 'Notes on some Sabellic demonstratives', in I. J. Hartmann and A. Willi (eds), *Oxford University working papers in linguistics, philology and phonetics*, vii. Oxford: University of Oxford, 131–42.
- (2004). 'Tocharian B *päst* and its vocalism', in J. H. W. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European perspectives: studies in honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 514–22.
- (2005). 'Connections in archaic Latin prose', in T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge, and J. N. Adams (eds), *Aspects of the language of Latin prose*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 37–51.
- (2006). 'Writing systems', in E. Bispham, T. Harrison, and B. A. Sparkes (eds), *The Edinburgh companion to ancient Greece and Rome*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 477–84.
- (2009). 'The Etruscan language and its Italic context', in J. Swaddling and P. Perkins (eds), *Etruscan by definition: the cultural, regional and personal identity of the Etruscans. Papers in honour of Sybille Haynes*. London: British Museum Press, 88–94.
- Pert, S., and Letts, C. (2006). 'Codeswitching in Mirpuri-speaking Pakistani heritage preschool children: bilingual language acquisition'. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 10: 349–74.

- Peters, M. (1987). Review of G. de Boel, *Goal accusative and object accusative in Homer: a contribution to the theory of transitivity* (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1988). *Die Sprache* 33: 285–92.
- (1998). ‘Homerisches und Unhomerisches bei Homer und auf dem Nestorbecher’, in J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver (eds), *Mir curad: studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 585–602.
- Petit, D. (2004). *Apophonie et catégories grammaticales dans les langues baltiques*. Leuven and Paris: Peeters.
- Pinault, G.-J. (2005). ‘Analyse étymologique d’un nom de parenté indo-européen’, in G. Schweiger (ed.), *Indogermanica: Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt*. Taimering: Schweiger, 465–86.
- (2007). ‘A star is born: a “new” PIE \*-ter-suffix’, in A. J. Nussbaum (ed.), *Verba docenti: studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and friends*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Beech Stave Press, 271–9.
- Pinkster, H. (1990). *Latin syntax and semantics*. London: Routledge.
- (1995). ‘Word order in the Late Latin *Gesta conlationis Carthaginensis*’, in L. Callebat (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif IV*. Hildesheim: Olms, 549–60.
- Pisani, V. (1950). ‘Studi sulla fonetica dell’armeno’. *Ricerche Linguistiche* 1: 165–93.
- (1966). ‘Armenische Miszellen’. *Die Sprache* 12: 227–36.
- Polivanov, E. D. (1928). ‘Faktory fonetičeskoy evoljucii jazyka, kak trudovogo processa [Factors relating to the phonetic evolution of language as a work process 1]’. *Učenye zapiski instituta jazyka i literatury rossijskoj associacii naučno-issledovatel'skikh institutov obščestvennykh nauk [Scholarly transactions of the Institute of Language and Literature of the Russian association of scientific-research institutes for the social sciences]* (Moscow) 3: 20–42.
- (1974). *Selected works: articles on general linguistics*, ed. A. A. Leont'ev et al. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Powell, J. G. F. (2007). ‘A new text of the *Appendix Probi*’. *Classical Quarterly* 57: 687–700.
- (2010). ‘Hyperbaton and register in Cicero’, in E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds), *Colloquial and literary Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163–85.
- Prendergast, G. L., and Marzollo, B. (1962). *A complete concordance to the Iliad of Homer* (2nd edn). Hildesheim: Olms.
- Prince, A., and Smolensky, P. (2004). *Optimality Theory: constraint interaction in generative grammar*. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Probert, P. (2006). *Ancient Greek accentuation: synchronic patterns, frequency effects, and prehistory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quirk, R. J. (2005). ‘The “Appendix Probi” as a compendium of popular Latin: description and bibliography’. *Classical World* 98: 397–409.
- Radatz, H.-I. (2001). *Die Semantik der Adjektivstellung: eine kognitive Studie zur Konstruktion <Adjektiv + Substantiv> im Spanischen, Französischen und Italienischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Ramat, P. (1981). *Einführung in das Germanische*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Rasmussen, J. E. (1989a). 'On the North Germanic treatment of *euvw*'. *Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi* 104: 1–9.
- (1989b). *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Ravnaes, E. (1991). *The chronology of sound changes from PIE to Classical Armenian* (Diss. Oslo).
- Reichelt, H. (1967). *Awestisches Elementarbuch* (2nd edn). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Renou, L. (1957). *Jacob Wackernagel: Altindische Grammatik. Introduction générale*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1964). *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*, xii. Paris: de Boccard.
- Reynolds, M. (1998). 'Punjabi/Urdu in Sheffield: language maintenance or shift'. Final Report to ESRC on Grant R000221740.
- Rice, C. (1992). 'Binarity and ternarity in metrical theory: parametric extensions' (PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin).
- Riemann, O. (1885). *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live* (2nd edn). Paris: Thorin.
- Ringe, D. (2006a). *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic (A linguistic history of English, i)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2006b). 'A sociolinguistically informed solution to an old historical problem: the Gothic genitive plural'. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 104: 167–206.
- Risch, E. (1974). *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (2nd edn). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- (1975). 'Remarques sur l'accent du grec ancien', in D. Moïnfar (ed.), *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*. Louvain: Peeters, 471–9.
- Risselada, R. (1984). 'Coordination and juxtaposition of adjectives in the Latin NP'. *Glotta* 62: 202–31.
- (1989). 'Latin illocutionary parentheticals', in M. Lavency and D. Longrée (eds), *Proceedings of the Vth Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 367–78.
