

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR KULTURWISSENSCHAFT

Band 23

# Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen

Festschrift für  
Johann Knobloch

Zum 65. Geburtstag am 5. Januar 1984  
dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen

Herausgegeben von  
Hermann M. Ölberg (Innsbruck)  
Gernot Schmidt (Bonn)  
unter Mitarbeit von Heinz Bothien (Bonn)

---

SONDERDRUCK

---



INNSBRUCK 1985

FRANCISCO R. ADRADOS

Gr. ἀλώπηξ, O.I. *lopāśá-*, Av. *urupis*, Lat. *uolpēs* and the IE laryngeals  
with appendix\*

I.

The words which feature in the title of this article and others mentioned herebelow are related to one another, with greater or lesser certainty, in etymological dictionaries. However, problems arise concerning their vocalism which are either hard to solve or are unsolvable from the point of view of traditional IE reconstruction: *ō* and *eu* alternate in what I believe to be a full degree, *u* and *ø* in what I consider is a zero degree. Notwithstanding, when one applies the theory of the laryngeals with appendix in the way I have been advocating since the publication of my "Estudios sobre las laringales indoeuropeas" (Madrid 1961) and even prior to this, these correspondences become inserted in totally regular series. I believe that the etymology of this family of words could be established with the help of this theory. I also believe that this family of words is in turn a good example for demonstrating the usefulness and even the need for the theory.

Certainly, one cannot say that the theory of the laryngeals with appendix in its different variants, including mine, has enjoyed what one might call good write-ups. As far as I myself am concerned, it may perhaps be my own fault that defects in the exposition of my book may, upon a quick reading, give the impression that I proposed to substitute the phonetic laws of the Neogrammarians by a sort of general arbitrariness in phonetic evolution. Nothing is further from the truth. In a series of later papers, I believe that I have expressed myself quite clearly on the general problems of phonetic evolution and in particular on those of the evolution of IE sonants and laryngeals. Of course, there is a regularity, but only one which is conditioned by the circumstances in which the phonemes or groups of phonemes occur.

Naturally, I am not going to enter here into the theoretical justification of the phonetic reconstructions and evolutions advocated by the above-mentioned theory and which are applied in this article. I would ask readers to refer to the articles collected in the 2nd edition of the above-mentioned book<sup>1</sup> and, among later bibliography, to two recent articles in which the present state of the subject is reviewed and certain refinements to the theory are put forwards.<sup>2</sup> In short, the influence of the phonemes in contact on the timbre of vocalizations of the laryngeals, the different possibilities of syllable boundary, certain geminations, have determined a quite complex evolution of these phonemes.

Insofar as there is irregularity, this latter depends on factors, so to speak, which are regular. There is therefore no arbitrariness, but well-justified phonetic tendencies which in some instances give way to more general levelling tendencies and in others to the contrary, leave traces which are kept long afterwards. What occurs with the laryngeals also occurs with the sonants and other phonemes. All these phenomena are in line with the most widely acknowledged ideas on phonetic evolution.

I shall here operate basically with one laryngeal:  $H^u_3$ , a laryngeal with *o* timbre and with labial appendix. It is one of the six laryngeals which I postulate: the other five are  $H^i_1$ ,  $H^i_2$ ,  $H^i_3$ ,  $H^u_1$  and  $H^u_2$ . It should be noted that when I write simply  $H^i$  or  $H^u$ , I am not proposing new laryngeals but merely indicate a palatal or labial laryngeal (respectively), the timbre of which is unknown or irrelevant. When I write  $H_1$ , I refer to a laryngeal with *e* timbre, the appendix of which is unknown or irrelevant (and the same goes in the case of  $H_2$  and  $H_3$ ). Finally, when I write simply  $H$ , I wish to indicate any of the six laryngeals by this, without referring to their timbre or appendixes.

## II.

The first thing to be said on the series of words which are usually related to the four which appear in the title of this paper is that it is not possible to reconstruct forms applicable specifically to each of the animals referred to, and which cover from the wolf, the fox, the jackal and the dog to the wild cat or simply the cat.

