THE ORIGIN OF THURNEYSEN'S LAW

A detailed analysis of the evidence

1. Introduction

Herewith are presented the results of the investigation into Thurneysen's law in Gothic alluded to in my earlier article (Woodhouse 1998) on early Germanic obstruent development. For a good introduction to Thurneysen's law with literature, discussion of a number of key issues, including criticism of recent views, the reader is referred to Suzuki (1992). Some criticisms of Suzuki's own views are contained in my earlier (1998) paper.

It is clear from the ongoing controversial status of Thurneysen's law that no account of the law published hitherto has subjected the data on which the law is based to a thorough case-by-case analysis in order to determine exactly which of the items actually require Thurneysen's law for their explanation and which can be adequately explained by other means, notably Verner's law. Thurneysen's richly supported seminal paper (1898), demonstrating the curious regularity with which a substantial body (around a hundred items) of Gothic data complied with the statable principle of voicing dissimilation that now bears his name, was intended as a rebuff to a statement by Johannes Schmidt (quoted by Thurneysen 1898, p. 208) treating the phenomenon as the - apparently direct - outcome of Verner's law. Thurneysen's conclusion (p. 214) that his Gothic data could not be used to determine accent position in Proto-Indo-European (PIE) is, at least as things stand, perfectly correct, but this does not of course mean that the, so to speak, bona fides of the Gothic material cannot be usefully tested by confronting it with information about accent position in PIE that can be ascertained from other sources. Attempts to do this have been made, but, as has been indicated, they have for the most part concentrated on generalities or, as in the case of Bammesberger (1986b), dealt with only a limited section of the corpus. This is hardly surprising, given the quantity of data involved. Even Flickinger (1981), who produced some genuine and useful insights (cf. 3.0, 3.0.1 below), treated accent position only in relation to some of the suffixes and some
of the stems as separate entities, regretting that whole words cognate with the Gothic items were hardly attested at all in Vedic Sanskrit. The present study is intended as a first attempt to remedy these and other deficiencies of studies of this kind.

In order to keep the labour involved in such an undertaking within reasonable bounds while at the same time consulting a significant body of data — and observing that Flickinger’s excursion into other sources resulted only in the quaint addition of an alleged "ganisa »salvation«" (1981, p. 68; the form cited is 1. sg. pres. act. ind., meaning mostly, as at Mt. 9,21, »I shall be saved«) — I have decided to base the study on Thurneysen’s original collection, with which it should be read in conjunction, and to treat the material in much the same sequence, classifying it however into the explicability groups indicated above, viz.: material conforming to Thurneysen’s law but explicable on the basis of Verner’s; material explicable only on the basis of Thurneysen’s law; material whose explanation is unclear; and material that cannot be explained by Thurneysen’s law because it contradicts it. For Gothic etymology I have relied chiefly on the well known dictionary of Feist (1939) and the update of this by Lehmann (1986), acknowledging their assistance simply by mentioning these two scholars’ names without date, and citing the relevant dictionary article only where this is not obvious from the context or not easily found from cross references within the works themselves. More recent scholarly literature has been scanned for updates.

Although a residue of uncertainty remains, some of which must inevitably yield to future research, I believe that the present study brings considerable clarity to the main outlines of the subject and thus makes possible a properly informed evaluation of the nature of the process we call Thurneysen’s law.

And so: to the material.

2. Data for alternating sibilants -s/-z-

For the -is/-iz- group Flickinger (1981, p. 72) offers curious comparisons with Skt. rājani »night«, rāmā »dear«. The obvious comparisons for Goth. (dat.) hatiza »hatred, anger«, and (dat.) rigiza »darkness« are the neuter -es-stems Gk. (Doric) κάδος >sorrow< and Skt. rājas- »(lower atmospheric region of) vapour, fog, gloom<, Gk. έρεβος >darkness of the underworld<, respectively (Feist, Lehmann), though
in Gothic these words have gone over to the PIE -o- (Germanic -a-) declension, as has happened in other branches of IE as well, e.g. Armenian and Baltic (Brugmann 1906, p. 520–525). In addition, hatiza differs from its Greek congener in having presumably either zero grade (*kh₂d-) or theme II (*kh₂ed-) of the root.

Current theory (see Beekes 1995, p. 185f.) suggests that in PIE the paradigm of the neuter substantives in -es- once had mobile accent, with accented root syllable in some forms and accented -es- suffix in others. The e-vocalism that predomInates in the root syllable and the suffix was originally proper only to the accented syllable in any particular member of the paradigm, the unaccented syllables having zero or, particularly in final syllables, o-grade. The spread of e to both syllables in so many forms, with concomitant fixing of the accent on the root syllable, is due to levelling which must have begun already in PIE (see examples in Brugmann 1906, p. 517–528).

Beside the neuter substantives there was also an adjectival paradigm apparently with columnar accent on the -es- suffix, though in compounds the accent position was more variable. These adjectives often had active meaning and were also capable of substantivization, as can be seen by the examples collected by Brugmann (1906, p. 528f.), e.g. Ved. táras- »velocity, energy, etc.« : tarás- »quick, energetic«, rákšas- »act of guarding; something to be guarded against = harm, injury« : rákšás- »harmful = an evil being or demon«, etc.

These brief remarks supply the minimum background required to make a start on classifying the material for the sibilants. Other theoretical material can be dealt with as the need arises.

2.1. Inherited material conforming to Thurneysen's law

2.1.1. Material supported elsewhere in Germanic:

2.1.1.1. agisa (neut.; dat. sg., nom. pl.) »fear, terror« has Gm. cognates with voiceless -s-, OE egestic, OHG egesth »fearsome, dread«, OE eg(e)sa (masc.) OS, OHG agiso, egiso (masc.), OHG egisa (fem., but this is possibly secondary) »terror«, Norw. egse »Aufgeregtigkeit«, Norw. dial. esga »durch Schreck zu etwas treiben, reizen« (Falk/Torp 1960, s.v. ekse), etc. The gender variation (certainly neut./masc.) and the phonology support interpretation as a substantivized adjective

1 Brugmann (e.g. 1906, p. 524) believed that the -e-e- vocalism was characteristic of these stems in PIE.
meaning ‘something dread, provoker of fear’. This meaning is attested in Gothic (for nom. sg. *agis*) in Rm. 13,3 and is clearly present in the two WGm. adjectives (above), and also in OE *egesfull* ‘fearsome, dread’ referring to Holofernes in the ‘Judith’ (257) and possibly in OE *egesa* (ibid. 252) if this is in apposition with the provoker of fear, viz. *maegen Ebrēa* ‘the might of the Hebrews’. Beside this there ought to be an original neuter substantive *agiz-* meaning the emotion of fear, etc., itself. Possibly this form is reflected in OE *ege*, which in the Mercian hymns (Whitelock 1974, p. 192, 195) glosses *timor* ‘fear, dread’ (‘Leid/sorrow’ in Feist/Lehmann), meaning, apparently, the emotion. The same meaning is widely attested, however, in the -s-forms as well: the remainder of the Gothic attestations of *agis-* appear to have it – certainly the gen. sg. (*agisis*) in Jo. 7,13, the cognate instr./dat. in Lk. 2,9 and cognate acc. in Mk. 4,41, and no doubt the nom. pl. in 2 Cor. 7,5; so too OE *Meotudes egsa* ‘fear of God’ (Seafarer 103); and both meanings are well attested for OHG *egeo* (Grosse 1971 s.v.), an r-form, *egiro*, in a 9th century MS being regarded (ibid.) as an error.2

2.1.1.2. *sigis-* ‘victory’ also has masc. WGm. cognates; the same semantic duality can apply as in Eng. *triumph* (= both the feeling and the event). The -s-forms are generally less conspicuous elsewhere in Gm. Feist lists a couple of personal names containing the -s- (e.g. *Segis-mundus*; these have been discarded by Lehmann). NHG presents a healthy contingent of *Sieges*-forms.3 The possibility that the -es- in these is genitival in origin is made unlikely by the seemingly complete absence of would-be genitival -s-forms among the compounds of an otherwise comparable word such as *Hof*- Thus the *Sieges*-words almost certainly attest an originally adjectival -es-stem.4

---

2 Why the substantivized adjectival form has been generalized at the expense of the original neuter substantive can only be a matter for speculation. Evidently, the provocation of fear occupied a more central place in the world of the early Teutons than the experiencing of it, but perhaps this was due less to an assumed >Inbrunst< than to a fondness for the *alu.*


4 On the basis of these and other WGm. masc. cognates to neut. -es-stems, and some other very limited data, Brugmann (1906, p. 522 f., 533 f.) thought to identify some PIE -is- stems. Consideration of this material is not without significance for the question of deciding the most reliable source for determining the PIE accent position in evaluating Germanic data. Brugmann’s solitary Greek example, viz. *χόνις*
2.1.2. Material with weak or no general support in Germanic:

2.1.2.1. hatiza (dat.) 'hatred' has the appropriate meaning for an original neuter substantive with accent on the root syllable, hence -z- is the expected result of Verner's law. (ON hatr supports this; Eng. hatred has an extra suffix; in general I have reservations about citing general Germanic -r- as support for Gothic -z-.)

2.1.2.2. riqiza (dat.) 'darkness' (reflecting the normal -e-e- vocalism): as for hatiza.

