

# DIALECTOLOGY / DIALECTOLOGIE

## INDO-EUROPEAN DIALECTOLOGY DIALECTOLOGIE INDO-EUROPEENNE

### “RIGHT”, “LEFT” AND “NAKED” IN PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN

#### 1. “Right”.

1.1. The forms for “right” can be most conveniently found in BUCK (1949: 864-865). I recapitulate the most relevant words. (I give the forms with *\*-no-* first, then those with *\*-wo-*, then *\*-tero-* and others. I add the words for “left” [BUCK 1949: *ibid.*]; the 2nd-4th columns give etymologically related words, the last ones other forms).

Skt.	<i>dakṣiná-</i>	<i>savyá-</i>				
Av.	<i>dašina-</i>	<i>haoya-</i>			<i>vairyastāra-</i>	
Lith.	<i>dėšinas, -ỹs</i>				<i>kaūr(i)as, -ūs</i>	
OCS	<i>desnŭ</i>	<i>šujŭ</i>	<i>lěvŭ</i>			
Gr.	δεξιμός		λαίος	σκαίος	ἀριστερός	εὐώνυμος
OIr.	<i>dess</i>				<i>clé</i>	<i>túath</i>
W.	<i>deheu</i>	<i>aswy</i>			<i>cledd</i>	<i>chwith</i>
Gall.	<i>Dexsiva</i>					
Goth.	<i>taihswa</i>				<i>hleiduma</i>	
OHG	<i>zěso</i>				<i>winistar</i>	
Gr.	δεξιτερός					
Lat.	<i>dexter</i>	<i>laevus</i>	<i>scaevus</i>	<i>sinister</i>		
OU	<i>destr-</i>					
Alb.	<i>djathë</i>				<i>majtë</i>	
Toch.	A <i>pāci</i> / B <i>saiwai</i> <sup>1</sup>				A <i>šālyi</i> / B <i>šwālyai</i>	
Luw.					<i>ipala/i-</i>	

1.2. I give some additional comments to BUCK. — The Slavic form did not have *-inŭ*<sup>2</sup>. The constant notation without *-ŭ-* in all OCS manuscripts proves this. The forms in the non-Slavic languages are no argument for an original *-i-* in Slavic, as we shall see.

<sup>1</sup> The Tocharian B forms in *-ai* are adverbs.

<sup>2</sup> SADNIK - AITZETMÜLLER (1955: Nr. 141) still refer to VAN WIJK (1916), who thought this.

Greek shows *-w-* in Pamphylian and in Myc. *de-ki-si-wo*.

OIr. *dess* < \**dek'swos*. W. *deheu*, C. *dughow*, B. *dehou* point to PBrit. \**dehow*. This form is usually derived from (PIE?) \**dek'souos* (*-euos* is also possible), but this seems very improbable to me, as no other language has an ablaut form of \**-uo-* here. One would like to derive it from \**-iuo-*, but this seems to give W. *-yw*. COWGILL (1985: 22-24) argues that *-uw-* gave *-ow-* in PBrit. (and not *-iw-* as traditionally assumed). Unstressed *-iw-* might give *-uw-* (see below; cf. W. *mwyar* < \**miyaros*, where the *-i-* > [ə] was influenced by the *-m-*), but in our form *-iw-* was stressed. A SIEVERS form \**dek'suwos* is perhaps possible but does not seem probable to me.

1.3. For Latin LEUMANN (1977: 95) assumes that Lat. *dexter* derives from \**déxiteros* through syncope. ERNOUT - MEILLET (1959: 171) state that there is no reason to assume that an *-i-* was lost in this form. The following consideration makes me believe that the latter view is correct. The form *dextr-um*, etc. (besides *-ter-um*, etc. with restored vowel; the question in which forms the vowel was retained is irrelevant here) shows that the vowel of the suffix was syncopated, and as forms with syncope of TWO (consecutive) vowels are unknown, it is improbable that our form lost an *-i-*<sup>3</sup>. For the Osco-Umbrian forms of the type *destr-* the same holds true; thus MEISER (1986: 41, 169) reconstructs Proto-Sabelian \**dekstero-*. (*alter* < \**aliteros* [LEUMANN 1977: 96-97] is no parallel for *dexter* < \**deksiteros*, as we have, here too, to start from a form without *-i-*; thus ERNOUT - MEILLET [1959: 22]. Cf. Osc. *altram* where we would otherwise have to assume syncope of both *-i-* and *-e-*. The adverb *aliter* cannot prove an old *-i-* for *alter*, as *alter* shows that the *i* would have been syncopated.) The fact that we would have to accept double syncope in both Latin and Osco-Umbrian makes it very doubtful to my mind that a form \**deksiteros* is possible. Thus it seems more probable that Italic did not have an *-i-*. Note that Greek δεξιτερός does not make it necessary to assume an *-i-*; see below.