For example, I could not advocate one sole original form for Gr. *άλωπηξ* and Lat. *uolpēs* "fox". Naturally, the animal may vary in another geographical context, thus O.I. *lopāsā-* means "jackal". However, supposing that it meant "fox" in the IE period, there is still the problem of the phonetic relationship to the above-mentioned words.<sup>3</sup> The same occurs in the case of Av. *urupis* "dog", which substituted the older IE word *\*kūōn*. Neither have we any autonomous form for "wolf": together with the forms derived from *\*urkʷos*, Lat. *lupus* may be placed (with metathesis of *ul* > *lu* and with another lengthening). But there are similar forms with different meaning, cf. Britt. *louarn* "fox" < *\*luperno-*, Lith. *vilpišys* "wild cat", M.Pers. *gurpak* "cat".

Thus, there are no autonomous IE forms for the animals mentioned: there have obviously been secondary attributions of a name to other animals or secondary specializations. But this is not the most serious point, for as I stated at the beginning, it is difficult to establish phonetic relationships between the forms which are reconstructible for IE by means of the application of traditional phonetics. Certainly there are several alternating lengthenings. We shall return to them later. The chief problem, however, is in the vowels (and in their absence). These problems are further complicated if one wishes to relate the names of animals studied so far to an IE root which means "white" (or rather "matted white") and which poses exactly parallel problems as far as vocalism is concerned.

I shall begin with the names of animals. For the moment I shall leave aside lengthenings and turn to a first point which gives only slight difficulty, that is, the opposition between the forms which begin in *a-* (Gr. *άλωπηξ*, Arm. *atuēs*) and those which begin in *l-*. I believe this is merely the presence in Gr. and Arm. of the prothetic vowel before an initial sonant, which is a well-known fact.<sup>4</sup> This is not the case of the other problems of vocalism.

Alongside forms with *-ō-* (Gr. *άλωπηξ*, Arm. *atuēs*, Lith. *lāpė*), there is a form with *-eu-* (or *-ou-*): O.I. *lopāsā-*, if this is a full degree such as the parallel with the previous forms seems to indicate. But then there are forms in which etymological *-l-* was followed by a *-u-* (Av. *urupis*) or by *ϕ*: Lat. *uolpēs*, Lith. *vilpišys*, diverse derivatives of *\*ul̥kʷos* (O.I. *urka-*, etc.), M.Pers. *gurpak*, etc.; and, with metathesis of the initial sonants, Lat. *lupus*, Britt. *louarn*, etc.

It seems logical that, from the point of view of traditional IE reconstruction, there should be general scepticism in relating these words etymologically, although in all truth this relationship is not altogether rejected. For example, in A. Ernout – A. Meillet's "Dictionnaire Etymologique du Latin", *uolpēs* is etymologically separate from ἀλώπηξ.<sup>5</sup> As far as the solutions put forward are concerned, we would point out that in H. Frisk's "Gr. Etym. Wb."<sup>6</sup> we are told in relation to the two series of words headed by Gr. ἀλώπηξ and Lat. *uolpēs*: "Es ist unmöglich, diese Wörter auf einen Nenner zu bringen. Falls alle überhaupt miteinander verwandt sind, muß es sich z. T. um Entlehnungen, vielleicht auch um absichtliche Verdrehungen in euphemistischer Absicht handeln". This latter proposal<sup>7</sup> is also that of P. Chantraine in his "Dict. Etymologique de la langue grecque": "les variations de formes ... s'expliquent par des déformations volontaires due à des interdictions de vocabulaire et des recherches d'euphémisme". Pokorny, in his "Idg. Etym. Wb."<sup>8</sup> expresses himself in similar terms. M. Mayrhofer in turn, in his "Kurzgef. Etym. Wb. des Altindischen"<sup>9</sup> believes that this is a non-IE root taken over as a loan-word.

These are emergency solutions, desperate resources which have nothing in their favour. After all, the alternance of consonantic lengthenings in animal and plant names (and in others) is nothing exceptional. Neither is the alternance of *ō/eu* (nor that of *ā/eu*, *ē/eu*), there being alongside *eu* apophonic forms with *ou* as well. On the contrary, this is quite common. Prior to my "Estudios sobre las laringales...", in which I gave a wide range of examples, these alternances were well-known, although attempts to explain them – repeated attempts – cannot be said to have been carried out with great success. Besides, the alternance of *u/φ* is also frequently repeated.

