

# PHONÉTIQUE ET PHONOLOGIE

## Domaine germanique.

### Germanic 'Verschärfung' and No Laryngeals.

1. Problem and aim. 2.  $\bar{V}H\dot{i}/u$ ; Excursus on  $eHu/euH$  etc. 3. Verschärfung and no laryngeal. 4.  $Hu$ . 5.  $H\dot{i}$ . 6.  $uH$ ,  $iH$ :  $*kreu_h$ -. 7.  $*sneu(H)$ -. 8. Conclusion. Appendix: Dutch *rau*w and Av. *xrū*- etc.

1. In 1836 HOLTZMANN observed that PIE  $u$  and  $i$  after short vowel and before vowel was sometimes represented by reflexes of  $uu$  and  $i\dot{i}$ . He called this phenomenon Verschärfung; sometimes it is referred to as HOLTZMANN's Law (though the problem is that there is no law). In North Germanic we find  $uu > gg$ v,  $i\dot{i} > gg$ j, in Gothic  $uu > gg$ w, but  $i\dot{i} > dd$ j. The West Germanic representations may be repeated here (after LINDEMAN, *Origines* 11).

PIE	PGm	OE		OS		OHG	
		inl.	ausl.	inl.	ausl.	inl.	ausl.
$e\dot{u}$	<i>ew</i> <i>eww</i>	?	<i>eo</i> <i>ēow</i>	?	?	?	<i>io</i> <i>iū</i>
$o\dot{u}$	<i>aw</i> <i>aww</i>	<i>eaw</i> <i>ēaw</i>	<i>ao</i> , <i>ēa</i> <i>ēaw</i>	<i>aw</i> , <i>auu</i> <i>auw</i> , <i>auu(u)</i>	<i>ao</i> , <i>ō</i> , <i>ā</i> <i>au</i>	<i>aw</i> , <i>ouu</i> <i>auw</i> , <i>ouw</i>	<i>ao</i> , <i>ō</i> <i>au</i> , <i>ou</i>
$e\dot{i}$	<i>iy</i> <i>iyy</i>	<i>ēo</i> <i>ī</i>	<i>ī</i>			<i>ī</i>	
$o\dot{i}$	<i>ay</i> <i>ayy</i>			<i>ej</i> <i>aij</i>	<i>ē</i> <i>ai</i>	<i>aij</i>	<i>ai</i>

Attempts to define the conditions under which the 'doubling' occurred have not met with succes (1). At present the theory which holds that

(1) Literature. W. P. LEHMANN, *PIEP = Proto-Indo-European Phonology* (1952) 36-52; id., *Evid. = Evidence for Laryngeals*, ed. W. WINTER (1965) 212-6. F. O. LINDEMAN, *Les origines de la 'Verschärfung' germanique* (1964) (rev. HIER-

laryngeals were the decisive factor is believed to be the best. I think it can be shown that this theory too is inadequate.

Laryngeals have been drawn into the problem by H. L. SMITH, *Lg.* 17 (1941) 93-8. It was worked out notably by POLOMÉ and LEHMANN, who gave it its 'final form' in *PIEP* 36-46 (and cf. 47-52; his treatment in *Evidence* 212-6 is essentially the same but less detailed). Discussion of the material may be found in LINDEMAN, *Origines*.

LEHMANN cites thirty cases of Verschärfung distributed as follows:

PGm. *eww* 8, *aww* 9, *uww* 1; *ww* total 18;  
       *yy* 2, *ayy* 10;       *yy* total 12.

(Other forms are given which are etymologically wholly obscure.) His conclusions from this material are as follows:

A  $\check{V}uH$  >  $Vww$   
 B 1  $i\check{i}H$  >  $yy$   
     2a  $a, o, e, \check{i}H$  } >  $ayy$   
     b  $a, o, e, H\check{i}$  }

It is supposed that  $VHu$  gives  $Vk$  or  $Vg$ . This supposed development does not belong to the Verschärfung, but it has been drawn into the problem.