1.4. Alb. *djathë* was recently discussed by HULD (1984: 53, 149) and KORTLANDT (1987: 221). *-të* is a recent suffix (see HULD), and *-tht-* cannot reflect \**-kst-* as this gave *-sht-*. HULD reconstructs \**dek'sio-*, but such a form is not known from the related languages. KORTLANDT suggests that in \**dek'sn-* the \**-s-* was lost before *-n-*, as usual (later \**k'*

<sup>3</sup> To my knowledge, only SCHRIJVER (1991: 279) assumes that *nūndinus* derives from \**novenodino-*. But this form is doubtful. (According to his own rules on p. 273, the form would give \**neunodno-*.) It seems easier to start from \**neuno-din-o-*. For \**neuno-*, cf. *neuna* (LEUMANN 1977: 70-71; MEISER 1986: 37). The word *nūndinus* is very old, and \**novenos* is young, based on *novem*.

resulted normally in *th*). \**djathnë* was then replaced by *djathtë*, after *majtë* "left". Thus Albanian would have the same form as Slavic, as is often the case.

For the explanation of the various forms we find, it may be useful to look at words for "left" first.

## 2. "Left".

There are four words that are found in more than one language or group.

OIr. *clé* (W. *cledd*, both from \**kleio-*), Goth. *hleiduma* derive from a root \**k'lei-*. Whether Lat. *clivis*, which we find used in the meaning "unfavourable", itself meant "left" is uncertain.

Lat. *laevus*, etc. must be \**h<sub>2</sub>ei-uo-* (SCHRIJVER 1991: 203). — Lat. *scaevus* and Greek *σκαίός* constitute another group.

There is a form \**seuio-* (W. \**ad-seuio-*) which has a remarkable distribution. In Slavic it is found in OCS *šujǐ*, Slov. *šûj*, Ukr. adv. *šújbič*. This may mean that this form, being found only in marginal areas, is an archaism and represents the oldest, PIE form. The fact that the word has no etymology and therefore can hardly result from independent innovations, seems to confirm this.

There is some overlap between these forms. Thus Greek has *σκαίός* and *λαίός*. The latter is rare (not in Homer), and probably Doric. *Σκαίός* is found in the *Iliad*; later it is used mainly as "awkward, clumsy, stupid". Already in Homer the normal word is *ἄριστερός* (*εὐώνυμος*, which first is used in its literal meaning "with good name", is a euphemism originating in religious context; it died out)<sup>4</sup>. So both words are archaic, but we cannot see what the relation between them was. Latin too has both *scaevus* and *laevus*. The first is rare; it means "left" in combination with *iter*, elsewhere it is "awkward", etc. and "unfavourable". It would seem to me that *scaevus* is older. Both words were replaced by *sinister*. In Slavic the cognates of OCS *lěvŭ* are the normal word, *šujǐ* is more limited. So probably the latter was replaced by *lěvŭ*. This confirms the conclusion reached above that \**seuio-* is the oldest word. Still the question remains how the *scaevus* and *laevus* words for "left" originated. Areal innovations seem improbable as Greek and Latin (and Slavic) do not have much in common. Thus the meaning of both words, which must have been inherited from PIE, must have been such that they could easily come to be used for "left". The gloss (Servius) *laevi (boves) quorum cornua ad terram spectant* might mean that *laevus* originally meant "crooked".

<sup>4</sup> See CHANTRAINE (1956).

## 3. "Right" once again.

We have:

* <i>dek's-uo-</i>	Celt., Germ.	* <i>dek'si-uo-</i>	Greek, Celt.
* <i>dek's-no-</i>	Slavic, Alb. (?)	* <i>dek'si-no-</i>	Indo-Ir., Baltic
* <i>dek's-tero-</i> (?)	Italic (?)	* <i>dek'si-tero-</i>	Greek.

