of abstractness (and predicativeness) of their singular, as (14) shows.

(14) *(hē) akróāsis* 'hearing'; pl. 'thing listened to, lectures'

Secondly, ANs do in general not occur in compounds. Yet this feature probably depends on the degree of the verbal origin (i.e., predicativeness) of such nouns rather than their abstract semantics (cf. Lazzeroni 2010 and Civilleri 2012). For instance, *-sis* nominals (which are the most verbal DNs; cf. Civilleri 2012) are never compounded. However, the corresponding *-(s)ía* nominals undergo composition according to the pattern shown in (15).

(15) *(hē) héxis* (= *hek-sis*) 'having, possession'; compound: *pleon-exía* 'advantage'.

Bibliography

Bader, Françoise. 1974. *Suffixes grecs en -m-: recherches comparatives sur l'hétéroclisie nominale*. Paris.

Benveniste, Émile. 1948. *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen*. Paris.

Bolelli, Tristano. 1953. "Origine e sviluppo delle formazioni greche in men/mon", *ASNP* 22:5–74.

Brugmann, Karl and Berthold Delbrück. 1889. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen II*. Strassburg.

Bruno, Carla. 2000. "Fra nome e verbo: osservazioni sulla sintassi dei nomi in -sis", *SSL* 38:129–167.

Chantraine, Pierre. [1933] 1979. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.

Civilleri, Germana O. 2012. *Nomi deverbali nel continuum nome-verbo: il caso del greco antico*. Munich.

Croft, William. 1991. *Syntactic categories and grammatical relations: the cognitive organization of information*. Chicago.

Flaux, Nelly, Michel Glatigny and Didier Samain. 1996. *Les noms abstraits. Histoire et théories*. Villeneuve d'Ascq.

Gagnepain, Jean. 1959. *Les noms grecs en -os et en -a. Contribution à l'étude du genre en indo-européen*. Paris.

Hamp, Eric P. 1982–1983. "Indo-European substantives in **-mó-* and **-ma-*", *ZVS* 96:171–177.

Holt, Jens. 1940. *Les noms d'action en -sis (-tis)*. Aarhus.

Krasuchin, Konstantin G. 2003. "Quantitativer und qualitativer Ablaut in der Nominalderivation". In: *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut*, Akten der Arbeitstatung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 19. bis 22. September 2001 in Freiburg, ed. by Eva Tichy, Dagmar S. Wodtko, Britta Irslinger, 83–104. Bremen.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1956. *L'apophonie en indo-européen*. Wrocław.

Lallot, Jean. 2008. "De Platon aux grammairiens: regards grecs sur la structure des mots non simples". In: *Regards croisés sur les mots non simples*, ed. by Barbara Kaltz, 51–63. Lyon.

Lazzeroni, Romano. 2010. "Nomi d'agente e composizione: una scala di nominalità". In: *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia*, ed. by Ignazio Putzu, Giulio Paulis, Gian Franco Nieddu, Pierluigi Cuzzolin, 256–265. Milan.

Lehmann, Christian. 2010. "Roots, stems and word classes". In: *Parts of speech. Empirical and theoretical advances*, ed. by Umberto Ansaldo, Jan Don and Roland Pfau, 43–64. Amsterdam – Philadelphia.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1958. "On earlier stages of the Indo-European nominal inflection", *Language* 34, 2:179–202.

Luraghi, Silvia. 2009. "The origin of the feminine gender in PIE. An old problem in a new perspective". In: *Grammatical change in Indo-European languages*, ed. by Vit Bubeník, John Hewson and Sarah Rose, 3–14. Amsterdam – Philadelphia.

Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics* 2. Cambridge.

Rico, Christophe. 2002. "Le suffixe -mos/-mós dans la recherche linguistique, de Ferdinand de Saussure à nos jours", *Emerita* 70, 2:305–320.

Schmidt, Johannes. 1889. *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra*. Weimar.

Simone, Raffaele. 2003. "Masdar, 'ismu al-marrati et la frontière verbe/nom". In: *Estudios ofrecidos al profesor J. Bustos de Tovar*, ed. by José Luis Girón Alconchel, 901–918. Madrid.

Simone, Raffaele and Anna Pompei. 2007. "Traits verbaux dans les formes nominalisées du verbe", *Faits de Langue* 30:43–58.

