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TWO PROPERTIES OF PIE *h₃

Abstract. Some new examples of posttonic voicing/lenition by *h₃ are discussed, together with the usefulness of this property in accounting for set roots in Vedic with unaspirated root finals. Along the way, a possibly new example of aspiration of a voiced stop by *h₁ is indicated. The second property of *h₃ is as anlaut consonant in PIE reconstructions currently having syllabic *u as anlaut.
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1. αὐδή ‘voice, sound, speech’ and posttonic voicing/lenition by *h₃ in Vedic, Greek, Latin, Slavic and Anatolian

The difficulty of relating Gk. αὐδή to Ved. vádati, ppp. uditá- ‘speak, say, utter, tell, report’, OCS vaditi ‘accuse’ is noted by Beekes (2010: s.v.), who rejects Derksen’s (2008: s.v. vaditi) solution *h₂uedh₂- for the Slavic and Vedic words because it implies aspiration of the Vedic root final. Kümmel (LIV: 286), reconstructing *h₂uedH-, also points out that H is unlikely to be *h₂ for the same reason.

It is also unlikely to be *h₁ since the latter is probably also an aspirator of Vedic voiced stops if we can accept Kuipers’ derivation of Ved. sadhás-(tha-) < *sedh₁e-s- beside Lat. sēdēs < *sed-eh₁-s-, as reported by Lindeman (1987: 93) and, with particular enthusiasm, by Schrijver (1991: 376) – which we probably can, despite the lukewarm reception accorded it in some quarters, such as de Vaan (2008: s.v. sēdēs) and especially Mayrhofer (EWAia 2: s.v. sadhāstha-), who invokes only *h₂ while at the same time mentioning the (therefore somewhat bizarre) comparison with Lat. sēdēs. However, it is well known that Mayrhofer did not believe in aspiration by *h₁. I find convincing (i) Schrijver’s (1991: 376) analysis of Lat. sēdēs as partly deriving from a *h₁-stem, as also his table of the prehistoric *h₁-stem declension showing a substantial proportion of forms in which the laryngeal is in contact with the root final consonant (ibid. p. 371) and thus also (ii) the proposition of aspiration by *h₁ in sadhás-(tha-).
Further, a second example of aspiration of a voiced consonant by $h$ emerges from the rejection by Martirosyan of Arm. cnawi ‘jawbone’ from his 2010 etymological dictionary and thus also of the traditional connection of the Armenian word with Gk. γένος ‘jaw’, YAv. du. *zanuwa, Lat. gena ‘cheek’, Ofr. giun, gin ‘mouth’, MWel. gen ‘cheek, chin’, Goth kinnus ‘cheek’, Toch. A du. šanw-e-m ‘cheeks’, Ved. hānu- ‘jawbone’, still cited by Beekes (2010: s.v.), which can now all be derived from PIE $g_{3}h_{1}énu-$.\(^1\)

Although Beekes (1995: 126) claims that any laryngeal following any stop yields an aspirated stop in Sanskrit with $\pm$ voice according to the voicing of the original stop (doubts are expressed about the participation of $p > ph$), I think the traditional interpretation of $h_{3}$ as a voicer of stops, not an aspirator, is correct, doctrinaire positions on the absence of voicing in PIE notwithstanding. Indeed I have managed to assemble a small number of examples in which (only) posttonic $h_{3}$ changes an immediately preceding PIE tensis into the corresponding PIE media (preglottalized voiced stop) in Vedic, Greek, Latin, Celtic and Slavic. The examples, aside from (1) the well known Ved. pres. pibati ‘drink’ : perf. participles papivāms-, pītā- ($ph_{1}i$-): Lat. bibō (with analogical initial), Gaul. ibet-i-s, are (2) Gk. ἀγόος ‘8th’ : ὀκτῶ ‘8’ (perhaps $h_{3}oks_{1}th_{3}-uh_{3}o-$ : $h_{3}oks_{1}th_{3}-éh$); (3) Gk. κιρβῆς ‘rotatable inscribed pyramid’ : καρπός ‘wrist’ : ($k_{3}órph_{1}is$ with $*o > u$ by Cowgill’s law followed by delabialization : $k_{3}rpis_{1}$) : Lat. corbis ‘basket’, Mr. corb ‘car’, Russ. dial. korób ‘belly’ (with acute), whence Russ. koróbit ‘bend, warp’, ($k_{3}erph_{1}$- ‘turn’, cf. LIV; 392), (4) Gk. κτύπος ‘loud noise’ : ἐρίγδουπος ‘loudbounding, thundering’ also, with originally accented augment, aor. ἐρίγδουπησαν ($*kh_{3}(e/o)up$-). For this reason also I reconstruct Gk. κότος ‘grudge, hatred’, Ved. šátru- ‘enemy’, Russ. dial. kotorá ‘quarrel, strife’, Ofr. cath ‘battle’ with anlaut (i.e. pretonic) $k_{3}h_{3}$-, where it neither voices nor aspirates the stop but depalatalizes it in the manner of a resonant in the Slavic o-grade while having no effect on the palatal feature of the stop in the Vedic e-grade (see Kortlandt 1978) and of course yielding -a- in the Celtic zero grade (Woodhouse 2008: 21f.; 2011: 156f., 164 n.15, 179; 2012: 160162).

