W. F. Wyatt, *The Greek Prothetic Vowel* (Philol. Monogr. Amer. Philol. Ass., 31). Cleveland, The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1972. XVIII, 124 p. Pr. $ 4.75.

For the so-called 'prothetic' vowel (hereafter p.v.) in Greek (ἀ-νήρ — Lat. *Nero*, ἐ-ρυθρός — Lat. *ruber*, etc.) only the laryngeal theory has so far given a simple and overall explanation. This theory holds that Proto-Indo-European had three consonants (h_1 h_2 h_3) that could be vocalized (to -*i*- in Indo-Iranian, to -*a*- in all other languages, but in Greek $h_1 > ε$, $h_2 > α$, $h_3 > o$; *$ph_2tēr$* > Skt. *pitar-*, Goth. *fadar*, Gr. πατήρ) or disappear (Goth. *dauhtar* against θυγάτηρ from *$dhugh_2tēr$*). This theory assumes that ἐρυθρός represents *$h_1rudhrós$* with the h_1 vocalized, which disappears in the other languages (except Armenian). See my *Development of the PIE Laryngeals in Greek*, 18-98.

Wyatt rejects the laryngeal theory and therefore tries to find another explanation. In my opinion, the author has utterly failed in this attempt. His hypothesis is that the p.v. arose before sequences RVRC- and RVCR- (R = *r l m n i̯ u̯*; V = vowel, C = consonant). This is in itself perfectly possible, but one problem is that p.v. appears only in *some* of these sequences, not in all. W.'s solution is to formulate the exceptions in terms of phonetic restrictions of V and RC, CR. E.g. for λευκός the sequence *u* + voiceless stop is excluded (analogy after λυχνός ἀμφιλυκή is most improbable); for νεκρός μακρός μέτρον sequences -*tr*-, -*kr*-. Analogy is often needed: λείπω after λιπεῖν (which has RVC-), which is not impossible, but λείχω after *λιχεῖν is not acceptable (as W. admits). -RR- is excluded (for μεῖραξ, εἶρος), but then ἀείρω must be analogic after the aorist *(a)wersa*. Εἴδομαι should have p.v. after W.'s rules, and this is assumed on the basis of ἐεισάμενος (W. rejects my explanation, *Dev.*, 59 f.). Εἴδομαι εἶδος would have εἰ- contracted from ἐει-. This is improbable since Homer has εἶδος very frequently (formulaic in εἶδος ἄριστος etc.) without any trace of p.v. Even in this way νεφροί, εἴκω, ἔργον remain, which should have p.v. according to W.'s rules.

Even more important is the fact that the rules themselves are improbable. They have no phonetic probability whatever: why would -υθ- and -ιχ- give p.v., while -υκ- does not, and -φρ- while -κρ- does not? -CC- is excluded, but allowed with *r*-.

Also the starting point that RVRC/RVCR give p.v., while RVR/RVC do not, is phonetically inconceivable. Moreover RVR/RVC is allowed with *r*- (p. 98). Also ἐνεγκεῖν is supposed to have p.v., but (ποδ-)ηνεκής shows that the root is ἐνεκ- and has p.v.

before a structure ReC- (though ἐνεγκεῖν is much more frequent than -ηνεκ-, it is improbable that the aorist would have given its ε- to the isolated -ηνεκ-). Ἀνήρ is explained from a paradigm *nēr *nros > *aros, but it is simply impossible that this system would have given ἀνήρ. We must therefore allow p.v. before *n(e)r-, i.e. ReR-. This point is essential, and fatal, to the theory because we would then expect p.v. with μέγας, μέδω, μέθυ, μέλι, μέλω, μένος, νειφ-/νιφ-, νέμω, etc. etc.

The author admits "that the environments . . . do not form any sort of natural class" (p. vi). Characteristic for his whole approach is the statement: "we have noted a few regularities in passing and can perhaps pick up a few more" (p. 116). Hypothesis after hypothesis is formulated to save the starting-point, without any internal probability or external support.

Ἀλέξω can hardly be explained: either a special rule (-ks- in -CR-), or a root *alek- (which is an impossible structure in PIE), or *l̥k-ā > alkā from where a- was introduced in *leksei (which is utterly improbable). And if ἀλέξω was 'accepted' (*leks- > *aleks-), αλκ- would be unintelligibe. Here exactly the laryngeal theory explains without difficulty, *h₂leks- > αλεξ-, *h₂(e)lk- > ἀλκ-.

In the cases of ἄημι and ἄεσα the Hittite evidence for laryngeal is denied.

Nor can W. explain the color of the p.v. (p. 116 ff.). One of his rules is: o- before -ei- in the root. This is in itself improbable ("some sort of dissimilation") and leaves ἐρείκω, ἐρείπω, ἐρείδω, where a rule 'before r- always e-' must help (ἀρήγω, ὀρέγω, ὀρύσσω are explained away). The cases ἀλείτης ἀλείφω ἀμείβω ἀείδω are exceptions because they have -oi- forms beside -ei-. This is phonetically not very clear, and in W.'s system -o- gives no p.v.!

Two things *not* studied in the book must be mentioned. P.v. occurs also before stop (ἀκούω, ἐγείρω, ἐθέλω, ὀφρῦς etc.), which cannot be explained by W. The agreement with Armenian has not been discussed either (*Dev.*, 21-3, and n. 1 below), which shows that Armenian has p.v. from laryngeal in the same words as Greek. Also the further arguments of laryngeal theory (*Dev.*, 88-94, 98-126) are passed over in silence.