- (1993). *Imperatives and other directive expressions in Latin: a study in the pragmatics of a dead language*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Rivet, A. L. F., and Smith, C. (1982). *The place names of Roman Britain*. London: Batsford.
- Rix, H. (1966). 'Die lateinische Synkope als historisches und phonologisches Problem'. *Kratylos* 11: 156–65.
- (1992). *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre* (2nd edn). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Rodway, S. (2009). 'What language did St Patrick swear in?'. *Ériu* 59: 139–51.
- Roesch, S. (2004). 'La Politesse dans la correspondance de Cicéron', in L. Nadjo and É. Gavoille (eds), *Epistulae antiquae III: actes du IIIe Colloque international 'L'Épistolaire antique et ses prolongements européens'*. Louvain: Peeters, 139–52.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd edn). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Ross, M. (1997). 'Social networks and kinds of speech-community event', in R. Blench and M. Spriggs (eds), *Archaeology and language*, i: *Theoretical and methodological orientations*. London: Routledge, 209–61.
- (1998). 'Sequencing and dating linguistic events in Oceania: the linguistics/archaeology interface', in R. Blench and M. Spriggs (eds), *Archaeology and language*, ii: *Archaeological data and linguistic hypotheses*. London: Routledge, 141–73.
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1967). *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Russell, P. (1985). 'Recent work in British Latin'. *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 9: 19–29.
- (1988). 'The sounds of a silence: the growth of Cormac's glossary'. *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 15: 1–30.
- (1995). 'Brittonic words in early Irish glossaries', in J. F. Eska, R. G. Gruffydd, and N. Jacobs (eds), *Hispano-Gallo-Brittonica: essays in honour of Professor D. Ellis Evans on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 166–82.
- (1996). 'Dúil Dromma Cetta and Cormac's glossary'. *Études Celtiques* 32: 147–74.
- (2003). 'Rouynniauc, Rhufoniog: the orthography and phonology of /u/ in early Welsh', in P. Russell (ed.), *Yr Hen Iaith: studies in early Welsh*. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 25–47.
- (2005a). 'Quasi: bridging the etymological gap in early Irish glossaries', in B. Smelik, R. Hofman, C. Hamans, and D. Cram (eds), *A companion in linguistics: a Festschrift for Anders Ahlqvist on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*. Nijmegen: Draak, 49–62.
- (2005b). '"What was best of every language": the early history of the Irish language', in D. Ó Cróinín (ed.), *A new history of Ireland*, i. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 405–50.
- (2008). 'Read it in a glossary': *glossaries and learned discourse in medieval Ireland*. Cambridge: Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic.
- Sadanand, K., and Vijayakrishnan, K. G. (1995). 'High tone in Punjabi: a case of deaspiration and tonogenesis'. Paper presented at the Seventeenth conference of the South Asian Linguistics Association, Austin, Texas.
- Saifullah Khan, V. (1977). 'The Pakistanis: Mirpuri villagers at home and in Bradford', in J. Watson (ed.), *Between two cultures: migrants and minorities in Britain*. Oxford: Blackwell, 57–89.
- Saloni, A. H. (1920). *Vitae Patrum: kritische Untersuchungen über Text, Syntax und Wortschatz der spätlateinischen Vitae Patrum* (B. III, V, VI, VII). Lund: Gleerup.
- Sammon, J. W., Jr (1969). 'A nonlinear mapping for data structure analysis'. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 18: 401–9.
- Sampat, K. S. (1964). 'Tonal structure of Majhi'. *Indian Linguistics* 25: 108–10.
- Samuels, M. (1972). *Linguistic evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sandhu, B. S. (1968). *The tonal system of the Panjabi language*. Patiala: Punjabi University.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: an introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Saussure, F. de (1955). *Cours de linguistique générale* (5th edn). Paris: Payot [1st edn, Lausanne and Paris, 1916].
- Scarlata, S. (1999). *Die Wurzelkomposita im Rg-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schindler, J. (1966). 'Hethitisch *lišši-* "Leber"'. *Die Sprache* 12: 77–8.
- (1969). 'Die idg. Wörter für "Vogel" und "Ei"'. *Die Sprache* 15: 144–67.
- (1977). 'Notizen zum Sieversschen Gesetz'. *Die Sprache* 23: 56–65.
- Schmid, W. P. (1986). 'Bemerkungen zur äolischen Konjugation der verba contracta', in A. Etter (ed.), *o-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 245–52.
- Schmitt, R. (1981). *Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft [2nd edn., 2007].
- (1996). 'Some remarks on Armenian *nēr* "sister-in-law, brother's wife"'. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 17: 21–4.
- Schneider, G. (1973). *Zum Begriff des Lautgesetzes in der Sprachwissenschaft seit den Junggrammatikern*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Schrijver, P. (1991). *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- (1995). *Studies in British Celtic historical phonology*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- (1998). 'The British word for "fox" and its Indo-European origin'. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26: 421–34.
- (2011). 'Old British', in E. Ternes (ed.), *Brythonic Celtic – Britannisches Keltisch. From Medieval British to Modern Breton*. Bremen: Hempen, 1–84.
- Schrödinger, E. (1929). 'Was ist ein Naturgesetz?'. *Die Naturwissenschaften* 17: 9–11.
- Schuchardt, H. (1885). *Ueber die Lautgesetze – Gegen die Junggrammatiker*. Berlin: Oppenheim.
- Schumacher, S. (2004). *Die keltischen Primärverben: ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Schwyzer, E. (1939). *Griechische Grammatik*, i: *Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Munich: Beck.
- and Debrunner, A. (1950). *Griechische Grammatik*, ii: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. Munich: Beck.
- Seibold, E. (1972). *Das System der indogermanischen Halbvokale*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- (1984). *Das System der Personalpronomina in den frühgermanischen Sprachen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Selkirk, E. (1984). *Phonology and syntax: the relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Siegel, J. (1988). 'Introduction', in Barz and Siegel (1988), 1–19.