In reality, Pokorny himself, not in the context of the animal names we are concerned with here, but in that of the root "white" from which it has so often been said (I believe rightly) that they derive, puts forward a root *\*alō(u)*, *\*aləu*, *\*alu*: he compares alternances of the type of Gr. *κορωνός* / Lat. *curius*, O.I. *palāla-* / O.Pruss. *palwo* and one could adduce a myriad others. But *\*alōu* does not exist and the relationship of *\*alō* to a hypothetical *\*aleu* is inexplicable, the same as the form *\*al* (with *φ*, cf. *\*albhós*, "white"), and Pokorny is forced to attribute, for example, Gr. ἀλωφός to a different root to that of ἀλφός. Pokorny really stumbles on the inherent difficulties of the evolutions of the long IE diphthongs and their relationship to other diverse forms. The prevailing scepticism with regard to the possibility of reaching a solution to this phonetic problem from a non-laryngeal angle, is what has led to the approaches of Ernout–Meillet and to the solutions based on loan-words and euphemisms of Pokorny, Frisk, Chantraine and Mayrhofer.

Nevertheless, the problem lies in the interpretation of the relationships among existing data. And these data are there, they are forms which have only secondarily been attached to different animals and which fit into well-documented correlated systems. If there are correlations and regularities, this means that there are etymological connections: this is a principle which no comparativist could discard. And it is quite clear that they are there. It is only a question of explaining these correlations and regularities on the basis of the new laryngeal theory. This is what we shall attempt in this paper.



## III.

We shall once more begin with the names of animals. Although the problem of vocalism is the one which essentially interests us, it is not the only one in the study of the relationships between these words. We shall begin with two more: that of the protheses and that of the lengthenings.

With regard to the protheses, we have already stated that the opposition between *al-* (Gr., Arm.) and *l-* (in other languages) has nothing abnormal about it. We have maintained in an above-mentioned work the thesis that the vocalic prothesis of Gr., Arm. and Alb. before a sonant does not require the presence of a laryngeal before this latter. That is to say that whether the root which concerns us begins or not with a laryngeal (that is, whether it begins with *\*Hl-* or with *\*l-*), the fact that in the languages in question it should get a prothesis and in others not so, fits into normal procedure. Therefore, if there exists a relationship between our root and words which mean "white" and begin with *al-* in all languages (Lith. *alvas*, Russ. *ótkovo* "tin", Arm. *atuuni* "dove", Lat. *albus*, Gr. *ἀλφός* "white", Hitt. *al-pa-aš* "cloud", etc.), one should look for an explanation of this alternance *(a)l-/al-*: the explanation can lie nowhere else but in the fact that the second form is a full degree and the first a zero degree. But this is an explanation which can obviously only be given on the basis of laryngeals (*\*H<sub>2</sub>l- > (a)l-/ \*H<sub>2</sub>el- > al-*).

Something similar should be said with regard to the relationship of all the above-mentioned forms with others which begin with *u-* or *u̯-* (Av. *urupis*, O.I. *vrka-*, etc.). That is, Gr. *ἀλώπηξ*, Arm. *atuēs* are forms with prothesis which can be explained without the need of laryngeals, although they are not excluded. But the remaining forms of the group we are studying display problems in their beginnings which can only be solved, we believe, on the basis of laryngeals.

As far as lengthenings are concerned, there are several, but parallel to many others which exist in diverse roots of IE. They are used to establish semantic differences, generally at the level of the diverse languages and not within IE itself. Although sometimes this statement should be qualified. In the case of the root we are concerned with, we find four series of lengthenings which follow one another:

- a) Consonants: *-p, -k, -kʰ*.
- b) Vowels: *-ō / -ě* (thematic), *-ē, -ā, -ī*.
- c) Consonants: the same.
- d) Vowels: *-ō / -ě* (thematic), *-ā, -ū*.

Thus, without attempting an exhaustive list, we get:

- 1) With *-p*: lengthened in *-ē*, whence Lat. *uolpēs*, Lith. *lāpė*, and, with a new lengthening, *-pēk* in Gr. *ἀλώπηξ*, *-pēko* in O.I. *lopāśā*; lengthened in *-ī*, whence Av. *urupis* and, with a new lengthening, *-piku* in Lith. *vīlpišỹs*; lengthened with the thematic vowel *-e/-o*, whence Gr. *ἀλωπός*, Lat. *lupus*, Britt. *louarn* < *\*luperno-*, M.Pers. *gurba* < *\*ulpós*, *-peku* in Arm. *atuēs*; lengthened in *-ā*, whence Gr. *ἀλώπη*.
- 2) With *-k*: possible in O.Pruss. *lapsa* < *\*lōpekā*.<sup>10</sup>
- 3) With *-kʰ*: only with *-kʰo* in the diverse forms of *\*ul̥kʰo-* "wolf" (O.I. *vrka-*, Lith. *vīlkas*, O.Slav. *vlākū*, Gr. *λύκος*, Goth. *wulfs*, etc.).