There is also hardly any progress in details. Let me first give a list of words that belong to the substratum and were not recognized as non-IE, for which evidence is now presented by Furnée (*Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*, 1972; see the index): p. 19 ἀμιχθαλόεσσα, 20 ἀμαλός, 48 ἀμαυρός, 54 ἄρδω (?), 55 Ὀιλεύς Οἴτυλον, 57 ἀλαπάζω, 59 ἀμαρυγή, 67 λείτωρ, 69 λυκάβας, 70 μέδιμνος, 81 λάβρος μάρτυς, 82 λαίθαργος λαικάζω λαῖλαψ λαιφάσσω λαιψηρός λάσται λατμενεία μαρμαίρω, 83 λαιός ματτύη ἄστυ,

85 μῖλαξ λίσσομαι(?), 86 λιβρός, 106 εὐρώς, 107 ὄρχη. There are
other words which are certainly non-IE: 17 λέπω etc. (*Dev.*, 42
and Orbis 20, 1971, 132-7), 69 λέχριος λικριφίς λοξός ¹), 73 ἕλμι(ν)ς
(even Furnée 290 A2 considers it IE, for which there is no reason:
'PIE' *k^u/ur̥mi- !), 81 νάρκισσος, 82 μᾶζα, 83 μαζός/μαστός/μασθός
'breast', 88 νεβρός(?), 99 ἐρωδιός, 106 ἄλοξ (I abandon *Dev.*, 275-7
and return to *Dev.*, 40), 107 εὔληρα. (Note that 'Αρεπυία, not
mentioned by W. but often included, is non-IE; v. Furnée.) I
agree that μάγγανον/μάνδαλος is non-IE, but I do not see why
ὀνα- (ὀνίνημι) should be so.

W. adopts the idea that a root vowel -*o*- gives no p.v. I have
considered this idea (*Dev.*, 74-6), but I think it must be abandoned.
'Ολίγος — λοιγός need not be cognate, ὀρεχθεῖν — ῥοχθεῖν is doubtful;
only ὀμείχω — μοιχός remains, and perhaps ἀνήρ — νώροπι.

Pp. 74-9 W. interprets augmented forms as forms with p.v.
E.g. ἔειπον would have p.v., εἶπον is contraction, εἰπ- in forms that
have no augment dropped the p.v. because it would otherwise seem
augmented! One objection is that the formula ὧδε δέ τις εἴπεσκε
has F-, no augment and no p.v. in an augment form. 'Ηργαζόμην
would represent *e-Vu̯erg-, but W. cannot explain why ἔργον has
no p.v. This idea creates mere difficulties.

For troublesome cases like ἐέρση/ἔρση W. has no solution either
(p. 103 ἔρση from *wertsa remodelled after ἄρδω!). ῎Εεδνα is sup-
posed to be epic diektasis of εδνα from *ἀεδνα, p. 37 f. (which is not
my opinion, *Dev.* 58 f., as W. suggests). I have no opinion on these
forms, but it should be said that the 'colloquial ἔδνα' (see Frisk) is
not clear (from *αεδν- we expect *ᾱδν-). On p. 38 n. 33, however,
W. assumes that εδν- was original. In that case the forms with p.v.
are hardly intelligible ²). I agree that ἀέλιοι has α-copulative (p. 60);
αἴλιοι will have αι for [*e*], εἰλίονες metrical lengthening (παρὰ τοῖς

---

¹) This shows that λοξός 'slanting, crosswise', if cognate with Arm. *olok*ʿ
'shinbone', which is semantically improbable (*Dev.*, 22), is not relevant to
the laryngeal explanation of the p.v. (Λέχριος — λικριφίς has ε/ι and either
κ/χ or *ks* (cf. λοξός)/*k*; see Furnée, 263 A3, if λικριφίς does not have κ-φ from
χ-φ. If beside λίξ· πλάγιος Hsch. also λίγξ πλάγιος· καμπτήρ. πλάγιον. Hsch.
belongs here, the prenasalized form would confirm substratum origin. It is
of course far from sure that λεκροί/λικροί = οἱ ὄζοι τῶν ἐλαφείων κεράτων is
cognate.

²) The word cannot derive from a PIE root *u̯edh- 'to lead', for -*dh*-
always gives -θ-; semantically this is also not evident. Hamp, Die Sprache
15 (1969) 63, points out that OE *weotuma* supposes *u̯ed-, but OHG *widomo*
*u̯edh-. He proposes *u̯edH̥-/u̯edH- > u̯edh-, but the last development has
not been demonstrated for Germanic. "The phenomenon would be parrallel
to that of Eng. *bottom*: Germ. *Boden*", but this group, cognate with πυθμήν
πύνδαξ, is certainly non-IE. Is ἔεδν- etc. also non-IE?

ποιηταῖς; cf. εἰνατέρες). As to ἀνεψιοί I am inclined to follow Ben-
veniste, *Institutions* I, 234, who interprets it as 'co-neveux' with
α-copulative (cf. ἀέλιοι), comparing Hsch. νεόπτραι (for *νεποτραι) ·
υἱῶν θυγατέρες.

    Wyatt's attempt clearly shows that it is impossible to explain the
Greek p.v. without the laryngeal theory, which gives a solution
without any further hypothesis, and that while the laryngeals were
not invented to explain the p.v.

OEGSTGEEST, Prinsenlaan 23   R. S. P. BEEKES