KENNETH SHIELDS, Jr.
Lancaster
Pennsylvania
U.S.A.

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE LATIN PRONOMINAL
GENITIVES *EIUS, CUIUS, HUIUS*

Abstract: In this paper it is proposed that Latin pronominal genitives like *eius, cuius,* and *huius* derive from a contamination of the Indo-European genitive markers $^*-i$ and $^*-os$. An additional element in $^*-i-$ (i.e., $^*-i-i-os$) appears as a result of the analogical influence of the demonstrative stem $^*ei-$, which underlies *eius*. This etymological explanation is related to the so-called "new image" of Indo-European morphology (Adrados 1992:1) and thereby avoids the phonological and morphological problems inherent in other more traditional accounts.

The origin of the genitive singular of the Latin pronominal forms like *eius* 'of this, that', *cuius* 'whose, of which', and *huius* 'of this' has been the subject of considerable debate. Buck (1933:222) thus asserts that "the origin of *eius, huius, cuius* (really, *eiius,* etc.) and *illīus, istīus, ipsīus* is much disputed," while Leumann (1963:289) reiterates that "die Erklärung der Genitiv- und Dativformen auf *-ĭus* und *-ī,* dazu *eius quoius huius* und *eī cui huic,* ist umstritten." Two major theories have been proposed to explain the appearance of these forms. According to the far more popular hypothesis today, supported, for example, by Kent (1946:66), Watkins (1966:38), Schmidt (1977: 61), Szemerényi (1980:188), and Markey (1980:99), these formations derive from the old pronominal genitive suffix $^*-syo$ (cf. gen. Skt. *tásya,* Gk. τοῖο 'of that') contaminated with the nominal genitive marker $^*-s$ (e.g., $^*e-syo-s$ > PItal. $^*eiyos$ > Lat. *eius,* "pronounced *ei-yos,* as is shown by inscriptional writings *EIIVS* ... as well as by other evidence" [Kent 1946:66]. However, as Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1995: 332) point out, "...positing $^*-syo$ in Latin raises both phonetic and morphological difficulties," for "other examples of $^*-syo$ > *-iyo* are lacking in Latin. The development is proposed *ad hoc* on the basis of only these ... forms" (n. 6)[1]. The second hypothesis has adherents in

---

[1] Meillet & Vendryes (1968:437–438) derive *-ius* from the contamination of the genitive markers $^*-ī$ and $^*-os$, with subsequent shortening of $^*-ī$. However, such abridgement of $^*-ī$ is not supported by general phonological developments in Latin.

Brugmann (1911:329–330) and Buck (1933:222). In short, "the form *cuius*, earlier *quoius*, is a stereotyped nom. sg. masc. of the possessive adjective *cuius*, -*a*, -*um*, earlier *quoius*, *quoiius*, which is most frequently used in early Latin, is attested for the Italic dialects (Osc. *puiiu* 'cuia'), and which may further be identified in form with G. ποῖος. That is, from a phrase like *quoiios servos*, in which the adjective form might refer to a man or a woman, this form came to serve as the gen. sg. of *quī* and *quis*, receiving some formal support from the still existing genitive forms in -*os*" (Buck 1933:222). Other pronominal genitive forms of this type were analogical creations. Although possible, these proposed analogical developments are complicated and strictly *ad hoc*; they deny any real continuity between the Latin pronouns and those of other dialects, despite obvious formal similarities. In this brief paper I wish to address the question of the etymology the Latin genitive pronouns in light of some recent research of mine into the evolution of the Indo-European case system in general and the genitive case in particular. This research, which embraces the so-called "new image" (Adrados 1992:1) of Indo-European morphology, is, in my opinion, able to provide a more elegant explanation of Latin developments within the context of broader Indo-European processes of linguistic change.

