

A. AUFSÄTZE

H₂O

1. The question whether the second laryngeal (h_2)¹ changed *o* to *a* or not is one of the points in the laryngeal theory on which general agreement has not yet been reached. The problem is not without importance. For example Kuryłowicz (Apophonie 168, Idg. Gramm. II 205) has whole constructions based on $oh_2 > \bar{a}$ in the 'Südsprachen', which, to my mind, must fall.

I discussed the problem Dev.² 128,166–8,290. In these pages I would like to review the present state of the problem, adding some new evidence and refuting some criticism. I think there can be no doubt that *o* was not affected by h_2 .

2. I start from the assumption that as regards the 'colouring' there was no difference between the sequences h_2o and oh_2 . This point is generally accepted, as far as I see.

The major difficulty is that in many IE languages *o* and *a* as well as \bar{o} and \bar{a} fell together. We find:

	Gr.	Lat.	Arm.	Celt.	Lith.	Germ.	Slav.	I.-Ir.	Hitt.
\bar{o}	ω	\bar{o}	<i>u</i>	\bar{a} (\bar{u})	$\left. \begin{matrix} uo \\ o \end{matrix} \right\}$	\bar{o}	<i>a</i>	\bar{a}	<i>a</i>
\bar{a}	$\bar{\alpha}$ (η)	\bar{a}	<i>a</i>	\bar{a}					
<i>o</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>o, a</i>	$\left. \begin{matrix} o \\ a \end{matrix} \right\}$	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>
<i>a</i>	α	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	$\left. \begin{matrix} a \\ a \end{matrix} \right\}$					

It appears that the evidence must come from Greek and Latin, while some further material could be expected from Lithuanian, Armenian and Celtic. As reliable material from the last two languages is, in general, scarce, and as Lithuanian can only be useful for oh_2 , the matter must be decided largely on the basis of Greek and Latin. It is useful to point this out, because it explains why it is difficult to find decisive evidence.

¹ To designate the laryngeal I use the sign *H*, but when it is followed by a number *h*, because there is then no reason to use the disturbing capital, as misunderstanding is excluded.

² Dev.: R. S. P. Beekes, *The Development of the PIE Laryngeals in Greek* (The Hague 1969).

3. There are cases where – as anybody allows – we seem to have an interchange a/o , \bar{a}/\bar{o} in the same element, which is most easily explained by groups with $e/o + h_2$ on the assumption that o retained its colour.

Those who maintain that o was changed to a have two arguments, of which in general the weakness may be pointed out here.

1. There are forms where we expect o -vocalism but find a (supposing $h_2o > a$; this argument providing positive evidence).

2. Forms with o alternating with a are due to secondary ablaut (this argument explaining evidence to the contrary).

As for 1, we should realize that our expectation may be wrong. We have drawn up rules to which most forms concerned obey, but there are almost always exceptions. To give one example, proterodynamic neutral u -stems have o -vocalism: δόρυ, $*h_2o\dot{\iota}u >$ Skt. *āyu* (below), γόνυ, nevertheless we find Lat. *genu*, Hitt. *genu*.

Ruijgh (in his review of Dev., *Lingua* 26 (1971) 189–195) supposes $\dot{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma < *h_2onh_1mo-$, which is a good case to show how difficult these problems are. The rule that $-mo-$ has o -grade of the root is well established: $*kolh_2mo-$, OHG *halm*, Lat. *culmus* etc., $*orHmo-$ (I use the notation of Meillet, Introduction⁸, p. 265, but see below), Goth. *arms*, OCS *ramo*. But there are other forms:

o -voc.	reduced grade	zero grade
<i>halm</i>	κάλαμος ($*k_eh_2$) ³	
<i>arms</i>		Skt. <i>īrmā-</i> ($-ṛH-$), OPr. <i>irmo</i>
We find a comparable situation with $-m\bar{a}$:		
o -voc.	reduced grade	zero grade
OHG <i>hamma</i> ($*konh_2-$ <i>mā</i>)	παλάμη, Lat. <i>palma</i> ($*p_eh_2-$)	κνήμη ($*k_eh_2-$), OIr. <i>cnāim</i> OIr. <i>lám</i> ($*plh_2-$)

My conclusion is that we must be careful with ablaut grades; what holds good in many cases, need not be true in all. As for $\dot{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$, Lat. *animus*, if it was not $*h_2enh_1mo-$, it could have been $*h_2enh_1mo-$ (probably not $*enh_1mo-$, since I expect $*\epsilon\nu\epsilon-$ from it, though this is not sure, cf. Dev. 229).

Cases with e -grade indeed are hard to find. Lat. *rēmus* is complicated as it seems to have $-smo$. E -grade have $\vartheta\epsilon\rho\mu\omicron\varsigma$, Arm. *ṣerm*, beside Av. *garəma-*, Lat. *formus*. The statement that e was typical of the adjective, o of the substantive, seems based on this case only and has therefore little value. It is contradicted by the forms with o . That these would have their o from the

³ Κάλαμος has been explained from $*\kappa\omicron\lambda\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma$ through assimilation, but o is never assimilated in Greek; see Schwyzler Gr. Gr. I 225f., Dev. 206.

substantive (Skt. *gharmá-*) is mere hypothesis, and it would have to be assumed for two languages (in Avestan and in Latin; the connection with OIc. *varmr* has been doubted). A sure case is Lat. *armus*⁴, which must represent **h₂erHmo-*, but I cannot use this evidence at this moment, since one might hold that *armus* from **h₂orHmo-* confirms *h₂o > a* (in Latin).

Moreover, I think that these old words showing ablaut derive from original hysterodynamic *m*-stems. In hysterodynamic words we find *o* and *e* grade side by side (ποιμήν, κολων-ός, οίων-ός below, πόντος against ἔρσην, γείτων, λειμών, εἰδώς, ἡώς; see my article on the hysterodynamic nominative which will appear in KZ 1972), so we may expect them here also.

In general, then, these rules about the distribution of *e* and *o* seldom obtain for 100 %, and if they do our material is so limited that we cannot conclude from that that it obtained in all cases that really existed.