Vogel, Petra M. 2000. "Nominal abstracts and gender in Modern German. A 'quantitative' approach towards the function of gender". In: *Gender in grammar and cognition: I. Approaches to gender, II. Manifestations of gender*, ed. by Barbara Unterbeck, Matti Rissannen, Terttu Nevalainen and Mirja Saari, 461–493. Berlin – New York.

Wodtko, Dagmar S. 2005. "Nomen und Nominalisierung im indogermanischen Lexikon", *IF* 110:41–85.

Germana Olga Civilleri

Accentuation

1. The Notational System

The accent marks written in modern editions of Ancient Greek texts derive from a grammatical tradition that most likely began in Alexandria in the early 2nd c. BCE, with Aristophanes of Byzantium, to whom the invention of the written signs is attributed, and his successor as librarian, Aristarchus of Samothrace (→ Philological-Grammatical Tradition in Ancient Linguistics; Metrics (*métron*), Ancient Theories of). Given the important functional role that accent played in the language, conveying accentual information in writing facilitated the difficult task of reading poetic texts written in *scriptio continua*. For example, the unaccented graphic sequence *aponou* could represent *ap' ónou* 'from a donkey' or, *apò noû* 'from (your) senses' (cf. Aristoph. *Nub*. 1273), or *apónou* 'without toil (gen. sg.)'. These lectional signs conveyed the accentuation of the Koine spoken during that period, and to a lesser extent, the accentuation

of other dialects; it is possible that the scholars also consulted oral traditions, e.g. rhapsodic performances of the Homeric poems, to determine the accentuation of forms that were unfamiliar to them. In the 2nd c. CE, Aelius Herodian codified the tradition in *perì katholikês prosōidíās* 'On Prosody in General', which served as the basis for later works on accentuation. In the early accented papyri, which date from the 2nd c. BCE onwards, notational conventions vary, as does the frequency with which written accents were applied. The notational system familiar to us, where each accented word is marked with an acute, circumflex, or grave, was first applied in minuscule manuscripts of the 9th c. CE by scribes following the precepts of the same grammatical tradition. The early works on accentuation including Herodian's do not survive as such, but scholia and short treatises based on them provide us with indirect access. On the grammatical tradition, the papyri, and the manuscripts, see Probert (2006:21–52) and references therein.

2. Phonetics and Phonology of the Greek Accentual System

Phonetically, accent may be studied from an articulatory, acoustic, and perceptual standpoint. It is clear that the most salient perceptual correlate of ancient Greek accent – what the Greeks themselves 'heard' – was → pitch, at least until the 2nd c. BCE. Within the word, pitch peaked during → syllables marked with an acute or grave accent, and it both peaked and fell again during syllables marked with a circumflex. Phonologically, we may say that syllables marked with acute accent hosted a High tone, and those with a circumflex hosted a High-Low tone, i.e., a falling contour tone. Evidence for the phonetic nature of Greek accent comes from several sources. The words used to refer to 'accent' have to do with musical pitch, e.g. *tónos* refers to the 'tension' and therefore to the perceived pitch of vibrating strings, and the basic meaning of *prosōidíā* is 'singing along (to music)'. The adjectives used to specify the three different types of *prosōidíā* are *oxeîa* 'high' for acute, *bareîa* 'low' for grave, and *oxubáreia* 'high-low' for circumflex. Fragments of non-strophic musical compositions dating from as early as the 3rd c. BCE – the Delphic hymns in particular – provide a richer source of phonetic detail. As in vocal music traditions in a number of languages with contrastive tone (Devine and Stephens 1994:160–171), the fragments display a relatively strict correspondence between the pitch movements of speech and the melody of the music it is set to (Devine and Stephens 1994:172–194; Probert 2006:47–48; West 1992:199). For example, the accented syllable of a word is set no lower than its unaccented syllables, such that the pitch peak of a word corresponds to a local peak in the music. If a syllable bearing a circumflex is set to a two-note melism, the first is usually higher, respecting the falling pitch contour of circumflex accent. The grave accent, a phrasal → sandhi variant of the acute, proves to be a lowered version of the acute that nevertheless represents the pitch peak within the word (Devine and Stephens 1994:180–183), and it is possible to reconstruct the accentual contour of entire words. For example, in a properoxytone word of five syllables (e.g. pres. mid. ptc. *eklegómenos* 'picked'), pitch rose steadily over the initial two unaccented syllables, peaked at the accented syllable, then fell steeply over the first post-accentual syllable and less steeply over the final syllable (Devine and Stephens 1994:183–189). The turning point between the post-accentual fall in pitch and the rise to the following accent coincides with word-boundary, which certainly had a 'demarcative' function, i.e., made word boundaries audible (Allen 1973:246); this may point to a Low word-final boundary tone in the phonological representation (Devine and Stephens 1994:180). Statements by grammarians and other ancient scholars provide a further source of information about the phonetic nature of word-level accentuation (Devine and Stephens 1994:171–172; Probert 2003:4–7), and comparison with the accentual systems of related languages, especially Vedic and Balto-Slavic, suggests that in Proto-Indo-European, one syllable of each accented word was realized with high pitch (cf. Olander 2009:53–100 with refs.).

