

Robert WOODHOUSE (Brisbane)

ME AND ETYMOLOGY

Abstract. Having been persuaded that this is a useful exercise, the author traces his growth as an etymologist and Indo-Europeanist from his early linguistic situation and guidance via a series of sidesteps through science, engineering, slavistics and an iconoclast Indo-Europeanist mentor to a barely supervised PhD in the subject. It is hoped readers will not be unduly disturbed by the author's lack of formal training in the precise disciplines in which he continues to publish in the belief that the background here portrayed may explain his adherence to a number of minority views.

I shall probably disappoint some by declaring at the outset that my principal interest is not etymology as such but comparative (and the associated historical) linguistics, particularly Indo-European with occasional peeks over the fence at Semitic (but not, alas, full blown Afro-Asiatic). On the other hand I do of course recognize that etymology and etymologies, both of inherited material and of loans, form both a vital component of the comparativist's tools and a fascinating and useful (in the sense of providing answers to legitimate questions about the world we live in) byproduct of the comparativist's research. It must also be said that the focus of much of this research is in refining existing etymologies and finding new ones, the discovery of which always provides me with something of a thrill. This means, in particular, that I am less interested in tracking down the origins of recent additions to the world's lexica, except insofar as they may shed light on typological realities that may have a bearing on what I regard as the main game.

Comparative linguistics is not possible in the absence of some acquaintance with more than one language. My tale begins therefore with early experiences that may have shaped my interest in languages and how they work.

I was born in Durban, South Africa and spent the first five years of my life in a village called Vaaldam on the Vaal River, near Vereeniging, where my father taught people to fly a type of aircraft called a flying boat. I think I should point out that flying boats differ from seaplanes in having a large boat-like hull which floats in the water, whereas seaplanes rest on the water on a pair of pontoon-like floats.

Here I must have been exposed to a form of Zulu, perhaps Xhosa, and Afrikaans, in which I am told I sang *Sarie Marie* at the age of three, though I have no recollection of these languages and was thoroughly surprised by the two South African accents of English (mother tongue and Afrikaner) which I heard from a touring theatre company in Brisbane some thirty years later.

When I was eight my Southampton boys' school gave us a term of French as an experiment and came to the conclusion that we were too young (!) to learn a language. It certainly didn't help me decipher the French my parents were in the habit of speaking when they wanted to have a private conversation in the presence of their children. My mother was nevertheless keen on the idea of my working my way through the French volume of the then popular Hugo series of teach yourself language manuals.¹

So I was ready for what lay ahead when at eleven or twelve I discovered on the bookshelves of our Brisbane home the manuals on spoken Arabic (De Lacy O'Leary's *Colloquial Arabic* and R.A. Marriott's *Marlborough's Egyptian (Arabic) self-taught*) that my father had acquired while an airline pilot in the Middle East and which I still possess. The Marlborough book had a table of the Arabic script, so I quickly taught myself to read the inscriptions on the Middle Eastern postage stamps that I was able to collect from the envelopes of hoarded correspondence and from parents' passports from those early days. Shortly I acquired from a Brisbane bookstore a brand new copy of A.S. Tritton's *Teach yourself Arabic* which focused severely on the rudiments of the written language, which was just what I wanted.

At thirteen I was advised that I would make a good engineer and should therefore take up German at high school. My mother obliged with the Hugo German volume² as holiday reading so that I shouldn't fall behind at school. It worked: I didn't have to do a tap of work on my German at school until I missed a week through illness. I was also good at having my pronunciation corrected and was invited to compete for the Goethe Society's prize for poetry reading in both sections, non-native and native speaker. At my first attempt I won the native speaker prize in my division. In subsequent years I only won the non-native speaker prizes. I don't know what drove me to enter the competition year after year because by this time I'd acquired a stammer which, though it didn't affect my recitation in the competition, was a sore embarrassment at the subsequent obligatory victory recitation before the assembled Society.

¹ I no longer possess a copy of this work or its counterpart for German mentioned below. A comparable volume using the same or a similar system is (no author) *Hugo's simplified system: Swedish in three months: grammar, exercises, conversation and reading: an easy and rapid self-instructor with the pronunciation exactly imitated*, London: Hugo's Language Institute Ltd., 1959 [1970].

² See footnote 1.

When I decided to show off one morning at school by writing something in Arabic on the blackboard before the German master arrived I was rewarded with an interview after school in the master's rooms. He explained that Russian would be much more useful to me as an engineer than Arabic and presented me with Potapova's excellent (if somewhat optimistic/mendacious regarding Soviet realities) two-volume course³ and a couple of Soviet bilingual dictionaries and said: "Go to!" Thus began my study of Russian which led ultimately to a university position and the contact with an Indo-Europeanist that sealed my fate.

At a somewhat earlier period my mother had made a remark about the people of India looking like ourselves, apart from a difference of skin colour, "because after all we speak related languages." Learning German was a fairly easy lesson in language interrelationship, Russian took things a stage further. In my teens I embarked on studies of Latin and Ancient Greek, not that Latin held any particular appeal and the Greek book spent far too many of its pages on fancy ways of making easy the Greek script, which my father thought was something everyone, including his own children, should know anyway.