4. Ad 2. Secondary ablaut as a general solution for 'unexplained' cases of *o*-vocalism is a mere guess. It is a far-reaching hypothesis which can hardly be made probable. The weakness of this suggestion appears from Ruijgh's words (*Lingua* 26 (1971) 193f): "Il vaut mieux expliquer les cas isolés de

⁴ As to Lat. *armus*, the treatment of Ernout-Meillet seems to me very inadequate. For *irmá-* etc. a basis **arə-*, **ĩ-* is posited (where we might posit **arə-* or **orə-*). I may cite what follows: "Ceci ne se concilie pas avec gr. ἄρμός 'jointure, épaule' de **ar-smo-* (. . .). C'est à gr. ἄρμός que ressemble lat. *armus*. — En arménien, l'«épaule (d'animal)» se dit *eri*. . . La racine *y* est donc de la forme *er-*, et l'on retrouve un procédé analogue à gr. ἄρμός et lat. *armus* (pour une trace de vocalisme *e* en germanique, v. sous *armentum*)."

It is not sure that Arm. *eri* belongs to the 'arm' word, because it has no *m*, as do all other languages. Its *e*- makes connection with lat. *armus* impossible. It does not, then, give any difficulty for the interpretation of *armus* etc. (That *armentum* 'troupeau de gros bétail' should have the same root as *armus* is most improbable, that it contains **ar-* 'to fit' is a mere guess. Its etymology need not concern us here. De Vries (*Etym. Wb.* v.s.) moreover rejects the connection with *jərmuni*.)

It is not stated explicitly why ἄρμός gives difficulty. I suppose it is the fact that it must derive from an aniṭ root **ar-*. However, it is misleading to state that ἄρμός (also) means 'épaule'. Liddell-Scott give 'joint, fastening, bolt, peg' and in the Hippiatrica 'shoulder-joint'. It is evident that this word is derived from a root meaning 'to fit'. The fact that it is (once?) used also of a shoulder is not relevant to its etymology. The Greek word, then, does not have the meaning 'arm', and should for this reason and for the aniṭ root not be connected with *armus* etc. As the root of *irmá-* etc. always has a laryngeal, and **ar-* (**h₂er-*) 'to fit' never has one, it is very doubtful whether the first root is an enlarged form of the second, i.e. whether **h₂er-H-* contains **h₂er-* 'to fit'. This belongs to what Frisk calls the 'entbehrliche Wurzelspekulationen'. The essential point is the statement: "C'est à gr. ἄρμός que ressemble lat. *armus*". What is meant is probably that we should expect **aramus* from **h₂erHmo-*. But this case is entirely parallel to *palma*, παλάμη and *culmus*, κάλαμος, so that *armus* may well represent **h₂erHmo-*. Both as to form and meaning *armus* should be connected with *irmá-* etc., while ἄρμός and Arm. *eri* should be kept separate.

mots tels que βωμός, φωνή, ὕγμος comme résultat d'une apophonie plus récente, qui n'a pas réussi à pénétrer plus profondément dans le système de la morphologie grecque". It is not probable that *isolated* cases are due to a recent reshaping (which is then called abortive), rather than cases where an old ablaut (*a/o*, *ā/ō*) has been preserved. Moreover, we would have to assume a parallel development for other languages. Most important is that – as such general considerations seldom carry conviction – for some good cases such an analogical secondary ablaut cannot possibly be taken into consideration.

5. In his review of Dev. (l.c.) Ruijgh adduces as evidence for $h_2o > a$, beside isolated instances where *o* is expected, three arguments:

1. perfects of roots with $\bar{a} < eh_2$ in the stem had \bar{a} also from oh_2 , which was one of the points from where the vocalism of the present was introduced in the perfect. E.g. πῆγγυμι < **peh₂g-*, πέπηγα < **-poh₂g-*.

2. The lengthening of the first vowel of the second element of compounds would be due to stems ending in *o* followed by a laryngeal of the second element, *-o-h₂-* giving \bar{a} -, which was considered as a simple lengthening of the α < h_2 -. If *-oh₂-* would have given ω -, such a reinterpretation would have been impossible. E.g. ἱππᾶμολγός > **-o-h₂molgo-*.

3. The 1 sg. Middle ending *-ai* would have *o*, as have *-soi*, *-toi*.

The first argument is a new one. I can only say that it could have been a factor, but that there is no necessity to assume it. There is a general leveling of ablaut and a general introduction of the present stem in all verb forms, which does not depend on this one phonological factor. In the case of η following a sonant, the form may derive from the zero grade, e.g. $\tau\epsilon$ - $\tau\lambda\eta$ < $\bar{t}\bar{l}h_2$ -.; see Dev. 244. (For $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\chi\alpha$ this is evident, since **g^uloh₁-* would have given * $\beta\lambda\omega$ -. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\mu\eta\mu\alpha\iota$, and $\tau\mu\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, seem older than $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\mu\eta\chi\alpha$ (which also has h_1 , so that oh_1 would have given ω), which certainly have **tmh₁-*.)

The second argument also is not more than a possible way of explaining a problem, but it is far from evident that this is the right one.

The last argument starts from one wrong and one unproven hypothesis. The unproven one is that the three endings must have had the same vocalism. In Cyprian, e.g., this is not the case, where we find *-μᾱι* against *-σοι* *-τοι*. The wrong one is that *-ai* may be compared with *-soi* *-toi*. The first belongs to a different set of endings (with h_2 , th_2 , \emptyset ; see e.g. Szemerényi, Einführung p. 305). There is, then, no reason to assume h_2oi . In an article which will appear in IF 1972, I demonstrated that, if *these* endings had the same vowel, it must have been *e*.

The counter arguments, then, are either wrong or indecisive. Mostly one rejects the evidence for one or two cases (as does Lindemann, Einführung in die Laryngaltheorie, pp. 34f and 48f), but there are several cases for which the evidence cannot be reasonably doubted.

6. The Material

It is my aim to review here all the material that may be relevant to the

problem, as far as it is known to me. Much of it has been discussed in Dev. (122, 166–8, 290) and I will not repeat that here. I shall present here only new evidence, or more complete considerations on the old material. After this detailed discussion I shall give a complete list (§ 28) with a synopsis of the relevant forms and a reference to the full discussion either in Dev. or in this article.