Given the semantic parallel of a common origin for words signalling such divergent disabilities as Ved. (ŚBr.) kadá- ‘mute, hoarse’ and Goth. hâlts ‘lame’,

\(^1\) On PIE Ch₁$é$- > Toch. Ca see Beekes 1988a: 85, 87 (PIE *$é$ > Toch. a and PIE “CHV > [Toch.] CV. No special developments.”)

\(^2\) My PIE contains two series of tectals: prevelars = palatovelars $k_{1}$, $g_{1}$, $g_{1}h$, subject to environmentally conditioned loss of the palatal feature, and backvelars $k_{2}$, $g_{2}$, $g_{2}h$ with environmentally conditioned labialization (Woodhouse 1998; 2005); a factual demonstration of this latter peculiarity will, I hope, shortly become available.

\(^3\) A better derivation, as I now see, is directly from the PIE singular *körph₁-ei having the same structure as $h_{3}oks_{1}ei$ (: $h_{3}k-éti$) deduced for the singular stem of Hitt. ἀκ-‘akk- ‘die, be killed’ by Kloekhorst (2008: s.v.), a structure we shall meet again very soon in this paper (p. 253).
which seem to be related to Gk. κλαδαρός ‘infirm, invalid’ etc. (cf. Woodhouse 2009: 89), I think it is possible to obtain a fifth example of conditioned voicing by *h₁ by deriving Slavic *slēp- ‘blind’ and Sl. *slēb- ‘weak’ from the splitting of an ablauting paradigm *slōph₃ ‘infirm’ with a similar pattern to the one Beekes (1995: 190) proposes for PIE *sōm ‘one’ and on the assumption that the lengthened grade inhibits acuting by Winter’s law by eliminating the preglottalization just like any other laryngeal (see Kortlandt 1985: 115 on the loss of laryngeals in contact with a preceding lengthened grade vowel), thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nom. } * & \text{slōph}_3 > * & \text{slēb} > * & \text{slāb} \\
\text{acc. } * & \text{slēph}_3,m > * & \text{slēb} > * & \text{slēb} \\
\text{dat. } * & \text{slph}_2-ēi > * & \text{slēp} > * & \text{silp} > \text{OCS } \text{o-slēp-no} & \text{‘go blind’} \\
\text{loc. } * & \text{slēph}_1(i) > * & \text{slēb} > * & \text{slēb} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The locative was taken into Germanic in the sense *time/state of weakness/sightlessness’ hence, e.g., OE slēpan ‘lie numb/motionless; sleep; die’ eventually replacing OE swefan ‘sleep; rest; sleep in death’ (cf. Boutkan/Siebinga 2005: s.v. slepa).

Consequently, a reconstruction with medial *h₃ should provide for the set nature of Ved. vádāti without incurring the penalty of aspiration. Evidently the auslaut of Gk. αυδὴ is not against this reconstruction otherwise Kümml (l.c.) might have felt constrained to opt for medial h₁ rather than the more inclusive H. But perhaps we can do better than this: Eichner (1988: 131) has examples of *h₂eh₃ > ō but none of *h₁eh₂ so, on the principle that of the two colouring laryngeals the one that lengthens the vowel also colours it, the outcome of *h₂eh₂ could conceivably be *ā > Gk. η.⁴

But that is not the end of the story. It is far from clear that Derksen’s (2008: s.v. vaditi) complete separation of Russ. váditi ‘slander, deceive, lure, spend time’ from OCS vaditi ‘accuse’ and other Slavic words meaning ‘accuse’, ‘quarrel’, ‘hamper’, ‘report’ and the like is justified. Instead, the Russian word probably represents a conflation of two different etyma, the meaning ‘slander’ belonging with the ‘accuse’ set under discussion while ‘lure’ and ‘spend time’ correspond to the form derived from Slavic voditi ‘lead, conduct’, the meaning ‘deceive’ being reconcilable with both. Sln. vāditi ‘anzeigen, verklagen’ (i.e. ‘denounce, accuse’) (Pleteršnik 1894–1895: s.v. váditi/2) and the Russian word seem to point to an

