

# GENERAL LINGUISTICS & COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY

## *Topic 5: The Comparative Method*

What are the assumptions and mechanisms underlying the Comparative Method? Does it have any restrictions or shortcomings, and if so, how can we remedy them?

ANTTILA, R. (1989) *Historical and Comparative Linguistics*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Ch. 11.

BLOOMFIELD, L. (1933) *Language*, New York: H. Holt. Ch. 18.

BYNON, T. (1977) *Historical Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 45–58.

HALE, M. (2007) *Historical Linguistics: Theory and Method*, Oxford: Blackwell. Ch. 10.

HALL JR., R.A. (1950) “The Reconstruction of Proto-Romance,” *Language* 26, 6–27.

HARRISON, S.P. (2003) “On the limits of the Comparative Method,” in B.D. JOSEPH and R.D. JANDA (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, Oxford: Blackwell, 213–243.

HOCK, H.H. (1991) *Principles of Historical Linguistics*, second edition, Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Chs. 18–19.

HOENIGSWALD, H.M. (1950) “The principle step in comparative grammar,” *Language* 26, 357–364.

——— (1960) *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KATIČIĆ, R. (1970) *A Contribution to the General Theory of Comparative Linguistics*, The Hague: Mouton.

LEHMANN, W.P. (1973) *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*, second edition, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. Ch. 5.

PULGRAM, E. (1959) “Proto-Indo-European reality and reconstruction,” *Language* 35, 421–426.