7. (οἰωνός) There can be no doubt that the connection of οἰωνός with Lat. *avis* etc. is the most evident one, that with ἰός ‘arrow’ is far fetched⁵. If this is right, it can be easily explained as athematization of *οἰων, as we have in κολωνός. Nouns derived from nouns in -ων are also found in ἀγκώνη, κορώνη, μελεδώνη, -ός. In an article in KZ 1972 (‘The Nominative of the Hysterodynamic Noun-inflection’) I try to demonstrate that the nominative of this type had full grade of the root (and root accent). The *a*-vocalism of Lat. *avis* requires **h₂euī-*. For *οἰων I would therefore suppose a nominative **h₂ouī-ōn* (of which the genitive would have been **h₂uī-n-os*)⁶. That the root of these hysterodynamic nouns could have *o*-vocalism appears from the forms cited in § 3 (ποιμήν, πόντος) and from the above cited κολωνός, κορώνη.

⁵ Ununderstandably complicated and unacceptable is Schmeja’s derivation (IF 68, 1963, 34–6) from a word for ‘egg’: φόν → *φωνος. He indicates himself some difficulties: “Auffallend ist nur, daß der im Griech. (nach Metathese -f- > -t-) neu entstandene Langdiphthong φ in φόν (...) erhalten geblieben ist, während er in οἰωνός < *φωνος gekürzt wurde; vielleicht spielen hier rhythmische Gründe mit.”

Schindler, Die Sprache 15 (1969) 144–67, also discussed the possibility that the word for ‘egg’ is cognate with that for ‘bird’. His article is wholly unacceptable to me and is not relevant here.

I do not understand Belardi’s objection (Doxa 3, 1950, 215f) against *οἰωνος: “l’esclusivo trisillabismo in Omero rende improbabile la connessione con Lat. *avis*”. First, *οἰων-*os* (*οἰωνος; Belardi writes *οἰ-ω-νός, but refers to Boisacq 694, where ἰ is found; of course *οἰ-ω- was realized as *οἰω-) could never have been other than trisyllabic. Secondly there are places in Homer where one could assume four syllables, e.g. κύνας ἦδ’ οἰωνούς at the end of the verse in B 393 θ 379 N 831 P 241. (But this is not decisive evidence to assume four syllables.) The objection, then, is not true, and if it were true, would be no objection.

⁶ In αἰετός < *αἰ-ετ- Greek preserves another noun probably of this type from the same root: **h₂euī-ōt*, acc. -έτ-η, gen. **h₂uī-t-ós*. – E. J. Furnée, Die wichtigsten konson. Erscheinungen d. Vorgriech. (Leiden 1972) 115 n. 4 considers αἰετός as pre-Greek, because of a variant αἰητός. However, this η occurs in one manuscript of Pi. P. 4. 4, where ε stands in a place that requires a long syllable (this slight metrical licence evidently caused the ‘conjecture’) and in Aratos 313 and 523, where it is “une forme purement artificielle” (Chantraine, Dict. étym.): it is a pun on ἀηται and ἀητεῖται resp. There can be no doubt as to the PIE origin of this word. (Note that Alb. *vito* ‘pigeon’ may continue **h₂uī-t-*; Solta, Stellung d. Arm. 173. I may also recall Welsh *hwytad* ‘duck’ which could represent **auīetos* according to Pedersen VKG I 55f., but which is not mentioned by Frisk or Chantraine.)

Since Schulze (Kl. Schr. 662) the *o*-vocalism of *οἰωνός* is explained by assimilation from **αἰων*-. But:

1. Schulze did not know that *o*-grade was possible in these forms;
 2. Greek has often *o*-grade in other *-ων* forms;
 3. there is no sure case of this type of assimilation;
 4. there are counter-instances that show that such assimilation did not occur.
- On 1 and 2 see above.

Ad 3. Schulze cites as evidence *κοχώνη*, *σαρωνίδες*/*σορωνίδες* and *ἄρρωδέω*/*ῥρρωδέω*. None of these cases, however, is without difficulty. The interpretation of *κοχώνη* is not sure, see Frisk. It has been connected with Skt. *jānghā*, *jaghāna*-. Both the Greek and Sanskrit words seem to me to be non-IE. (see Mayrhofer Etym. Wb. s.v. *jānghā*). This is the more probable if *προχῶναι* is cognate with *κοχώνη*. The explanation of *προχῶναι* as comic contamination of *πρωκτός* and *κοχώνη* is far from sure, and to my mind improbable. Reduplication (in *κο-χών-η*) is well known from Greek substratum words. We need not assume that the *o* was assimilated from *a*.

The same is true of *σαρωνίς*/*σορωνίς*: the word is probably not IE. In these substratum words an interchange *α*/*o* is found more often, an explanation being impossible. It should be added that it would be strange when the assimilated and the unassimilated form would exist side by side.

The origin and relation of Ion. *ἄρρωδέω* – Att. *ῥρρωδέω* is not clear. Connection with *ῥρος* < *ῥροσ*- is improbable as it supposes “daß die att. Form ins Ionische eingedrungen ist mit gleichzeitigem Übergang von *ῥρο*- zu *ἄρο*-” (Frisk). This means that we are not sure what the original vocalism was. That *ἄρο*- was changed in Attic to *ῥρο*- by association with (Attic!) *ῥρος* seems a possibility. As proof of assimilation *ἄρο*- > *ῥρο*- it cannot be used; moreover *ἄρρωδέω* is the Ionic form, and Ionic has *οἰωνός*, not **αἰωνος*.

Schwyzler, Gr. Gr. I 255 only gives the last two cases as instances of a supposed assimilation *α* : *ο*(*ω*) > *ο* : *ο*(*ω*). This type of assimilation, then, has not been demonstrated.

Ad 4. *Αἰών* ‘life, age’ is a sure instance of exactly the same sequence, where no assimilation occurred. (One could also point to *αἰῶ* < **αἰοσ*-*α*, presupposing **αἰω*ς, where *αι* has been retained.) Another sure piece of evidence is *αἰωρέω*⁷.

⁷ To connect the word *αἰώρα* ‘swing, hammock’ with *αἰρέω* it has been explained as derived from the verb *αἰωρέω*, “ein Deverbatives Intensivum” with “sowohl Intensivreduplikation wie Dehnstufe” (Frisk). I do not believe in this intensive reduplication; the cases cited (Schwyzler, Gr. Gr. I 647a 1), *δαιδύσσεσθαι*, *παιπάλλω*, *ποιφύσσω*, *ποιπνύω*, are to my mind for a large part non-IE. Our case would be the only one to have it with *ῥ*-, and *-αι*- would have to be analogical, since dissimilation from **ῥαρ*-*ῥω*- is improbable, in any case it would be the only instance of it. Decisive is that *αἰρέω* has a stem **αῖῥε*- from **h₂yer-*, and the laryngeal, or the *α*-, is neglected in the analysis **ῥαι*-*ῥω*-, which is therefore impossible. (Continue next page.)