One of the difficulties is that there are variants of the theory. AUSTIN (*Lg.* 34, 1958, 211) operates with the accent (following SMITH):

$Hw'$  > PGm.  $ww$   
 $'Hw$  >  $g/k$

POLOMÉ in a privately circulated paper (Remarks on the Problem of the Germanic 'Verschärfung'), while rejecting a development to  $g/k$ , tends to give no restrictions whatever: both  $Hu/i$  and  $u/iH$  give Verschärfung.

A few words on LINDEMAN's theory. He holds that groups of  $u/i$  + laryngeal could give  $uu/i\check{i}$  through assimilation. However, he also assumes that this  $uu/i\check{i}$ , « n'étant considérées que comme des 'variantes' phoniques plus ou moins accidentelles, ont pu être supprimées, ..., au bénéfice des structures 'normales' (*ēwo*, *ewo*) » [from  $eHu_o$ ,  $euHo$  resp.] (p. 4). It is evident that this makes the theory wholly arbitrary.

SCHE, *PBB(T)* 90 (1968) 118-26). E. G. POLOMÉ, *Handelingen der Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis* 4 (1950) 61-75; *RBPH* 31 (1953) 538-42; *Mél. Mossé* (1959) 387-402; Remarks on the Problem of the Germanic 'Verschärfung' (priv. circul.). DE VRIES = D. VR., *Altnord. etym. Wb.* A complete bibliography gives LINDEMAN, *Origines*. (A non laryngealistic explanation gives KURYŁOWICZ, *Lg.* 43 (1967) 445-51, *Idg. Gr.* 2.329-33; rev. LINDEMAN, *NTS* 23 (1969) 25-36).

I really don't see why the book has been written. It is clear that everything can be explained in this way, but that at the same time nothing has been explained. In any case it can be neither proved nor refuted, so that I shall neglect it. Also, at the end (p. 182), the assimilation is attributed to expressivity. But then I fail to see why laryngeals are involved. A  $u/i$  can be doubled through expressivity; then a laryngeal is not necessary. A group laryngeal +  $u/i$  might give  $uu/i$ ; then expressivity is not necessary. The recourse to expressivity here, if ever, is an *ultima ratio* because the laryngeals did not work.

When one considers the discussion of the forms given in *PIEP* and *Origines* one cannot help being very disappointed. Evidence for laryngeal is mostly very unreliable. Often the Lithuanian accent is the only proof, but this is a very uncertain basis (specially in full grade forms as *rāuti*, *ziāunos*; cf. ZGUSTA, *Arch. Or.* 23, 1935, 199). This, of course, does not plead against the theory. Firstly, many words have no very safe etymology, and secondly very special forms are required to establish a laryngeal. Moreover, there is the principal difficulty that a root may occur with and without *H* as an enlargement. However, this should not be assumed arbitrarily, i.e. without conclusive evidence, certainly not when we try to establish a new theory. One example may be given, which, I think, is characteristic of the difficulties we regularly encounter.

Oic. *roggr* 'long coarse wool', OE *rēow* 'wild', OHG *rouaz* 'crude'. LEHMANN adduces Lith. *rāuti* as evidence for laryngeal beside the vocalism of Oic. *rýja*, OS *rūwi*. These forms have also been connected with Skt. *róman lóman* 'hair', *rutá-* 'smashed', where there is evidently no laryngeal. Lat. *ruo obrūtus* shows no laryngeal either, but *rūta* in the apparently old asyndeton *rūta caesa* 'alles was auf einem Grundstück ausgegraben und gefällt ist' can be best explained with a laryngeal. However, DE VRIES, following FRANCK-VAN WIJK, compares with *rogg(r)* 'eingewebte Wollflocke' (note the meaning), OS *raginna* 'strüppiges Haar', OE *ragu* 'moss', Dutch *rag*, Fris. *reach*, *rēch* 'cobweb', ἀράχνη, Lat. *arāneus*. DE VRIES thinks one cannot separate *rogg* from Dutch *rag*. I think one might separate *rogg*, OS *raginna* from the other words on the basis of their meaning, but one does not feel sure. If, then, *rogg* belongs with Skt. *rutá-*, there is no laryngeal, but there might be an enlarged root *\*reuH-*; if it belongs with *rag* etc., the word is not relevant here (it is probably not IE).