For many years, I have been an advocate of what has now come to be known as "the new image" of Indo-European morphology, which characterizes Indo-European as an originally uninflected language that only gradually acquired the complicated inflectional patterns attested in dialects like Greek and Sanskrit. As Adrados (1992:1) explains, "there is an increasingly wider acceptance of the idea that one should attempt to reconstruct not one sole type of Indoeuropean (IE., henceforth) without spatial or temporal definition, but three. The most ancient of these, IE. I (also called Proto-Indo-European or PIE.), would not yet be inflected. Then there would come IE. II, inherited by Anatolian, some of whose archaisms, though, would be preserved in other languages: in this type, there would already be inflexion, although merely on the basis of using endings and other resources, not the opposition of stems. Finally, the most recent phase would be IE. III, which is practically that of traditional reconstruction: in this, type, stems were opposed to mark tenses and moods in the verb, the masc. and fem. genders, and degrees of comparison in the adjective." As far as the grammatical categories associated with nominals are concerned, the "new image" obviously disputes standard Brugmannian formulations of Indo-European gender, number, and case systems. In contrast to the earlier view of a tripartite gender system, many scholars today subscribe to the opinion that in early Indo-European "there were two classes of nouns, on the one hand a 'common gender' later difffferentiated into masculines and feminines, and on the other hand the 'neu-

ters'. This state of affairs is faithfully reflected in Hittite, which is distinguished from all other IE languages by the absence of a special feminine gender. The next stage sees the development of the feminine, and it is only at this period that it is proper to speak of gender in the true sense" (Burrow 1973:202). Similarly, "in contrast to traditional reconstructions of three numbers in Indo-European, more recent scholarship has posited a very late appearance of the non-singular (dual/ plural)" (Shields 1991a:53). Lehmann (1974:201–202) thus argues: "The system of verbal endings clearly points to an earlier period in which there was no verbal inflection for number ... For the dual and plural endings are obviously defective. We cannot reconstruct endings which are as well supported as are those of the singular, except for the third plural ... The number system is defective in substantival as well as in verbal inflection. The personal pronouns never did introduce expressions for plurality, as suppletive paradigms indicate, e.g., Hitt. *uk* 'I,' *wēš* 'we,' etc. ... Number accordingly was not consistently applied in late PIE and the early dialects in accordance with natural reference. Subsequently application became more regular, and number congruence was carried out for both substantives and verbs" (cf. Adrados 1985:31-32). The variability of number specification for the Hittite genitive suffixes *-aš* and *-an* can thus be ascribed to the late introduction of the non-singular category itself. Finally, "the evidence in the Anatolian languages supported by that in dialects like Germanic and Greek indicates that even for a late stage of Proto-Indo-European we cannot assume the set of inflections for eight cases ... The large set of inflections in Indo-Iranian, Italic and Armenian are increasingly ascribed to special developments of the dialect area to which they belong, while the earlier peripheral languages from which Germanic, Anatolian and Celtic arose did not participate in that development" (Lehmann 1993:154–155). It is "the cases expressing adverbial relationships (instrumental, dative, ablative, locative, and the genitive in some uses)" that are especially recent, for "the plural endings for these cases are not attested in Hittite. Sandhi phenomena of Sanskrit support the assumption that these endings are late; that of the locative plural of the *s*-stems, for example, indicates that this construction belongs to the sphere of derivation rather than inflection" (Lehmann 1958:182). The primary process whereby new case categories arose in Indo-European is characterized by Fairbanks (1977:118) as "the split of a single category into two," that is, "two forms come to be in competition with each other in representing a single category. When this happens, it is very common for one of the competing forms to be lost, but sometimes they are both kept and a distinction is made in their usage, producing two different categories" (1977:118). Such competing forms can arise through the "fission" of new elements (e.g., deictics or postpositions) with stems or through the contamination of

extant elements; and such subsequent distinctions in usage result from the secondary function of an old category coming to represent a primary function of a new one. Endorsing this viewpoint, Kurylowicz (1964:195), for example, "derives the dative and the locative singular forms from a single case form" (Fairbanks 1977:102, cf. Adrados 1987); and he tentatively proposes that "the forms of the ... [dative-locative, instrumental, and ablative-genitive] seem to go back to a common base in *-e*. Maybe this was originally a case form in *-e* uniting the functions of instr., dat., and [gen.-]abl." (1964:196–197). In any event, Kurylowicz (1964:200) is more definitive in his assertion about the etymological relationship between the dative-locative and the genitive: "The paradigm of the dual suggests an original identity of the gen. and the loc., i.e. a prehistorical stage attested neither in the sing. (-*s*, -*i*) nor in the plural (-*ōm*, -*su*/-*si*)". I believe that positing a common origin for the Indo-European dative-locative and genitive cases can explain a wide variety of dialectal data, including the origin of the Latin pronominal forms under consideration here.