2.1.2.3. walisa 'genuine, beautiful' (possibly with o-grade in first syllable, see fn. 4 above): voiceless -s- reflects the expected adjectival accent on the suffix *-es-. Bammesberger's (1980) proposal to regard

> dust, clearly accenst the first syllable and has the same o-grade as is possible in walisa and agisa, whereas the handful of Vedic examples agree with Gm. -s- by accenting the suffix, thus presenting the same accentual split as is observed with the *-as-stems (e.g. Gk. κέφας > meat-, Ved. κράνις > raw meat-). The practical significance of Brugmann's theory, in my view, is that it lends some support to the idea that PIE *i, in addition to representing the syllabic allophone of *y, may have been preserved in some cases as an intermediate stage between accented *é and zero, since immediate loss of all unaccented vowels is a priori unlikely and would lead at a stroke to a language in which all vowels were accented (cf. Beekes 1995, p. 166). Moreover, instances in which *i alternates with *e, and also cases where *u alternates with *u/o, were documented by Speirs (1984, p. 39ff., 57ff., 171-176 and passim) partly in order to explain zero grade (p. 67-70), though Speirs's explanation was not really helped by his appeal to an idiosyncratic pair of laryngeals. The objection that PIE *i is never lost in zero grade is not cogent since the retention of this *i is due to its alternation with PIE *y and paradigm coherence. >Intermediate zero grade< i and u are preserved in Baltic (and more or less in Slavic) in the vicinity of liquids (etc.; Stang 1966, p. 33-35), and also in Sanskrit, if they were lengthened in this environment by a nearby laryngeal, and possibly in some other languages as well (Speirs 1984, p. 163-170, etc.). The theory that the quality of these vowels was determined by the preceding consonant is now rejected for Sanskrit by Mayrhofer (1986-1996, s. v. GARl 1) and is equally futile for Baltic-Slavic (see Kortlandt 1978a, p. 240). If, therefore, Brugmann's -is- stems represent a few instances in which a near zero grade i has been preserved, as sometimes also happens, for reasons >still unclear< (Beekes 1995, p. 107), in Hittite in these stems, e.g. nepis -sky-, these would constitute another case in which, as in Ved. mātār, etc., OHG muote/iər, OE mə dolər : Gk. μητήρ, acc. μητέρα > mother-, Germanic agrees better with Vedic than with Greek on the position of the accent.

5 The suggested (Feist, Lehmann) protoform *waliz should be amended to *wəliz- >Wahl- and *wəlis- >der Gewählte-.
the word as an ex-comparative is unconvincing for the following reasons: (1) the absolute use of comparatives cited in support evidently dates from a later epoch than *walisa, if the latter is indeed also a comparative, since the forms cited, viz. *framaldrozei and *managizo (Bammesberger 1980, p. 3), have either resisted Thurneysen's law or have eliminated its effects by analogy, and also *walisa would then be the only comparative form in the language with ending -is-; (2) the personal names OE *Walisung, OHG *Welisung (Feist, Lehmann) appear to contain the exact cognate of *walisa, yet Thurneysen's law can hardly have applied to them; (3) the objections to the -es- stem etymology of *walisa (see Bammesberger 1980, p. 2f.) are by no means insurmountable, since (a) levelled e-vocalism of the root is not obligatory, nor do deviations from e-vocalism necessarily have to be of PIE age, and (b) the conclusion that *walisa was declined only weak, even though it is somewhat insecure, being based entirely on four similar vocative expressions, nevertheless sits well with the fact that *walisa, if it means «real, genuine», belongs with a small group of qualifiers

6 Cf. (i) attesting zero grade: Skt. *ūras- »breast« (Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954, p. 227; Mayrhofer 1986–1996, s. v.), Gk. (neut.) πυτος »receptacle, cover; protuberance, cavity« (of PIE age if identical with Lith. dial. kūtas »hem of garment«, Illich-Svitych 1979, p. 37); Lith. puvišiai »ruins« (ibid., p. 34); in Germanic, OE slular »theft« (Wright/Wright 1925, p. 213); and (ii) attesting o-grade: apparently inherited in Lat. foedus »league, alliance«, but said to be transferred from o-stems in Lat. pondus »weight, modes-tus »moderate; modest« (Leumann 1977, p. 378) and also in Lith. lūpas »leaf« beside Gk. (neut.) λέτος »pod« (Illich-Svitych 1979, p. 37 [»PIE lepos« is presumably a misprint for lépos]); in Germanic cf. OFris. klāth, klēth, pl. klāther »dress«, OE clæd, clæd (cf. Steller 1928, p. 45; Holthausen 1934, s. v.), since there appears to be little or no support for a root form **glh&eyt- (cf. also Fraenkel 1962–1965, s. v. gīēti); OHG (neut.) farr(a)h, pl. farhir »pig«, (possibly) Lith. pařas »piglet«, beside Lat. (masc.) porcus »pig«, especially if, as seems likely despite the misgivings of Walde/ Hofmann (1938–1954, s. v. 2. porcus), the word belongs with *perk-* »speckled«; probably also OE sweng »blow«, perhaps speere »spear« and some other items with OE stem vowel e- recorded by Wright/Wright (1925, p. 213). Cf. also Hamp (1973, p. 142f.).

7 See Bammesberger (1980, p. 1) for these and also for the one other occurrence of the word, viz. in the phrase weihans jah walisans; in this phrase the weak form walisans is necessarily in tandem with that of weihans (an adjective also possessing a strong declension) and is thus, strictly speaking, non-probable with respect to the ability or inability of the parent adjective to generate strong forms.
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possessing only weak declensions and indicating not so much descriptive attributes as a relationship of the target item with respect to other (potentially) similar items, viz. ibna ñequal, ainaha ñsole, solitary, only, sama ñthe same, i.e. not some similar item, taihswa ñthe right (as opposed to ñleft, Goth. heiduma, significantly, a comparative), hence, at some point in its semantic development, walisa ñthe genuine one. 8

2.1.2.4. ñewisa (voc. pl.) ñservantsñ. If this is an ñes- derivative of ñtekñ- ñrunñ (Lehmann) the meaning is incompatible with that of an original neuter substantive, pointing instead to a substantivized neuter adjective (on the gender cf. the Old Russ. neut. otroña ñservantñ), the long root vowel possibly being that of a vrddhi collective, as Brugmann (1906, p. 527) suggested. Alternatively, the word may have the accented ñ-wes- of the perf. act. participle (Feist citing Walde; cf. Streitberg 1963, p. 213f.) with the same root vocalism as in berusjos (cf. 2.1.2.8 below). Either way this word, with its medial ñ-w-, belongs with the distinguished group of Gothic words preserving the voicing effects of Verner's law. 9 This raises certain questions concerning the chronological connection between Thurneysen's law, the arrest of Verner's law voicing and some other issues. These will be dealt with in the concluding section 6.2 below.

2.1.2.5. riqizjan ñgrow darkñ is a denominative. The ñ-z- agrees with the accent on the suffix ñ-ya- of denominatives in Vedic, where, coincidentally, the commonest consonant stems giving rise to denominatives are those in ñ-as- (PIE ñ-es- ) (Macdonell 1968, p. 401).

2.1.2.6. hatizofj (2. pl. pres., not 3. sg., pace Feist, Lehmann) ñare angryñ, a denominative formation of mixed derivation (Prokosch 1939, p. 157-159; Wright 1954, p. 156; Streitberg 1963, p. 312) making difficult or impossible any rigorous statement on accentuation. True, Bam-

8 The above list is given by Streitberg (1920, p. 129f.) along with some other material that requires a different explanation: aleujo ñof Olivesñ, a local place name, so always definite, and unheilo ñintenseñ, a hapax, like laushandja ñempty-handedñ.

9 On two grounds, therefore, the protoform given by Lehmann may be supplied with an accent, thus: ñtekñ-w-es-o-. Note: (1) the effect of vrddhi on the accent of collectives appears to be unpredictable, cf. sápta- and sáptá- ñgroup of sevenñ (Brugmann 1906, p. 648), both occurring twice each in the Rigveda (1,20,7; 2,19,7 and 8,55,5; 8,59,5, respectively), despite Mayrhofer (1986-1996, s.v. sáptá); (2) Brugmann's (1906, p. 527) appeal to an unaccented suffix ñ-wes- can be discarded.
mesberger (1986a, p. 38f.) would derive Gothic verbs of this class from PGM. forms continuing accented *-yé/-yó- suffix, which would indeed provide a natural Verner's law explanation for the -z- in our form, except that there appears to be no evidence that the Gothic forms ever contained this suffix (cf. also ibid., p. 84, especially on the difficulty of trying to reconstruct a *y-suffix in the verbs in -ē-). On the contrary, a few accented denominatives lacking the characteristic accented -yá- suffix occur also in Vedic, viz. bhiṣākti, kṛpānanta, and possibly vānāvati (Macdonell 1968, p. 401), and a reasonable working hypothesis based on them is that the accent of the verb tended to be that of the noun. On this basis hatizóp would naturally have the consonantism of hatiza (cf. 2.1.2.1. above).

2.1.2.7. swartiz(I)a (dat.) >ink<. The -z- is due to Verner's law, cf. Zimmer's (cited Feist, Lehmann) comparison with the suffixes of Ved. tam-isrá-m and tam-asá-m, both meaning >darkness<.

The next two items offer further valuable insights into early Germanic treatment of perfect active participles.

2.1.2.8. berusjos (masc. pl.) >parents<, representing in origin the fem. of the perf. act. participle with levelled accented suffix *-ūs (as in both Vedic and Greek) + (fem.) -i/-iya, or laryngeal equivalent (possibly, with Feist, originally -iyā, but see next item 2.1.2.9), and adapted to masc. gender either by semantic default or by reanalysis of fem. (possibly neut.) dual as masc. pl. (cf. Bammesberger 1995, p. 6), the article pai being capable of supporting all three possibilities (= Skt. té which represents nom./acc. fem./neut. du. and masc. pl., but not neut. pl., pace Lehmann). The vrddhi of the root occurs also in the pret. pl. berum (= PIE perf.) (Feist, Lehmann; cf. also þewisa, 2.1.2.4. above).