Though it may be very difficult to *prove* the theory, it should be less difficult to *disprove* it. When there are a few sure cases that contradict it, the theory must be given up, or at least be modified. This can be done in two ways: 1. by demonstrating that Verschärfung occurred in cases where there was no laryngeal (§ 3); 2. by showing that  $u/i + H$  did not give Verschärfung. The last point must be divided in two cases: roots with  $-Hu-$ ,  $-Hi-$  (§ 4, 5) and such with  $-uH-$ ,  $-iH-$  (§ 6, 7).

2. At first I would like to remark that, when a cluster of  $\mu$  or  $i$  plus laryngeal caused the Verschärfung, one would expect the same phenomenon after long vowels as well as after short ones. Nevertheless there are some cases of  $\mu H$  after long vowel where we do not find Verschärfung.

Goth. *bauan* is generally considered to represent PGm. *\*bōwan* and to contain the root *\*bheuh<sub>2</sub>* 'to be'. (Comparison with Skt. *bhāvayati* is of course wrong, as this must be recent for *\*bhavayati* < *\*bhōuh<sub>2</sub>-ei-e-ti*, with short *o*.) This means that *\*bhōuh<sub>2</sub>* does not give Verschärfung. (The same root is supposed to present it in OIc. pret. *biugga*.)

Goth. *trawan* < *\*trōwan* against Goth. *triggwa-*, supposed to represent *\*dreuHo-*.

OE *bræw*, OHG *brāwa* together with OE *brū*, Skt. *bhrū-*, Gr. *ὀφρῶς* point to a paradigm *\*h<sub>3</sub>bhrēuH-s*, gen. *\*h<sub>3</sub>bhrūH-ós*, as was pointed out by KUIPER, *Notes on Vedic Noun-inflexion*, p. 9. This means that *\*h<sub>3</sub>bhrēuH-* did not cause Verschärfung. (See the excursus below.)

Cases with  $\bar{V}H\mu/i$  cannot be established with certainty as the long vowel could also be ascribed to laryngeal after short vowel.

Excursus: *eHu* | *euH* etc.

LEHMANN assumes a form *\*bhreHu-* for OHG *brāwa* etc., with which I must deal at some length. I think it is impossible to explain *bhrū-* from it. It is true that sometimes metathesis must have occurred of *u* (or *i*) and *H* (as in Skt. *dhītá-* from the root *\*dheh<sub>1</sub>-(i)-* 'to suck'), but this occurred as far as I see only after stops. POLOMÉ (*Mél. Mossé* 394f.), who assumes *\*preHi-* as the root of Skt. *pri-* shows in what difficulties we come by this assumption (this assumption is partly due to the connection with Gr. *πρῶς*, but this is not a necessary connection at all; it should be given up). I do not mean his explanation of *pri-* from *\*pyHi-*, which could only have given *\*puri-* in Sanskrit. More essential is that Skt. *priyá-* brings him to supposing that *H* fell in *\*prHiō-* and assuming a SIEVERS' form *\*prijo-* beside this *\*prio-*. All this is most improbable, and unnecessary as *\*priH-o-* gives Skt. *priyá-* directly.

I also want to oppose ZGUSTA, *Arch. Or.* 23 (1955) 200, who thinks  $\bar{u}$  alone is not enough to establish laryngeal (a full grade is also needed). This depends on whether one assumes long  $\bar{i}$  and  $\bar{u}$  not from *iH*, *uH* in PIE. I think there is not enough evidence for  $\bar{i}$ ,  $\bar{u}$  not representing *iH*, *uH*. It is true that there are some difficult cases of *u*/ $\bar{u}$ , but I think it is not wise to assume separate phonemes without trying to account for them otherwise.