In my final year as an engineering undergrad I acquired Ellis's *Elementary Old High German grammar* and Barber's *Reader* and chose as my prize for topping my course Gordon's *Introduction to Old Norse*, all of which I found interesting but rather daunting. For example, it seemed to take me for ever to realize that OHG *perk* was the same as NHG *Berg*.

As an undergrad I had taken a scholarship with the Australian Army because the government scholarships I was on didn't supply enough cash for pursuing girls properly. The Army had other virtues too: it didn't expect testimonials from clerics or headmasters. Consequently when I graduated as an engineer and was expected to spend the next five years in the Army, even though they had virtually nothing for me to do, I decided to preserve my sanity by enrolling for a BA in German, Russian and music.

After a year or so the Russians seduced me with the idea of doing their Honours course, so I dropped German. The course contained classes in Old Church Slavonic and Slavonic comparative philology. I had long before acquired and been slavering over de Bray's *Guide to the Slavonic languages* and now felt motivated to buy a copy of Shevelov's supremely expensive *Prehistory of Slavic*.

Eventually I spent five months in Russia, wrote a master's thesis, acquired a copy each of Macdonell's *Vedic grammar for students* and *Vedic reader for students* and R. Antoine's two-volume *Sanskrit manual for high schools*, and got

³ Published 1955; likewise I no longer possess a copy of this work. Unlike language manuals I had encountered previously, instead of presenting series upon series of disjointed sentences in the target language, Potapova provided connected texts from the outset, the first of which required familiarity with only a handful of the letters of the Russian alphabet.

a job for a year teaching in the Russian Department at the University of Auckland. I approached this prospect with much fear and trembling because of my stammer but when finally faced with a sea of trusting pairs of eyes the stammer went away during the first week of teaching.

The following year, 1974, I managed to get a similar job at the University of Queensland, probably because (1) in my application I claimed to have studied about thirty languages, the criterion for inclusion in this list being that I possessed some sort of coursebook for the language and had got beyond the first chapter in it and (2) the scholar in charge of the Department at that moment was the Acting Head, Albert Speirs, who was very proficient in many languages ancient and modern. Shortly it transpired that he was also an Indo-Europeanist. Apparently Albert had another reason for hiring me: one of my referees, someone well known to Albert, had mentioned my “speech impediment”. When the person who interviewed me returned home with no report of any speech impediment, Albert had put the mention down to some dark motive of the other scholar and for Albert this had had the effect of turning the disparaging remark into a recommendation.

At our first meeting Albert asked how my Sanskrit was and I replied: “Pretty elementary” and added that I was hoping it would enable me to produce my own examples for various phenomena in Slavic comparative linguistics, such as the metathesis of liquids. At that Albert slammed the desk between us with his fist and roared that he would fail any sixth-former who regurgitated nonsense about the Slavic metathesis of liquids. Duly chastened, it was some days before I summoned up the pluck to ask Speirs if he had anything I could read on this new departure in Slavic linguistics; he responded by giving me the relevant chapter of his PhD thesis (1973; published in abbreviated form 1978, 1984). Out of context the chapter didn’t make much sense so I set about reading the whole 700 pages of it and, I have to say, knowing little about the subject beyond Grimm’s law, I found it utterly fascinating. Albert had the knack of making the entire Indo-European fraternity, with the exception of Johannes Schmidt and a few other mavericks, look like a ship of fools trying to solve a host of intractable problems by juggling variously coloured laryngeals like so many balloons. When the real Head of Department, Professor Boris Christa, returned to the helm he warned me of the pitfalls of following Speirs into Indo-European studies, viz. it was a field riddled with controversy and it required knowledge of languages like Hittite. Both problems were music to my ears, but for the time being I said nothing, though I returned from my first sabbatical trip to Europe in 1978 with both of Johannes Friedrich’s two-volume pedagogical works on Hittite and a standing order for the new Friedrich/Kammenhuber *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, apart from a mountain of volumes on Akkadian, Egyptian, Ugaritic, etc. etc., then plentiful in London and Oxford and elsewhere in Europe but rare as hen’s teeth in dear old Brisbane (as they seem now to be also in London, Oxford, etc.).

When the question arose of writing my own PhD, I spent two years trying to find a tame Slavic topic that I and those in control in my Department could agree on before, frustrated beyond belief, I abandoned all caution and proclaimed I would have a crack at Indo-European, focussing on a problem Speirs had alluded to but not pursued in his own thesis, namely consonant alternations of the kind $T : D : D^h$. I had, after all, recently done a year of Sanskrit under Chris Hauri in the German Department, I had read Albert's thesis, I had done comparative Slav philology at Melbourne, I'd read Xenophon's *Anabasis* and potted about with Latin, OHG, OE, Gothic and Old Norse; I possessed a diplomatic edition of the Middle Welsh *Red Book of Hergest* that I'd bid for at a rare book auction, and a copy of the English edition of Thurneysen's Old Irish grammar a mature-age student had sold me for a dollar – what more did I need in the way of formal tuition? This was the early 1980s when the now almost universally accepted laryngeal theory was still experiencing hefty growing pains, and there were plenty of alternatives doing the rounds, though perhaps none as bizarre as Speirs'.