2.1.2.9. *jukuzi (fem. i-declension) >yoke<: suggested origin from fem. perf. act. participle rejected by Feist, but considered possible by Lehmann based chiefly, no doubt, on the able demonstration by Bammesberger (1965; cf. also Bammesberger 1986a, p. 103). In order to account for the apparently aberrant accentuation of the Gothic word we begin by observing that the ablaut of the fem. perf. act. participle Ved. vidūṣi, Gk. ἴονια shows that the accent in these forms is not original, but must once have been on the fem. termination(s), which in turn must also represent some levelling consequent perhaps upon the settling of the accent in its attested position. With jukuzi Brugmann (1906, p. 544) compares OHG feminines chilburra >ewe-lamb<, zaturra >meretrix<, chuburra >boat, raft<. Phonologically speak-
ing, all four of these Germanic words can be derived unproblematically from the levelling of protoforms in -us-éyeh/-us-yéh2. At least in the case of the first three (i.e. excluding chuburra), this derivation clearly meets with no semantic problems, since the perfect indicates a settled characteristic, as in the Vedic/Greek example(s) above, which cover such meanings as >knowing, wise, sensible<. The fourth item, chuburra, probably belongs with the group listed under the root gēy-, etc., by Pokorny (1948–1959, p. 393–398), cf. e.g. OHG kiol, etc., >ship<, kiola >pocket< (p. 397), Swed. kypa >round receptacle made of straw<, MLG kumme >deep, round, vessel< (p. 396), OE cofa >chamber, hiding place, hollow<, OHG chubisi >hut, cottage< (p. 395) (see also Beekes 1996, p. 223–227).10 The basic meaning thus seems to be >structure that maintains a hollow, rounded shape<, which is an ideal meaning for a perf. act. participle. These four Germanic words can thus represent archaisms which early became separated from the participial paradigm and thus remained immune from the levellings of accent and other innovations that were clearly under way if not completed in the living paradigm during the PIE period (pace Bammesberger 1986a, p. 103 and 161, n. 9, who equally clearly believes the levellings occurred independently in some daughter languages but not in Germanic).

2.1.2.10. riqizeins >dark< had accent on the suffix following the -z-, whether this be *-íno-, so accented in both Vedic and Greek, or the less certainly attested -eino- (Brugmann 1906, p. 275–277).

10 This last may show the sort of realignment to an -es- suffix that some have posited (unnecessarily) for OE gyecer >yoke< (e.g. Walde and Pokorny: see Bammesberger 1965, p. 417f.) except that OHG chubisi attests in addition the characteristic accent place of an (eventually substantivized) adjective of this formation. Such a realignment could have been due either to speakers’ growing unfamiliarity with the derivation or, with equal probability, to a fading need to keep the precise derivation of a familiar item alive. Cf. the confusion that eventually descends on hackneyed phrases which results in slips like sense of false security for false sense of security and probably also in the common confusion of vaguely synonymous and phonetically overlapping items such as: Eng. suppress, repress and oppress; the common Australian malapropism mitigate (sc. militate) against; and the like.
2.2. Items whose consonantism appears to be determined by Thurneysen's law

2.2.1. *aqizi* >ax<. Germanic >cognates< (Feist, Lehmann) suggest a thorough confusion of Lat. *ascia* >ax*, mattock, hoe, trowel< with *acus* >needle< and even *acūtus* >sharp, cutting<. The context in Luke is an agricultural one, so that the old Germanic word for battleax (OHG *bīhal*, Eng. *bill*) was not appropriate: speakers of early Germanic evidently favoured keeping the two concepts apart. The -s- elsewhere in Germanic suggests that the Gothic word is a genuine example of Thurneysen's law.

2.2.2. *barusnjan* >regulate with religion, etc.<: despite the uncertainties of meaning, structure and etymology, the -ja- suffix indicates accent after the -s-, which must therefore owe its existence to Thurneysen's law.

2.3. Items whose causal relationship with Thurneysen's law cannot be determined

2.3.1. *rimisa* (dat.) >quietness<, hapax, only in the phrase *mīp rimisā* >quietly<, which, in the context of 2 Thess. 3,12, must contrast with *περιεργαζόμενους* >busybodying< in the previous verse and thus signify something like >with quiet demeanour< (hardly >[working] with rest<, as Lehmann's gloss might suggest). Lith. *rāmas* (Lehmann) appears to confirm the existence of a root-accented neuter substantive in -es-, given that Illich-Svitych (1979, p. 35–39) cites four words of this structure and origin (*pařsas, jaūkas, kūtas, lāpas*) among his ten examples of PIE barytone neutrals in Lithuanian but has no -es- stems among the eight items he cites for his PIE neuter mobile oxytones; in addition, the -as desinence augurs well for an old neut.subst. nom. sg. in *-os*, rather than the *-és* of the adjectives. However, the Lithuanian substantive is not well known to the world of learning. It figures not at all in the five volume dictionary by Niedermann et al. (1932–1968). According to A. Kurschat (1968–1973, s.v. *rāmas*), who like his father before him (F. Kurschat 1883, s.v.), records the word without accent, it was heard in a folksong in the middle of the last century by Nesselmann, who went so far as to indicate stress on the first syllable of the citation form. Lehmann's circumflex was apparently supplied, perhaps under the stimulus of the word's possessing an IE etymology, by Fraenkel (1960–1962, s.v. *rāmas* 2), who also cites Nesselmann as his
source but neglects to indicate precisely the all-important accentual paradigm. Thus independent confirmation that our Lithuanian word belongs to the old barytone accent class (2) is lacking. Against this, Gk. (compar.) ἡρεμέστερος (Feist, Lehmann) presupposes the existence of an adjective (masc., fem.) *ἡρεμής, (neut.) *ἡρεμές, and given the apparent confusion of subst. and adj. in the 'terror' area in Germanic (cf. 2.1.1. above), a similar confusion cannot be ruled out for the 'calm, quiet' words (note that each of these two English glosses embraces both functions). But although it is tempting to argue that the active meaning expected for the adjective, viz. *promoting peace, conducive to peace, would lead to a substantive with a more suitable meaning for the context, such as *peaceful ways, a peaceful disposition, a quiet demeanour and the like, there is no proving that this is any more suitable than plain 'tranquillity'. Nor does an examination of alternative Gothic translations of Gk. ἡσυχία carry us any further forward. Consequently, both the available alternative interpretations have their attractions and their problems, so that a decision favouring one over the other appears impossible.

The same is, however, tantalisingly not true for the homographic loan meaning 'piledriver' or 'pillar' recorded adjacent, also without consensus over the accent, by both Fraenkel and A. Kurschat, and supplied by the latter with a plural form indicating class (2). While the possibility of mutual influence between the two words cannot be entirely ruled out, there is no clear evidence for it in our sources.

Beside Goth. miþ rimisa translating Gk. μετά ἡσυχίας are Goth. in haunifxii (A; B has in hauifxii) 'in/with humility(?)' and in pahainai 'in silence', both translating εν ἡσυχία (1 Tim. 2,11 and 12) indicating St. Paul's desperately pessimistic view of how a woman should dispose herself in any intellectual dealings with a man. The stylistic variation evident here in the Gothic reappears in the Latin text of 1 Tim. with in silentio vs. in taciturnitate (cf. Friedrichsen 1939, p. 128–135, who neglects, however, to mention the case of ἡσυχία), whereas the difference in the preposition in the Thess. context (Gk. μετά, Goth. miþ, Lat. cum [silentio]) rests clearly enough on the difference of meaning signalled in the handbooks for the Greek text (e.g. Bauer 1958, s.vv. μετά III, col. 1007, et εν III.2, col. 517; Schirliclz 1908, svv. μετά I.d, p. 264, et εν 3.a, p. 140; etc.), viz. the phrase with μετά indicates a circumstance accomplishing an action, i.e. it refers to general ambient conditions applicable to all participants, while the phrase with εν indicates the state or manner in which a particular person acts and so is often reducible to a simple adverb of manner, e.g. εν τάχει 'quickly', and can thus easily refer to the unilateral behaviour of a single participant in the action, in this case the woman.
2.3.2. walwisoda (pret.) *(intrans.) roll about, roll to and fro*: another denominative of the type of hatizoph (cf. 2.1.2.6 above). It is tempting to speculate that while the semantics naturally favour the derivation of *hatizon >be angry* from the neuter abstractum hátiz-*anger*, *walwison would equally naturally derive from a substantivized adj. *walwis-*rolling, roller-like; roller; sth. that rolls/is rolled to and fro* (possibly some unknown item of the Gothic toolkit), preserving the latter’s consonantism – for this property cf. awiliudon >thank* from awiliuda (pl.) >thanks* despite liufon >sing praise* (and despite Thurneysen’s law, unless this is a compound). On the other hand one cannot help noticing that four other verbs of this class with root final spirants fit the voicing dissimilation pattern, even though they have nothing to do with Thurneysen’s law, viz. lapon >invite*, harbon >go about*, sidon >practise* and swiglon >pipe*.

2.3.3. halisaiw (Lk. 9,39) >hardly (ever), almost never*: no judgement possible in view of uncertain etymology (Feist, Lehmann) and uncertain status, the word (word group?) being a hapax in a single MS not free from scribal errors in the immediate vicinity – cf. ⟨sunu⟩ for sunau (v. 38), ⟨hidrei⟩ for hidre (v. 41), etc. (Streitberg 1950, p. 131–133); and even uncertain componential analysis: if sunsaiw >immediately* contains comparative suns >soonest*, halis- in principle could also be a fossilized comparative with -s- then due to Thurneysen’s law. The meaning would then be *least* – and the semantic connection between >weak* (MHG hel, etc., Holthausen, cited Feist, Lehmann), >thin* (cf. Arabic da’if- [Classical] >weak, frail* > [vernacular] >skinny, slim*) and >small* (NHG mager, Eng. meagre) is not hard to establish.