The problem of the presence vs. absence of *-i-*, which is all the more acute as both forms are found within separate subgroups (Balto-Slavic, Celtic), is not accounted for in the modern literature. Thus ERNOUT - MEILLET (1959: 171) state: "l'*i* [...] n'est ici, comme en bien d'autres cas, qu'un élargissement sans valeur organique". The modern etymological dictionaries do not give an explanation, nor did POKORNY (1959: 190). It seemed to me that the solution was very simple, i.e. that the forms in *-i-* were derived from an adverb \**dek'si* "at the right side". Then I saw that this conclusion had been drawn long ago. It is given by BRUGMANN (1906: 270-271); probably also HIRT (1927: 187); it is also found in PORZIG (1953: 132, 166); cf. WACKERNAGEL - DEBRUNNER (1954: 817). — As possible (and to my mind probable) parallels are given \**medhios* from \**medhi*, \**neuos*/\**neuios* from \**neu*/\**neui* (to which \**nu* belongs). MAYRHOFER (1986-94: I, 690) mentions it with a question mark. (He is right in rejecting the explanation as a CALAND suffix: it is clear that a CALAND suffix has nothing to do with the formation of "right" and that it is something quite different.)

It is then assumed that there was an adverb \**dek's(i)* from which all forms were derived. This seems quite possible to me. Cf. Gr.  $\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\zeta$  < \**-es* vs. Lat. *heri* < \**-esi*. As to the PIE adjective, I see three possibilities: (a) either \**-no-* or \**-wo-* made the adjective; (b) they existed both already in PIE, side by side; (c) there was no adjective in PIE.

*Ad (a/1)*. If \**-no-* was the PIE form, \**-wo-* could have been taken from "left". However, it is not certain that this word had \**-wo-*: Celtic and Germanic, which have \**-wo-* for "right", do not have it for "left"; of course they may have had it in an earlier word for "left". — *Ad (a/2)*. If the PIE word had \**-wo-*, \**-no-* may have been a common innovation of the satem languages. I do not see, however, what the reason could have been for this change.

*Ad (b)*. If both words existed side by side in PIE, there will have been a difference in meaning, which we cannot reconstruct.

*Ad (c)*. If there was no adjective but only the adverb \**dek's(i)*, each language (group) created its own adjective. Then we must explain, I think, why mostly \**-no-* and \**-wo-* were used. One might think that these were the right suffixes to make this adjective. Also it seems that \**-uo-* and \**-no-* are used in identical or comparable formations. Thus

both make colour adjectives, and both make verbal adjectives. Compare further *\*oinos* (Lat. *ūnus*) beside *\*oiuos* (Gr. οἶος), also Lat. *clīnus*: *clīvus* (see ERNOUT - MEILLET 1959: 127-128).

I think that (a/2) is the most probable solution: PIE had *\*-wo-*, and the satem languages replaced it with *\*-no-*, for whatsoever reason.

The existence of forms in *\*-tero-* is not problematic<sup>5</sup>.

#### 4. “Naked”.

4.1. The word for “naked” still shows some problems. Gr. γυμνός may be the most difficult form. The last attempt was COWGILL’s (1956: 156), who assumed *\*nog<sup>w</sup>nos* > *\*nug<sup>w</sup>nos* > *\*nugnos* > *\*mugnos* (as in Av. *maγna-*) > *\*gumnos*. This explanation has been rightly rejected; the metathesis in the last phase is improbable. — The problem can be located very exactly. There can be no doubt about the proto-form: an adjective in *\*-no-*, from a root *\*nog<sup>w</sup>-*. (Most languages have *o*-grade, only Hittite has *-e-*, and probably Arm. *merk*. MAYRHOFER [1986-94: II,5] seems to assume *e*-grade for Indo-Iranian, which is of course possible, but *-o-* is better represented. For Greek we need *-o-* to explain the υ.) There are two problems: the *g-* and the *-m-*; further problems provide the glosses that show divergent forms.