⁴ In view of my suggestion that anlaut *h₁eh₁-l/*h₂h₂-l > non-Anatolian, non-Indo-Iranian *ōl/*ol- (Woodhouse 2011: 163) it may be that *h₁eh₂ > ō only in auslaut and/or inlaut. Alternatively there may be no connection between Hitt. hahhal ‘palm of hand’ and Lat. ulna ‘elbow’.
acute (thus too Kortlandt 1975: 65, although SCr. vāditi ‘take out’ does not seem to belong here) by Winter’s law, as Derksen (l.c.) also recognized. Thus, Slavic vāditi can reflect a singular *h₂uōd-ei with medial preglottalized *d, i.e. the same structure as I now prefer for Russ. korōbit’ (see n. 3 above).

We then see that Ved. vádati, the first syllable of ávōṇ < *h₂eu-⁵ and Sl. vāditi provisionally < *h₂uōd-ei can all point to original accent on the root, consequently a reconstruction with h₃ also allows us to posit an etymon with medial posttonic *th₁ > preglottalized d. This will of course entail that any pretonic d in the paradigm of Ved. vádati, e.g. pf. ūdimā, ppp. uditā-, prec. udýšam, caus. vādáyati will be analogical, just as the aspirates in Ved. grbhnáti, mathnámi,⁶ (Br.) grathnáti all < *C(R=C)RC-νH- are analogical to forms like the respective ppp. grbẖūa-, mathitā-, grathitā-, i.e. in each case a change from plain to voiced or plain to aspirated.

It has been proposed that the semantics of Lat. vetō ‘forbid’ may derive from *‘say (not)’ (Rix apud de Vaan 2008: 672 s.v. ve/otō), or perhaps better *‘sternly or threateningly say (not)’ (= *‘hamper’?). Further, de Vaan (l.c.) finds there is a good chance that Lat. vetō is a later form of Nonius’ votō votāre which requires reconstruction as *uotH-éi-élo with closed first syllable to take care of preservation of the rounded vowel. De Vaan (l.c.) sets *H = *h₂ apparently so *uoth₂-éiélo- can

---

⁵ Beekes (2010: s.v. ávōṇ) adduces the zero grade form bōdō, proving that anlaut aʊð represents the e-grade. It is extraordinary that LIV₂ is not alone in generally (i.e. inconsistently) preferring the two counterfactual developments ḤRC- and ṢHCCR- (which infringe the principle that PIE words begin with nonsyllabic sounds) to factual HRC- and ṢHCCR-, the latter being Beekes’ (1988b) law, a law I was recently criticized by an anonymous reviewer for employing. Beekes’ only mistake was not to realize that his new law, as applied properly to Latin, disproved Lehmann’s idea that anlaut *r- was impossible in PIE (Woodhouse 2011: 158–162) in favour of Clackson’s (1994: 33, see also p. 200) conclusion that Anatolian, Armenian and Greek may have shared “an areal tendency to avoid initial r-”. In fact I think these three language systems, plus Phrygian, also shared a tendency to keep the three PIE laryngeals in something approaching their original condition for far longer than other IE languages, i.e. as three distinct resonants/vowels in Greek and Phrygian and as obstruents (fricatives, with audible turbulent airflow) in Hittite (presumably) and Armenian. It is not particularly remarkable that PIE *HHRV- yielded for the most part a cluster *HR- in Greek in which *R remained nonsyllabic so that *H was vocalized in Greek.