The accentuation of a word is determined by interacting phonological, morphological, and lexical factors. The → phonology plays two important roles in this system. First, it places restrictions on which syllables can host an accent and on what type of accent (acute and/or circumflex) can be realized there. The most important of these restrictions, the so-called '→ Law of Limitation', essentially sets the accent-

able domain of a word, which consists of the final three syllables if the ultima is light, and the final two if it is heavy (Göttling 1835:21–28; Steriade 1988:273–275). Note that for the Law of Limitation, a single word-final consonant is weightless (is not associated with a → mora); final syllables ending in a short → vowel (-V#) and those ending in a short vowel followed by a single → consonant (-VC#) both count as light (monomoraic), e.g. *basíleia* 'queen', acc. sg. *basíleian*. All other syllable rhymes count as heavy (bimoraic) (→ Syllable Weight). Within the accentable domain, an acute accent is phonologically permissible on any syllable (with one systematic exception noted below), but the circumflex accent is subject to further restrictions. It is phonologically licit on final syllables containing a long vowel or → diphthong (i.e., final VV-syllables), where an acute is also possible, as reflected by contrasts such as *isthmoí* 'isthmuses' (nom.) vs. *isthmoî* 'on the isthmus' (loc./adv.). The circumflex also occurs on penultimate VV-syllables, where it is in complementary distribution with the acute according to the so-called '*sōtêra* rule': the accent on a penultimate VV-syllable is realized as a circumflex if the word-final syllable contains a short vowel, e.g. *sōtêra* 'savior' (acc.), *oîkos* 'house'; otherwise, it is realized as an acute, e.g. *sōtḗrōn* 'saviors' (gen.), *oíkois* 'houses' (dat.). In other words, if the penult is accented, the phonology determines which type of accent is realized there, meaning that phonologically, a contrast in accent type is limited to word-final VV-syllables. Together, these phonological restrictions permit only the five combinations of accent location and type already recognized by the ancient grammarians:

- Oxytone (*oxútonos*): acute on the ultima, e.g. *ophthalmoí* 'eyes'
- Perispomenon (*perispṓmenos*): circumflex on the ultima, e.g. *ophthalmôn* 'eyes' (gen.)
- Paroxytone (*paroxútonos*): acute on the penult, e.g. *sōtḗrōn* 'saviors' (gen.)
- Properispomenon (*properispṓmenos*): circumflex on the penult, e.g. *sōtêra* 'savior' (acc.)
- Proparoxytone (*proparoxútonos*): acute on the antepenult, e.g. *hḗlios* 'sun'

However, the maximum number of ways any given form may be accented is three, as exemplified by the following nonsense words:

meiduplērē:	*meiduplērê*	*meiduplērḗ*	*meiduplḗrē*
meiduplēros:	*meiduplērós*	*meiduplêros*	*meidúplēros*
meiduploros:	*meiduplorós*	*meiduplóros*	*meidúploros*

3. Lexicon, Morphology, Phonology: Recessive Accentuation

Within the bounds set by the phonology, morphological and lexical factors determine the accentuation of a given word (→ Classical Greek Morphology (Survey); → Greek Lexicon, Structure and Origin of). Thus, Greek accent is only 'free' insofar as the accentuation of a word is not determined by phonological factors alone. This limited freedom is reflected in minimal pairs that differ only in position and/or type of accent, e.g. *kḗr* 'doom' vs. *kêr* 'heart', *lithobólos* 'pelting with stones' vs. *lithóbolos* 'pelted with stones'.