As to the question of the initial *g-*, I saw only one possibility, i.e. to assume that *\*nog<sup>w</sup>-* was assimilated to *\*g<sup>(w)</sup>og<sup>w</sup>-* (the labial feature would have been lost before the *-u-*). This is not indeed an evident development, but there seems to be no other way (unless we would adduce influence of a related form, but no such form has been found). KORTLANDT points out to me that it is easier to assume the following sequence. Before *-n-* the (labio)velar was pronounced as a velar nasal *ŋ<sup>w</sup>* (cf. LEJEUNE [1972: 78] on γίγνομαι). KORTLANDT thinks that there was an assimilation of *\*noŋ<sup>w</sup>no-* to *\*ŋoŋ<sup>w</sup>no-*. Later this *ŋ-* became *g-*. — I saw later that GRAMMONT (1909: 372-373) also used the realisation [ŋ] (he writes *ñ*). He assumed that in *\*nuŋ-* metathesis occurred to *\*ñun-*, “et dans ce déplacement il [i.e. the *ŋ*] perd naturellement sa qualité de nasale qu’il ne devait qu’à son contact avec le *μ* suivant [GRAMMONT started from a suffix *\*-mo-*], parce qu’un *ñ* n’est pas possible en grec devant une voyelle [...]”. I find metathesis less likely than assimilation to *ŋ* — *ŋ* as assumed here.

The problem of the *-m-*. A development of *-g<sup>w</sup>n-* to *-mn-* is well known. Also the development of *-o-* to *-u-* is known. But there is the

<sup>5</sup> It may be interesting to consider the situation in Dutch. Here we have *recht*, *rechts*, *rechter* and *link*, *links*, *linker* beside the adverbs *rechts* and *links*. Of the adjectives the first ones are disappearing, the second ones are (based on) the adverb. The third ones are old datives; they are the most frequent.

problem that *-o-* plus labiovelar became *-u-* plus velar as is shown by  $\nu\kappa\tau < *nok^wt$ - “night” (e.g., FRISK 1960-72: II, 327-328). This means that no *-m-* could have arisen in this way. I see four possibilities to explain the *-m-*.

(a) I considered the possibility that the labiovelar became *-m-* before the development  $o > u$ . This would mean that the development of  $-g^wn- > -mn-$  did not go through a phase *-bn-*, as is generally assumed (LEJEUNE 1972: 78; RIX 1976: 94). Phonetically, there is no necessity to assume intermediate *b*. All examples of the supposed development concern  $-g^wn-$ ; there are no instances of old *-bn-* (*-b-* being rare in PIE). LEJEUNE remarks that there are not instances in Mycenaean, where he expects the labiovelar to be preserved, as the development to labial is post-Mycenaean. However, if the development did not go through a labial, this argument does not hold. If the development of the labiovelar to *-m-* preceded  $o > u$ , I would expect *-umn-* in Mycenaean in this form, as the latter development had occurred already in Mycenaean, cf. *onuk-* “nail”. I feel not convinced that this is the right solution.

(b) A very simple solution would be to assume a PIE suffix *\*-mo-*, i.e. *\*nog<sup>w</sup>mo-*. This was assumed by GRAMMONT (1909, see above). He further supposed metathesis of *-nm-* to *-mn-*: “le groupe  $-\nu\mu-$  que le grec ne connaît pas et par suite ne peut pas conserver”. The price to be paid is that we have to assume a separate suffix for PIE. One would prefer another solution.

(c) One might assume that *\*nog<sup>w</sup>no-* was dissimilated to *\*nog<sup>w</sup>mo-*. This dissimilation would have been supported by the assimilation to the preceding labiovelar which it created. Note that for Av. *magna-* a dissimilation but in the reverse direction must be assumed. The *m-* of Arm. *merk* must have the same origin. This explanation seems quite unproblematic, but I would like to suggest still another one.

(d) One might assume that, when *\*-u $\eta$ <sup>w</sup>n-* lost its labial feature (after the *-u-*), the labiality was transferred to the following *-n-*, giving *\*-u $\eta$ m-*. In one or another way, the *-m-* may be explained. Combining this with the preceding, we get a form *\* $\eta$ u $\eta$ mos*.

We shall now first look at the various glosses. There are several variants (CHANTRAINE 1968-80: I, 242):  $\lambda\upsilon\mu\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (=  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ : Κύπριοι),  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\iota\mu\omicron\nu$  (=  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ ). As they are all from Hesychius, they may be unreliable. As all known Greek dialects have  $\gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ , one wonders where all these variants might have been found. However, one might better try to explain them. If we put the (essential part of the) forms together, we have:

	γυμν-	< γυμν-	< γυμν-	< * <i>gunm-</i>
1	λυμν-	< νυμν-	< νυμν-	< * <i>nunm-</i>
2	λυγ(μ)-	< νυγ(μ)-	< νυγ(μ)-	< * <i>nuym-</i>
3	νοιμ-	< ν...μ-	< νυγμ-	< ...