⁶ From the limited list of believable cognates cited for MATH₁ ‘rob, wrest away’ and MANTH₁ ‘stir, disturb’ in EWAia (s.vv.), viz. Toch. AB mānt- ‘injure, separate’ for the former and Lith. mėstis ‘stir’, mentė ‘trowel, shovel, mixing paddle’, OCS mětet (l. měteta) ‘stirs up; (refl.) is afraid’, it is evident that we have two homonymous roots in PIE, as Mayrhofer (l.c.c.) essentially suggests, with, in Indoliranian, the zero grade form math- levelled in derivatives of the first and manth- tending to predominate in those of the second. Whether both go back to a single root meaning something like ‘pull about, tease’ is a matter for speculation: certainly ‘injure, separate’ and ‘stir up; is afraid’ seem to form a relatively seamless progression.
yield Pltal. *uot-ā(je) (thus, too, Kümmel LIV₂: 694), but since de Vaan also posits (l.c. s.v.v.) *h₂rog₁-o- > rogō, -āre and *h₂mh₁- > amō, -āre, the presence or absence of the laryngeal is not pertinent to the infinitive suffix, so we need have no qualms about setting *H = *h₃ here as well. After all, if posttonic voicing by h₃ is also the rule for Latin – which seems reasonable since the anlaut of bibō ‘drink’ is universally regarded as a natural adjustment to correct an apparently aberrant reduplication *pib- then no voicing of the pretonic medial cluster *th₃ can occur in the reconstruction *uoth₁-ēie/o-,⁷ which for Latin can also be written *h₂uoth₁-ēie/o-.⁸ In other words Lat. votō (> vetō) is a splendid candidate, both semantically and phonologically, for membership of the group of Ved. vad₁-, Gk. αὐδή under discussion.

Derksen (2008; s.v. vaditi) also mentions a likely connection with Hittite wātarahh₁ ‘order, instruct’ (< *s ‘sternly’?), and so does Kümmel (LIV₂: 286), who does not recognize the long vowel in the first syllable. Yet this long vowel is important because it must reflect an accented o-grade, which means that, as Eichner (apud Kloekhorst 2008: 932) saw in his attempt to connect Gk. αὐδή, Ved. vādāti with Hitt. uttar/uddan- ‘word, case, story, reason’ (meanings suggesting *s ‘stern or serious word’), the disappearance of the initial *h₂ in the Hittite reflex of the proto-anlaut *h₂u- can be explained by the Saussure effect with subsequent analogical spread.

In fact wātarahh₁ is a factitive in -ahh- (Kloekhorst 2008: 149f.) and must be based on a nominal form wātar-, perhaps a conflation of nom.sg. *wātar and a weak stem like uddan-. But *wātar has a lenited stop like the CLuvian cognate utar/utn- ‘word(?), spell(?), whereas uttar/uddan does not; and on this basis Kloekhorst (2008: 932f., 988f.), like Kümmel (LIV₂: 286), refuses to accept Eichner’s (and others’, e.g. Mayrhofer’s EWAia 2: 496 s.v. VAD₁) connection of wātarahh₁ with Hitt. uttar/uddan- and suspects CLuv. utar/utn- of belonging elsewhere. Part of the reason for this unfortunate state of affairs is Kloekhorst’s (2008: s.v.) reconstruction of Hitt. uttar/uddan as *uēth₂-r, *uth₂-én-s, the *h₂ of which completely rules out lenition of the stop (Kloekhorst 2008: 65f., 79) and is only there to facilitate connection with Kümmel’s (LIV₂: 694) and de Vaan’s (l.c.) reconstruction of Lat. veto with medial *h₂. The whole family can in fact be saved by adopting, apart from our medial *h₃, the twin paradigm – singular and

---

⁷ Eichner (1988: 132 n. 30) points out restoration of e after h₃ in *piph₂eti in OIr. ibid ‘drinks’.

⁸ It is noteworthy that in LIV₂ (see p. 706) all roots ending in *h₃ have either a vowel or a resonant before the laryngeal with the exception of *h₂ekh₃- ‘eat’, in which the laryngeals are chosen solely in order to afford an accommodation with Gk. ἀκολούθος ‘morsel’ (which bears an uncanny resemblance to Arabic ‘akl ‘eating’, uk(u)l ‘food’), yet this, according to Beeckes (2010; s.v.), leads nowhere (see, however, §1.1 below). Apparently root final *h₃ is currently identifiable only on the basis of its vocalic effects.
collective – presented by Meier-Brügger (2003: 204) for the PIE ‘water’ word. These make it clear that Hitt. uttar/udder- has more in common with a similar collective paradigm, while Hitt. wātarnah- and CLuv. utar/un- are best derived from a singular one. This latter we may write, with insertion of our laryngeals: nom. sg. *h₂uōth₁-r, gen. sg. *h₂uēth₁-n-s, loc. sg. *h₂uth₁-éni which, assuming lenition in the posttonic cluster th₁ (Kloekhorst seemingly having no examples to the contrary⁹), yields Hitt. *wātar, *huwetans >> *wetans, *hattēnii >> *wittēni,¹⁰ which takes care of our verbal root and the (levelled) lenition of the CLuvian cognate, though the latter might also be taken care of by the collective system with *h₂, viz. nom. sg. *h₂uēth₁-(ōʔ)r, gen. sg. *h₂uth₁-nós, loc. sg. *h₂uth₁-éni > (assuming analogical loss of *h₁-) CLuv. *wetar >> utar, *uttnos >> utn-.