The next three words contain the suffix combination -s/z-na-, the accentual properties of which appear to be variable: root accent in Ved. mátasna- >paired internal organ in the chest (lung*?) (cf. mátysa- >fish*), barytone in karásna- >forearm* (cf. kará- >doer, hand*), oxytone in vadhasná- >weapon, Indra’s thunderbolt* (cf. vadhá- >slayer*), all masc. or neut. Since the Gothic words are all fem. we should perhaps compare Ved. jyótsná- >moonlit night*, Skt. mrtsná- >loam, fine dust* (probably oxytone in view of ablaut and [late] Ved. märtsná- >pulverized*), barytone in Gk. (Att.) σελήνη, (Lesb.) σελάννα >moon*. The sparse indications of derivatives mimicking the accent of the simplex seem to be offset by a distinct tendency towards oxytonesis, judging by the forms cited by Wackernagel/Debrunner (1954, p. 927f., though mrtsná- on p. 928 appears to be an error), Brugmann (1906,
p. 282) and Macdonell (1968, p. 133f.). This renders insecure the fair to mediocre arguments that can be mounted to reconcile the consonantism of the first two of the Gothic items below with the likely PIE accent of their respective simplicia and to support the operation of Thurneysen's law in the case of the third.

2.3.4. arhaznos (fem. acc. pl.) >arrows<: Germanic cognates – Olcel. gr, OE earh – point to root accent of the base, but the Gothic arrest of Verner's law voicing makes it impossible to be certain that the -h- of the compound and, by implication, the -z- of the suffix are original. On the chronological implications this raises, see 6.2 below.

2.3.5. filusna >great extent, multitude<: despite the corruption of the text of Neh. 5,18 (cf. LXX 2 Esdras 15,18), meaning and structure seem to be clear enough. An argument for inherited status is as follows. The suggestion that PIE *i (= Goth. i) might represent reduced grade of PIE *e (cf. fn. 4 above) raises a doubt that the simplex filu contains full grade of the root, given the curious underrepresentation of this elsewhere in IE outside Germanic. The few examples that can be cited mostly refer unmistakably to liquids and pouring (see Pokorny 1948-1959, p. 798-801) and can largely be eliminated from consideration by adopting Fraenkel's (1962-1965, s.v. pilve) separation of the >marsh< words from the >pour< group. Old Irish il can represent *pilu- just as easily as *pelu- (Thurneysen 1946, p. 38, 47f.). Ved. pârînas- >abundance<, pârîman- >id.<, which are claimed as full grade derivatives of the >fill/full< root by Mayrhofer (1986-1996, s.vv.), have no correspondences outside Indo-Iranian, so that nothing prevents their interpretation as pâri (prefix = adv.) >all around< (= Gk. πέρι >around; exceeding[ly]) + i >go< + suffixes, the structure being very similar to that of Old Church Slav. obîtiže >abundance<, viz. ob(i) >around< + i >go< + suffixes.13 Goth. filusna may therefore reflect the grade and accent of Gk. πολύς, Ved. purû-14 and thus have inherited consonantism. But since this possibility entails a revision of current ablaut theory it must be either discarded or reworked or set aside for the future.

2.3.6. hlaiwasnos (fem. nom. pl.) >graves<: differs in suffix vocalism from the root-accented -es- stem attested for WGm. by OE hlæw, OHG

13 Of no particular attraction is the alternative based on *vey/vî >desire, delight, pursue< offered by Vasmer/Trubačev (1986–1987, s.v. obînyf).

14 Beekes's (1995, p. 198) perplexity regarding the PIE paradigm reflected in these words may thus point to persistent inadequacies in our theoretical appraisal of PIE vocalism.
(h)lēo, (solitary nom. pl.) lēwir >grave-mound< (Nedoma 1993a, p. 124). The Lithuanian cognate šleivās >lame< offered for the simplex (Feist, Lehmann) can tell us nothing about PIE accent since Lithuanian adjectives of this type underwent generalization of accentual mobility during the brief historical period (Illich-Svitych 1979, p. 43).

2.4. Exceptions to Thurneysen's law

2.4.1. barizeins >made of barley<: as for rigizeins (cf. 2.1.2.10 above).

2.4.2. ubizwa >porch/vestibule of a hall<: PIE *u̯p-es-wâ (Lehmann, citing Hirt) seems eminently suitable, with *w- as in Skt. takvā- >swift creature(?), Boeot. καλφός >beautiful<.

3. Data for alternating dentals -p/-d-

3.0. First it is necessary to eliminate some material that clearly does not belong here. Thurneysen (1898, p. 211) himself correctly excised the weak preterite suffix(es) from the material for his law, but claimed that levelling had been at work in the case of the suffixes -i̯ba and -i̯ro. The latter group, which actually includes sundro >especially<, has long since been regarded as having its consonants determined purely and simply by Verner's law (Feist, Lehmann aijpro; also, somewhat incompletely, Flickinger 1981, p. 72).

3.0.1. The case of -i̯ba/-ida is particularly instructive. Thurneysen's (1898, p. 211) description of the distribution of the forms is unimpeachable: -ida is found in the only two items in the corpus in which the consonant just before the suffix is /p/ and in the solitary hapax variant weitwodida, and nowhere else. Thurneysen plausibly suggests dissimilation of the double p sequence for the first two (accepted by Feist wairpida, Lehmann au̯ps), and confusion with the participle for the hapax. After listing 25 -i̯ba items with presuffixal voiced consonants conforming of course to his law, Thurneysen then cites

15 Indeed this was Thurneysen's (1898, p. 210) explanation for all derivational and flexional suffixes that contradicted his law, a position rejected nowadays (Suzuki 1992, p. 32 f.).

16 In the context po weitwodida is (Jo. 3,32 in Sk. 4,20 f.) it would then be neuter plural and more or less make sense: >the things testified of (= by) him<.
no less than six items with -iba and presuffixal voiceless consonants (armahairtiiba, etc.) that of course do not. This shows unmistakably that Thurneysen's law as it is usually formulated does not apply to this suffix.

Such is the force of tradition, however,\(^\text{17}\) that Suzuki nearly a century later (1992, p. 30) was able to content himself with the statement that «the suffix -iba shows a greater degree of exceptionality (than -aha, R.W.)», which he endeavoured to explain on the basis of this suffix’s greater productivity (1992, p. 43). The productivity argument thus appears to be without foundation.\(^\text{18}\)

The immunity of the -iba- suffix from Thurneysen’s law in Gothic is hardly surprising, given the connection established by Flickinger (1981, p. 71) between this fact and the fact that in the bulk of the Vedic material containing a related suffix (or suffixes) the accent falls on the syllable just before the dental consonant of the suffix.\(^\text{19}\) Perhaps Thurneysen was right to talk about levelling after all, since if post-Verner pre-Thurneysen Gothic contained any naturally derived -ida forms, their number would have been so small that they would readily have given way to the overwhelming abundance of -iba forms,

---

\(^\text{17}\) Cf., e.g., Wright (1954 [= 1910], p. 175), with no new evidence in support of his claim that «iiba generally became -ida by dissimilation when the preceding syllable began with a voiceless consonant».

\(^\text{18}\) Even if Gothic -pi- is due to levelling, it nevertheless stands outside the material for Thurneysen’s law since it is attached without intervening vowel to the final consonant of the root. In this position it is very likely to have simply undergone the usual loss of Verner voicing that was typical for that position, especially as Rigvedic and other evidence suggests that the accent fell on the *-ti- at the earliest period (Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954, p. 631). Thus, in common with the purely Verner-derived comparative suffix -iz- (Flickinger 1981, p. 72), this -pi- suffix offers no support, or at least no relevant support, to the productivity-levelling theory either (pace Suzuki 1992, p. 32f. and 43, fn. 14).

\(^\text{19}\) Collections of data in both languages – Gothic and Vedic – reveal a 10% exception rate. Thurneysen cites 31 Gothic items with -iba against three with -ida. Macdonell (1968, p. 138) and Brugmann (1906, p. 416–418, 451) cite about twenty Vedic items with accent on the vowel immediately before the related Vedic suffixes -tā, -tāt(i) (even when this vowel is zero grade, e.g. sū-nī-rā-tā- »gladness») against two (cited by Brugmann) which atypically preserve the accent position of their base forms, viz. a-vīra-tā »lack of sons», āstātātī »home«.
leaving behind the two unarguably dissimilated forms attested in our records (and perhaps a very few others) as their memorial.\textsuperscript{20}

It can of course be argued that the dissimilation evident in the two genuine -\textit{ida} items testifies to a feeling for well-formedness similar to the one that I shall be suggesting was responsible for Thurneysen’s law proper and is thus supportive of the basic thesis being developed here. The potential this material thus has for shedding its own peculiar light on the problem no doubt warrants its continued inclusion in discussions of Thurneysen’s law, but it is clear that the distribution of the forms of this suffix in Gothic can be of no further statistical interest here.