One might point out that αῖών has no original *o* in the root (so that we should not expect it in οἰωνός either), or otherwise points to *h₂o* > *a*. On the last assumption οἰωνός is inexplicable, and the fact that both *e* and *o* occur in hysterodynamic nouns cannot be doubted (the forms cited in § 3). There is no explanation of this fact. (Perhaps *o* was normal in the nominative, while *e* belonged to another case: vocative, accusative, locative?).

I resume. The most evident etymology connects οἰωνός with Lat. *avis*. The *a*-vocalism demonstrates **h₂eui-*. Οἰωνός is then without any difficulty explained as a thematic derivation from **h₂oui-ōn* > **οἰων*, cf. **kolH-ōn* > **κολων* in κολωνός. This formation must be very old. It is improbable that οἰ- originated from αἰ- by assimilation, as there is no positive evidence for this type of assimilation and as αἰών (αἰῶ) and αἰωρέω are evidence to the contrary. Analogic introduction of the *o* is improbable either, because one sees no basis for the analogy. Secondary ablaut, if this is anything else then analogy (which I do not think), is a vague guess that could not be substantiated. The form, then, can only be explained, and easily so, by assuming *h₂o* > *o*.

8. *H₂ouiōn*.

A few words may be added about **h₂ouiōn*.

The reconstruction may seem doubtful, as it is based on one language only. However, because of the *o*-vocalism of the root, it is hardly possible that it is a Greek formation. It must therefore date back to PIE.

As, then, the reconstruction is reliable, we have in **h₂ouiōn* an important testimony for full grade of the root in such – hysterodynamic – forms, and more specially of *o*-vocalism. (For root accentuation there is no independent evidence in this case.)

9. (οἶς) An important form provides the word for ‘ear’, where Greek has οἶς, while *a*-vocalism is found in Lat. *auris* etc., OIr. *au*, *ó*. (Not relevant are Av. *ušī* and Arm. *unkn*, which have zero grade, and Goth. *auso* etc., Lith. *ausis*, OCS *ušī*, of which it is uncertain whether they have *ou* or *au*.)

Meillet probably saw the difficulty of these forms, for he assumes for **aus-* “*a* prothétique”, Introduction 312. We need not discuss this suggestion. A form **aus-* (e.g. Frisk) means either **eus-* or **Hus-*. The first will hardly be accepted by anybody – I know of no case where it has been assumed with some probability –, the second must have had *h₂* to explain the *a*-vocalism⁸.

If αἰώρα is IE at all, it may have been derived from αἰωρέω, but this can itself be denominative supposing **aiωpos*, -ov. This in turn may be secondary for **aiωp*, as κολωνός supposes **κολων*. This form might continue **h₂eui-ōr* or **h₂eiu-ōr* (of which the first has at least the root in common with αἰτω).

⁸ A form *H₂us-* is hardly acceptable. Of course *Hus-* would have given *us-*, also in Greek. Rix, MSS 27 (1970) 108 n. 5, supposes that *HiC-* became *lC-*, but *HuC-* > *α/ε/ουC-*. This assumption seems improbable to me and it is refuted by ὑδέω (belonging to αὔδῃ etc., Dev. 89,127) and ὑφ-αίνω, if my interpretation of Myc. *ewepesēsomena* (*ewepsēsomena* from **h₂uebh-*, Dev. 67) is right.

Szemerényi (SMEA 3, 1967, 47–88) explained the *o*-vocalism through influence of the words for ‘eye’, ὄμμα, ὀφθαλμός, ὄψ. This suggestion, taken over by Ruijgh (l.c., 194), may be attractive to those who speak Dutch, where these words are *oog* and *oor*, but it is hardly understandable that **aus-*(*os*)/*aus-nt-* took over the *o* from **ōk^{us}*, **ok^u-m^h*, ὀφθαλμός⁹. Moreover Greek has also traces of **aus-*. The evidence may be put together here.

1. Hom. παρήιον, Att. παρειάι, Aeol. παραιῦαι. For the connection with ‘ear’ see Frisk s.v. The forms have been convincingly explained by Kiparsky, Lg. 43, 619–35 (*-aus-* > *-awh-* > *-ahw-* > Aeol. *-aww-*, written *-av-*, elsewhere > *-āw-*). The form is found in Myc. *parawajo/paraw(w)aiō* ‘cheek-pieces.’

2. ἄτα (codd. ἄτα) · ὤτα. Ταραντῖνοι, Hesychius. Kiparsky (l.c.) proposes **ousnta* > **ō(u)ata* > *āta*, but this is impossible. The groups *ōā* (πρωαν > πραν) and *āō* give *ā* in Doric, but *oa* and *ao* both give *ω* (Buck, Gr. Dialect. pp. 37 and 42, Lejeune, *Traité* 235f; cf. Dev. 215). In these two cases (*ōā*, *āō* and *oa*, *ao*) the lengths of the vowels are equal. When *o* + *a* gives *ω* (even though *ō* + *ā* gives *ā*), we may be sure that *ō* + *a* would have become *ω*. We must therefore assume **aus-nt-* to explain ἄτα. (Szemerényi starts from **ōfāt-*, but Kiparsky clearly demonstrated that **ousnt-* gives **ōyat-*).

3. **αῶς*. The testimony for a nominative **αῶς* is very dubious (see Wackernagel, IF 45 (1927) 312 = Kl. Schr. II 1252f). It rests on Paulus ex Festo 100,4: *heus* adverbium vocandi a Graeco ays. As *heus* means ‘ho, hark’ and *ays* must represent a Greek form **αῶς*, it has been supposed that **αῶς* was a (Doric) form for ‘ear’. Frisk hesitatingly accepts it, Szemerényi (l.c.) rejects it. The only thing in favour of the suggestion is that the Roman scholar might have known the word from Tarentum (see nr. 2). But there is more against it. It is not stated that a word for ‘ear’ was meant with *ays*. If it were, it is strange that there is no comment, for Romans of course knew *οἶς*, as we do, but not **αῶς*. It seems therefore more probable that a Greek interjection is meant (or could not connection with *ἄλω* be considered?) Further, we would have expected **ἄς*, not **αῶς*, just as Doric has *ῶς* (not *οῶς*, which has Attic *ου* = [*ō*]). The evidence, then, is not reliable.