- Sievers, E. (1878). 'Zur Accent- und Lautlehre der germanischen Sprachen'. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 5: 63–163.
- Sihler, A. L. (1969). 'Sievers-Edgerton phenomena and Rigvedic meter'. *Language* 45: 248–73.
- (1971). 'Word-initial semivowel alternation in the Rigveda'. *Language* 47: 53–78.
- (1995). *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2006). *Edgerton's Law: the phantom evidence*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Sims-Williams, P. (2003). *The Celtic inscriptions of Britain: phonology and chronology, c. 400–1200*. Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Smith, C. (1983). 'Vulgar Latin in Roman Britain: epigraphic and other evidence', in H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, pt 2, vol. 29.2. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 893–948.
- Solmsen, F. (1907). 'Vordorisches in Lakonien'. *Rheinisches Museum* 62: 329–38.
- Solta, G. R. (1960). *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vienna: Mechitharisten-Buchdruckerei.
- (1963). 'Die armenische Sprache', in G. Deeters, G. R. Solta, V. Inglisian, and B. Spuler (eds), *Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und der Mittlere Osten*, vii: *Armenisch und kaukasische Sprachen*. Leiden: Brill, 80–128.
- Sommer, F. (1948). *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre: eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Lateins* (2nd edn). Heidelberg: Winter.
- and Pfister, R. (1977). *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre: eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Lateins* (4th edn). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (1973). *The sound pattern of Ancient Greek*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Southern, M. R. (2002[2006]). 'Grain, the staff of life: Indo-European \*(h₂)yeu̯-os'. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 62: 173–217.
- Spevak, O. (2010a). *Constituent order in classical Latin prose*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- (2010b). 'Le Syntagme nominal en latin: les travaux des trente dernières années', in O. Spevak (ed.), *Le Syntagme nominal en latin: nouvelles contributions*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 23–40.
- Stearns, M., Jr (1978). *Crimean Gothic: analysis and etymology of the corpus*. Saratoga: Anma Libri.
- Stiles, P. V. (1985–6). 'The fate of the numeral "4" in Germanic'. *North-Western European Language Evolution* 6: 81–104; 7: 3–27; 8: 3–25.
- Stockert, W. (1983). *T. Maccius Plautus: Aulularia*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Stokes, W. (ed.) (1862). *Three Irish glossaries*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- (ed.) (1892). 'The Bodleian Dindshenchas'. *Folklore* 3: 467–516.
- (ed.) (1893). 'The Edinburgh Dindshenchas'. *Folklore* 4: 471–97.
- (ed.) (1894–5). 'The prose tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas'. *Revue Celtique* 15: 272–336, 418–84; 16: 31–83, 135–67, 269–312.