The first gloss (1) is easily explained from a dissimilation. In the second gloss we are not quite certain about the μ, as this could have been taken from the suffix -μα(τ)-. A form with μ, however, is confirmed by the third gloss. — The vocalism of the third gloss is difficult. It cannot be a misspelling for \*νογμ-, as we would expect β < g<sup>w</sup> after ο. If we start from \*νυγμος, we might think that -οι- represents -ī- and envisage \*νυγμος [nuymos] > [niymos] > [nīmos], cf. γίγνομαι > γίνομαι (LEJEUNE 1972: 78). Thus the reconstruction for the third gloss would be the same as that for the second.

Above we reconstructed a stage \**nyymos*. I assume that not only γυμνός but also the glosses (1, and 2 = 3) derive from this form. First there was rephonemicisation of \*η- as γ- or ν-. Then \**gunmos* became \**gunmos* > γυμνός. In the other case \**nuymos* > \**nunmos* > \*νυμμος. Dissimilation of *n-* to *l-* further explains glosses 2 and 3. In this way it seems possible to account for all forms by simple developments. (If one or more of the glosses would be non-existing forms, this does not, of course, detract from the explanation of γυμνός.)

4.2. Skt. *nagná-* will be \**nog<sup>w</sup>no-* though it could be \**neg<sup>w</sup>no-* (see above). Avestan has *maγna-*, which is continued in Middle Iranian forms with *b-*. OIr. *nocht*, W. *noeth* point to \**nog<sup>w</sup>-to-*. Both the long vowel and the acute accent of Lith. *núogas*, OCS *nagŭ* are now explained by the WINTER - KORTLANDT law (cf. Lith. *nāgas* “nail”, *noga* “foot” with short vowel and circumflex before an old aspirate). Lat. *nūdus* is now explained as \**nog<sup>w</sup>odho-* (SCHRIJVER 1991: 274-275). Arm. *merk* will be from \**neg<sup>w</sup>ro-* in the first instance (see further below). For Hitt. *neku-mant-* I refer to TISCHLER’s discussion in his dictionary (1991: 307-309).

4.3. The Germanic forms are more complicated. OIc. *nøkkviðr* is just the regular participle of the verb *nøkkva*. Further we find forms in a dental beside such in a nasal:

Gothic		<i>naqaps</i> (- <i>d-</i> )	
OIc.	Run.	<i>nAkdan</i>	<i>nakinn</i>
OE		<i>nacod</i> , - <i>ud</i>	
OFr.		<i>nakad</i>	<i>naken</i> ; <i>nakend</i>
MDu.		<i>nāket</i> , <i>naect</i>	<i>naken<sup>6</sup></i> ; <i>nakent</i>

<sup>6</sup> MDu. *naken* is West Flemish.

MLG	<i>nāket</i>	<i>nāken; nākent</i>
O/MHG	O. <i>na(c)kot, nahhut</i>	<i>nacken; nackend/t.</i>

The forms with the nasal are probably *no*-adjectives reshaped into a participle (Oic. *-k-* instead of *-kv-* proves that; POKORNY 1959: 769). (The added dental is no doubt secondary, under the influence of the present participle.) The other forms have *\*-odh-*. The Runic form is said to have had *\*-id-* but it can as well have been *\*-ad-* (SCHRIJVER 1991: 274). OE and OHG have *-ud-* from *\*-ad-* followed by *\*-u-* (BRUNNER 1965: 32, 44, 5). BOUTKAN points out to me that this proves that the suffix was originally athematic, the *\*-u-* being found in the acc. sg. *\*-um*.

4.4. We shall consider now the question of the PIE situation. I note that there is no need whatever to assume tabuistic deformations. We have:

<i>*nog<sup>w</sup>-o-</i>	Balto-Slavic
<i>*nog<sup>w</sup>-no-</i>	Indo-Iranian, Greek, Germanic <sup>7</sup>
<i>*nog<sup>w</sup>-odh-</i>	Latin, Germanic
<i>*nog<sup>w</sup>-to-</i>	Celtic
<i>*neg<sup>w</sup>-(no-?)</i>	Hittite, Armenian.