In Shields (1995:51), I point out that typological considerations support the common origin of the Indo-European dative-locative and genitive. On the basis of data obtained from a wide variety of languages, Lyons (1968:500, 1971:388–395) concludes that, because there exist intimate formal and semantic correspondences between genitive and locative constructions, "in many, and perhaps in all, languages existential and possessive constructions derive (both synchronically and diachronically) from locatives"; while Clark (1978:117–118) similarly proposes that "the existential, locative, and possessive constructions examined in the present sample of [thirty] languages [distributed among a number of different language families] are related to one another in word order, in verbs used, and in their locative characteristics."

Further internal Indo-European evidence in support of the same conclusion can also be easily accrued (cf. Shields 1983, 1987a, 1987b, 1995). First of all, from a functional point of view, the fact that within Indo-European "the genitive case ... residually retains into the dialects a secondary locative function, 'Der Gen. von räumlichen und zeitlichen Begriffen' (Brugmann 1904:438), ... implies the original identity of these two cases" (Shields 1987b:345). Moreover, the formal similarities of the markers of the dative-locative and the genitive are striking, and these markers seem to bear an affinity to deictic particles which can be independently reconstructed for the protolanguage. According to Markey (1979:65), such deictics provided the exponents for adverbial cases which emerged as the language evolved. It is, of course, well established that Indo-European possessed deictic particles in **i* and **u*. Hirt (1927:11–12) reconstructs a deictic in **i* on the basis of items like "gr. ἰ-δέ 'und,' 1. *i-bi* 'hier,' 1. *i-ta* 'so,' *i-tidem*, ai. *i-há*

'hier,' ai. *i-va* 'wie,' ai. *i-ti* 'so,' ai. *i-d* hervorhebende Partikel". Moreover, since "vielleicht sind alle Demonstrativa einmal deiktische Partikeln, also indeklinabele Wörter gewesen" (Brugmann 1911:311), the demonstrative stem $^*i$- (Lat. *i-s*, Lith. *jì-s*) has its origin in this same deictic element. $^*u$ is attested in "1. *ubi* 'wo,' 1. *u-ti* 'so,' aw. *u^{l}ti*, gr. ἠ-ὑτε 'gleichwie,' ai. *u-tá* 'auch sogar'" (Hirt 1927:11–12). According to Hirt (1927:10–11), the Indo-European deictic particle $^*e/o$ appears dialectally "als Verbalpräfix, namentlich als Augment (gr. ἐ-φέρον, ai. *á-bharam* 'ich trug'), als angetretene Postposition hinter Kasusformen, z.B. ai. Dat. *aśvāj-a*, abg, *kamen-e* usw. und in ai. *a-sắu* 'jener,' gr. ἠ-κεῖ 'dort,' wohl auch in gr. εῖ 'wenn,' eig. 'da' < *e* + *i*, vielleicht auch ἔ-τι 'ferner.' The reconstruction of a deictic in $^*(e/o)s$ can be inferred from the Hittite personal pronoun *-aš*, which itself derives from a demonstrative (Sturtevant 1933:198 and Friedrich 1974:63), and from the etymologically related demonstrative in $^*so$- (Skt. *sá(s)*, Gk. ὅ, Go. *sa*), cf. Anttila (1972:359), while a deictic in $^*(e/o)N$ (*N*= *m* or *n*) can be assumed from the existence of "die *n*- Demonstrativa $^*no$-, $^*eno$-, $^*ono$-, $^*oino$-, $^*aino$- (cf. Skt. *aná-*, OCS *onъ*, Lith. *anàs*)². Now the element $^*i$ is attested in the locative (loc. sg. Skt. *-i*, Gk. *-ι*; loc. pl. Gk. *-σ-ι*) and the genitive cases. In Shields (1979), I propose "that *-i* in genitive function can ... be found in Tocharian AB *-i* (< IE $^*-o-i$, cf. Krause & Thomas 1960:59) and in the problematic Gothic genitive plural ending *-ē* (< IE $^*-ē$ < $^*-o-i$, cf. Schmalstieg 1973) and the Italo-Celtic genitive singular ending *-ī* (< IE $^*-ī$ < $^*-e-i$, cf. Schmalstieg 1973)" (Shields 1991b:24). "The use of the genitive suffix *-i* in early Germanic is perhaps seen in the Runic inscription of the gold ring of Bucharest: *gutaniowi hailag*" (Shields 1982a:48). I would also identify the *-y-* of the genitive singular desinence $^*-syo$ (Skt. *-sya*, Hom. *-οιο* < $^*-o-syo$) as an occurrence of this same element $^*-i$. In Shields (1991b:58), I argue that the $^*-y-$ of the ending $^*-syo$ must be viewed as an independent morphological entity: "Much of the impetus for positing a pronominal source for ... $^*-syo$ ... seems to come from the identification of [a] pronominal element within this suffix – $^*-yo$ (the stem of the relative pronoun) ..., cf. Szemerényi 1980:196, Burrow 1973:256. However, ... Hier. Luv. gen. sg. *-aši*, cf. Szemerényi 1980:169, which attests $^*-si$ without final $^*-o$, speaks strongly against a morphologically indivisible $^*-yo$. Likewise, Mycenaean Greek appears to show a genitive singular in $^*-o$ alone (e.g., *te-o*, *do-e-ra*), though Vilborg (1960:57) argues that these forms 'may be explained as showing erroneous omission of the sign *-jo*.'" $^*u$, with locative value, can be seen in the plural suffix $^*-s-u$ (Skt. *-s-u*,