I agree with ZGUSTA that in some cases expressive lengthening must be considered, as in  $\kappa\bar{\nu}\bar{\upsilon}\omega$  (cf.  $\pi\tau\bar{\upsilon}\omega$ ).

Again I object to ZGUSTA when he argues (about  $\kappa\bar{\nu}\bar{\upsilon}\omega$ ): " $\kappa\bar{\nu}\acute{o}\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$  has short *o*, which indicates rather the absence of laryngeal". This means that ZGUSTA expects *\*knHu-* for  $\kappa\bar{\nu}\bar{\upsilon}$ . This is unacceptable.

We expect *\*knuH-*, and this is not excluded by *\*kvoFos* (< *\*kno<sub>u</sub>Ho-*; though not proven either).

### 3. Verschärfung and no laryngeal.

As stated above it is very difficult to prove that a root had no laryngeal, or better, could not have had a laryngeal, since the possibility of a laryngeal as enlargement can hardly ever be denied. Nevertheless consider the next case.

For OE *sēaw*, OHG *son*, gen. *souwes* 'sap', Ic. *söggr* 'something damp' LEHMANN compares *ṽ-ei* 'it is raining' (with long *ṽ*) and OIc. *súga* 'suck'. However, it may well be doubted that the group meaning 'rain' must be connected with the words for 'sap'. OIc. *súga* seems to ask a laryngeal, but we also find evidence for *\*sūg-/sūk-*: OE *socian* < PGm. *\*sukōn*. We also have *\*sūp-* beside *\*sūp-*: Goth. *supon*, OHG *soffōn*, OCS *sъso* if from *\*sūp-s-* against OIc. *súpa*, Skt. *sūpa-*. One might in this case consider expressive lengthening (cf. ZGUSTA, cited above), cf. the expressive doubling in OIc. OHG *soffa* etc. < *\*sūpp-*. These words have also been connected with OIc. *súrr*, *saurr* etc. This shows long *ū* and has in its turn been connected with Hitt. *sehur* 'urine', which would show a laryngeal. But these connections cannot be regarded as sure. It is most evident to compare *sēaw* etc. 'sap' with OIr. *suth* 'sap' < *\*sutus*, Skt. *sóma-* 'juice (of a plant)', *sótar-*, *sutá-*, which all have no laryngeal. The strongest evidence, then, points to no laryngeal, but it cannot be denied that beside *\*seu-* a form *\*seuH-* was possible.

I must admit that I am not able to demonstrate with any certainty that one of the roots concerned did *not* have a laryngeal.

### 4. *Hu*.

Forms with *Hu* are by LEHMANN supposed to give *g* or *k*, by others to result in Verschärfung. For *H<sub>i</sub>* LEHMANN too assumes Verschärfung as the regular development. It has been pointed out that there are cases contradicting these rules. I discuss some forms with *u* first.

Goth. *staua* 'judgement' (originally 'place of execution'), OE *stōw* 'place' point to PGm. *\*stōwā* < PIE *\*stoh<sub>2</sub>u-*.

Goth. *sawil* 'sun' continues PGm. *\*sōwila-* < PIE *\*seh<sub>2</sub>uel-*. LEHMANN (PIEP 48) mentions this but does not account for it.

Goth. *qius* 'alive' beside Skt. *jīvā-* etc. must represent *\*g<sub>vi</sub>H<sub>u</sub>o-*. LEHMANN's comment (PIEP 50) that "in Goth. *qius* the laryngeal was lost" explains nothing.

For possible *\*bhleh<sub>1</sub>uo-* see p. 333, n. 1.