4. *αῶσιν* ὥσιν is cited by Chantraine, *Morphologie*² 85 R II, as given by Hesychius, but it is not found there (as was pointed out by Szemerényi). Chantraine kindly informs me that he took the form from Meillet-Vendryes, *Traité de gramm. comp.* (1948³) p. 475. He was not able to retrace the origin of the ‘gloss’, nor am I. It seems, then, that we must forget it.

5. ἄνθα· εἶδος ἐνωπίου παρὰ Ἀλκμαῶνι ὥς Ἀριστοφάνης, Hesychius. The value of this form is reduced by the fact that its formation is not clear.

Greek, then, has evidence for *a-* beside *o*-vocalism, though only in two forms (1 and 2). This refutes, I think, Szemerényi’s theory that the *o-*

⁹ Ὀφθαλμός is certainly of non-IE origin; see Dev. 193.

vocalism is analogical. He has to assume that, when *o*-vocalism was introduced, the word for 'cheek' had become sufficiently independent to remain unaltered. This possibility may be granted. But $\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$ shows that Doric had *a*-vocalism beside *o*-vocalism ($\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\acute{\omega}\alpha\tau$; Szemerényi's denial of Doric $\acute{\omega}\alpha\tau$ does not convince). It is hardly possible that *o*-vocalism within one dialect-(group) was not introduced in all forms (of the word for 'ear' itself), while we find the *o* in all dialects. On the other hand it is not difficult to understand that, when both *e*- and *o*-vocalism originally coexisted in the word, both vocalisms occur in one dialect¹⁰. Szemerényi's idea must therefore be rejected. As stated above, the idea is improbable in itself¹¹.

The root of the word for 'ear', then, had the forms $*h_2eus-$, $*h_2ous-$, $*h_2us-$, and Greek retains the *o*-vocalism, which shows that h_2 did not affect the timbre of the *o*.

10. ($\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$, $p\bar{a}-/p\bar{o}-$) On the question whether $p\bar{a}-$ and $p\bar{o}-$ are forms of one root we shall be short. The distinction is based on a difference in meaning supposed to be parallel to a difference in form: $*p\bar{a}-$ 'füttern, nähren, weiden': $*p\bar{o}-$ 'weiden, hüten, schützen (bedecken)'. For the distinction of the forms the Indian, Tocharian, German, Slavic and Baltic forms are of no use. It is, then, based on Lat. *pasco pastor pabulum*, $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (and Arm. *hauran*?) against $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$ $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$. Of course, the two fields of meaning distinguished have one in common ('to tend'), from which both 'feed' and 'protect' can be easily derived. (Trier starts from 'Zaun, -geflecht', the basic meaning of nearly all German words according to some scholars; see De Vries, Altnord. etym. Wb. s.v. *fóðr*.) I think a convincing argument can be found in Hitt. *pahs-* 'schützen'. If we were to distinguish $*p\bar{a}- = *peh_2-$ from $*p\bar{o}- = *peh_3-$, the meaning of the Hittite word would make us expect $*p\bar{o}- = *peh_3-$. This, however, is impossible, as Hitt. *pas-* 'einen Schluck nehmen'¹² must certainly represent $*p\bar{o}- = *peh_3-$ 'to drink', which shows that h_3 in this position disappeared. The *-h-* therefore must represent h_2 . Further, the *-s-* of Hittite has its parallel in Latin. This means that the form ($*peh_2-s-$) of the one and the meaning ('schützen') of the other of the two supposed roots are found together in Hittite. This strongly suggests that it is in fact one root. We have, then, $*peh_2- > *p\bar{a}-/ *poh_2- > *p\bar{o}-$.

11. ($\sigma\tau\omicron(\iota)\acute{\alpha}$, $st\bar{a}-/st\bar{o}-$) If Frisk's explanation that $\sigma\tau\omicron(\iota)\acute{\alpha}$ is based on $*\sigma\tau\omega\text{Fj}\alpha > *\sigma\tau\omicron\text{Fj}\alpha > *\sigma\tau\omicron\alpha$ and contains the root $*steh_2-$, is accepted, we

¹⁰ It should be stressed that the co-occurrence of *o* and *e* in one paradigm presents a problem. However, this cannot be a reason to deny the reconstruction, because the same is found in so sure a case as $\gamma\acute{o}\nu\upsilon$, Lat. *genu* (see above § 3).

¹¹ I am glad that Prof. Chantraine wrote me that he is of the same opinion.

¹² On the basis of this meaning Kronasser, Vgl. Laut- u. Formenl. d. Heth. p. 43, suggests connection with Lat. *pasco*, for which he compares $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ 'ich esse' oder 'trinke'. However, Bechtel, Lexilogus zu Hom. s.v., demonstrated that its use for drinking is secondary.

must start from **stoh₂u-ih₂*. The same root has been assumed for *στώμιξ* (*δοκίς ξωλίνη* Hesychius); Frisk s.v. *στήμων*. Neither of the two hypotheses can be regarded as certain. However, Lith. *stuomuõ*, *stúomas* (beside *stomuõ* < **stā-*), all meaning 'Körperwuchs, Gestalt', seem more reliable witnesses for **stoh₂-*; see Fraenkel s.vv. (It is not necessary to explain the *o*-vocalism of *stuomuõ* from that of *stúomas*; see above §§ 3 and 7).

12. (ὄναρ) For *ὄναρ* *ὄνειρος* Hamp, AION-L 2 (1960) 187, convincingly argued for **Honr* **Hner-*. If we assume *h₂*, we could explain the Cretan forms *ἄναρ* *ἄναιρον*, when we allow different levelings of *ὄναρ* **ἄνερ-* (This possibility was not considered in Dev. 71; assimilation *ὄναρ* > *ἄναρ*, which was suggested there, is very improbable, as *o* is never changed by assimilation in Greek.)

13. (οἰδέω) With the root of *οἰδέω* has been connected Lat. *aemidus*. Though this connection seems generally accepted (Frisk, Ernout-Meillet, Kuryłowicz, Idg. Gramm. II 252), it cannot be regarded as certain.