If every inflectional form of a word is accented as early (i.e., as far 'left') as permitted by the Law of Limitation, that word is said to exhibit 'recessive accentuation', e.g. *ánthrōpos* '(hu) man', gen. sg. *anthrṓpou*, dat. sg. *anthrṓpōi*, acc. sg. *ánthrōpon*, etc. In this accentual subtype, we observe the second role of phonology interacting with lexical and morphological factors. Recessive accentuation is both the property of particular lexical items, such as *ánthrōpos*, and the property of entire morphologically circumscribed classes of words, such as finite verbs, 3rd-declension neuter nouns, and most types of → compounds, including those whose first member is a governing preposition or verb (Kiparsky 2003; Vendryes 1945:189–196), e.g. *phil(o)*-X 'X-loving' compounds such as *phíloinos* 'wine-loving', *philósophos* 'wisdom-loving', *philópais* 'boy-loving', *philórtux* 'quail-loving', *philospêlunx* 'cave-loving', etc. In short, lexical and/or morphological features determine whether a word is recessively accented; the phonology determines the accentable domain and locates the accent 'leftmost' in that domain.

A number of facts suggest that recessive accentuation was the unmarked or default type of accentuation in the language (cf. Probert 2006:128–144): among accented words, recessive accentuation is more frequent than non-recessive accentuation by both type and token; comparison with Vedic and Germanic points to a tendency within the history of Greek to innovate recessive accentuation in inherited lexical items,

e.g. *páros* 'formerly' vs. Vedic *purás* 'before' < PIE **pṛh$_x$ós* or **pṛh$_x$és*; entire morphological classes of words (noted above) are recessively accented in Greek, but no such class is associated with a non-recessive type of accentuation; finally, in Lesbian, recessive accentuation was generalized to virtually all accented words, arguably due to an extreme form of the tendency just noted.

A central question regarding the Law of Limitation and recessive accentuation is whether the accentable domain is related to the rhythmic phonology of the language in general (cf. Devine and Stephens 1994:154). In other words, can the accentable domain be equated with a rhythmic/prosodic constituent that is also reflected in meter, word formation, and other (morpho) phonological processes? Building on Steriade (1988), recent studies suggest that the accentual domain is – or is aligned with – a unit of rhythmic organization known as a → foot (cf. Probert 2010 with refs.). The span between the accent (´) and word-end (#) consists of two light syllables (LL), e.g. *heurḗ**mata**#*, a heavy syllable (H), e.g. *heurēmá**tōn**#*, or a heavy-light sequence (HL), e.g. *heú**rēma**#* – in other words, ´LL# or ´H(L)#. This span has been equated with a word-final quantity-insensitive trochaic foot (Sauzet 1989) and a quantity-sensitive one (Golston 1990). The latter, a bimoraic rhythmic unit consisting of either two light syllables (LL) or one heavy syllable (H) may also be reflected in Greek word formation (Gunkel 2011), meter (Golston & Riad 2000; 2005; Gunkel 2010:43–75), and constraints on minimal word size, *alias* word minima (Devine and Stephens 1994:93; Golston 1991). On that analysis, in recessively accented words, the beginning of the post-accentual fall in pitch (`) is aligned with the first mora of the word-final foot, e.g. *heurḗ*(*màta*) and – representing the bimoraic long vowel *ō* as *oo* – *heurēmá*(*tòon*). For indispensable in-depth treatments of Ancient Greek rhythmic organization including alternative views on foot structure, cf. Allen (1973) and Devine and Stephens (1984, 1994).