This is cogent evidence that the group *Hu* after short vowel did not in itself result in Verschärfung or *g/k*. AUSTIN thinks (Lg. 34, 1958, 203-11) that *g/k* developped only after the accent, but while he presents thirty instances, he nowhere even discusses the place of the PIE accent,

let alone that he would have demonstrated anything. For example \**gʷiHyo-*, the basis of OE *cwic* (AUSTIN posits \**gʷeHy-w-* !!) will have been \**gʷiHyo-*, as shown by Skt. *jīvā-* and the zero grade of the root. One could then assume \**gʷiHyo-* beside \**gʷiHyó-*, but this cannot be demonstrated and is arbitrary. For Gothic *qius* he assumes that Gothic alone did not know the development to *g/k*. Given the parallelism of Gothic in the other developments this is improbable (1).

POLOMÉ (*Mél. Mossé* 389f.) thinks there are much more cases that have *Hu*, not *uH* as thought LEHMANN. Mostly he is wrong in this. Skt. *dhāvati* does not prove \**dheHu-*, and *dhāvate*, Gr. *θέω θεός* disprove it (2). If OE *hāwian* belongs with *sceawian* this does not prove \*(s)*keHu-*, for this is impossible for Skt. *kavi-*. OE *snōwan* does not demonstrate \**sneHu-*, as Goth. *snīwan* forbids it. I cannot help saying that most discussions of the Verschärfung are full of such inaccuracies.

LINDEMAN has no difficulty: « De tels cas ne nous intéressent ... pas ici... » (p. 123, 153).

The problem is generally recognized by those who defend the laryngeal explanation, but they cannot account for it.

As regards *g/k* from *u* POLOMÉ has for almost all cases adduced evidence for a guttural (*Hand.* 71 n. 8; *RBPH* 31; *Mél. Mossé* 395 on *skeggia*). He also pointed to OIc. *nór* (< \**nōwa*) as against *nohkkvi*. I think the connection of laryngeals with this problem can safely be forgotten.

As regards LEHMANN's view that all *Hw* became *g/k*, note that OHG *jugund* etc. does not represent \**ieHu-* but \*(*h*<sub>2</sub>)\**ieuH-*, because of Skt. *yūvā yūnās*; there is no reason to put the laryngeal in 'the wrong place' except LEHMANN's theory itself. (Goth. *junda* cannot be explained by him either. What are we to think about an 'explanation' \**y<sub>e</sub>untā*? Of course, \**iuH-ŋ-* gives no difficulties. POLOMÉ points to *ajuk-dūps* for *jugund*.)

## 5. *H<sub>i</sub>*.

As for *H<sub>i</sub>* I would like to stress that the reconstruction \**oH<sub>i</sub>-es-* for OIc. *egg*, OS (gen. pl.) *eiiero* 'egg' is arbitrary. The PIE words for egg are notoriously obscure, and \**oH<sub>i</sub>-* accounts only for some of the words, not for e.g. Lat. *ovum*, Gr. *ὄν* (in \**oH<sub>i</sub>-V-* the *i* would have disappeared

(1) In general his suggestions are beneath criticism. To take his first instance: OE *fercian* 'conduct': Gr. *περάω*; there is no comment on the fact that we would have here the phenomenon after a consonant. How are we to explain OE *fær* 'journey (by different accent? then this should be made probable)? AUSTIN also has no answer to LEHMANN's objection that we expect grammatical change \**blik* \**blak bluggum bluggwans*.

(2) To assume \**dhh<sub>1</sub>eu-* beside \**dheh<sub>1</sub>u-*, as does LINDEMAN, *Origines* 143, is not convincing. I think we have here a trace of Miss NARTEN's proterodynamic inflexion; see *Pratidānam* (Festschrift Kuiper) 9-19.

as in  $\pi\acute{\omega}v < *poh_2i\acute{u}$ , Skt.  $pāyú$ -. One might as well assume  $*(H)\delta i$ - (as does ZGUSTA). This form, then, can never be used as an argument.