As to the Arm. *merk*, it could have had *\*-ro-*, but this may have developed from *\*-no-*. Note that there is not much reason to “adapt” the Armenian preform to the others (by assuming *\*-no-*), as it has a different root shape<sup>7</sup>. The same holds for Hittite.

One might think that *\*-no-* is an old form, and that Celtic replaced this suffix by *\*-to-*. But it would not be surprising if closely related languages came to choose the same suffix independently.

The two forms in Germanic are surprising. That with the suffix *\*-odh-* is found also in Latin. This is remarkable as the suffix is not known from elsewhere. Also a common Germanic-Italic innovation is improbable<sup>8</sup>.

One might consider the possibility that PIE had two (or more) forms, just as Germanic had (and has). One would think in that case of *\*-no-* and *\*-odh-*, the latter because it is hard to explain in the languages where it is found. But that would leave *\*nog<sup>w</sup>-o-*, for I find it hard to assume that this was dissimilated from the form in *\*-no-*.

As this seems not the right way, it is most probable that PIE had a consonant stem. This now also enables us to incorporate *\*neg<sup>w</sup>-*, by assuming a static *\*nog<sup>w</sup>-s*, gen. *\*neg<sup>w</sup>-s* (cf. BEEKES 1990: 239). The fact that the nominative and the accusative had *-o-* explains why this vocalism is most often found.

<sup>7</sup> GRAMMONT (1909) points to Av. *tiyra-* besides Skt. *tigmā-*.

<sup>8</sup> Both KORTLANDT and LUBOTSKY suggest that it was a compound *\*nog<sup>w</sup>o-dhh<sub>1</sub>-o-*.



## REFERENCES

- BEEKES, Robert S.P. 1990. *Vergelijkende taalwetenschap. Tussen Sanskrit en Nederlands*. Utrecht: Aula.
- BRUGMANN, Karl. 1906. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft* II/1. Strassburg: Trübner.
- BRUNNER, Karl. 1965. *Altenglische Grammatik*. Nach der angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers. Dritte, neubearbeitete Auflage. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- BUCK, Carl Darling. 1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. A Contribution to the History of Ideas*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- CHANTRAINE, Pierre. 1956. "Les mots désignant la gauche en grec ancien". In: Heinz KRONASSER (Hrsg.), MNHMHX XAPIN, *Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer (2. Mai 1866 - 9. März 1956)*, I, 61-69. Vienna: Verlag der Wiener Sprachgesellschaft.
- . 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- COWGILL, Warren. 1985. "PIE \*duyo '2' in Germanic and Celtic, and the Nom.-Acc. Dual of Non-Neuter o Stems". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46. 13-28.
- ERNOUT, Alfred - MEILLET, Antoine. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*. Quatrième édition revue, corrigée et augmentée d'un index. Paris: Klincksieck.
- FRISK, Hjalmar. 1960-72. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* I-III. Heidelberg: Winter.
- GRAMMONT, Maurice. 1909. "Grec γυμνός 'nu'". *IF* 25. 371-374.
- HIRT, Herman. 1927. *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Teil III: *Das Nomen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- HULD, Martin E. 1984. *Basic Albanian Etymologies*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik. 1987. "PIE \*s in Albanian". *Dutch Studies in South Slavic and Balkan Linguistics* 10. 219-226. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- LEJEUNE, Michel. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- LEUMANN, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Grammatik I: Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich: Beck.
- MAYRHOFER, Manfred. 1986-94. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* I-II. Heidelberg: Winter.
- MEISER, Gerhard. 1986. *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- POKORNY, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern/Munich: Francke.
- PORZIG, Walter. 1953. *Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*. Heidelberg: Winter. [Zweite, unveränderte Auflage, 1974.]

- RIX, Helmut. 1976. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- SADNIK, Linda - AITZETMÜLLER, Rudolf. 1955. *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- SCHRIJVER, Peter. 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin (Leiden Studies in Indo-European, 2)*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- TISCHLER, Johann. 1991. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann und Erich Neu. Teil II, Lieferung 7: N. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- VAN WIJK, Nikolaas. 1916. "Abg. *desnъ, želěznъi, znati*". *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 36. 589.
- WACKERNAGEL, Jacob - DEBRUNNER, Albert. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik, II/2. Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

*University of Leiden.*

Robert S.P. BEEKES.