- Stokes, W. (ed.) (1900). ‘O’Mulconry’s Glossary’. *Archiv für Celtische Lexikographie* 1: 232–324.

— and Strachan, J. (eds) (1901–3). *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus: a collection of Old-Irish glosses, scholia, prose, and verse* (2 vols). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strunk, K. (1960). ‘Der böötische Imperativ δέσοι’. *Glotta* 39: 114–23.

— (1967). *Nasalpräsentien und Aoriste: ein Beitrag zur Morphologie des Verbums im Indo-Iranischen und Griechischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Stuart-Smith, J. (2004). *Phonetics and philology: sound change in Italic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Svennung, J. (1935). *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Szemerényi, O. J. L. (1968). ‘The development *s* > *h* in Indo-European languages’. *Die Sprache* 14: 161–3.

— (1996). *Introduction to Indo-European linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Teodorsson, S.-T. (1977). *The phonology of Ptolemaic koine*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Terkourafi, M. (2002). ‘Politeness and formulaicity’. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 3: 179–201.

— (2004). ‘Testing Brown and Levinson’s theory in a corpus of spontaneous conversational data from Cypriot Greek’. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168: 119–34.

— (2005). ‘An argument for a frame-based approach to politeness: evidence from the use of the imperative in Cypriot Greek’, in R. Lakoff and I. Sachiko (eds), *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 99–116.