One further item belongs with this group, although it has traditionally been separated from it thanks to misinterpretation of an apparent variant in a corrupt passage, which has caused much puzzlement. The genuine attestation of this item is \textit{fullip}\textsuperscript{e} (gen. pl.) >full moon(?)< at Col. 2,16. For the alleged acc. sg. *\textit{fullep} the MS (Mk. 4,28) actually has \textit{fullep}, i.e. 3. sg. pres. of \textit{fulljan} (trans.) >fill sth. (with), make sth. full (of)<, which is constructed with an >instrumental< genitive. The (corrupt) Gothic text at this point reads:

\begin{quote}
\textit{silbo auk air}f\textit{a akran bairif}: frumist gras, \textit{faprh} ahs, \textit{faprh fullep kaurnis in \textit{\textbeta}amma ahsa,}
\end{quote}

which, aping the element order of the (partly forgotten?) Greek, thus represents:

\begin{quote}
>of itself then the earth bears fruit: first the plant, then the ear, then it [= the earth] fills [it = the plant] with grain in the ear<.\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

The confusion evident here is mirrored in the Greek text. Apart from the plain acc. sg. \textit{\pi\lambda\eta\iota\sigma\iota\tau\omicron\nu} of Streitberg’s edition, which would normally be taken to mean >then [the earth bears] full grain<, other

\textsuperscript{20} The paucity of the data and the nature of the Vedic material entitle us to a doubt which cannot be resolved by other Germanic data, since among the West Germanic cognates of these two items the only forms having the suffix (see Feist, Lehmann \textit{aufs}, Lehmann \textit{wairf}) all occur in Alemannic OHG: \textit{wirthida} (8th century) >dignitas<, \textit{unwirida/unwirieda} (10th/11th century) >probrum/contemptum< (Graff 1963, vol. I, p. 1019), all pointing to an older levelled \textit{wirfpa} – and it is anybody’s guess which of the two obstruents is to be regarded as the levelled one.

\textsuperscript{21} For omission of the object pronoun, cf. Mt. 27,48: \textit{jah nam swamm fulljands aketis} >and took a sponge, filling [it] with vinegar<.
versions of the Greek text present the following additional variants (my source is Ἡ κοινή διαθήκη, British and Foreign Bible Society, 2nd ed., 1958, p. 112):

1. acc. with art.: πλήρη τὸν σίτον > (then full [is] the grain [borne by the earth]), hardly > (then) [the plant] full of the grain> with the so called acc. of respect; possibly πλήρη has been misinterpreted as fem. sg. nom. to agree with ἡ γῆ >the earth<;
2. plain nom.: πλήρης σίτος > (then) [there is] full grain;
3. nom. with art.: πλήρης ὁ σίτος > (then) full [is] the grain;
4. nom. plus acc.: πλήρης σίτον > (then) [the earth, or the plant, is] full of grain> – the acc. of respect again.

With such a variety of interpretations present in the Greek text, some uncertainty in the Gothic text at this point is perhaps not particularly surprising.

Thus only the gen. pl. fullībe is trustworthy and, in view of OE (in compounds) (-)fylleb(-), OHG fullida >fullness< (Feist), this word can be safely assigned to the -ipā group.

3.0.2. After some hesitation, I have decided to join Feist and others in excluding the three fem. nouns in -bwa – fri(j)aþwa >love<, fi(j)aþwa >enmity<, saliþwos (pl.) >inn, dwelling< (Thurneysen 1898, p. 211) – from consideration, chiefly because of the two neuters in -dw – þiwadw >servants< and gaidw >lack< – the first of which (but understandably not the second) was cited by Thurneysen (ibid.) as an exception to his law. Since all five nouns in these two groups have voiced consonants before the suffix there seems to be no basis for claiming that the difference in their suffix consonants has any connection with Thurneysen’s law. Nevertheless a small doubt may remain.

The two neuters may be easily disposed of with a reference to Verner’s law (Feist, Lehmann, etc.), but the feminines are more problematic. Feist’s argument (fijaþwa) invoking Verner’s law for the feminines on the basis of Slavic accent must now be regarded as out of date (see below).\(^{22}\) Moreover, Germanic support for the consonantism of the feminines, which do after all conform to Thurneysen’s law, is patchy. For fri(j)aþwa there is nothing at all. For the other two words, complete loss of -w- in cognates must be assumed: fi(j)aþwa has only OE féogap >hatred<, however there is no dissenting material; saliþwos has rather better support, especially in the pluralized direc-

\(^{22}\) Lehmann’s uncoordinated emendation excising this has unfortunately left his own position here somewhat unclear.
tional expressions OHG zi selidon, OS te selidun \(\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\) (towards) home\(\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\) (Feist, Lehmann). Consequently, some discussion of the background of the suffix in these words is called for.

Somewhat indirect extra-Germanic indications for a generalized accent position for this suffix can be extracted from Indo-Iranian and Baltic-Slavic. The \*-twä- suffix is not directly demonstrable in Vedic or Greek. Vedic has root-accented gerundives capable of becoming (neuter) substantives,\(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) such as kārtva- \(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) to be done; (neut.) task, hāntva- \(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) to be slain\(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) (= OCS \(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) žētva \(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) harvest\(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) \(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) produce to be gathered by cutting/striking\(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\)), etc., Brugmann 1906, p. 448f.). The fem. of these belong to the \(\tilde{a}\)-declension, cf. RV 1,161,3: dhenuḥ kārtvā \(\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\) the milch cow \(\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\) to be fashioned\(\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\).

Fem. *-twä- substantives occur in Avestan, e.g. Gothic dāstvā- \(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\) teaching, doctrine, dogma\(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\), i.e. *-material or system to be taught/learnt\(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\). The invariable full grade of the root in these nouns (Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954, p. 713) suggests accent on the root syllable, as in the Vedic gerundives.

The same accent commonly occurs, as has been seen, with the suffix found, e.g., in Ved. (fem.) priyātā \(\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\) love\(\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\) so that it seems possible to regard the \*-twä- suffix as representing a blend of the \*-tä suffix with the gerundive, complete with the shared accentual properties they exhibit in Vedic. The three formal possibilities appear to meet in Lith. lūstvās \(\text{\textsuperscript{26}}\) chicken coop\(\text{\textsuperscript{26}}\), lūst(v)ā \(\text{\textsuperscript{26}}\) chicken coop, dog kennel, cage\(\text{\textsuperscript{26}}\) (Fraenkel 1962–1965, p. 377). The information regarding PIE accent that can be extracted from the Lithuanian words depends on the accentual paradigm class to which they are/can be assigned. In standard Lithuanian, lūstā belongs to accentual paradigm class (4), as does brūstā \(\text{\textsuperscript{27}}\) ford\(\text{\textsuperscript{27}}\) (Kruopas et al. 1972, s.vv.), a preference reflected in the treatment of these two words and their variants in the larger work by Kurschat (1968–1973, s.vv.), who cites in addition, however, class (2) variants of brūsta, brūstas, lanstas, lūstas, lūstvās and lūstvā (and possibly some others) from older works. The similarly compendious work by Niedermann et al. (1932–1968, s.vv., the relevant sections all being completed, however, before the death of Franz Bender in 1938, see preface to vol. 2) treats lūsta and its variants similarly, but speci-

\(\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\) The fact that the metre (and Sievers/Edgerton’s law) frequently requires the written \*-tva- suffix to be read as a disyllable (-tu[v]a-) is of no consequence in the present context.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\) This disagrees in accent with OE \(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\) frīod, frēod (fem.) \(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\) id\(\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\).
fies only class (2) for brasta and its variant brastva. Thus, relying additionally, and with Kortlandt (1978b, p. 274), on Illich-Svitych (cf. 1979, p. 15, a work originally published in Russian in 1963) for the normal direction of the transfer being from class (2) to class (4), we can safely posit the originals of the all-important variants lqastvà and brastvà as PIE barytones, which agrees with the tentative conclusions reached above on the basis of Indo-Iranian.

Some modest support for the Gothic consonantism seems to be forthcoming also in Slavic, though I am aware that the tentative conclusions that I have been able to draw in this complex field may well require modification. Slavic items with acute (laryngealized) root syllables do not count since they can have the accent on this syllable by Hirt's law; similarly items like Russ. lovítva (obsl.) >catching, hunting, molítva >prayer appear to have their stress advanced from the (word initial) root syllable by Dybo's law. The same law appears

25 The direction of the transfer agrees with the proposition that the å-stem barytones comprised a secondary class in PIE anyway, since stems in å < *Äh2 were originally basically oxytones (Beekes 1995, p. 182, 185).

26 Brugmann (1906, p. 450), followed by Wackernagel/Debrunner (1954, p. 714), compared the Gothic (deverbal) feminines with Lith. senätvë >old age< and also with Vedic end-stressed neuters. The comparison of these last two types with each other is probably better off without the Gothic forms, both phonologically and semantically, since the medial accent of senätvë seems more certainly to represent a retraction from the final syllable (cf. Kortlandt 1977, p. 324) and there is some evidence that the end-stressed neuters originally denoted a more passive or inert state than the root-accented feminines, even though the two types converged and became interchangeable in Classical Sanskrit. Thus Ved. devätã- means >service to a god, sacrifice<, >divine power< as well as >divinity< (Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954, p. 617), whereas devatvā-m has only the latter meaning; Gothic Av. dqstvã- means >teaching< (cf. 3.0.2 above); further Ved. sünätã- >generosity, narisëtã- >joking, chattering, tryátã- >alertness, vrótã- >manliness, heroism< (Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954, p. 617); vs. janitvã-m >state of being a woman, garbhatvã-m >pregnancy, etc. (Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954, p. 713).

And it cannot be denied that >love<, >enmity< and >settlement< can denote more active concepts than mere senätvë >old age, vienätvë >solitude, loneliness, and the like; for >love in action<, e.g., cf. frijapwos (B: in) pizaiei frijoda uns (Eph. 2,4) >on account of the love with which he loved us<.

27 These include (pace Feist fijapwa) Russ. bítva >battle, brítva >razor, žàtva >reaping, žèrtva >sacrifice, victim, pástva >flock; congregation (>*to be grazed, fed) (cf. Kortlandt 1975, p. 58-62).
to be responsible for the final stress in Russ. źratvá ›guzzling‹, which would thus be an example of an old accent just before the suffix, if the word is old and if its stress is not merely a matter of affectivity. This stress/accent place seems to be confirmed, however, by Russ. kljátva ›oath‹, with circumflex root syllable (cf. SCR. kletva ›oath, curse‹) which would protect it from Dybo’s law and also, as far as I can see, preclude retraction of the ictus by any other principle during the post-PIE period (cf. Kortlandt 1994).