Speirs assisted in this illusion by proclaiming that all the current literature, i.e. from Brugmann to then present moment, was rubbish but that I should beware of indicating too much familiarity with, or approval of, his own work because it would land me in trouble. Accordingly he set me to work reading Kuhns *Zeitschrift* from volume one, 1852. Given my topic, this wasn't such bad advice because the rules of comparison in those far off days were still pretty fluid so that I was able to find a certain amount of material ready for the taking. Unfortunately, Speirs also ran roughshod over all the advances in the appreciation of PIE grammar that have been underway since at least F.B.J. Kuiper's *Notes on Vedic noun inflection* (1947), of which, on checking, I now discover I've read only about 20 pages.

Since I began my career in Indo-European studies so much under the influence of Speirs' work, I think a short summary of his ideas is in order. Fundamental to Albert's thinking were two laryngeals he found in Hittite – a palatal one and a labialized one reflected most directly as PIE y and w , respectively (Thesis p. 138). Every PIE word family originated in a sequence of these two laryngeals in both orders to which other consonants might be attached as extensions and in which were found various iterations of stressed and unstressed allophones of a single /e/ vowel. These two allophones of the vowel were further changed by a following laryngeal + consonant yielding, with lapse of the laryngeals (stressed) \bar{e} and \bar{a} ,⁴ beside (unstressed) i and u , respectively, the double laryngeal sequences thus yielding naturally $\bar{e}yu$, $\bar{a}wi$, $iy\bar{a}$, $uw\bar{e}$, iyu , uwi from which various levelled

⁴ This latter reflex is based on the observation that the labiovelarized Cockney // makes words like *pail* and *pal*, *mail* and *Mall* homophones (Thesis p. 154f).

sequences emerged by analogy, particularly those in which the long vowels were shortened. The short high vowels were particularly subject to syncope etc., yielding $\check{e}(y)$, $\check{a}w$, $y\check{a}$, $w\check{e}$, yu , wi , \bar{i} , \bar{u} . Additionally, $\check{a}w$ tended to yield \check{o} while u could also $> o$ rather as in Germanic. All these different vocalic sequences Speirs referred to as ablaut grades. Further levelling produced the more wayward diphthongs $\check{a}y$ and $\check{e}w$. Other consonants beside the laryngeals could come and go as extensions or stems, much like s mobile, though without positional restriction. Their comings and goings were assisted by the (in retrospect somewhat superfluous) property that all the stops of the traditional reconstruction were derivable from the three labiovelars $k^w g^w g^{wh}$ in the vicinity of certain vowels, as in Greek. Put this way, it does, admittedly, sound quite crazy, but of course it was buttressed by copious examples of the various alternations of vowels and diphthongs and consonants – some of them longstanding problems of IE phonology – in words having relatable meanings. The links holding this complicated, but also somewhat superficial, structure together were elaborated with immense care, so that although it was easy for me to see that in essence it was a theory of anything goes (which Speirs hotly denied), it was very difficult for me as a novice to see where exactly Speirs had gone wrong in his thinking, particularly as Albert maintained that his theory enabled him to predict the shapes of scores of words in a language he knew poorly, like Armenian: he claimed he would look them up in a dictionary and there they would be, just as predicted. Later, I noticed an error in a key example, namely that Albert had incorrectly assumed a long root vowel in the Latin infinitive *dare*; I also noticed that his series of examples for his claimed e/i alternation consisted largely or entirely of Greek words having the target e beside Sanskrit words having the target i – a situation now regarded as representing nothing more surprising than the regular reflexes of $*h_1$ in these two languages. No doubt a critical review of Speirs' work would reveal other now generally accepted doctrines that were regarded by Speirs as unsolved problems, but it can be seriously questioned whether it would be worth the effort.

Despite these deficiencies, it must be said on the one hand that, apart from ignoring the work of other scholars covering a period of about a century, Speirs' methodology is fundamentally unimpeachable: he observed that there were many forms that were controversial in that they did not fit (possibly a simplified form of) the current theory, so he set about devising a new theory, buttressed with numerous facts at every turn, in which this material did fit. On the other hand there are disconcerting aspects of Speirs' theory, chief among them being, to my mind, first, that it does not seem realistic that of all the consonants employed in Speirs' reconstruction the two laryngeals should have pride of place as root formants; and, secondly, that essentially all forms occurring in the languages commonly drawn upon for data in Indo-European linguistics seem to be represented (aside from some well recognized phonological developments)

directly in his PIE, a PIE that possessed extraordinary and apparently ungoverned flexibility both in vocalism and consonantism and left rather little room in the intervening centuries or even millennia for further linguistic development by way of the competing processes of phonological change and restorative analogy. A simple example of this latter problem is that dialectal pronunciations similar to [hu:s] of English *house* and NHG *Haus* beside standard [haus] in both languages, usually thought of as representing different historical stages in the development of these languages over approximately the last millennium, could be seen in Speirs' system (not that he saw them as such) as representing ablaut variation (**āwi* >> *au* : **uwi* > **ū*) within his PIE.