As may be seen, this is a system with numerous *cases vides*; really, the lengthening which has most guarantee of antiquity is *-p*; *-k* is uncertain and *-kʰ* is without a doubt recent. I am led to think along these lines by the fact that it only appears with the thematic vowel (that is, in a recent form) and with a well-settled meaning. On the other hand, it is commonly acknowledged that the labiovelars are relatively recent phonemes in IE. I shall later expound a hypothesis on the origin of *kʰ* in the word I refer to based precisely on the influence of a laryngeal *Hʷ* of this root.

Diverse forms of one and the same root, with diverse degrees of alternance due to levellings within the inflectional system or else to the existence of diverse lengthenings, have been used to denote different animals belonging, with one exception, to the canine family. Sometimes, there have been variations over the centuries in the meaning of the diverse forms, as there is sometimes homonymia among them, the different languages making their choices secondarily. But the most remarkable thing is that, almost without exception, there is always a *-p* lengthening, in turn enlarged in different ways. A special case is the one mentioned above of *\*ulkʰos*.

Therefore, if the root meaning "white" to which we refer is originally the same, one should advocate that from a very remote date, there was a tendency to differentiate it from the name of the animal or animals which, on account of their fur, began to be denoted as "the white one" ("matte white", "greyish", we would say, in opposition to *\*leukʰós*). For this adjective "white" appears with the forms *\*alō-*, *\*alu-*, *\*alau-* and *\*albh-*, sometimes followed by other lengthenings (*\*alōbhō-*, *\*albhō-*, *\*albhni-*, etc.). That is, the root forms and the lengthened ones with *-bh* (which, as is known, is a common suffix in colour names) were kept for adjectival use; those with *-p* (later also with *-kʰo-*) for nominal use to denote certain animals with a whitish skin.

#### IV.

At this point we come to the problem of vocalism, which, although it is the one which interests us most, has been left to one side so far on account of others which needed to be cleared up beforehand.

In order to understand the following, one should remember, although in very brief form, the doctrine advocated in the above-mentioned books and papers and in several others of the Spanish school:

1) A group *eHʷ₃* followed by a consonant may have a monosyllabic *ō* solution or a disyllabic one *eu*: in this second case, the *-Hʷ* belonged to the following syllable, the timbre of *e* was not affected. Both mono- and disyllabic pronunciations were alternative, so that there is a double result, in exactly the same way as, for example, a group *\*pro-* could give in different languages either monosyllabic *\*pro-* results or disyllabic *\*poro-* ones (Gr. *πρός/πάρος* for example). This doublet *ō/eu* (and *ou* in apophonic forms) is frequent in IE languages, as are, with other laryngeals, *ē/eu*, *ā/eu*, *ē/ei*, *ā/ei*, *ō/ei*.

2) When a laryngeal *Hʷ* is found between two consonants, it may be kept as a consonant or vocalized: this depends on the articulation of the syllable and there are two alternative possibilities. However, consonantic *Hʷ* is dropped (in Hittite it appears as *h*), whilst vocalic *Hʷo* gives *u* (Hitt. *hu*).<sup>11</sup> Now, there is another possibility of vocalization, which is

alternative to the previous one: with a double supporting vowel (*voyelle d'appui*)  $oHk^o$ , which gives *au* (Hitt. *ahu*).<sup>12</sup> That is, really: a zero degree  $lH^u$  may give either  $H > \emptyset$  or  $Hk^o > u$ , or  $oHk^o > au$  in IE languages. This is not a case of arbitrariness, but of results depending on the diverse existing possibilities of articulating one and the same syllable with a sonantic centre, and these possibilities are well-known. They are, then, the result of free allophones which are diversely phonologized.