Goth. *saiān*, OS *sāian* from PGm.  $*sējan < \text{PIE } *seh_1i$ - does not have Verschärfung.

Goth. *waiān* < PGm.  $*wējan < \text{PIE } *h_2ueh_1i$ -.

The conclusion of the preceding paragraph is confirmed.

#### 6. $uH$ , $iH$ .

The most important part form the groups  $-uH$ -,  $-iH$ -. I collected the roots POKORNY lists as presenting such groups. From the few that had Germanic cognates I found only one which is relevant here. The root was already in discussion, but its importance has not been understood.

LEHMANN, *PIEP* 42, connects OIc. *hryggva* 'make sorrowful' etc. with  $\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha s$ , Skt. *kraviṣ*-. DE VRIES s.v. *hryggr* rightly calls this connection on semantic grounds "wenig wahrscheinlich". However, that OIc. *hrár* OHG (*h*)*rō* etc. 'raw' belong to this root can hardly be doubted and it has never been done as far as I know. Cf. Skt. *krūrā*- ( $*kruh_2r\acute{o}$ -) 'wounded, raw, bloody, cruel, hard, solid', Av. *xrūra*- 'id.'. The Germanic forms are sometimes derived from PGm.  $*hrawa$ -, sometimes from  $*hrēwa$ -. The handbooks which give one of the two forms are misleading, because the two forms exist side by side (FRANCK-VAN WIJK states this correctly). Moreover the forms cited are often wrong or arbitrarily interpreted. We must, then, into details, if only for the fact that in  $*hrēwa$ - after long vowel Verschärfung cannot be expected. I cite some instances of PGm.  $-ēw$ - and  $-aw$ - in the dialects here relevant.

#### PGm. $-ēw$ -

MDu.	Dutch	OHG	MHG	ModHG	OE	ModE	OIc
<i>blā</i>					<i>blāw</i>		
<i>bla(e)u</i>	<i>blauw</i>	<i>blāo</i>	<i>blā</i>	<i>blau</i>	<i>blāw</i>		<i>blár</i> (1)
<i>-bra(e)-</i>							
<i>uwe</i>	<i>-brauw</i>	<i>brāwa</i>	<i>brā(we)</i>	<i>braue</i>	<i>brāw</i>		<i>brá</i>

#### PGm. $-aw$ -

		<i>frao</i>					
<i>vrō</i>	<i>vro(o)-lijh</i>	<i>frō</i>	<i>vrō</i>	<i>froh</i>			<i>frár</i> (2)
<i>strō</i> (3)	<i>stro(o)</i>	<i>strō</i>		<i>stroh</i> (4)	<i>strēaw</i>	<i>straw</i>	<i>strá</i>

(1) If  $*bhlēyo$ - continues  $*bhlēh_1yo$ - it should be added to § 4.

(2) This form was plausibly connected with Skt. *práivate* 'springs up'. I see no reason to deny the existence of an original root  $*preu$ - 'to spring' as does MAYRHOFER, *Etym. Wb.* s.v., who thinks they are *r*-forms of *plávate* 'to float, swim' ( $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  etc.); there is a clear semantic difference.

(3) *Strō* <  $*strāo$  (DE VRIES, *Ned. etym. wb.*) must be wrong (for  $*strao$ ).

(4) KLUGE-MITZKA posit  $*strāwa$ -, which must be wrong.

The following are the forms of 'raw' :

MDu.	Dutch	OHG	MHG	ModHG	OE	ModE	OIc
<i>ra(e)u</i>	<i>rauw</i>				-(1)		<i>hrár(?)</i>
<i>rō</i>	-	<i>hrao,</i> <i>hrō</i>	<i>rō</i>	<i>roh</i>	<i>hrēaw</i>	<i>raw</i>	

It is clear that MDu. *rō*, German and English point to *\*hrawa-*, Dutch *rauw* to *\*hrēwa-*. OIc. *hrár* may represent both, but *\*hrēwa-* is more probable because of Finnish *rieva*. (The situation in Old Saxon is not clear to me. Only *hrā* seems really to occur.)