There might also be some vocalic change. The accented syllable of our weak stem *h₂uth₁éni- contains *h₂ē > *ō > PAnat. ŏ > Hitt. á, which is contrary to Kloekhorst’s (2008: 932) reconstruction but seems to fit some of the attestations he cites, e.g. dat. / loc. sg. (Old Hittite/New script) ud-da-a-ni-i (which is actually the same as the collective form).¹¹

In this way the distribution of lenited and nonlenited stops in the Hittite words is explained and their connection with the above Greek, Vedic, Slavic and Latin words is made probable.

And we have acquired a sixth example of posttonic voicing/lenition by *h₂.

1.1. Further application of the above principle

From Beekes’ notion that all three laryngeals cause aspiration in Sanskrit we would have to conclude that no inherited set root with unaspirated medial stop adjacent to the laryngeal was possible in that language. But such is not the case, even if the counterexamples are not plentiful. And if the set nature of such roots is not secondary it would seem that nonaspiration plus conditioned voicing by *h₂ might supply a solution for some of these “counterexamples”. From EWAia it appears that beside the Ved. vad₁- just dealt with, and its nasalized partner vand₁-, there are only aś₁- ‘eat’, krap₁- ‘lament’ (set character in doubt) and rod₁- ‘weep,

⁹ Kloekhorst’s (2008: 79) sole example for this clustering rule with h₁ has the cluster *dh₁ in anlaut, where (i) we do not expect lenition by *h₁ and (ii) Hittite orthography makes no such distinction.

¹⁰ See Kloekhorst (2008: 987f.) on the need for some reshuffling to eliminate any Hittite alternation of anlaut w and u.

¹¹ Something similar is found among the specifically collective forms, e.g. gen. sg. *h₂uth₁-n-ös >> Hitt. uttnās found in Old/Middle Hittite (Middle script) gen. sg. ud-da-na-a-aš. Kloekhorst should perhaps examine whether he has not confounded two distinct paradigms here, though it is probable that the task is made more difficult by the complete absence of nominal derivatives with accented initial syllable.
bewail’. LIV₂ has some more, the additional ones with representation in Vedic being: \*lembʰH- ‘hang slack’, \*h₂et(H)- ‘wander’, \*petʰ₁- ‘fall’; \*petʰ₂ ‘spread (wings), fly’.

For \*aśi- ‘eat’ we can assume, for a reason quite different from Kümmel’s in LIV₂: 261, that the root final laryngeal is \*h₁, which is unobjectionable for the nasal infixing present (class 9) system where the laryngeal is always separated from the medial prevelar and for the ppp. and gerund where the \*k₁,h₁ cluster is pretonic. In the perfect, the oxytone of the nonsingular forms will inhibit voicing by \*h₁. In the remaining forms of the perfect, voicing by \*h₁ would result in forms that might be mistaken for a perfect of aj- ‘drive’, a set of forms that seems generally unknown in PIE,\(^{12}\) perhaps for this reason, though similar scruples have admittedly not prevented the homonymy of Ved. āśā, reckoned to be a perfect of both aś- ‘eat’ and amś-/naś- ‘attain’. Similar remarks apply to the aorist, though the hypothetical aorist forms of anīṣ aj- should have remained distinct from those of set aś-.

There appears to be no satisfactory etymology for \*aśi- ‘eat’, though I think one can be found in Hittite āk-/ākk- ‘die, be killed; be eclipsed’\(^{13}\) because the idea that a heavenly body undergoing an eclipse is ‘being eaten or devoured’ is an appropriate metaphor, particularly for lunar eclipses at night when a biteshaped “missing piece” can be seen gradually changing and increasing in size over the lunar surface. Another semantic link is that being ‘killed’ and ‘eaten’ by a carnivore in the wild are two things that tend to go hand in hand. All of what we eat cooked is in fact dead. On the formal side: as already mentioned (n. 3 above), Kloekhorst (2008: 168) reconstructs \*h₁j,śók-ei, \*h₁j,ś-k-énti which takes care of the lenition in the singular stem of the Hittite verb and its absence in the plural, just as the changing position of the accent would do if \*h₁ were present after the tectal. Any differences of vocalism can be overcome by restorative analogy (Eichner, see n. 7 above). Thus a root \*h₁j,śek₁h₁- suits both the Vedic and the Hittite words.