---

² $^*so$- can represent either a thematization of $^*(e/o)s$ or a contamination of the deictics $^*(e/o)s$ and $^*e/o$ (Shields 1991a:25, n.3). A demonstrative stem in $^*es$- is also probably found in Osc. nom. sg. masc. *es-idum*, OIr. *ē* (*he*), OHG *er*, etc. (Shields 1987a:102).

Lith. *-s-u*) and in the dual desinence *-ous* (Skt. *-os*, OCS *-u*), while in genitive dual function it is attested not only in the suffix *-ous* but also in Toch. B *-naisäñ* (< *-oisun*) and Arcad. -οιυν (< *-oisun*) (Winter 1962:126). The marker *e/o/* is found, for example, in the locative and genitive dual (*-ous*), the dative-locative singular (*-ei*: Sk. *-e*, Lat. *-ī*, cf. Szemerényi 1980:146), and the genitive singular (*-syo*). *-(e/o)s* in locative function appears in the locative plural endings *-s-i* and *-s-u* and the locative dual suffix *-ous*. Besides its appearance in the genitive dual, this same element serves as the basis of the genitive ending *-(e/o)s* (sg.: Skt. *-as*, Gk. -ος, Lat. *-is*), as well as *-syo* and *-so* (Hom. τέο 'of which,' Go. *h̬is*, OCS *česo* 'whose')[3]. Finally, as a parallel to the genitive (plural) desinence *-ŏN* (Hitt. sg./pl. *-an*, Gk. -ων, Skt. *-ām*, Lat. *-um*), I have proposed in Shields (1982a:38–40, 1982b) that a locative marker in *-(e/o)N* is to be ascribed to Indo-European on the basis of locative forms like Skt. *áśvāyām* 'mare' and OP *schisman* 'this,' as well as the suffix *-i(n)* found "in Skt. and Av. loc. types like *a-sm-ín*, *a-hm-i*, *a-hm-y-a*, and in Homeric ablatives, instrumentals, and locatives (both sing. and plur. without distinction of form) in -φι(ν) (< *-bh-i(n)*)" Gray 1932:192–193. "These forms ... show *-N* in contamination with other elements, e.g., the suffix *-i*, with *-m* > *-n* in Sanskrit on analogy with the endingless locative of the *n*-stems" (Shields 1982a:38). "A locative nasal marker is likewise attested in Hitt. *ketani* 'this' and Sanskrit adverbs like *idā́nīm* 'now' and *tedā́nīm* 'then,' cf. Josephson 1967:137–138. In Shields (1982b), I propose that certain of the problematic Hittite adverbs in *-an* (e.g., *dagan* 'at the bottom') and the Tocharian locative endings (A *-aṃ*, B *-ne*) derive from this same locative-case construction in *-N*" (Shields 1987b:344–345).