3) In initial position, one should distinguish between  $H$  before a vowel,  $H$  before a consonant (or sonant in consonantic function) and  $H$  before a vocalic sonant:

a) Before a vowel, the laryngeal, whatever its appendix might be, loses it: thus,  $H^u_2$  (which is the initial laryngeal of our root, to judge from the diverse phonetic results) gives  $H_2$ , which lends its timbre to the vowel:  $*H^u_2el- > *H_2el- > al-$  (*\*albhōs*, "white", etc.).

b) Before a consonant, the laryngeal is dropped; in Greek and Armenian it may leave a prothetic vowel as a trace, derived from the supporting vowel developed before it ( $*H^u_2l-V- > l-V- / *oH^u_2l-V- > al-V-$ ). This last result, I repeat, occurs in Greek and Armenian (and Albanian) without on the other hand it being sufficient to demonstrate the presence of the laryngeal; the existence of this latter is deduced from the results of a) and c). Thus, Gr. *ἀλώπηξ*, Arm. *atuēs*, alongside O.I. *lopāsā-* and other forms with *l-* are really explained. It is remarkable that in the adjective a full degree became stabilized, whereas in the noun it was a zero one. It is one more differentiating feature between them.

c) Before a vocalic sonant, the laryngeal  $H^u$  gives  $u$ : thus should be explained forms of the *\*ul̥kʷos* type, Lith. *vilpišys*, etc. On the other hand, the  $ul̥-$  group may undergo metathesis, becoming *lu-* (in Lat. *lupus*, etc.).

I believe the foregoing is sufficient to explain the series of forms we refer to here, always on the basis of the same disyllabic root (that it was in fact a disyllabic root, Pokorny already realized, p. 31):  $H^u_2leH^u_3$  ( $\emptyset$ /full degree),  $H^u_2elH^u_3$  (full/ $\emptyset$  degree),  $H^u_2lH^u_3$  ( $\emptyset$ / $\emptyset$  degree). Naturally, apart from the forms mentioned below, most of them already having been discussed, there are others which may be found in etymological dictionaries and which are easily explained along the same principles.

The names of animals are deduced from this root on the basis of the  $\emptyset$ /full and  $\emptyset$ / $\emptyset$  degrees and with several lengthenings which begin with *-p*; the only clear exception is, as has been said *\*ul̥kʷos*, a relatively recent form for the reasons already discussed. I believe a form with *-k* underlies it (which on the other hand appears to be in O.Pruss.):  $*H^u_2lH^u_3ko-$ , the zero degree of the second syllable of which before *-o-* is easily explainable, and which, by means of metathesis of the appendix has produced  $*H^u_2lH^u_3ko- > *ul̥kʷo-$ . I think that parallel explanations could be tried out for the origin of other labiovelars.

From the  $\emptyset$ /full degree for  $*H^u_2leH^u_3p-$  we get  $\bar{o}$  in Gr. *ἀλώπηξ* and other already mentioned forms, *-eu-* in O.I. *lopāsā-*. Similarly, we get  $\emptyset$ / $\emptyset$  degrees of two types: with vocalization in *u* of the second laryngeal (Av. *urupis* <  $*H^u_2oH^u_3p-$ ); and with its loss  $*H^u_2l-p(-k^u)-$  when the consonantic pronunciation is kept: Lat. *uolpēs*, Lith. *vilpišys*<sup>13</sup> <  $*H^u_2lH^u_3p-$ , the forms derived from  $*H^u_2lH^u_3ko- > *H^u_2lk^u- > *ul̥kʷo-$  to which we have just re-

ferred, etc. As regards the phonetic results of the first laryngeal, see above.

If we now turn to the adjective which means "matte white", we have already stated that it specialized forms with full/∅ degree which produced an initial syllable *al-*. In view of the diverse possibilities of phonetic evolution of the ∅ degree of the second syllable, the results are, as we have said, forms *al-* (before consonantic lengthenings, above all *-bʰ-*), *alau-* and also *alu-* (these forms need not necessarily be strictly vocalizations but results of *H<sup>2</sup>* before a vowel). On the other hand, there also exists a secondary form full/full: *\*H<sup>2</sup><sub>2</sub>eleH<sup>2</sup><sub>3</sub>-* which is in Gr. ἀλωφός "white".<sup>14</sup> Cf. also ἀλωπόχρους • πολτός.<sup>15</sup>

If we disregard this form, we may refer, among the characteristic ones, to others from *\*al-*: *\*albhōs* with its various derivatives (Gr. ἀλφός, Lat. *albus*, etc.), perhaps also Gr. ἄλφι<sup>16</sup>, possibly Arm. *atauni* "dove".<sup>17</sup> Then there are the forms which are based on *\*alau-*: Russ. *ótowo* "tin", O.Pruss. *alwis* "lead". There are also less certain forms from *\*ala-* which may likewise be explained by means of the same theory.