Naturally in those early days I did turn to other works for guidance, especially the repeatedly updated *Einführung* of Oswald Szemerényi. Szemerényi's insistence on a single laryngeal ultimately rendered his book inadequate as I became increasingly convinced of the general correctness of the now standard, if still evolving, laryngeal theory and increasingly aware of the shortage of handbooks in which laryngealist reconstructions were the order of the day. The first major reference works to overcome this difficulty, as far as I was aware, were the late Manfred Mayrhofer's *Lautlehre* (1986) and especially his new Vedic + Sanskrit etymological dictionary (1992–2001) the first fascicle of which was also issued in 1986. Now of course we have the excellent textbooks by Michael Meier-Brügger and Robert Beekes, as well as, more recently, the splendid Leiden series of etymological dictionaries edited by Alexander Lubotsky.

Perhaps the saddest aspect of my philological training was that on the question of accentuation the Slavic course I had attended in 1968–69 had, not surprisingly, given roughly equal billing to Stang's (1957) ideas and those of the traditional theory. I soon discovered that without some grasp of the theory that seems to me to have received much sound elaboration in the many papers on the subject by Frederik Kortlandt, I was frequently unable to call on Slavic data to support my theses. Unfortunately, too, I found that a subject that had held such allure to me as a student of Russian keen to discover the origin of the various accentual patterns dominating the morphology of that language, turned out in practice to have a powerful soporific quality as one tried to commit to memory the minutely varying conditions under which the ictus now headed left, then right, then left again, then right again and so on and on.

Another feature of the early 80s in my part of the world was that it was quite the thing to sneer at the "publish or perish" mentality. "Publish or perish" of course suddenly became the mantra for survival with the corporatization of universities that got underway in the 90s. Consequently a couple of my early publications in the field were either inspired by, or a direct steal from, my thesis, a notable feature of which was preoccupation with the typological problems of the PIE consonant inventory, viz. the rarity of **b* and the presence of the

allegedly marked voiced aspirated series in the absence of the allegedly unmarked voiceless aspirated series.

Perhaps as a consequence of this I continue to cling to minority views concerning some aspects of PIE phonology. First, while I consider that Lubotsky's (1988) specifications regarding the allocation of accent position in PIE must have taken place when there were no glottalic stops in PIE, and most probably when there were only two series of occlusives, viz. a voiceless and a voiced, I also believe that there were two phases of preglottalization of voiced stops. The first of these split the existing single series of voiced stops into the forerunners of the traditional mediae aspiratae and "plain" mediae – and eliminated plain /b/ from the system; the second resulted in the preglottalization of the traditional "plain" mediae as detected up to a point by Kortlandt (1985). Secondly, I agree that Kortlandt (1978, 1979) is on the right track when he sees the two extreme ends of the tectal spectrum (palatovelars and labiovelars) as the preferable bitectal system for most purposes, although there are a couple of phenomena – and typological considerations – that favour a stage of positional labialization of the incipient labiovelars in early PIE. Thirdly, I agree with Kortlandt's (1988: 390f.; 2006: 1; 2007: 2) resurrection of Thurneysen's principle of nasal invasion (e.g. Woodhouse 2008: 18–21, 23; contra Beekes 2010 s.vv. *ἀτέμβω*, *θιγγάνω*, *πύνδαζ* etc.). Fourthly, I agree with the Leideners in rejecting PIE *a as a phoneme distinct from PIE *e: the typological parallel is here offered by Classical and Written Arabic in which a single nonhigh vocalic phoneme, usually denoted /a/ and occurring both short and long, has allophones approaching [ɛ], [a] and [ã] depending on the consonantal environment; in addition this yields an account of ablaut *o that allows the lengthened reflex found in Indo-Iranian and Anatolian to be older than the shortened reflex found elsewhere (see Woodhouse 2012, n. 1; in press, §2). I am probably unique in siding with the Leideners in believing in Beekes' law but differing from them in holding that the law applies equally to anlaut *rHC- in exactly the same way as with most other anlaut resonants and that the assumption of *h₁ before PIE *r- is authorized only by evidence other than Greek *ἐρV-*, Armenian *arV-* and Hittite/Anatolian **ərV-* (Woodhouse 2011: 158ff.). Finally, I have found some additional cases of voicing by *h₃ in Vedic, Greek and Slavic – always in a postaccentual syllable (see Woodhouse in press, n. 22). I hope that the future of etymology will include more widespread acceptance of these positions of mine.