The root has a laryngeal as appears from *κρέας*, Skt. *kraviṣ-* and Skt. *krūrā-*, Av. *xrūra-* < *\*kruh<sub>2</sub>-ró-*. Only the forms Skt. *kravyám*, OPr. *krawian* (etc.), Lith. *kraũjas* (Lithuanian has no neuter gender; neuters generally became masculines; STANG, *Vgl. Gr.* 179) seem to have no evidence for a laryngeal. In Lithuanian we would expect *\*kráujas*, but when the accent originally was on the thematic vowel (as in Skt. *kravyám*), the accent may have been withdrawn and reshaped into a rising pitch (STANG, *Vgl. Gr.* 153, 171). This accent, then, as often, is not reliable. In Sanskrit we would have expected *\*kraviyam*, but *kravyám* may be the regular development of this form. Also it is possible that the laryngeal in *\*kreu<sub>h</sub><sub>2</sub>íóm* was consonantal and was not vocalized in Sanskrit (cf. my *Development of the PIE Laryngeals in Greek*, p. 10 g, 255). These forms, then, do not suffice to demonstrate a root without laryngeal. (It should be remarked that here we would have to assume a variant *without* laryngeal as elsewhere one with one to save the theory.)

In *\*kreu<sub>h</sub><sub>2</sub>-o-* (on the vocalism see the appendix) > PGM. *\*hrēwa-* the preceding vowel is long and Verschärfung is not expected (but see § 2), but PGM. *\*hrawa-* must represent *\*krou<sub>h</sub><sub>2</sub>-o-*. This contradicts the theory. LEHMANN *PIEP* 42, states: "Although the related adjectives OE *hrēaw* ... seem to have single *-w-*, the verbal forms [*hryggva* etc.] give us evidence for the development of *-eww-* and *-aww-*." It is easy to say this, but it cannot be accounted for. This is to my mind a hard fact, that cannot reasonably be doubted.

7. Quite as proving, and much simpler, is the following case. LEHMANN *PIEP* 43, cites OIc. *snæggr*, *snöggr* 'clipped, bare'. Its etymology is to my mind wholly obscure (it has been connected with Lat. *novācula*). But LEHMANN does not cite a homonym meaning 'quick' ('schnell'). DE VRIES wants to connect the two adjectives "weil man kaum an zwei homonyme denken kann". I think we must and I don't see why we

(1) OE *hræw* 'Leichman' does not belong here (< PGM. *\*hraiwa-*).



could not. And the connection with Goth. *sniwan* 'to hasten' ('schnellen') can hardly be objected to. This gives the problem that one form has no Verschärfung while another from the same root does have it. We can leave out of discussion the exact PIE form (1). If the root had no laryngeal, a laryngeal cannot have caused the Verschärfung. If the root did have a laryngeal, we would have expected in Gothic *\*sniggwan* (cf. *bliggwan*) when laryngeal after *-u-* caused Verschärfung.

Incidentally it might be remarked that OIc. *snoggr*/*snoggr* < *\*sna<sub>w</sub>wu-* points to an *u*-stem, so that one might explain the Verschärfung here from a PIE form *\*snou-u-*. Such a form supposes a hysterodynamic inflexion, type *\*snó<sub>u</sub>-ēu-s*, gen. *\*snou-u-ós* (secondary for *\*snu-u-ós*). Germanic generalized the proterodynamic type (e.g. *\*h<sub>2</sub>é<sub>u</sub>-i-s*, gen. *\*h<sub>2</sub>é<sub>u</sub>-ei-s*), but there are traces of the other one in Gothic forms showing *au* where *u* is normal and *vice versa* (KRAHE-SEEBOLD, *Hist. Laut- u. Formenlehre d. Got.*, 1967<sup>2</sup>, 86).