I believe that in this way forms which appeared to be related within each one of the two significant series may be considered to be of equal etymology and the two series to be equal to each other. It is simply a matter of relating their correspondences to others which exist in other roots, thus establishing correlations and explaining the origin of these latter. Only with the aid of the laryngeal theory, and in particular, of the theory of the laryngeals with appendix can one come to these conclusions in my opinion.

## V.

A slight objection may be made by adducing certain words with *\*al-* which contain an *-i* in their second syllable and which have sometimes been related to those with which we are concerned. It is not easy to explain the existence of the *-u* alternating with *-i* in the second syllable of a disyllabic root, although cases do exist which are generally explainable as contaminated.

But the truth is that the material which may be brought forward is scant and dubious. There are no strong reasons to attribute forms like *\*alisa* "white poplar" to our root, in diverse IE languages; or such as Gr. ἀλίφαλος (corrupt) • γένος δρυός in Hsch.; or such as Gr. ἄλλξ "mush".



## Notes:

- \* I wish to thank Dr. Francisco Villar, Professor of IE Linguistics at Salamanca University, for his invaluable help with this article.
- 1 Estudios sobre las sonantes y laringales indoeuropeas, 2nd edition, revised and enlarged, Madrid 1973. Also "Loi phonétique, sonantes et laryngales", *Emerita* 31, 1963, pp. 185–211 and "Loi phonétique, phonologie et sonantes indoeuropéennes", *Lingua* 18, 1967, pp. 113–144 (spanish version in *Estudios de Lingüística General*, 2nd ed., Madrid 1974).
  - 2 "More on the Laryngeals with Labial and Palatal Appendixes", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 2, 1981, pp. 191–235, and "Further Considerations on the Phonetic and Morphologizations of  $H\bar{h}$  and  $H\bar{h}^*$  in Indoeuropean", *Emerita* 49, 1981, pp. 231–271.
  - 3 Cf. C. A. Martelli, "Una concordanza greca e indiana nella denominazione della volpe", *AGI* 50, 1965, pp. 105–120.
  - 4 Cf. Estudios sobre las sonantes . . . , p. 74 ff.
  - 5 Paris 1951 ff., s. u.
  - 6 Heidelberg 1954 ff., s. u.
  - 7 Paris 1968 ff., s. u.
  - 8 Bern 1951 ff., s. u. *ulp*, *lup*.
  - 9 Heidelberg 1976 ff., s. u. *lopásá*.
  - 10 One may doubt whether the lengthening is with  $\bar{e}$  (cf. Gen. ἀλώπεκος, etc.). But this is doubtless an analogical alternative form. In favour of  $\bar{e}$  are F. Specht, *Der Ursprung der idg. Deklination*, Gothinga 1944, p. 40, E. Hermann, *KZ* 69, 1948, p. 66, myself, *Estudios sobre las sonantes* . . . , p. 349. Naturally, the lengthenings  $\bar{e}$  and  $\bar{i}$  are related as is usual. On the other hand, it may be suggested that the  $\bar{k}$  of Gr. ἀλώπηξ (and that of O.I. *lopásá*, secondarily thematized) comes from the group  $\bar{e}H$  before desinential  $\bar{s}$ , no more nor less than Lat. *senex*, cf. Martinet, *BSL* 51, 1955, pp. 42–56.
  - 11 For the results  $H/H\bar{i} > \emptyset/i$  of the palatal laryngeals ( $H\bar{i}$ ), parallel to these, and for vocalizations in  $\bar{a}$  of all the laryngeals, I refer to the above-mentioned publications.
  - 12 Similarly, there is *ai* from  $\emptyset H\bar{i}\emptyset$ .
  - 13 Cf. E. Lidén, "Zur vergl. Wortgeschichte", *KZ* 56, 1969, p. 212.
  - 14 If it is true that  $\bar{h}$  does not come from  $\bar{h}$ , as in other cases.
  - 15 *Anecdota Bekkeriana*, p. 381; Eustathius, p. 1968, 39.
  - 16 Cf. H. Ehrlich, "Die Nomina auf  $\bar{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$ ", *KZ* 38, 1905, p. 55 and L. A. Moritz, *CQ* 43, 1949, pp. 113–119 (I think that W. M. Austin, *Language* 17, 1941, pp. 83–92, is wrong). Perhaps ἀλίφατα (in Hsch.) may be an alternate form for ἀλφατα. 'Αλίφατα is the manuscript reading (Schmidt's and Latte's editions correct it to ἀλήφατα).
  - 17 From *\*albhnī* according to S. Bugge, *KZ* 32, 1893–94, p. 1.