— (2008). ‘Toward a unified theory of politeness, impoliteness, and rudeness’, in D. Bousfield and M. Locher (eds), *Impoliteness in language: studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 45–74.

— (forthcoming). *From politeness to impoliteness: the frame-based approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, R. J. E. (2008). ‘Mycenaean non-assibilations and its significance for the prehistory of the Greek dialects’, in A. Sacconi, M. Del Freo, L. Godart, and M. Negri (eds), *Colloquium Romanum: atti del XII Colloquio internazionale di micenologia*, ii. Pisa and Rome: Serra, 753–65.

Thumb, A., and Kieckers, E. (1932). *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte: erster Teil* (2nd edn). Heidelberg: Winter.

— and Scherer, A. (1959). *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte: zweiter Teil* (2nd edn). Heidelberg: Winter.

Tobler, L. (1879). ‘Über die Anwendung des Begriffs von Gesetzen auf die Sprache’. *Vierteljahrsschrift für Wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 3: 30–52.

Tremblay, X. (2003). *La Déclinaison des noms de parenté indo-européens en -ter-*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Trnka, B. (1896). *Amsterdam: Diachrony of native speech*. London: Uhlich, J. (1970). *neutral varieties*. Väänänen, V. (1996). *York: Scottish English*. Venables, V. (1996). *London: in A. L. Verma, M. (eds), Enigma, 1996*. — (2006). *forschung*. Volkart, M. (1996). *wissenschaft*. Vollgraff, V. (1996). *171–2000*. Von der Malsburg, W. (1996). *Wackernagel: Sprachforschung*. — (1895). *Sprachforschung*. — (1896). *Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg: Rektorat*. — (1905). *Göttingen: Universität*.