Thus the combined evidence of Indo-Iranian, Baltic and Slavic supports Verner’s law as the source of voiceless $b$ in the Gothic suffix -$bwa$.

3.1. Inherited material conforming to Thurneysen’s law

3.1.1. Material supported elsewhere in Germanic:

3.1.1.1. *framapeis ›alien, allienated, someone else’s‹, said to have the same suffix as in dalapa (cf. 3.3.4 below). Gm. cognates differ in the suffix consonant, OHG fremadi, OS fremithi, OFris. fremethe agreeing with the Gothic word, OE frem(è)de pointing to PGm. */d/ (Feist, Lehmann).

3.1.1.2. *framapidans (participle from denominative) ›estranged‹: contrary to expectation, OHG fremidan, OE a-fremban agree with the Gothic verb in the voiceless form of the suffix (Feist, Lehmann), suggesting either levelling or a late (posterior to the initial onset of Verner, cf. fn. 40 below) formation within PGm.

3.1.1.3. haimofrli ›homestead‹, the suffix -ofrli goes back to PGm. *-ofala- (Feist, Lehmann).

3.1.1.4. magåpaï (dat.) ›maiden‹: Gm. cognates mostly confirm Gothic consonantism in which -g- is due to Verner’s law: OE mag(e)þ, OS magath, OFris. megith, OHG magad; only the extended forms OHG magatîn (Lehmann), OE mægden, Eng. maiden, etc., dissenting (see also 6.2 below).

3.1.1.5. menopum (dat. pl.) ›month‹, OE mônþ, OHG mánōd, etc. (Feist, Lehmann).

3.1.1.6. naqad- ›naked‹, Runic (acc. sg.) nAkdan, OE nacod, OFris. nakad, OHG nac(c)kot, nahhut (Lehmann).

3.1.2. Material with weak or no general support in Germanic:

First the -odus/-opus group. The considerable variability in the accent position in IE words containing the *-tu- suffix rests to some
extent on the opposition of accented full grade of the root vs. suffix accent accompanied by zero grade of the root, an opposition that is still clearly preserved in Vedic (Brugmann 1906, p. 440–446). Further, judging by the non-palatalized velars in Ved. gántum : gatvā, kártum: krtvā, the full grade probably represents o-grade. This provides some indirect indications of accent position which acquire a particular importance in view of the productivity of the compound suffix *-odu/-oḫu- in PGm. (ibid., p. 445).

Krause (1971, p. 40) has suggested that the variation in the cognate suffix attested in three Runic words is due to Verner's law. Two of these fit the expected accentual distribution exactly, viz. lapōdu »invitation«, with root-accented o-grade (Kluge/Seebold 1989, s.v. laden 2), and unapōu »contentment«, with zero grade root and accent on the first part of the suffix. The third item is haukoþu, with o-grade diphthong losing accent to the following syllable, rather, apparently, as in Goth. flodus »stream«, OE (runes) flódu »flood«, OE, OS, OFris. flód, OHG flōt, fluot (Feist, Lehmann).

Three of the five Gothic items cited for this suffix seem to fit this same pattern, viz.:

3.1.2.1. wratodum (dat. pl.) »journey«, with accented o-grade of the root;
3.1.2.2. gabaurjolwm (dat. pl.) »pleasure«, with zero grade of the root and accent on the following syllable;
3.1.2.3. *gaunofw (acc.) »mourning, sorrow«, losing accent from the o-grade diphthong to the following syllable. However both manuscripts have gaunota and the emendation has been made on the basis

28 Beside flodus, Brugmann (1906, p. 441) cites Goth. skildus vs. daubus, wulfus as illustrative of accent position in PGm. words containing the *-tu- simplex. Curiously enough, these four items also reveal a sort of compatibility with Thurneysen's law, except that here the determining consonants are the root initials: voiceless fl-, sk- vs. voiced d-, w- (the same is also true of bloþ- »blood«, the only one of Suzuki's [1994, p. 235, fn. 20] eight non-analogical items [Woodhouse 1998, p. 195f.] with medial dental), yet all four of Brugmann's examples do indeed derive their consonantism from PGm. Thus skildus »shield« agrees with Olcel. skioldr, OHG skilt, apparently with suffix accent, despite e-grade of the root – unless this is another of my >intermediate zero grades (fn. 4 above); daubus »death« agrees with OE deþaþ, OfRis. dōþ, dōþ, OG tōþ, all with root-accented o-grade; wulfus agrees with Runic wulþbewaR (man's name), Olcel. Ullr (god's name), all having accented zero grade of the root.
that the emended suffix is proper to abstracta derived from the ō-
class of weak verbs. Such a connection is by no means obligatory,
however, cf. fahed-joy< : faginon →rejoice<, frijaŋwa : frijon →love<.
Consequently, it may be preferable to take gaunõba (acc.) at face
value and see in it a *-tā abstractum based on the verb gaunon. Ac-
cent just before the suffix of such abstracta appears to have been
common (Brugmann 1906, p. 416–418).

The following additional item can be safely included here:

3.1.2.4. manniskodus →human nature<: the only certain information
on accent is supplied by Greek, where the diminutive suffix -iosko-is
constantly so accented (Brugmann 1906, p. 501f.); in Germanic only
OICel. oëska (< *junhiskon →youth<, ibid.) is against this, the *h indi-
cating accent on the first syllable. On the other hand Greek -tu- pre-
ceded by long vowel retains its accent as before (e.g. ἄλαωτυς →act
of blinding<); consequently there is evidence for accent on every sylla-
ble of manniskodus except -sko-.

Several members of the weitwod- →witness< word family have natu-
rally developed -d-, as follows.

3.1.2.5. weitwodiça →testimony, etc.< belongs here on account of
the -d-, not the -p-, although, as we have seen (3.0.1 above), it is the
latter that enables us to predict the accent position with a high degree
of confidence.

3.1.2.6. weitwodjan →testify, bear witness<, denominative: accent
on -ja- (cf. 2.1.2.5 above).

3.1.2.7. weitwodeins →testimony, etc.< see riqizeins (2.1.2.10 above).

3.1.2.8. weitwodei →testimony, etc.<, -in- stem: the accent in Greek
-tv- stems is uniformly on this suffix, and also on the allegedly related
Vedic adjectival suffix -in-, cf. also kanīna- →young< (: Av. kainīn-
→girl<) (Brugmann 1906, p. 313–315).

The remaining items are more various in their origins.

3.1.2.9. witoda (dat. sg.) (and compounds) →law<, differing in its suf-
fix consonant from OHG wizzod →id<, but agreeing with OE witod-
līce →truly, certainly<. The meaning →law< of the Gothic word derives
readily from *that which is has been observed, adhered to< (hardly
**what has been seen<, pace Lehmann), indicating a passive participle
from a denominative *witon (Feist) →practice observance of, adher-
ence to< related to primary witan →watch, observe<. The -d- of the
Gothic word agrees with the characteristic accented suffix *-tō- of the
participle (Brugmann 1906, p. 400), not *-tu- (pace Lehmann), since
Gothic would have preserved the ū, as in items 3.1.2.1–4 above.
3.1.2.10. *naqadei* >nakedness<, Verner’s law as for *weitwodei* (cf. 3.1.2.8 above).

3.1.2.11. *liuhada* (dat. sg.) >light< has suffix *elo-tó-, cf. Ved. *vr-átá-m* >commandment<, Gk. *βρ-οτό-ς* >mortal< (Brugmann 1906, p. 401); the medial -h- is then due to arrest of Verner’s law voicing (see 6.2 below for the chronological, etc., questions this raises).

3.1.2.12. *liuhadei, liuhadeins*, the -a- can be due to Verner’s law in *weitwodei* (cf. 3.1.2.7–8 above); the -h- as for *liuhada*; but the consonant-ism of the words may be entirely adopted from *liuhada* (see preceding).

3.1.2.13. *mitade* (gen. pl., fem. cons. stem) >measure, amount measured out; device for measuring (?)<, a fem. abstractum, according to Brugmann (1906, p. 426), but the Vedic items with alleged accented suffix *-élo-t-* adduced as possibly comparable by Brugmann (*sravát-, etc., 1906, p. 425) are regarded by Macdonell (1968, p. 189) — probably correctly in view of the absence of any lengthening by Brugmann’s law of a putative suffixal *o* in items such as *jága-t* >world<, *vághat->sacrificer< — as having zero grade (*-n£-) of the participial suffix with (Vedic only?) substantivizing shift of accent. A number of Greek and one or two Germanic t-stems cited in this context by Brugmann (1906, p. 425–427) appear to differ from comparable Vedic material in having accented e-grade of either root or suffix, cf. Gk. *άργετ-, πένητ-, ἕχητ-, κέλητ-, μέλιτ-, Θέμα-, μέλιτ-* also *χάριτ-, OS *metod* (= *OE* metód), perhaps also (with o-grade root and accented suffix) OHG *leitid, sceffid*, OE *hattet* (= OS *helid*, ON *hlard* with a different development of the suffix and with indeterminate stem final consonant anyway); these, I believe, make likely, if not absolutely certain, original accent on the first syllable of *mitad-*.  