14. (ὠκύς) With *ὠκύς*, Lat. *ōcior* must probably be connected Lat. *acupediū* and *accipiter* ('hawk'). See Ernout-Meillet s.vv. They suppose for *acu-* a zero grade form *ə-*. This, however, would mean a (PIE) vocalized laryngeal, **H₂ku-* (**Hku-* would have given Lat. **cu-*), which is not probable. It must be a full grade **h₂ek-*. In that case *h₂* is necessary. Whether then **ōk-* represents **oh₂k-* or **h₂ōk-* is difficult to decide. However, *h₂* seems sure, and for our purpose it is irrelevant whether we have *oh₂* or *h₂o*.

15. (κώπη) *Κώπη* - *κάπτω* is adduced by Kuryłowicz, Idg. Gr. II 252. Pokorny (p. 527f) establishes *a*-vocalism (< *h₂e*) on the basis of Skt. *kapāṭi* 'two handful'. Ernout-Meillet (s.v. *capio*) rightly consider this basis not safe enough (Mayrhofer considers non-IE origin), and posit **kēp-/kep-* on the basis of *cēpi*. This, however, is not possible for *καπ-*, which must be **kh₂(e)p-* (unless **k_ep-* is assumed, which is not impossible). Lat. *cēpi* may be analogical; OIc. *háfr* 'Fischnetz' is too doubtful to establish *ē*. Connection with Lith. *kūopa* 'Haufen, Schar' would confirm *ō*. (I could not see Karaliunas, Baltistica 5 (1969) 183-96, who denies the connection *kūopa* - *kaũpas*.)

16. (ψωμός) Mostly *ψωμός* is, together with *ψώχω* *ψώρα* etc., considered as the *o*-grade of **psā-* in *ψῆν*, and connected with Skt. *psāti* 'kaut, verschlingt'. However, there are some semantic obstacles, though these are not decisive (*ψῆν* 'reiben': Skt. *psāti* 'kauen'; if *ψωμός* 'Brocken, Bissen' against *ψῆν* 'reiben, kratzen' would be difficult, we could as well use *ψώχω* 'zer-, abreiben'), while several forms that are adduced have a strong non-IE aspect: *ψαθάλλω*, *ψαθυρός* (beside *ψαδυρός*!), *ψάμμος* (beside *ψάμαθος*, *ἄμαθος*, *ψῆφος*, Lat. *sabulum* giving a root **(p)sam-/sab(h)-*; see Kuiper, Μνήμης χάριν I 228). It is of course possible that IE and non-IE elements were mixed. The evidence, then, is not very reliable.

17. (ἄγωγή) The interpretation of *ἄγωγή* is quite uncertain. The latest discussion is from Benveniste (BSL 59, 1964, 32): it is parallel to *ἐδωδή*

which is *ὦδη, from a root *ōd- found in Arm. *utem* and Lith. *úodas* 'gnat', "renforcé et réinterprété par un rappel de ēδ-."

18. (ῥμος) A group that is of importance here is ῥμος 'shoulder' beside Hesychius' ἄμέσω· ὠμοπλάται. The group was recently discussed by Ambrosini, Ann. Pisa 26 (1957) 3-20 and Polomé, RBPH 45 (1967) 824-6. There are many difficulties. Skt. *amsá-*, Goth. *ams(a)* suggest **omsos*, but this form would have given *ὀμός in Ionic-Attic (if not *ὀόνος, see Lejeune, Traité 124 with n. 3). If a form with -ōm- is considered, -ōms- seems not possible, as this was in Greek shortened to -oms-. The form with -ομμ-, cited to show the Aeolic development, is ἐπομμάσιαις which one manuscript gives for ἐπωμαδίαις in Theocritus 29, 29. This -ομμ- can represent -oms- without difficulty.

Ambrosini proposed a noun **h₃em-s* **h₃m-es-*, supposing that ἄμέσω was of Phrygian origin. In that case it would be of no interest to us. But I am not convinced that this is right. As the word is apparently given in the dual (of an *o*-stem *ἄμεσος), it is evidently taken from a - (archaic?) Greek - text. It would then have to be a Phrygian loan, but Phrygian loans in Greek (for a word of the 'vocabulaire fondamental') are rare, if they exist at all. (One might rather think of Macedonian. Cf. for *h₃* > α ἀβροῦτες· ὀφρῦς.) The difficulty, of course, is the intervocalic σ. I have no solution for it, but given the many uncertainties I would not at present exclude the possibility of Greek **h₂ōm-* or **oh₂m-*, **h₂mes-* (**h₂m-et-i-* ? Cf. Skt. *aratnī* beside ὠλέν-η).

19. (ὠτειλῆ) ὠτειλῆ supposed to derive from *oFα-τ- has been connected with ἄάω, that probably had a stem *ἄFα-. These reconstructed stems would have to be **h₂ouh₂-*, **h₂eu_hh₂-*, but the connection of the two words is semantically far from sure.

20. (οἶμος) Benveniste, BSL 50, 39f, connected οἶμη, οἶμος 'song' with Hitt. *ishamai-* as **sHom-ḫo-*. When the *h* represents *h₂*, the hypothesis would be of interest to us. However, in the sequence -*m_i*- the *m* turned to *n* in Greek, as appears from βάλνω < **g^um_i-ḫ-*. (The alternative in Schwyzler, Gr. Gr. I 309 Zus. is improbable. Lejeune, Traité 124 n. 2, gives no comment.) The idea, then, must be given up.

21. (οὐδέησσα) In this discussion the form οὐδέησσα has been mentioned, e.g. Kuryłowicz, Idg. Gr. II 252. He understands it as a variant of αὐδέησσα. As such it would show **h₂oudeh₂* > *οὐδή (with the expected *o*-vocalism) and would be a striking confirmation of our theory.

However, this form does not exist. In the first place it is not a variant, as say e.g. Liddell-Scott and Chantraine (Dict. étym. s.v. αὐδή), but it is a conjecture of Aristotle. Also this conjecture was not made to restore αὐδέησσα to an older form, but it was coined by Aristotle from οὐδας, as appears from the fact that it is presented by the scholia with the interpretation 'ἐπίγειος' 'ἐπὶ γῆς'. Most explicit is the statement of the scholia E.P.Q.T on ε 334: ζητεῖ Ἀριστοτέλης, διὰ τί τὴν Καλυψὼ καὶ τὴν Κίρκην καὶ τὴν Ἰνώ αὐδέησσας

λέγει μόνας. πᾶσαι γὰρ καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι φωνὴν εἶχον. καὶ λῦσαι μὲν οὐ βεβούληται. μεταγράφει δὲ . . . οὐδήςεσσα . . . πᾶσαι γὰρ αὐται ἐπὶ γῆς ὥκουν. This clearly shows that Aristotle replaced the word he found in the text by another, because he did not understand it¹³. (Of course, Aristotle's suggestion is useless.)