In order to illustrate in more detail what I believe to be my contribution to etymology to date, I append a list of my etymological suggestions in alphabetical order of salient languages (the numbers prefixed before the items indicate: 1. = new suggestion/analysis; 2. = new support for existing etymology)

Avestan

2. *varəz-* SEC 16 (2011) 174

English

2. *hop* IF 115 (2010) 128–134
1. *hug* HS 118 (2005) 266

Germanic

1. **deupaz* SEC 14 (2009) 307–309; FS Levickij 2008: 21
1. **hug-* ‘think’ IF 104 (1999) 211–213; HS 118 (2005) 264–266

Gothic

1. *fraisan* PBB 122 (2000) 218 n.33; HS 118 (2005) 266f.
2. *gadaban* Fs Levickij 2008: 18
2. *gadraban* SEC 14 (2009) 309
1. *gaþlaihan, gaþlaihts* SEC 5 (2005) 145f.
2. *kilþei* SEC 11 (2006) 169–173; IF 114 (2009) 87–91
2. *nati* IF 116 (2011) 34
1. *þlaqus* SEC 5 (2005) 146; HS 118 (2005) 263f.
1. *walisa* PBB 122 (2000) 191f.
1. *fulleiþ* (Mk 4.28) PBB 122 (2000) 202

Greek

2. *ἀγνός, ἄζομαι* SEC 16 (2011) 166
2. *ἀτέμβομαι* Fs Levickij 2008: 20f.
1. *ἀσταλέος* Glotta 73 (1997) 257–258.
1. *δεῖσα* HS 107 (1994) 99
2. *ἔραμαι* SEC 16 (2011) 159; IF 116 (2011) 35 n.11
2. *ἐρυγόντα* SEC 16 (2011) 159; IF 116 (2011) 35 n. 11
2. *θάμβος* Fs Levickij 2008: 20
2. *ἦμι* SEC 16 (2011) 166f.

2. *ἴππος* JIES 26/3&4 (1998) 467–468

1. *κάπρος* SEC 16 (2011) 177
2. *καρπός* Fs Levickij 2008: 22
2. *κότος* SEC 16 (2011) 179
2. *κοῦφος* IF 115 (2010) 127–134
2. *κύρβ(ε)ις* Fs Levickij 2008: 22
2. *λαιός* SEC 16 (2011) 175f.
2. *ὄγδοος, ὀκτώ* SEC 16 (2011) 156f.
2. *ταῦρος* SEC 16 (2011) 179–181
2. *τάφος* n. Fs Levickij 2008: 20
2. *τάφος* m. Fs Levickij 2008: 20
1. *τύμβος* Fs Levickij 2008: 21

Hebrew

1. *ḥlh=ḥly* IF 108 (2003) 61; SEC 10 (2005) 215
2. *-o/aw* ‘his’ SEC 10 (2005)
1. *šibbōlet* SEC 7 (2007) 173–189

Hittite

2. *aku-* ‘sea-shell’ SLing 129 (2012) 227f.
2. *alpa* ‘cloud’ SLing 129 (2012) 226–227
2. *ariye/a-^{zi}* ‘determine by oracle’ SLing 129 (2012) 228f.
2. *hāli-* ‘corral for cows and horses’ SLing 129 (2012) 230f.
1. *henkan-* ‘death, doom’, *hai(n) k-^{ta(ri)}*, *hink-^{a(ri)}*, *hi(n)k-* ‘bestow’ SLing 129 (2012) 239f.
2. *hēu-/hē(y)aw-* ‘rain’ SLing 129 (2012) 229f.
1. *idālu-* ‘bad, evil’ SLing 129 (2012) 238
2. *kalmara-* ‘ray’, *kalmi-* ‘piece of firewood’, *kalmis(a)nali* ‘id.; brand, firebolt’ SLing 129 (2012) 231–233
2. *māhla* ‘branch of grapevine’ SLing 129 (2012) 233–236

2. *sūu-*, *sūwaw-* ‘full’ *SLing* 129 (2012) 236f.
1. *tarai-ⁱ/tari-* ‘become weary’ *SLing* 129 (2012) 238f.
2. *tarra-^{ta(ri)}* ‘be able’, *tarhu-^{zi}* ‘id.; be powerful, conquer’ *SLing* 129 (2012) 237f.

Latin

2. *acu-* *SEC* 16 (2011) 163
2. *arduus* *SEC* 16 (2011) 163
1. *baculum* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 24
1. *caper*, *caput* *SEC* 16 (2011) 177, 178
2. *laevus* *SEC* 16 (2011) 175f.
2. *nāris* *IF* 116 (2011) 29–41
2. *nassa* *IF* 116 (2011) 35f.
1. *radius* *IF* 117 (2012) 1–13
2. *rāvus* *SEC* 16 (2011) 159f.
1. *rādō* *SEC* 16 (2011) 160
1. *rōdō* *SEC* 16 (2011) 160
2. *taurus* *SEC* 16 (2011) 179–181
2. *ulna* *SEC* 16 (2011) 163
1. *tōtus* *JIES* 24/1&2 (1996) 28 n.2; *SEC* 6 (2001) 193

Latvian

2. *dubens*, *dibens* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 18–21
1. *rādīt* *IF* 117 (2012) 3f., 10f.