Ved. krapʰ-‘lament’ (if it is set) might be expected to have aspirated or voiced labial in RV aor. akrapaṣṭa, which, if accented, would have accent on the first syllable (the augment): the absence of both voicing and aspiration, as also in the case of \*⁻peH in Ved. -pipānā-, -pipūte (in which, according to the view put forward here \*H is unlikely to be \*h₁), is covered by Beekes’ (1995: 126) doubt about \*p being aspirated by laryngeals.

\(^{12}\) But cf. the Neubildung ON ók ‘drove’ < \*h₂e-h₁j(o)g₁- (Kümmel LIV₂: 256).

\(^{13}\) The etymologies recorded for this by Kloekhorst (2008: s.v.) are not particularly convincing: Kloekhorst himself rejects Eichner’s connection with Ved. āśú- ‘swift’, while his own proposed connection with Ved. áka- ‘pain’ would normally require \*k₂, i.e. a labiovelar, though this might be subject to delabialization perhaps by dissimilation against an anlaut \*h₁ except that Mayrhofer (EWAia: s.vv.) finds worthy of consideration only Schwyzser’s connection of Ved. áka- with Ved. aṅc- ‘bend’, which has a sound etymology believably reconstructed with anlaut \*h₂-.
Ved. rod\(^i\)- can have original *d followed by *h\(_3\).

For Ved. ramb- ‘hang slack’, the reconstruction *lembH- by Kümmel (LIV\(_2\): s.v.) is said to be required by Tocharian, yet when reconstructing *ieug\(_3\)H- (not found in Indo-Aryan unless as yodh-) with laryngeal for the same reason, the same Kümmel (l.c., s.v.) says the Tocharian evidence is not binding because of the significant oversupply of set forms in that language.

The medial laryngeal proposed in *h\(_3\)et(H)- ‘wander’ is admittedly only required if the verb belongs with Ved. átithi- ‘guest’, a connection that is very uncertain both with respect to its very existence and in the matter of the direction of derivation. From the individual suggestions of other scholars recorded in EWAia (s.v. átithi-) it is possible to formulate the single idea that Grassmann’s law eliminated the aspiration that would have been induced by the medial aspirating laryngeal (since *h\(_3\) is clearly impossible on the view being supported here) in Ved. átithi- = OAv. asti- and the lack of aspiration then spread to the verb.

Both laryngeals proposed on the basis of Greek material in *peth\(_1\)- ‘fall’ and *peth\(_2\)- ‘spread (wings), fly’ in LIV\(_2\) are rejected by EWAia (s.v. PAT/1). Beekes (2010: 1181f.) allows one in *peth\(_2\) only, but finds confusion between the two roots in Greek anyway; none of the extra-Greek cognates cited by Beekes for either root seems to require specifically *h\(_2\). So much for the putative set status of either root in Vedic.

Thus our hypothesis of posttonic voicing/lentition by *h\(_3\) is useful for the purpose of explaining the lack of aspiration in set roots in Vedic in the cases of vad\(^i\)-, vand\(^i\)-, aś\(^i\)-, and rod\(^i\)-.

2. *h\(_3\)uV- in Greek

There are a small number of Vedic va-onset verbs having zero grade forms with anlaut u- and sometimes other forms with vocalic onset. They include vac- ‘speak’: passive ucyáte; vaś- ‘wish’: pres. uśmási; and vah- ‘carry’: passive uhyáte, o-stem aughá- ‘flood, stream’ (connected, e.g., by Narten 1986: 219–221). These roots are traditionally reconstructed without anlaut laryngeal, whether in LIV\(_2\), EWAia or Beekes (2010: s.vv. ἔπος, ἐκόνος, ἱχος/2), yet if the vocalic onset forms go back to PIE – and note that Narten (1986: 221 n. 84), with her parallel between *uag\(_2\)h-: *aug\(_h\)- and *uak\(_h\)-: *aug- ‘grow, increase’ suggests that the ‘carry’ root usually reconstructed *ueg\(_3\)h- is a backformation from *ueg\(_3\)h-s- < *eug\(_h\)-s- with schwbeablaut due to suffixed *s (cf. LIV\(_2\): 641 s.v. τευκρ-2 n. 3) – then it seems to me these reconstructions should be supplied with a consonantal, i.e. laryngeal, anlaut. On the other hand the addition of such a laryngeal would seemingly clash with the absence of any “prothetic” vowel which might be expected in the respective Greek cognates, such as ἐπος ‘word, speech’, 1.sg. aor. ἐπον ‘say, speak’ <
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*₁hₑ + *₁ueik₂,₁₄ < *₁ueuk₂- by dissimilation (recorded, e.g., by Beekes 2010: s.v. εἴπον); ἐκόν, dial. ἕκκον ‘deliberate(l)’; and ὄχος ‘cart, chariot’, ἐκω ‘transport’, Pamph. 3.sg. imperat. ἐκεῖσθω, Cypr. aor. ὑεῖε; respectively.