¹³ It is curious to see that this simple epithet has caused trouble from antiquity to now. In the phrase δεινὴ θεὸς αὐδήςεσσα (μ 449, κ 136 = λ 8 = μ 150) it is mostly translated 'speaking with human voice' (Liddell-Scott, Stanford ad ε 334), 'mit menschlicher Stimme begabt' (Ameis-Hentze-Cauer ad κ 136, Frisk), following a tradition: φωνῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ χρωμένῃ. This is obviously wrong. Aristotle rightly remarked that all gods have φωνή = αὐδὴ (there was no distinction between the words). There is no evidence that the gods were ever imagined as not having a voice or as having another *kind* of voice as men have. This may be demonstrated from Homer: θεῶ (θεοῖς) ἐναλίγκιος αὐδὴν T 250 α 371 = ι 4, θεοῦ (-οῖο, . . .) ἔκλυεν αὐδὴν O 270 β 297 δ 831 ξ 89. Apparently aware of this difficulty is Chantraine, Dict. étym. s.v. αὐδὴ, who presents another interpretation: "possédant le langage humain par opposition à celui des dieux". This suggestion is impossible because αὐδὴ never means 'language, (tongue)', but 'voice', and from there 'the ability of speaking' (if this is what is meant with the slightly ambiguous word *langage*). The answer to Aristotle's question why specially these goddesses were αὐδήςεσσα is simple: because they are described as singing goddesses. The epithet clearly means 'having a good voice'. Both Calypso and Circe are said to sing *ὅτι καλῇ* (ε 61, κ 221).

There is no difficulty in the fact that elsewhere αὐδήςεσσα evidently has a different function. Αὐδήςεσσα means 'having voice', not 'having human voice', for this translation suggests that it indicated human voice in opposition to other types of voice, but such do not exist. Then we can distinguish three contexts (in Homer):

I ἀνθρώπων . . . αὐδέντων ζ 215

βρότος αὐδήςεσσα ε 334 (of Ino)

II αὐδέντα δ' ἔθηκε . . . "Ἡρ T 270 (of Achilles' horse)

III δεινὴ θεὸς αὐδήςεσσα κ 136 = λ 8 = μ 150 (Circe), μ 449 (Calypso)

In I man is distinguished by a typical characteristic – as epithets do –, his voice, i.e. his ability of speaking. As the scholiast (V ad ε 334) clearly says: ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀνθρωποὶ φωνήεντες πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα ζῷα. (Note that in ε 334 Ino is not a θεὸς αὐδήςεσσα; she is said to have been a βρότος αὐδήςεσσα, that is a human. Αὐδήςεσσα cannot, therefore, be used to put her on a line with Circe and Calypso, as did, e.g. Aristotle and Untersteiner (see below). In II 'having voice' is also clear, for horses do not normally have a voice = the ability of speaking, as men do. 'Having voice' in III, where it is used of somebody who sings, naturally means 'having a good voice'. These adjectives easily take the notion of 'many' (ἰχθυεῖς, δεινὴς, πιδήεις 'riche en sources' Chantraine, Formation 272) or 'good' (μητιεῖς, τερμύεις 'à la belle bordure', Chantraine ibid. 271). I do not think that Untersteiner, *Odyssey* Libro XI, ad vs. 8, is right when he says that αὐδὴ "significa la parola umana sotto l'aspetto della sua musicalità"; this is an ad hoc assertion for which there is no evidence in Homer. I think the slight modification in the value is due to the context. However, he is right, I think, when he holds that the singing of the two goddesses had originally a deeper meaning. To my mind it refers to the magic practices of Circe, as does δεινὴ. Perhaps δεινὴ θεὸς αὐδήςεσσα originally even meant 'the terrible goddess with the voice', i.e. 'with the dreadful voice', or 'the mighty, powerful voice'. There is, then, no difficulty whatever with form or interpretation of αὐδήςεσσα.

Aristotle's conjecture has no right to a place in an Indogermanische Grammatik, nor in this discussion.

22. (φωνή) As to φωνή (*Dev.* 167) compare now Frisk. (As φωνέω probably replaced *φωνάω, this part of the argumentation in *Dev.* 168 must be given up.) There is little evidence for a root **bhen-*, which has also been suggested. Skt. *bhanati* and OHG *bannan* may have **bhh₂-en-*. Moreover, Kuiper, Proto-Munda Words in Sanskrit 32, considers *bhanati* as a secondary form taken by a non-IE *bhaṇati*. Another explanation (followed by Frisk) is that which connects it with OCS *zvoni* as **ghuōn-*. However, I see no reason to abandon the connection with φημι. The semantic objection (see Frisk) is not decisive; cf. αὐδῶ – αὐδάζω, φωνή – φωνέω.

23. (θῶξιαι) The forms θῶξιαι, τέθωκται beside θήγω (*Dev.* 168) have been explained as shortened from θωρήσσομαι (see Chantraine, *Dict. étym. s. v.* *θώσσω). This idea is not very probable: why would θωκ- have been connected with θᾱγ-/θήγ-? The forms θᾱξιαι· μεθύσαι, τεθᾱγμένοι· μεμεθυσμένοι show that the α-forms have same meaning. Τέθωκται· τεθύμωται shows a meaning that can be easily derived from θήγω 'schärfen, anfeuern'. It is enough to demonstrate θᾱγ-/θωγ- (It may be recalled that πτήσσω/πτώσσω is exactly parallel.)

24. (Skt. *āyu*) Indo-Iranian has one word that is of interest here, Skt. *āyu*, Av. *āyū*. If this represents **h₂oīu*, with *ā* from *o* according to Brugmann's Law, *o* must still have been present as such in Indo-Iranian.

25. (Arm. *hotn*) Arm *hotn* is since Meillet, BSL 26,11, connected with *ἄνεμος* etc. with *o*-vocalism of the root. As *ἄνεμος*, Lat. *animus* require **h₂en_h₁-mo-*, this etymology would imply **h₂on_h₁-mo-*. However, it would require a dissimilation *nm* > *lm*, which cannot be demonstrated elsewhere (though it cannot be refuted either by a case with *-nm-* preserved). *Etungn* has been supposed to show a dissimilation (*-no(n)gh-* >) *-nungn-* > *-lungn*, but this is almost certainly wrong (see my article 'μόνουχες ἱπποί' in *Orbis* 20). In *anun* < *-nomn-* there was no such dissimilation. The idea therefore is very doubtful. Van Windekens proposed (Handes Amsorya 1961, 547f) connection with Toch B *onolme* 'be alive' etc.