Lithuanian

1. *dubūs* *SEC* 14 (2009) 307–309; *Fs Levickij* 2008: 18–21
2. *gaūbti* *gaubiù* *IF* 115 (2010) 128–134
1. *ródyti* *IF* 117 (2012) 3f., 10f.
2. *vōs* *SEC* 17 (2012) 171
2. *žiùpsnis* *IF* 115 (2010) 130

Middle High German

2. *hupfen/hüpfen* *IF* 115 (2010) 128–134

Old English

2. *géopan* *IF* 115 (2010) 128–134
2. *nasu* ‘nose’ *IF* 116 (2011) 29–41
2. *WS nosu* ‘nose’ *IF* 117 (2012) 9f.
1. *rót*, *rætan/rétan* *IF* 117 (2012) 8, 11
2. *WS rodor* *IF* 117 (2012) 9f.

Old High German

2. *.goufana* *IF* 115 (2010) 128–134
2. *tapfar* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 18–21
2. *treffan* *SEC* 14 (2009) 309f.

Old Icelandic / Old Norse

2. *drepa* *SEC* 14 (2009) 309f.
2. *gaupn* *IF* 115 (2010) 128–134
1. *happ* *SEC* 14 (2009) 310
2. *nōt* *IF* 116 (2011) 34
1. *rætask* *IF* 117 (2012) 8

Old Irish

2. *cath* ‘battle’ *SEC* 16 (2011) 179

Norwegian

1. *Radund-* *IF* 117 (2012) 10

Phrygian

2. *bagun* *SEC* 11 (2006) 179f.
2. *benagonos* *SEC* 11 (2006) 169
2. *bonok?* *SEC* 11 (2006) 169
2. *dokseś* *SEC* 11 (2006) 174
1. *duman* *SEC* 11 (2006) 177f.
2. *Erginos* *SEC* 11 (2006) 181
1. *kciyanaveyos* *SEC* 13 (2008) 171–182
2. *keneman* *SEC* 11 (2006) 184f.
1. *lakedo* *HS* 122 (2009) 209–216
2. *lavagtaei* *SEC* 11 (2006) 178
2. *mekas* *SEC* 11 (2006) 161
2. *podas* *SEC* 11 (2006) 174; *HS* 122 (2009) 221–223
2. *vrekun* *SEC* 11 (2006) 175 n. 27
1. *αδειτ(τυ)ov* *SEC* 12 (2007) 194f.

2. *αζεν, αζενον, αζην* SEC 11 (2006) 169
2. *ακροδμαν* HS 122 (2009) 224
2. *ατω* SEC 11 (2006) 181
2. *βαγαιος* SEC 11 (2006) 179f.
1. *βαλαιος* SEC 11 (2006) 179–181
2. *Βας, Βαταν* SEC 11 (2006) 166
2. *βεδυ* SEC 11 (2006) 178f.
2. *βεκος* SEC 11 (2006) 166
2. *Βρύκαι, Βρυκεις, Βρυκίοι, Βρύκης* SEC 11 (2006) 166
2. *γάλλος* SEC 15 (2010) 137–142
1. *γεγαριτιμενος* SEC 11 (2006) 162
2. *γεγρ(ε)μιμενα, -νον* SEC 11 (2006) 176
2. *γελαρ/φος* SEC 11 (2006) 172–174
2. *Γευδης* SEC 11 (2006) 164, 169
2. *δαδιτι* SEC 11 (2006) 166
1. *δαδου* SEC 11 (2006) 166
1. *δεκμουταη/ις* SEC 11 (2006) 163
2. *Δίνδυμος* SEC 11 (2006) 162
2. *Δοιας* SEC 11 (2006) 165
1. *δουμε* see *duman* (above)
1. *εγδαες* SEC 11 (2006) 181f.
1. *ζηρα(ι)* SEC 12 (2007) 191–199
2. *ζετνα* SEC 11 (2006) 169
2. *ζως* SEC 12 (2007) 195, 199
1. *κενα* HS 122 (2009) 216–220
2. *κιμερος* SEC 11 (2006) 162; HS 122 (2009) 216
2. *κναικο, κναικαν* SEC 11 (2006) 158–161, 168f.
2. *κνουμαν(ει)* SEC 11 (2006) 158–161, 168f., 184f.
1. *κολταη, κολταμανει* SEC 11 (2006) 169–173; IF 114 (2009) 87–91
1. *Μιμογας, Μιμογαδης* SEC 11 (2006) 170
1. **Μορδιας* SEC 11 (2006) 176f.
1. *μουκρα[ι]ον* SEC 11 (2006) 182f.
1. *μурсα* SEC 11 (2006) 183
2. *οοιτετου* SEC 11 (2006) 163f.
2. *οογνω* SEC 11 (2006) 169
1. *πεις* SEC 12 (2007) 196–199
1. *πειες* SEC 12 (2007) 196–199
2. *τετικμενος* SEC 11 (2006) 161, 173
1. **τι(τ/δ)* SEC 11 (2006) 167f.; HS 122 (2009) 220f.
1. *τιδρεγρον* SEC 11 (2006) 166–168
2. *Τιε/η, Τιαν, Τιος* SEC 11 (2006) 164
1. *Τορκο(υ)ς* SEC 11 (2006) 181