- Trnka, B. (1982). *Selected papers in structural linguistics*. Berlin, New York, and Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Trudgill, P. (1983). *On dialect: social and geographical perspectives*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- (2003). 'Linguistic changes in pan-world English', in C. Tschichold (ed.), *English core linguistics: essays in honour of David Allerton*. Berne: Lang, 55–68.
- and Gordon, E. (2006). 'Predicting the past. Dialect archaeology and Australian English rhoticity'. *English World-Wide* 27: 235–46.
- Lewis, G., and Maclagan, M. (2000). 'The role of drift in the formation of native-speaker southern hemisphere Englishes: some New Zealand evidence'. *Diachronica* 17: 111–38.
- Uhlich, J. (1995). 'On the fate of intervocalic \*-w- in Old Irish, especially between neutral vowels'. *Ériu* 46: 11–48.
- Väänänen, V. (1981). *Introduction au latin vulgaire* (3rd edn). Paris: Klincksieck.
- Venables, W. N., and Ripley, B. D. (1992). *Modern applied statistics with S-PLUS*. New York: Springer.
- Verma, M. (1995). 'Ethnic minority languages in Scotland: a sociolinguistic appraisal'. *Scottish Language* 14/15: 118–33.
- Vincent, N. (1988). 'Latin', in M. Harris and N. Vincent (eds), *The Romance languages*. London: Routledge, 26–78.
- (2007). 'Learned vs popular syntax: adjective placement in early Italian vernaculars', in A. L. Lepchy and A. Tosi (eds), *Languages of Italy: histories and dictionaries*. Ravenna: Longo, 55–75.
- Vine, B. (1999). 'On "Cowgill's Law" in Greek', in H. C. Luschützky and H. Eichner (eds), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Prague: Enigma, 555–600.
- (2006). 'On "Thurneysen-Havet's Law" in Latin and Italic'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 119: 211–49.
- Volkart, M. (1994). *Zu Brugmanns Gesetz im Altindischen*. Berne: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Bern.
- Vollgraff, W. (1909). 'Inscriptions d'Argos'. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 33: 171–200.
- Von der Muehll, P. (ed.) (1962). *Homeri Odyssea*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Wackernagel, J. (1877). 'Der griechische Verbalaccent'. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 23: 457–70.
- (1895). 'Miszellen zur griechischen Grammatik'. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 33: 1–62.
- (1896). *Altindische Grammatik*, i: *Lautlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1897). 'Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde'. *Programm zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel*, 3–62.
- (1905). *Altindische Grammatik*, ii.1: *Einleitung zur Wortlehre, Nominalkomposition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Wackernagel, J. (1914). 'Akzentstudien III: Zum homerischen Akzent'. *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 97–130.
- (1926). *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, i (2nd edn). Basle: Birkhäuser.
- Watkins, C. (1969). *Indogermanische Grammatik*, iii: *Formenlehre, Erster Teil: Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- (1976). 'Observations on the "Nestor's Cup" inscription'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80: 25–40.
- (1992). 'The comparison of formulaic sequences', in E. C. Polomé and W. Winter (eds), *Reconstructing languages and cultures*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 391–418.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weinreich, U., Labov, W., and Herzog, M. I. (1968). 'Empirical foundations of a theory of language change', in W. P. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel (eds), *Directions for historical linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 95–195.
- Weitenberg, J. J. (1986). 'Additional *h*-, initial *y*- and Indo-European \**y*- in Armenian', in M. Leroy and F. Mawet (eds), *La Place de l'arménien dans les langues indo-européennes*. Leuven: Peeters, 90–101.
- (1997). 'The prepositional group *i y*- and the orthography of gospel manuscript M (Matenadaran 6200)'. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 18: 39–50.
- Wells, C., and Roach, P. (1980). 'An experimental investigation of some aspects of tone in Panjabi'. *Journal of Phonetics* 8: 85–9.
- Wells, J. C. (1982). *Accents of English*, ii: *The British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, M. L. (1978). *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (ed.) (1998–2000). *Homeri Ilias* (2 vols). Stuttgart: Teubner (vol. i), Munich and Leipzig: Saur (vol. ii).
- (2007). *Indo-European poetry and myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whitney, W. D. (1881). *Index verborum to the published text of the Atharva-Veda*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Wijk, N. van (1939). 'L'Étude diachronique des phénomènes phonologiques et extra-phonologiques'. *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 8: 297–318.
- Willi, A. (2003). 'καί – mykenisch oder nachmykenisch?'. *Glotta* 79: 224–48.
- (2008). *Sikelismos: Sprache, Literatur und Gesellschaft im griechischen Sizilien* (8.–5. Jh. v. Chr.). Basle: Schwabe.
- Winter, W. (ed.) (1965a). *Evidence for laryngeals*. London, The Hague, and Paris: Mouton.
- (1965b). 'Armenian evidence', in Winter (1965a), 100–15.
- (1965c). 'Tocharian evidence', in Winter (1965a), 190–212.
- (1999). 'Consonant harmony in Armenian', in E. C. Polomé and C. F. Justus (eds), *Language change and typological variation: in honor of Winfred P. Lehmann on the occasion of his 83rd birthday*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 313–19.

- Winters, M. E. (1984). 'Steps toward the Romance passive inferrable from the *Itinerarium Egeriae*'. *Romance Philology* 37: 445–54.
- (1997). 'Kuryłowicz, analogical change, and cognitive grammar'. *Cognitive Linguistics* 8: 359–86.
- Wodtko, D. S., Irslinger, B., and Schneider, C. (2008). *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Zehnder, T. (1999). *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Idstein: Schulz-Kirschner.
- Zilsel, E. (1941). 'Physics and the problem of historicico-sociological laws'. *Philosophy of Science* 8: 567–79.
- (1942). 'The genesis of the concept of physical law'. *Philosophical Review* 51: 245–79.
- Zubatý, J. (1892). 'Die ursprachliche tenuis aspirata dentalis im ärischen, griechischen und latein'. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 31: 1–9.