26. (OIr. *úan*) Celtic too has one form with *o* where the other languages have *a* < *h₂e*. It is the word for 'lamb', OIr. *úan*, Welsh *oen* from **oghⁿnos*, against Lat. *agnus*, Gr. *ἄμνός* (for the stop, *gⁿ* or *ghⁿ*, see Pokorny 9). The Celtic *o-* has been explained through influence of **o₂is* < **h₃eyi*¹⁴. This idea cannot be refuted. One could only point out that the long *ā* or *ō* of Slavic (*j*)*agnę* points to ablaut of the root, so that *h₂o-* beside *h₂e-* might be expected as well.

27. (Lith. *úolektis*) Very difficult is the interpretation of the group to which Lith *úolektis* 'elbow' belongs. The form *úolektis* beside *alkūne* point to **ōl-ek-*, *ol-k-*. This type of ablaut is not known from one paradigm. (The same type

¹⁴ Cf. Luw. *hayi-*, HierHitt. *hawa/i-*, Lyc. *χava-*. However, the possibility of **h₂o₂yi-* cannot be excluded.

is perhaps found in ὠλήν etc. beside ὀλέκρονον, if from *ὀλενοκρ-.) The form is only important here if Hesychius' ἄλαξ· πῆγυς. Ἀθαμάνων belongs to it and if this word is Greek. However, ἄλαξ could only represent **h₂l_ek-* (**h₂l_e-k-* would have given *ἄλκ-). Neither **h₂ōl-ek-* / *h₂e / ol-k-* nor **oh₂l-ek-* / *h₂e / ol-k-* (with **h₂l_ek-*) can be fitted into a PIE paradigm. Most important, however, is that ἄλαξ is not found in Hesychius. I do not know how it came into the discussion.

28. Survey of the Material

I will presently give a survey of the cases that point to *h₂o* or *oh₂*. They will be given in alphabetical order, whenever possible under the Greek cognate, because the majority of the material comes from Greek. After these the words from other languages will be given. Signs have been put before the catchword, meaning: (?) probable, ? doubtful, ?? very doubtful (see the following paragraph).

1. ?? ἀγωγή Dev. 125f and above § 17.
2. βωμός, from the root βᾱ- in ἔβην; Dev. 167, 290.
3. θῶξαι, τέθωκται beside θήγω, θάγω, τεθαγμένοι. Dev. 168 and above § 23.
4. ? κώπη beside κάπτω; o-vocalism perhaps also in Lith. *kúopa*. Above § 15.
5. ὄγκος beside ἄγκ- (see Frisk s.v.). Dev. 128.
6. (?) ὄγμος, if from ἄγω. Dev. 128.
7. (?) οἰδέω, if cognate with Lat. *aemidus*. Above § 13.
8. ? οἶτος, if cognate with αἶσα. Dev. 128.
9. οἰωνός from **h₂oui-ōn*, cognate with Lat. *avis* < **h₂eyis*. Above § 7.
10. ὄκρις, Lat. *ocris*, Umbr. *ukar*, gen. *ocrer* beside ἄκρος, ἄκρις. Dev. 128.
11. (?) ὄναρ, if together with ἄναρ from a paradigm **h₂on₁* **h₂ner-*. Above § 12.
12. οὖς against παρήϊον etc., Tarentine ἄτα, Lat. *auris*. Above § 9.
13. ποιμήν, πῶν beside Lat. *pabulum*, *pasco*, *pastor*, Hitt. *pahszi*. Dev. 168 and above § 10.
14. πτώσσω beside πτήσσω (Dor. πτᾱκ-). Dev. 290.
15. (?) στοά (στώμιξ), Lith. *stuomuō*, *stúomas* from the root **stā-*, **steh₂-*. Above § 11.
16. φωνή from the root **bheh₂-* in φημί. Dev. 167 and above § 22.
17. ? ψωμός, ψώχω beside ψῆν; above § 16.
18. (?) 1 sg. -ω < -*oh₂*. Dev. 168.
19. (?) ὀκύς, Lat. *ocior* beside Lat. *acupedius*, *accipiter*. Above § 14.
20. ?? ὄμος, if ἄμέσω is Greek. Above § 18.
21. Skt. *āyu* < **h₂oju*, cognate with αἰεί etc. Above § 24.
22. ?? Arm. *hotm*, if from **h₂onh₁-mo-* beside **h₂enh₁-mo-* in ἄνεμος etc. Above § 25.
23. (?) Celt. *uan* < **h₂ogh^{uo}-* beside Lat. *agnus*. Above § 26.

29. Conclusion

The material discussed and presented above may be grouped according to its probability. It gives this picture:

sure	probable	doubtful	very doubtful
βωμός	ὄγμος	κώπη	ἀγωγή
θῶξαι	οἰδέω	οἴτοζ	ῶμος
ὄγκος	ὄναρ	ψωμός	<i>hotm</i>
οἰωνός	στοά		
ὄκρις	-ω (1 sg.)		
οὔς	ὠκύς		
ποιμήν	<i>uan</i>		
πτώσσω			
φωνή			
<i>āyu</i>			

The conclusion is evident from this table. There are some ten sure, some five probable cases¹⁵ where *o*-vocalism was retained before or after *h*₂. This is enough material to establish a fact, the more so as in this case the material must come from a small group of the IE languages as we saw above (§ 2). The second, *a*-colouring laryngeal, then, did not affect the timbre of PIE *o*.

Addendum:

Lat. *rādo rōdo*, Skt. *rādati* can only be explained from a root **rehd-/rhed-*. However, we cannot be sure whether *rād-* represents **reh₂d-* or **rhd-* (with any laryngeal).

Lat. *aio* and *žv-ωγ-α* I hope to discuss elsewhere.

Prinsenlaan 23,
Oegstgeest,
The Netherlands

R. S. P. Beekes

¹⁵ I may add that I myself consider *-ω < -o-h₂* as sure; it is only in this context that I think that it should be classified as 'probable', in the hope that anyone can accept this.