PIE

2. ***abol-* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 24
1. ***bak-* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 23f.
1. ***bel-* ‘strong’ *IF* 114 (2009) 95 n. 26
1. ***d^heb-* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 18–21
1. **Hneh₂s-*, **Hnh₂os* ‘nose’ *IF* 116 (2011) 29–41
1. ***kob-* SEC 14 (2009) 310
1. ***korb-* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 21f.
1. ***^(s)ka(m)b-* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 22f.
2. **suerHg₂^h-* ‘heed, care, worry, be ill’ *IF* 108 (2003) 58–91

Slavic

2. **debel-* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 18–21
2. **doba* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 18–21
2. **dobrǫ* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 18–21
1. **dǫbno* > **dǫno* ‘bottom’ SEC 14 (2009) 307–309; *Fs Levickij* 2008: 21
2. **dǫbrǫ* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 21
2. **dǫbrǫ* *Fs Levickij* 2008: 21
2. **edǫmь* SEC 17 (2012) 151–178
1. **ed(ъ)và* SEC 17 (2012) 171f.; *SLing* 129 (2012) 238
1. *-gd-* in temporals *ASEES* 8/2 (1994) 97–102; *IJSLP* 41 (1997) 69–82
1. *-go* gen. sg. desinence *ASEES* 8/2 (1994) 81–95, 102
2. **gǫsь* *IF* 115 (2010) 131
2. **gubiti* *IF* 115 (2010) 128–134
2. **gybati* *IF* 115 (2010) 128–134
2. **klobukь* *IJSLP* 42 (1998) 15–16.
1. **kòrb-* ‘warp, buckle’ *Fs Levickij* 2008: 21; in press, n. 22

2. *kōtorā ‘quarrel, battle’ *SEC* 16 (2011) 179
 2. *radīti, *rodīti *IF* 117 (2012) 5–8
 2. *rādṭ, *radostṭ *IF* 117 (2012) 6–8, 10f.
 2. *tūrṭ *SEC* 16 (2011) 179–181

Syriac

2. tawrō *SEC* 16 (2011) 180f.

Vedic

1. ágra-, agrimá-, agriyá- *SEC* 16 (2011) 172f.
 2. adánt-, anánt- *IF* 116 (2011) 31–34
 2. āḍhyá- *IF* 114 (2009) 87–89
 2. íḍ-, íḍā *IF* 114 (2009) 87–90
 2. kadá- *IF* 114 (2009) 87–89
 2. káprth-, kaprthá- *SEC* 16 (2011) 177
 2. kuṭhara- *IF* 114 (2009) 87–89
 1. gaja- ‘elephant’ *Fs Levickij* 2008: 24
 2. gáldā *IF* 114 (2009) 88
 2. ghuṭa- *IF* 114 (2009) 87–89
 2. jaṭhāra- *IF* 114 (2009) 87–91
 1. jálhu- (not **jálhu-) (RV 8.61.11) *IF* 114 (2009) 94f.

2. da(m)bh- *Fs Levickij* 2008: 18–24
 2. nadh-/nah- *IF* 116 (2011) 34f.
 2. nás- *IF* 116 (2011) 29–41
 1. párīṇas-, párīman- *PBB* 122 (2000) 199
 2. puṭa- *IF* 114 (2009) 87–89
 2. bhadrá- ‘good’ : bhadrá- ‘fortunate’ *SEC* 16 (2011) 174
 2. rad- ‘cut, scrape’ *SEC* 16 (2011) 160
 2. rāḍhat(i) *IF* 117 (2012) 5, 9
 1. Rāhú- *IF* 117 (2012) 10
 2. vag- ‘incoherent sound’ *SEC* 16 (2011) 172f.
 2. śátru- *SEC* 16 (2011) 179
 2. śad- ‘excel, prevail’ *SEC* 16 (2011) 170f.
 2. sphuṭa- *IF* 114 (2009) 87–89
 2. huḍa-, huḍu- *IF* 114 (2009) 87–90

Welsh

1. brathu *SEC* 16 (2011) 161
 1. rhathu *SEC* 16 (2011) 160f.
 1. rhawdd *IF* 117 (2012) 8, 10

Robert Woodhouse

School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies

The University of Queensland

Brisbane QLD 4072, Australia

[r.woodhouse@uq.edu.au] [jandrwoodhouse@bigpond.com]