4. Further Morphological Factors

Morphological features also condition the phonological status of the word-final diphthongs *-oi* and *-ai* in the accentual system. For both the Law of Limitation and the *sōtêra* rule, word-final *-oi* and *-ai* have the status of a light word-final syllable rhyme consisting of a short vowel plus a consonant (-VC#). This is apparent in recessively accented paradigms where, for example, nom. pl. *philósophoi* 'philosophers', *basíleiai* 'queens', and 2 sg. aor. imp. mid. *paídeusai* 'educate' are proparoxytone like nom. sg. *philósophos*, acc. sg. *basíleian*, and 2 sg. aor. imp. act. *paídeuson*, which end in -VC#. It is also apparent in forms where the *sōtêra* rule applies. For example, nom. pl. *oîkoi* 'houses', *gaîai* 'lands', and aor. inf. act. *paideûsai* are properispomenon like nom. sg. *oîkos* 'house', acc. sg. *gaîan* 'land', and neut. nom./acc./voc. sg. aor. act. ptc. *paideûsan*, which end in -VC#. The inflectional endings *-oi* and *-ai* of the 3 sg. present and aorist optative active and the locative singular – or adverbial locative – ending *-oi* pose morphologically conditioned exceptions. Like all other word-final long vowels and diphthongs, they have the status of heavy -VV# rhymes in the accentual system. This is likewise reflected in recessive paradigms where, for example, 3 sg. pres. and aor. opt. act. *paideúoi* and *paideúsai* are paroxytone like *paideúō* 'I am educating', and where the *sōtêra* rule fails to apply: loc. sg. *oíkoi* 'at home' is paroxytone like dat. sg. *oíkōi*. There is no evidence that this morphologically conditioned phonological distinction between diphthongs existed outside the system of accentuation (Probert 2012).

The distribution of acute and circumflex accents on word-final syllables that are phonologically 'free' to host either accent is conditioned by morphological features as well. Specifically, the distribution appears to be based on case: nominative and accusative forms bear an acute accent, genitive and dative forms bear circumflex accents, e.g. 1st declension nom. and acc. sg. *phorá̱* 'carrying, bearing; load, burden', *phorá̱n*, pl. *phoraí*, *phorá̱s* vs. gen. and dat. sg. *phorâs*, *phorâi*, pl. *phorôn*, *phorâis*.

Morphemes themselves have accentual properties (Kiparsky 1973, 2010, forthcoming; Probert 2006:145–148; Steriade 1988). Descriptively, there are four types in Ancient Greek. First, there are inherently accented morphemes such as the stem *agró-* of *agrós* 'farm, country' and the suffixes *-ád-* and *-ikó-* of words such as gen. sg. *phugádos* 'exile', *manikós* 'mad'. The last inherently accented morpheme imposes its accent on the entire derivative, e.g. *phugád-ikó-s* *phugadikós* 'of/for exile' (not **phugádikos*). Most inherently accented morphemes are stems or derivational suffixes (→ Derivational Morphology) such as the *-eú-* used to form nouns of

occupational/ethnic appurtenance and agent nouns, e.g. *khalkeús* 'bronzesmith' (derived from *khalkós* 'bronze'), *Euboieús* 'Euboean' (from *Eúboia* 'Euboea'), *stigeús* 'tattooer' (from *stízō* 'I tattoo'), the *-mó-* used to form deverbal nouns, e.g. *biasmós* 'violence' (from *biázō* 'I (use) force'), *hoplismós* 'arming' (from *hoplízō* 'I arm'), and the *-téo-* used to form deontic verbal adjectives, e.g. *graptéos* 'to be written' (from *gráphō* 'I write'), *ōnētéos* 'to be bought' (from *ōnéomai* 'I buy'), etc. However, there are also inherently accented inflectional suffixes, such as the genitive plural ending *-ôn* of 1st declension nouns, which arose by contraction from *ā́-ōn*. Compare the accented ending in nouns such as nom. sg. *pórnē* 'prostitute', gen. pl. *pornôn* with the unaccented ending *-ōn* of 1st declension feminine adjectives such as nom. sg. *állē* 'other', gen. pl. *állōn* (not **allôn*). Second, there are pre-accenting morphemes, which differ from accented morphemes in that they induce an accent on the preceding syllable. They include the *´-ai* used to form aorist active infinitives, e.g. *telésai* 'complete', *poiêsai* 'do, make' (with a circumflex by the *sōtêra* rule) and the *´-sthai* used to form perfect medio-passive infinitives, e.g. *tetelésthai* 'have completed'. Third, there are inherently unaccented morphemes that adopt the accentual properties of the base form. Most inflectional endings are of this type, e.g. the gen., dat., and acc. sg. endings *-os, -i*, and *-a*, of *phugádos, phugádi, phugáda*, and the nom., gen., dat., and acc. endings of *phugádes, phugádōn, phugási(n)*, and *phugádas*. The suffix *-the(n)* that is used to form ablatival adverbs also has these properties; compare *agróthe(n)* 'from the country' (from *agrós*) with *állothe(n)* 'from another place' (from *állos* 'other'). Fourth, there are inherently unaccented suffixes that induce recessive accentuation regardless of the accentual properties of the base. The suffix *-(i̯)a* has those properties, e.g. *alḗtheia* 'truth' (from *alēthḗs* 'true'), *basíleia* 'queen' (from *basileús* 'king').