But perhaps such an expectation is unsoundly based. For whereas Beekes (2010: s.vv.) has ample examples of *₁hₑuíV > Gk. εἰV- (e.g. Hom. ἐέλλομαι, ἔδνα = ἔδνα) and of *₁hₑuíV > Gk. ἀV- (e.g. ἀμι, less securely ἀέλλα, ἀείωδ), a careful search for entries likely to reflect *₁hₑuíV in Beekes 2010 (viz. under ὀα-, *ος-, *ον-, ὀτ-, *οο-, ὀυ-, *οω-, *ὁα(-), *ὁο-) raises only the possibility that *₁hₑui(e/o)iC- may yield Gk. ὀψ(ε/o)iC- > ὀε(ε/o)iC- in οἴγνυμι/όειγ/ν μ ‘open’ and οἶομαι ‘deem’, both derivations being very uncertain. LIV₂ does not strongly support the first (s.v. *₁hₑuiεig-) nor mention the second at all, and for this latter Beekes (2010: s.v.) prefers to reconstruct *₁hₑεου(is) (NB *₁h₃-).₁₅

For οἴγνυμι, no worse than Beekes’ (2010: s.v.) tentative acceptance of Forssman’s connection with Ved. vij- ‘tremble; start back’, viγα- ‘violent movement’ (< *₁hₑig₂,₁₄ ‘give way’) (and OHG wiþhan, OE wiþcan ‘yield’ – EWAtl 2: 578) is a new connection I here propose with OE swičan, ‘yield, deceive etc.’, ON svikva, svikja ‘betray’ etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 1042 s.v. sueig) for which purpose we may reconstruct *₁hₑsu(e/o)iɡ₂ > preMyc.₁₇ *₁ohw(e/o)iɡ₂ > οѝγ-νυμι / οίειγ-ν in fact. Beekes (l.c.) cross-references οἴγνυμι with εἶποξατο ‘were closed’, nineteen a connection that may, via Grassmann’s law, provide a rationale, if any is needed, for the psilosis of οἴγνυμι, as well as shoring up the semantic progression of ‘open/close’ – (un)cover – ‘deceive’ required by this comparison (cf. Russian kryt’ ‘cover’ – zakryt’ ‘close’ – otkryt’ ‘open’ – skryt’ ‘conceal’).

The only other *₁hₑuí-onset root in LIV₂ apart from *₁hₑuiεig- is *₁hₑuath₂-. Beekes (2010: s.vv.) regards this as a non-PIE reconstruction, though recently I have attempted (2014: 200) to give it some respectability by pointing out that the medial *₁a represents merely a failure to recognize that *₁uō and *₁uā fall together in Baltic, while the tones of the Baltic cognates, Latv. vāts and older Lith. vōtis,

---

₁₄ Interestingly enough, this form preserved the labiality of the labiovelar which might otherwise have been lost after *₁u in the original reduplicated form.

₁₅ Native anglophones will I think agree that by “depart from” Beekes here means not ‘reject’, ‘avoid’ or ‘eschew’ but ‘start with, take as our point of departure’.  

₁₆ Orel’s (2003: s.v. *swik(w)anan) connection with Lith. svaišt, svaištû (= svaigštû?), svaigašt conflicts with Winter’s law: Smoczyński (2007: s.v. svajšt), no doubt correctly, holds the voiced stop to be an intra-Lithuanian voicing after nonsyllabic i.

₁₇ I.e. pre-Mycenaean, referring to a linguistic stage between PIE and Mycenaean or Proto-Greek, since Beekes (2009: passim; 2010: passim) following Furnée has – I think it not too severe to say – hijacked "Pre-Greek" ("Vorgriechisch") to refer to sub- and/or substratum material recorded in Greek.

₁₈ Labialization of *₁g₂ perhaps lost by dissimilation against *₁h₃ + *₁u in Greek.