References

- Antoine, R., 1968, 1970, *A Sanskrit manual for high schools*, 2 vols., 6th and 3rd ed..resp. Calcutta: Xavier Publications.
 Barber, Charles Clyde, 1951, *An Old High German reader, with notes, list of proper names, and vocabulary*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 Beekes, Robert Stephen Paul, 1995, *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: an introduction*, tr. UvA Vertalers/Paul Gabriner. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- de Bray, Reginald G.A., 1951 [1963], *Guide to the Slavonic languages*. London/ New York: J.M. Dent/ E.P. Dutton.
- Ellis, Jeffrey, 1953, *An elementary Old High German grammar, descriptive and comparative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Friedrich, Johannes, 1974, 1967, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch, 1: kurzgefaßte Grammatik*, 3rd. ed; 2: *Lesestücke in Transkription mit Erläuterungen und Wörterverzeichnissen*, 2nd rev. ed. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- , 1960, *Hethitisches Keilschrift-Lesebuch, 1: Lesestücke; 2: Schrifttafel und Erläuterungen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Friedrich, Johannes and Annelies Kammenhuber (et al.), 1975-, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch, 2.*, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Fs Levickij = Woodhouse 2008.
- Gordon, E.V., 1957 [1962], *An introduction to Old Norse*, 2nd ed. rev. A.R. Taylor. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kortlandt, Frederik, 1988, Remarks on Winter's law, in *Dutch contributions to the Tenth international congress of Slavists: Linguistics*, (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 11). Amsterdam: Rodopi. Pp. 387–396.
- , 2006, Miscellaneous remarks on Balto-Slavic accentuation, www.kortlandt.nl
- , 2007, Winter's law again, www.kortlandt.nl
- LIV₂ = (2001): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, ed. Helmut Rix assisted by Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer, 2nd rev. ed. by Martin Kümmel and Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- Lubotsky, Alexander M., 1988, *The system of nominal accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*, (Memoirs of the Kern Institute 4). Leiden / New York / Copenhagen / Cologne: E.J. Brill.
- (ed.), Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series. Leiden/Boston: Brill. Volumes I have found particularly useful include
1. Boutkan, Dirk and S.M. Siebinga, 2005, Old Frisian e.d.
 4. Derksen, Rick, 2008, E.d. of the Slavic inherited Lexicon.
 5. Kloekhorst, Alwin, 2008, E.d. of the Hittite inherited Lexicon.
 7. Vaan, Michiel de, 2008, E.d. of Latin and the other Italic languages.
 8. Martirosyan, Hrach K., 2010, E.d. of the Armenian inherited Lexicon.
 9. Matasović, Ranko, 2009, E.d. of Proto-Celtic.
 10. Beekes, Robert S.P., 2010, E.d. of Greek, 2 vols.
- Macdonell, Arthur, Antony, 1916 [1966], *A Vedic grammar for students*. London [Bombay/ Calcutta/ Madras]: Oxford University Press.
- , 1917 [1970], *A Vedic reader for students*. London [Madras]: Oxford University Press.
- Marriott, Major R.A., (n.d. Preface dated 1907), *Marlborough's self-taught series: Egyptian (Arabic) self-taught by the natural method with phonetic pronunciation, Thimm's system*, 6th ed.

- Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1986, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, 1: 2. Halbband: *Lautlehre [segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen]*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- , 1992–2001, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, 1–2: *Ers-ter Teil: älterer Sprache*; 3: *Zweiter Teil: jüngerer Sprache*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael, in cooperation with Matthias Fritz and Manfred Mayrhofer, 2003, *Indo-European linguistics*, tr. Charles Gertmenian. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- O’Leary, De Lacy (n.d.; preface dated April, 1925), *Colloquial Arabic, with notes on the vernacular speech of Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, and an appendix on the local characteristics of Algerian dialect*, 2nd ed. London: / New York: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner / E.P. Dutton.
- Shevelov, George Y., 1964, *A prehistory of Slavic: the historical phonology of Common Slavic*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Speir’s, Albert G.E., 1973, *Proto-Indo-European labio-velars and laryngeals*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Brisbane: University of Queensland.
- , 1978, *The Proto-Indo-European labiovelars*, (Bibliotheca Slavonica 18). Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- , 1984, *Proto-Indo-European laryngeals and ablaut*, (Bibliotheca Slavonica 24). Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Stang, Christian S., 1957, *Slavonic accentuation*, (Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskap-Akademi i Oslo, II. Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse 1957, no. 3). Oslo: [Universitetsvorlaget, 1965].
- Szemerényi, Oswald, 1989, *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, 3., vollständig neu bearbeitete Auflage. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Tritton, A.S., 1943 [1944 or later], *Teach yourself Arabic*. London: Hodder and Stoughton for The English Universities Press.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf, 1946, *A grammar of Old Irish*, tr. D.A. Binchey and Osborn Bergin. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Woodhouse, Robert, 2008, Some more etymologies not requiring Proto-Indo-European *b, in *Problemy zahal’noho, herman’skoho ta slov’jan’skoho movoznavstva: do 70-ričja profesora V.V. Levyc’koho / Problems of general, Germanic and Slavic linguistics: papers for the 70-th anniversary of Professor V. Levickij*. Černivci/Černovcy: Knyhy-XXI. Pp. 18–26.
- , 2011, Lubotsky’s and Beekes’ laws, PIE *(H)r-, *(H)i(V)-, *a and some other laryngeal matters, *SEC* 16: 151–187.
- , 2012, Latin *radius* ‘ray of light; spoke of wheel’: PIE *a versus an extension of *u*-umlaut in West Saxon, *IF* 117: 1–13.
- , in press, On the reality of the laryngeal theory: a response to Witold Mańczak, *HS*.