5. The Evolution of the Greek Accentual System

Examination of linguistic developments within the history of Greek and comparison with related languages, especially Vedic, allows us to reconstruct the development of the Greek accentual system. Perhaps the most important trend in the diachronic development of the Greek accentual system involves a trajectory from a relatively 'free' accentual system, where accent was primarily morphologically determined and phonology played a minor role – like the Vedic system – to a less free, more phonologically constrained system. Specific developments along this trajectory are the Law of Limitation and several prehistoric and historic leftward accent shifts which also display sensitivity to the distribution of syllable weight, such as → Wheeler's Law, which was apparently pan-dialectal, and → Vendryes' Law, which affected → Attic only. The development of the Law of Limitation in Proto- or Common Greek was likely facilitated by the fact that the inherited morphological accent very often happened to 'obey' the Law of Limitation before it arose (Probert 2012). For example, language learners could analyze forms such as *phérō, phéreis, phérei, phéromes/n, phérete, phéronti*, etc. either as being morphologically accented on the verbal root *phér* 'carry', or phonologically accented, such that the accent was aligned with a rhythmic constituent such as the word-final foot mentioned above, i.e., *phé(ròo)*, *phé(rète)*, etc. An analysis of the latter sort – likely facilitated by changes in rhythmic organization and/or its phonetic expression – produced the Law of Limitation.

In the wake of the accent shifts, speakers made sense of new weight-sensitive accentual differences within the same word-formation type by innovating morphophonological rules for accent placement. For example, Wheeler's Law produced alternations such as *psūkho-pompós* 'soul-escorting' vs. *patro-któnos* 'father-killing' in a compound type which was originally oxytone, to judge by Vedic, e.g. *hasta-grābháḥ* 'hand-grasping', *bhuvana-cyaváḥ* 'world-shaking'. Speakers innovated the following rule for the formation of these compounds: if the penult is light, accent it (*teukhes-phóros, teukho-phóros* 'armor-wearing'); otherwise, accent the ultima (*psūkho-pompós*). Neuter diminutives in *-ion* reflect a comparable rule: they are usually paroxytone if the antepenult is heavy and properoxytone if it is light (Vendryes 1945:166), e.g. *thēríon* 'little beast' vs. *thúrion* 'little door'.

The Proto-Greek innovation of circumflex accentuation offset this trend slightly, insofar as it introduced a new kind of accentual freedom – the contrast between acute and circumflex – in word-final VV-syllables, e.g. gen. sg. *phorâs* vs. acc. pl. *phorā́s*. The circumflex in such forms,

and likely in Greek in general (Jasanoff 2004), arose via the contraction of an accented vowel with a following unaccented vowel over which the pitch fell again, e.g. gen. sg. (PIE **bʰoréh₂es* >) **pʰoráas* > *phorâs*, dat. sg. (PIE **bʰoréh₂ei̯* >) **pʰoráai̯* > *phorâi*, gen. pl. (PIE **sth₂tóhₓom*) > **statóom* > *statôn* 'placed, standing'; compare the Rigvedic and Avestan metrical evidence for uncontracted genitive plural forms in **-aăm* (cf. Kümmel forthcoming). Speakers apparently found morphological case to be the best predictor of accent type, with the result that circumflex accentuation was analogically extended to forms that originally had acute accentuation, e.g. PIE dat. sg. **sth₂tói̯* >> *statôi* (→ Analogy).