₁₉ Here Beekes’ putative PIE *₁hₑuiεig- conveniently changes its meaning from ‘give way’ to ‘open’.
require, not Kümmel’s (LIV₂: l.c.) lengthened grade, but an internal laryngeal sited so as to inhibit stress retraction to the first syllable by Hirt’s law in order to account for the Latvian broken tone, i.e. \( *h₃uvelleth₂ \). For laryngeal imposing acute when before the vocalic nucleus in Baltic rather than after it, cf. Lith. \( būti \), Latv. \( būt < \text{PIE} *bʰHu- \). Lith. \( výti \), Latv. \( višt < \text{PIE} *uh₁i- \) (Derksen 2008: s.vv. *byti, *viti – error for *viti?; Kortlandt 1975: 3, 65; note that these supporting examples all have the stress retraction described by Kortlandt 1994=2002: §4.4).

Further, as we have seen above, Beekes (e.g., 2010: 168 s.v. \( \omegãn̄ \)) has shown that Kümmel’s (l.c.) anlaut zero grade will not yield the desired result because \( \text{Gk.} \, \dot{v}C-, \) which would include also \( *h₂ułe/o/oth₂ - \rightarrow \text{Gk.} \, \dot{v}e/o-, \) consequently the precise protoform of Hom. \( \omegãta \) requires a vowel either immediately before or immediately after \( *u.\)²⁰

With vowel immediately after \( *u \), i.e. \( *h₃ułe/o/oh₁th₂ \), we would get in Greek, according to the received wisdom, **\( \dot{o}\dot{f}\dot{v}/\dot{o}\dot{tau} \) which is obviously wide of the mark. With vowel immediately before \( *u \), i.e. \( *h₂e/ouh₁th₂ \), we get, with vocalization of the medial and final laryngeals, \( \dot{o}\dot{v}e\dot{tau} > \dot{o}\dot{v}eta > \text{Gk.} \, \omegãta \) by contraction. Now although isolated examples of this kind of contraction are found in the epic, e.g. Z 508 \( λούεσθαι \) for \( λούεσθαι \), it is generally not expected to be characteristic of a given etymology throughout, cf. Beekes’ (2010: s.v. \( \omegãς \)) misgivings about etymologies that require contracted \( \omegãς \) ‘ear’ at Λ 109 and Y 473. So even with \( *h₂e/ouh₁th₂ \) we do not have a particularly secure etymology of \( \omegãta \).

The main point here, however, is that none of these modifications of alleged \( *h₃uvelleth₂ \) (nor the original quirky form itself) provides any evidence to support any convention that \( *h₃uV⁻ > \text{Gk.} \, \dot{o}fV⁻ \).

Thus we have no secure items demonstrating the proposition that \( \text{PIE} \, *h₃uV⁻ > \text{Gk.} \, \dot{o}(f)V⁻ \). Further, there appears to be no evidence to the contrary in Hittite (see Kloekhorst 2008: 75ff.) and the question of \( *h₃u⁻ \) in Armenian remains completely uncertain (see Martirosyan 2010: 712f. et s.v. \( hu\dot{u}m \); see also Woodhouse 2011: 163 for a preference to reconstruct this Armenian word with anlaut \( *h₂⁻ \)).

All this leaves the way open for my new proposal that in the PIE segment \( *h₃u⁻ \), certainly in anlaut, and, judging by the derivation of Gk. \( εἵπον \) quoted above, medi ally as well, the laryngeal vanishes in all languages²¹ (with the possible exception

---
²⁰ This is a common error in LIV₂, e.g. 286f. s.vv. \( *h₂\dot{y}edH⁻ \) and \( *h₂\dot{u}e\dot{g}₂ \) and wherever else a type 1q present (LIV₂: 19) has been incorrectly reconstructed instead of a type 1r for Greek reflexes of \( \text{Hu}-\text{onset roots.} \)

²¹ An obvious parallel to this is the gradual merger of PGmc. \( *hw \) and \( *w \) in attested Germanic, early in German (during the OHG period) and in Dutch (already in the Old Low Franconian documents – e.g. \( uuanda \) ‘because’), completed in current Swedish, mostly complete, despite the standard orthography, in current Danish, Norwegian and English, still to come in current Icelandic and the English spoken in, e.g., Scotland.
of Armenian), and this property enables *h₃u- to be regarded as a believable anlaut for reconstructions that have hitherto relied on a probably incorrect syllabic anlaut **u-.
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