#### 8. Conclusion.

We found (§ 4 and 5) that there is evidence that *H<sub>u</sub>* and *H<sub>i</sub>* did not cause Verschärfung, or at least that these groups in themselves were not sufficient. Additional rules have not been found. The suggestion that the accent was the decisive factor has not been proven.

For *uH* we found (§ 6) that *\*krouh<sub>2</sub>o-* did not give Verschärfung, and (§ 7) that Goth. *sniwan* against OIc. *snoggr*, *snoggr* also contradicted the theory that this sound group caused the Verschärfung.

OIc. *snoggr* might be explained by *\*snou-u-*. It may be remembered that COWGILL (*Lg.* 36, 1960, 497f.) suggested *\*ei<sub>1</sub>nt* > *\*ei<sub>1</sub>nt* > *\*i<sub>1</sub>un* to explain *iddj-* in Goth *iddja*. (I am glad to see that COWGILL too considers the laryngeal explanation of the Verschärfung as — at least — unproven.)

The theory, then, is unproven. Not one striking argument has been adduced by its defenders. For example one would be convinced if an explanation was given for Goth. *sniwan* as against OIc. *snoggr* which at the same time accounts for the paradigm OIc. *búa bió bioggum búinn* and *hoggva hió*. As it is, such problems remain as difficult as before. Now there are clear cases which refute the theory. This can only mean that we were on the wrong way (2).

(1) POKORNY, *IEW* 977, connects it with Skt. *snāvan-* etc., which is possible but not unobjectionable. If this root had *\*snē<sub>u</sub>-* < *\*sneh<sub>1</sub>u-*, it cannot be the basis of Goth. *sniwan*. (A root *\*sneHu-* was also posited by POLOMÉ (*Mél. Mossé* 390) on the basis of OE *snōwan*. But, as shown above (§ 2), this does not prove *\*sneHu-*, as it might simply be *\*snōu-*; so BRUNNER, *Altengl. Gr.*<sup>3</sup> § 384 n. 4, LINDEMAN, *NTS* 23, 32 n. 2 — where I do not understand LINDEMAN's interpretation of OE *sneowan*.)

(2) There must be something wrong when OE *hrēaw* is said not to show Verschärfung, while OE *sēaw* *dēaw* *ðēaw* would.

*Appendix.* Dutch *rauw* and Av. *xrū-* etc.

I would like to ask attention for the form *\*krēuh<sub>2</sub>-* (§ 6 above) for its own sake. Long *ē* is not known from the other languages and one might ask what was its original place. Lengthened vocalism is typical of the nominative of root nouns, and it has long ago been observed that Av. *xrū-*, OPolish *kry*, MIr. *crú* point to a root noun. This must then have had the form *\*krēuh<sub>2</sub>-s*, gen. *\*kruh<sub>2</sub>-ós*. This form is exactly parallel with that for 'brow' as reconstructed by KUIPER (see § 2) :

<i>*h<sub>3</sub>bhrēuH-s</i> PGm.	<i>*brēw-</i>	<i>*krēuh<sub>2</sub>-s</i> PGm.	<i>*hrēw-</i>
<i>*h<sub>3</sub>bhruH-ós</i> Skt.	<i>bhru-</i>	<i>*kruh<sub>2</sub>-ós</i> OCS	<i>krzv-</i>
<i>*h<sub>3</sub>bhruH-sú</i> Skt.	<i>bhrū-</i> (ὄφρῶς)	<i>*kruh<sub>2</sub>-sú</i> Av.	<i>xrū-</i>

Avestan has (only) the accusative *xrūm*, which might have generalized anteconsonantal *xrū-* < *\*kruh<sub>2</sub>-* (if it is not to be read *|xruvəm|* < *\*kruh<sub>2</sub>-m*). OCS *krzv* is based on PSl. *\*kruvim* < *\*kruh<sub>2</sub>-m* (though the accusative will originally have had full grade).

R.S.P. BEEKES.