3.1.2.14. *mitadjon* (hapax dat. sg. — not acc., pace Lehmann *mitan*) >measure, method of measuring (?)<: the uniform accent on the zero grade *-ín-* suggests that the PIE accent should fall on some part of the full grade *-iyôn-* of the same suffix and is therefore in fact preserved by the Greek forms in *-ióv* cited by Brugmann (1906, p. 316), even though in principle PIE accent on any preceding syllable would also result in the same Greek accent place; this conclusion receives indirect and perhaps somewhat slight confirmation from the suffix accent evident in the shortened form reflected in Gm. *-jan-* in Goth. *wai-dedja*, etc., *-evil-doer* (Brugmann 1906, p. 317), assuming this goes back to a PIE *-deh₁tíyon-*.

29 The time is perhaps ripe for a little more assertiveness on my part in
3.1.2.15. \textit{fahedai} \textit{joy}: despite the lack of a formally exact Gothic verbal equivalent to this nominal formation, its structure nevertheless appears to be exactly paralleled by Gk. ὀξησις (Feist), φόρησις, κόσμησις (Brugmann 1906, p. 435f.), all pointing to suffix *-eti-s with accented o-grade of the root, exactly as in the Gothic word.

3.1.2.16. \textit{ahtuda} \textit{eight}: \textit{niunda} \textit{ninth}, \textit{taihunda} \textit{tenth} (seventh is unfortunately not attested) suggest levelling of /d/ in these consecutive ordinals (for discussion see Ross/Berns 1992, p. 622–624, 629–632).

3.2. Items whose consonantism appears to be determined by Thurneysen's law

3.2.1. \textit{awefn} \textit{flock of sheep} = ποίμνη (Feist), not, pace Lehmann, **ποίμην (nor **herd of sheep??). On the other hand Lehmann's judgement -b -by Thurneysen's law is unassailable beside OE eod(e), OHG ewit, owiti.

3.3. Items whose causal relationship with Thurneysen's law cannot be determined

3.3.1. \textit{auhjodus} \textit{hubbub}: no secure etymology; while it would be nice to be able to claim accented o-grade of the root, the first syllable can just as easily continue an exclamatory *uh.

3.3.2. \textit{bajofwm} (dat. pl.) \textit{both}: etymology and structure uncertain; may originate in a compound like OHG beide, bëde, etc. (Feist, Lehmann).

3.3.3. -dub, i-stem suffix in mikildupais (gen.) \textit{greatness} and gamaindupais (gen.) \textit{community}, etc. That the suffix itself represents a productive leveled form in Gothic is vouched for, unless an intervening vowel has been lost, by the clusters -kd- and -gd- (instead of **-ht-) in ajukdup (acc.) \textit{eternity}, managdupais \textit{abundance}. The suffix is found only in Ionic, Celtic, Iranian and Gothic, not in Indic or Greek (Brugmann 1906, p. 453f.), so there is no way of checking its accentual characteristics. The first consonant of the suffix must be due to Verner's law (gamainfps \textit{congregation}, OHG gimeinida employing the usual symbols for implosives to denote the PIE consonants traditionally regarded as having been voiced aspirates (see Woodhouse 1995 and 1997).
>community< scuttle any possibility of analogy) and nothing is against assuming that the accent was on the -\( u \)- of the suffix, but there is nothing to prove this either (certainly not the nomen actionis Gk. \( \textit{μνηστεύς} \) >an asking in marriage< cited in this connection by Brugmann, ibid.).

3.3.4. \( \textit{dala}p\)a >below<: a hapax (Mk. 14,66). If the final -a is not a dittography (the next word is \( \textit{atiddja} \) and a sign of carelessness at this point in the text is the omission, according to Streitberg [1950], of an intervening *[jah]), the form appears to be quasi-loc./dat. beside >acc.< \( \textit{dala}p\). If this is so, then, given the defectiveness of the >paradigm< and the absence of any other information as to the age of the form, there is little to choose between the conflicting preferences for the etymology of the \( p \) of the suffix indicated by Lehmann (s.v. \( \textit{aljap, sama}p\), viz. allative *-te, locative *-dī, ablative *-den in the Greek interrogatives \( \textit{πόσε}, \textit{πόθι}, \textit{πόθεν} \) and elsewhere, e.g. \( \textit{τηλόσε}, \textit{τηλόθι} \) >far away<, \( \textit{τηλόθεν} \) >(from) far away<, except for one thing: if voiceless \( p \) is derived from PIE *d this would represent the only instance in which an old pre-Verner PGm. voiced obstruent was subject to Thurneysen's law (see also Schwzyzer 1939, p. 627–629 on the etymology of the Greek desinences; note that the final consonant in Ved. \( s(u)m\) at is unhelpful here since it is a product of neutralization).

3.3.5. \( \textit{magafei} \) >maidenhood<: one expects *-dei as in \( \textit{weitwodei} \) (cf. 3.1.2.8 above), but \( p \) may come from \( \textit{magaf} \) (q.v. 3.1.1.4 above; also 6.2 below). Thurneysen modification is possible, but questionable in the light of the >exception< \( \textit{frumadei} \) (cf. 3.4.1 below).

3.3.6. \( \textit{weitwode} \) (gen. pl.) >one who witnesses<: concerning the validity of the direct comparison of this with a perfect participle, viz. Gk. \( \textit{εἰδός}, \textit{εἰδότος} \), despite comparison of Goth. \( \textit{berusjos, pevisa} \) with the same member of the verbal paradigm, see Brugmann's (1906, p. 565f.) suggestion of PIE *-wōt- beside *-wes- (cf. also Bammesberger 1986a, p. 103). As has perhaps been hinted at above (2.1.2.9), the -e-grade in the first syllable means that Gk. \( \textit{εἰδότ} \) - with accented ó cannot be original. Apart from this source of uncertainty, there is also fairly heavy analogical pressure from the rest of the family (3.1.2.5ff.) in favour of the -d-

3.3.7. \( \textit{weitwodi} \) >testimony, etc.<: accent of *-(i)yo-stems appears to be very variable judging by the examples collected by Brugmann (1906, p. 182–193) and there is the possibility of analogical interference (see preceding 3.3.6).
3.4. Exceptions to Thurneysen's law

3.4.1. *frumadei* ›pre-eminence‹, with the voiced -d- expected with the -tn- suffix (*weitwoodei*, cf. 3.1.2.8 above).

3.4.2. *arbaiddim*, (dat. pl.) ›work, labour, toil, trouble, etc.‹: agrees with OHG ar(a)beit, OFris. arbed against OE earfop, OS arbed, etc. (Feist, Lehmann).

3.4.3. *arbaiddjan* ›work‹: the -d- is expected in a denominative; the differences between OHG arapaitón ›work‹ and OE earfopian ›burden‹ (Feist, Lehmann) point to separate levelling processes within the languages (cf. *arbaiddim*).

3.4.4. *haubida* (dat. sg.) ›head‹: -d- well supported in Germanic, cf. OS hōbid, OHG houbit, etc. (Beekes 1996, p. 218).

4. Data for alternating velars -h-/g-

Ignoring the enclitic -uh with its various peculiarities, and also -hun, as being beyond useful analysis here, the material reduces to groups containing the following ›suffixes‹: -ah/-ag, -ih/-ig, -eig and -ug, together with some items containing further derivational suffixes, especially -ei(n-).

In a special study of nearly all of this material, Bammesberger (1986b) challenged the communis opinio that the alternants here are purely the result of Verner's law (p. 35) by raising doubts that this could be so for any of the material containing the voiceless alternant /h/ (p. 36–38). Bammesberger concluded that since, as Thurneysen (1898, p. 212) himself saw, all h-forms are in harmony with Thurneysen's law, Thurneysen's original formulation must have been correct, i.e. that the alternants were originally phonologically determined by his law and that the large number of exceptional cases involving the voiced alternant /g/ were the result of subsequent levelling (1986b, p. 37f.).

While Bammesberger's separate conclusions regarding the individual h-items can in general be upheld, his overall conclusion attributing the non-conforming g-items to levelling is another unhappy child of the piecemeal approach that has characterized this subject to date. The uniformity in the direction of the alleged levelling, which is still somewhat worrying even when viewed in isolation, becomes quite incredible when placed alongside the forms containing -iβa-. As Bammesberger (1986b, p. 35) himself points out (somewhat cursorily), the
available comparative evidence for the \( h/g \)-items indicates that the suffixes in question overwhelmingly continue Proto-Germanic \( */g/ \) arising from Verner's law, since the accent in comparable material in Vedic and Greek is almost never on the vowel preceding the \( */k/ \). The \( -IPA- \) case is essentially the mirror image of this (cf. 3.0.1 above). The levelling theory thus requires that in two separate cases the original preponderance of one of the alternants dictated by Verner's law was first obliterated by Thurneysen's law and then the same preponderance was restored by analogy in the same unidirectional way in both cases, and, be it noticed, in the absence of any competing case in which analogy might have favoured an originally non-preponderant alternant. This is surely pushing coincidence too far. It is surely much more likely that the preponderance of the \( g \)-forms in Gothic is a direct reflection of the situation obtaining in Proto-Germanic immediately posterior to Verner's law.