Regarding the accentual properties of morphemes, Vedic has correlates for the four Greek types sketched out above, as well as a fifth type of underlyingly accented morpheme that either imposes its accent on the derivative, like Greek *-ikó-*, or adopts the accent of the base, like Greek *-the(n)*, depending on the accentual properties of the base (cf. 'recessive accented' morphemes in Kiparsky 2010, forthcoming, with refs.). The Vedic suffix *-(m)āná-*, the cognate of the Greek medio-passive participial suffix *-meno-*, has those properties. Compare suffix-accented *śaśamānáḥ* 'having labored' with root-accented *yájamānaḥ* 'sacrificing'. Which language innovated in this case is a subject for future investigation.

The complex interplay of phonological, morphological, and lexical factors, the robust attestation of the language, and a tradition of scholarship on the subject that has its roots in the 2nd c. BCE make Ancient Greek accentuation a unique subject for constructing and testing linguistic theories as well as for reconstructing the accentual system of Proto-Indo-European.

Bibliography

Allen, W. S. 1973. *Accent and rhythm*. Cambridge.

Devine, A. M. and Laurence D. Stephens. 1984. *Language and metre: resolution, Porson's Bridge, and their prosodic basis*. Chico, CA.

———. 1994. *The prosody of Greek speech*. Oxford.

Golston, Chris. 1990. "Floating H (and L*) tones in Ancient Greek". In: *Proceedings of the Arizona Phonology Conference*, vol. 3, ed. by J. Myers and P. E. Perez, 66–82. Tucson, AZ.

———. 1991. "Minimal word, minimal affix". In: *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. 21, ed. by T. Scherer, 95–110. Amherst, MA.

Golston, Chris and Tomas Riad. 2000. "The phonology of Classical Greek meter", *Linguistics* 38.1:1–69.

———. 2005. "The phonology of Greek lyric meter", *Journal of Linguistics* 41:77–115.

Göttling, Karl W. 1835. *Allgemeine Lehre vom Accent der griechischen Sprache*. Jena.

Gunkel, Dieter. 2010. *Studies in Greek and Vedic prosody, morphology, and meter*. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

———. 2011. "The emergence of foot structure as a factor in the formation of Greek verbal nouns in -μα(τ)-", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 65:77–103.

Jasanoff, Jay. 2004. "Acute vs. circumflex: some notes on PIE and post-PIE prosodic phonology". In: *Per aspera ad asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen*, ed. by A. Hyllested et al., 247–256. Innsbruck.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1973. "The inflectional accent in Indo-European", *Language* 49:794–849.

———. 2010. "Compositional vs. paradigmatic approaches to accent and ablaut". In: *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, ed. by Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine, 137–181. Bremen.

Kiparsky, Paul. *Forthcoming*. "Accent and ablaut".

Kümmel, Martin. *Forthcoming*. "Der Genitiv Plural im Indoiranischen", *Indogermanische Forschungen*.

Olander, Thomas. 2009. *Balto-Slavic accentual mobility*. Berlin – New York.

Probert, Philomen. 2006. *Ancient Greek accentuation: synchronic patterns, frequency effects, and prehistory*. Oxford.

———. 2010. "Ancient Greek accentuation in Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory", *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4:1–26.

———. 2012. "Origins of the Greek law of limitation". In: *Laws and rules in Indo-European*, ed. by P. Probert and A. Willi, 163–181. Oxford.

Sauzet, Paul. 1989. "L'accent du grec ancien et les relations entre structure métrique et représentation autosegmentale", *Langages* 24:81–111.

Steriade, Donca. 1988. "Greek accent: a case for preserving structure", *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:271–314.

Vendryes, Joseph. 1945. *Traité d'accentuation grecque*. Paris.

West, M. L. 1992. *Ancient Greek music*. Oxford.

Dieter Gunkel

Accommodation

Language accommodation (LA) is the tendency of a speaker to modify linguistic behavior according to interlocutor characteristics. "Language Accommodation Theory" was developed in the 1970s (Giles 1979) in the area of social psychology and is based on the assumption that speakers are motivated to adjust their speech style, or accommodate it, to express their attitude to others. The motivation for accommodation lies in the (unconscious?) desire of speakers to associate themselves with (positive LA), or keep themselves apart from (negative LA), given social groups. In order to have one of the two typologies of LA, speakers should possess different languages and/or social and regional dialects → (Dialects, Classification of). In order to predict instances of LA, a model based on the