In light of the late origin of genitive formations, the dialectal variety which results from such recent origin, and the deictic sources of genitive(-locative) markers, it would seem reasonable to derive the desinence of Italic pronominal genitives like *eius* from a contamination of the deictics *-i* and *-(e/o)s*, i.e., *-i-os*. This suffix *-i-os* was originally attached to a demonstrative pronominal stem alternate in *ei*, itself the result of the contamination of the deictics in *e* and *i* (cf. Brugmann 1911:332, Hirt 1927:15). A demonstrative stem-alternate in *ei-* for the demonstrative in *i-* can, of course, be independently reconstructed on the basis of such forms as dat. - abl. pl. *ei-bh(y)os* (Skt. *ebhyos*, OLat. *ībus*), loc. pl. *ei-su* (Skt. *eṣu*, OCS *ixъ*), and gen. pl. *ei-soN* (Skt. *esā́m*, Osc. *eisun-k*) (cf. Szemerényi 1980:190). Lane (1961:469–470) explains that contaminations of demonstrative (deictic) stems is a common linguistic development: "It is

---

[3] In Shields (1991b), I provide evidence that *-so* is not, in origin, a pronominal suffix but rather a general nominal genitive affix.

well known that by use a demonstrative tends to become weaker and weaker in its deictic force, and is therefore continually reinforced by being compounded with itself or with other demonstratives or with adverbs". The occurrence of this stem-alternate *ei-* in the genitive and locative cases is significant for the etymological analysis of Lat. *eius*, especially when one considers the variability of number specification in late Indo-European and the early dialects resulting from the relatively recent emergence of the non-singular number category. Indeed, Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1995:332) independently acknowledge that *eius* "could be explained" as containing an original root in *ei-*. It was the genitive (singular) demonstrative in *ei-ios* which served as the basis for subsequent analogical reformulation of the genitive (singular) case of other pronouns[4]. Perhaps this development was prompted, in part, by a reinterpretation of the element *-i-* of *ei-* as the genitive marker *-i*. In any event, Kurylowicz (1964:243) demonstrates that the demonstrative pronoun is central in analogical changes originating in pronominal paradigms. This proposal of mine regarding the origin of *eius* and similar forms is clearly in keeping with general tendencies of linguistic change, phonological developments in Latin, and morphological developments in the dialects generally. In regard to phonology, no *ad hoc* explanations of the shift of a hypothetical desinential *-s-* to *-y-* are necessery[5]; and, as far as morphology is concerned, the contamination of historically discrete genitive endings in dialectally unique ways is commonplace, cf., e.g., Lat. *-ōrum* < *-os-on*.

The origin of the Latin pronominal genitives under consideration remains controversial. However, I believe that the proposal made here is as reasonable as any heretofore presented and that it is quite consistent with much contemporary thinking about the evolutionary trends manifested by Indo-European and the early dialects.

REFERENCES

Adrados, Francisco. 1985. "Der Ursprung der grammatischen Kategorien des Indoeuropäischen." In *Gramatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte*, eds. B. Schlerath & V. Rittner. Pp. 1–49. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Richter Verlag.

Adrados, Francisco. 1987. "Binary and Multiple Oppositions in the History of Indo-European." In *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald*, eds. G. Cardona & N. Zide. Pp. 1–10. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

---

[4] On scribal and phonological variation between *eius* and *eiius*, etc., see Leumann (1963:290).

[5] Of course, *cuius* itself may derive from a root in *kwi-* (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995:332), to which *-ios* was attached.

Adrados, Francisco. 1992. "The New Image of Indoeuropean: The History of a Revolution." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 97:1–28.

Anttila, Raimo. 1972. *An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics.* New York: Macmillan.

Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Strassburg: Trübner.

Brugmann, Karl. 1911. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Vol. 2.2. Strassburg: Trübner.

Buck, Carl D. 1933. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burrow, T. 1973. *The Sanskrit Language.* Rev. ed. London: Faber & Faber.

Clark, Eve. 1978. "Locationals: Existential, Locative, and Possessive Constructions." *In Universals of Human Language*, vol. 4, ed. J. Greenberg. Pp. 85–126. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Fairbanks, Gordon. 1977. "Case Inflections in Indo-European." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 5:101–131.

Friedrich, Johannes. 1974. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I.* 2nd ed. Heidelberg: Winter.

Gamkrelidze, Thomas & V. V. Ivanov. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*, trans. by J. Nichols. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gray, Louis. 1932. "On Indo-European Noun Declension: Especially of -*o*- and -*ā*-Stems." *Language* 8:183–199.

Hirt, Hermann. 1927. *Indogermanische Grammatik.* Vol. 3. Heidelberg: Winter.

Josephson, Folke. 1967. "Pronominal Adverbs of Anatolian: Formation and Function." *RHA* 24:133–154.

Kent, Roland. 1946. *The Forms of Latin: A Descriptive and Historical Morphology.* Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.

Krause, Wolfgang & Werner Thomas. 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch.* Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Winter.

Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1964. *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Lane, George. 1961. "On the Formation of the Indo-European Demonstrative." *Language* 37:469–475.

Lehmann, Winfred. 1958. "On Earlier Stages of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection." *Language* 34:179–202.

Lehmann, Winfred. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Lehmann, Winfred. 1993. *Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics.* London: Routledge.

Leumann, Manu. 1963. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre.* Vol. 1. München: C. H. Beck'sche.

Lyons, John. 1968. "Existence. Location, Possession, and Transitivity." In *Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*, vol. 3., eds. V. van Rootselaar & T. Staal. Pp. 495–509. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Lyons, John. 1971. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Markey, T. L. 1979. "Deixis and the *u*-Perfect." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 7:65–75.

Markey, T. L. 1980. "An Historical Necessity: Non-Paradogmatic Paradigms. The Indo-European *SYO*-Genitive." *Folia Linguistica* 1:97–108.

Meillet, A. & J. Vendryes. 1968. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques.* Paris: Champion.

Schmalstieg, William. 1973. "New Thoughts on Indo-European Phonology." *KZ* 87:99–157.

Schmidt, Gernot. 1977. "Über indogermanische nominale Relativkonstruktionen." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 82:61–74.

Shields, Kenneth. 1979. "The Gothic Genitive Plural Ending *-ē.*" *Leuvense Bijdragen* 68:257–268.

Shields, Kenneth. 1982a. *Indo-European Noun Inflection: A Developmental History.* University Park: Penn State Press.

Shields, Kenneth. 1982b. "The Origin of the Tocharian Locative Suffixes." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102:129–131.

Shields, Kenneth. 1983. "Hittite Pronominal Suffixes in *-l.*" *Indogermanische Forschungen* 88:191–201.

Shields, Kenneth. 1987a. "Gothic *izwis.*" *NOWELE* 10:95–108.

Shields, Kenneth. 1987b. "Some Remarks about the Dual of Indo-European *o*-Stems." *Jorunal of Indo-European Studies* 15:341–352.

Shields, Kenneth. 1991a. "Comments about the *o*-Stem Genitive of Indo-European." *Historische Sprachforschung* 104:52–62.

Shields, Kenneth. 1991b. "Speculations about the Early Indo-European Genitive-Ablative and Dative-Locative." *Linguistique Balkanique* 34.1:221–227.

Shields, Kenneth. 1995. "The Indo-European Genitive Marker **-r*: Evidence from Germanic and Other Dialects." *NOWELE* 25:49–62.

Sturtevant, Edgar. 1933. *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language.* Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.

Szemerényi, Oswald. 1980. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft.* 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Vilborg. Ebbe. 1960. *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek.* Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.

Watkins, Calvert. 1966. "Italo-Celtic Revisited." In *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, eds. H. Birnbaum & J. Puhvel. Pp. 29–50. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Winter, Werner. 1962. "Nominal and Pronominal Dual in Tocharian." *Language* 38: 111–134.