Although this conclusion implies a very different view of Thurneysen's law than that espoused by Bammesberger, its immediate practical effect for present purposes is about the same, viz. it is only the \( h \)-forms that need be subjected to detailed analysis of their Thurneysen status. Much of this task, as has been indicated, has already been done for us by Bammesberger (1986b), although in some instances in a curiously non-explicit way – see, e.g., his remarks on

\[30\] Exceptions generally have long vowels before the suffixed \( k \), viz. \( \text{zandıkə} - \text{egg-laying} \) (Brugmann 1906, p. 496), \( \text{parphtarıkə} - \text{filler} \) (Macdonell 1968, p. 118), \( \text{süctıkə} - \text{stinging insect} \) (Lehmann baırghet), \( \text{asmıkə} - \text{our} \) (Feist ainohə, Lehmann ainaha). But cf., with accent short vowel, Gk. \( \text{πηλίκος} \) – how much? (in size, quantity, age), etc. (Brugmann 1906, p. 496). – For \( -ag-/ah- \) cf. Ved. ekakə - only, ašvakə - horse (dimin.), sanakə - old, dārakə - distant, arbhakə - small, and nāgəka - naked, māmaka - (and māmaka-) my, àntakə - ending, destroyıng, rūpaka - adopting a form, sāyaka - intended for throwing (Brugmann 1906, p. 493). – For \( -ig-/ih- \) cf. Ved. paryāyıkə - strophic, vārsıkə - of the wet season, Gk. ἑπίκος - horse’s, νυμφικός - bride’s, and many others (Brugmann 1906, p. 488). – For \( -ig- \) cf. Ved. (mostly subst.) mrdıkə - gracious, grace, àntıkə - face, dṛśıkə - aspect, dārıkə - rheumatic pains, dṛbhıkə - (N. of demon), vṛdhıkə - increaser, etc. (Macdonell 1968, p. 118; Brugmann 1906, p. 495f.). – For \( -ug \) in handugs cf. Ved. tānuka - thin, śiśukə - little child, sānuka - desirous of prey, etc., Gk. ἄθλικος - Libyan, θηλικός - feminine (Brugmann 1906, p. 491; Macdonell 1968, p. 120), remembering also that Goth. handus hand is a u-stem. – For the suffix \( -ei(n-) \) cf. weitwodei (3.1.2.6 above).
bairgahei, unbarnahs, broprahans (1986b, p. 36f.). It remains only to present the results, together with any additional commentary that may appear necessary, in a manner compatible with the remainder of this survey.

4.1. Inherited material conforming to Thurneysen's law

In principle this simply includes all the $g$-forms that ostensibly comply with Thurneysen's law; the remaining $g$-forms will, as indicated, also constitute output from Verner's law but will be exceptions to Thurneysen's. In the case of the -eig- suffix the numbers in each of these groups are roughly equal (eight vs. nine). Of all the remaining $g$-forms only wulpags belongs to the conforming group; the rest - a total of some 19 items, counting derivatives - count as exceptions. Under these circumstances further division of this material into those with and those without Germanic support outside Gothic seems rather pointless.

As might be expected, none of the $h$-forms can be shown with any reasonable degree of probability to have contributed to the genesis of the law. For some items there are nevertheless certain slender hints. These items are therefore presented in a special group under the »uncertains« (cf. 4.3.1 below).

4.2. Items whose consonantism appears to be determined by Thurneysen's law

4.2.1. aurahjom (dat. pl.) »tombs«: cf. mitadjon (3.1.2.14 above); in addition derivation via, among other things, a collective based on */tn- (Feist and, with the addition of OIcel. aurigr, Lehmann) leads to expectation of **-g- (unless a connection with OHG -ahi collectives can be made good, see 4.2.6 below).

4.2.2. broprahans (acc. pl.): the other Germanic evidence (Feist, Lehmann) attests solid /g/.

---

31 From Thurneysen's original list of 19 such items, one, »wainags«, is to be subtracted, since it is now read either wainahs or wainans (Feist, Lehmann; Bammesberger 1986b, p. 37), and a new one, hailag (neut.) from the Pietroassa ring, in all probability to be added (Bammesberger 1986b, p. 35, fn. 1; cf. also more recently Nedoma 1993b and Reichert 1993).
4.2.3. *unbarnahs* >childless*: no exact Germanic cognates for this wordform (Feist, Lehmann), which undoubtedly represents a productive type (cf. e.g., OIcel. *úblóðigr* >unbloody*, which shows the expected general Germanic form with */g*/ but is otherwise uninformative).

4.2.4. *waurdahs* >characterized by words (?)*: hapax in context (Sk. 4,18) that makes determination of precise meaning extremely difficult (some sort of compromise between >heavenly< and >earthly<?); Germanic cognates (meaning roughly >characterized by many words<) support only */g*/ (Feist, Lehmann; Bammesberger 1986b, p. 36).

4.2.5. *wainahs* >miserable, wretched*: hapax; reading with */h*/ possibly incorrect; Germanic cognates support only */g*/ (Feist, Lehmann; Bammesberger 1986b, p. 37).

4.2.6. *stainahamma* (dat.; adj. functioning as subst., perhaps in imitation of the Greek) >(the) stony (i.e. ground)*. All the other Gm. >stony< words, except OHG steinahī >stones, stony ground*, attest solid */g*/ (Feist, Lehmann). Several arguments against citing OHG steinahī in support of */h*/ in the Gothic word are presented by Bammesberger (1986b, p. 38). There is another argument in the same vein that is worth mentioning: since there is a well-attested group of OHG -ahi collectives traditionally regarded as containing the collective suffix *-ja-* (Thomas Klein [Bonn], personal communication), it is also possible that the OHG suffix -ahi represents a (possibly generalized) PIE *-όκ(ι)γο- with accent position determined not by the *-κό- suffix but, as might be expected, by the *-(ι)γο- suffix, since Gk. θείος, θείος >divine*: θεός >god; τίμως >honoured, honourable*: τίμη >honour; ἄγριος >wild*: ἄγρος >field* (beside Skt. ágra- >plain, meadow; Brugmann 1906, p. 188f.) suggest that the *-(ι)γο- suffix can send the accent back to the syllable before itself. Note that the Greek feminine collectives in -ία (φρατρία, etc.; Brugmann 1906, p. 647) follow Greek accentual principles and are non-probative for PIE accent – cf. ξενία >hospitality* beside probative accent in ξένιος >hospitable* (Brugmann 1906, p. 189). The question of whether the OHG neut. collectives in -ahi have influenced the consonantism of Gothic fem. collectives in -ahein- (see aurahjom 4.2.1 above and bairgahei 4.3.1.2 below) can be reserved for another occasion: it may have a small but non-significant effect on the results of the present investigation.
4.3. Items whose causal relationship with Thurneysen's law
cannot be determined

In view of the dearth of 'velar' material that could definitely have
served as the basis for Thurneysen's law it seems appropriate here to sep-
arate items for which there is even the slightest indication that they could
have fulfilled this function from the completely uncertain material.

4.3.1. Material with faint indications of possible inherited or 'inde-
pendent' status:

4.3.1.1. ainaha (masc., 2 ×), ainoho (fem., hapax, usually held to be
a scribal error for ainaho) (all in Luke) μονογενής, only (begotten). Ge-
manic cognates are solidly in favour of PGm. /-g-/ (Feist, Lehmann;
Bammesberger 1986b, p. 36); but in view of (1) the paucity of attesta-
tion, (2) the etymological connection — fortuitous though this may be
— between Gk. γέν- in μονογενής and Eng. kind used in glossing
some items containing the suffix found in Ved. asmáka- 'our', Russ.
odináki (obsol.), odínákovyj 'same, identical, of one kind', dvojáki
[of two kinds] beside odinóki 'solitary.' (Feist, Lehmann, citing Kluge)
and (3) the ever present possibility of confusion between words for
the concepts 'solitary', 'unique', 'one of a kind', 'only begotten' and
'of one kind', it must be said that the scribal error theory for
ainoho, though persuasive, is not quite conclusive. Instead it is just possible
that Gothic preserves the vestiges of a competition between these
two similar forms, with the (voiceless) consonant of the 'variant' with
long accented vowel (cf. fn. 30 above) levelled into the other forms.
But this is, admittedly, a long shot, and besides, it would hardly be
possible to substantiate any claim that the putative levelling had pro-
ceeded independently of Thurneysen's law.

4.3.1.2. bairgahei 'mountainous region', with -ei(n-) suffix. Against
accepting Thurneysen's law as the sole explanation is the possibility of
/g - g/ dissimilation. Cf. also the case of magafei (3.3.5 above); and
also OHG steinahi (4.2.6 above). Feist, Lehmann make no attempt to
discuss the consonant of the suffix: both refer the reader to
stainahs, where however the reader is referred straight back to bairgahei; both
authors refer to Kluge's 'Stammbildungslehre' of 1926, but both limit
themselves to an expression of disagreement with the latter's detailed
treatment of ainoho. While their disagreement is understandable, it
might have merited a little more discussion since ainoho surely rep-
resents the most important (even if ultimately erroneous) piece of evi-
dence for (pre-Thurneysen) PGm. */h/ in these suffixes.
4.3.1.3. *pariulis* (gen.) unshrunk: hapax; »Deutung [...] völlig unsicher« (Bammesberger 1986b, p. 37); no certain Germanic cognates (Lehmann; Feist's emendation and comparison with OHG *derh* holed, holey: would remove the word from consideration here). Ebbinghaus's cogent emendation to *pareihis* (Lehmann) opens some possibility of PIE accent on the long vowel (cf. fn. 30 above), which would supply a needed example with post-Verner voiceless velar and also transfer the `g-only` status from the `-eig` to the `-ig` group.

4.3.2. Completely uncertain material:

4.3.2.1. *niuklahs* child, immature person: no judgement possible in view of uncertain etymology (Feist, Lehmann; Bammesberger 1986b, p. 37).

4.3.2.2. *niuklahein* (dat.) pusillanimity: as preceding, which may however have supplied the /h/.

4.4. Exceptions to Thurneysen's law

These have been discussed in a general way in section 4.1 above. I see little point in listing the relatively large number of forms individually. The precise number to be considered is not really very important except insofar as it may affect perceptions regarding the validity of the levelling theory espoused by Bammesberger (1986b). Ebbinghaus's emendation of *pariulis* (cf. 4.3.1.3 above) additionally prompts caution in evaluating the nine `exceptions` among the otherwise apparently non-relevant `-eig` group. The remaining 19 exceptional items already referred to comprise: 13 `-ag-`, 3 `-ig-`, 1 `-i/eg-`, 2 `-ug-` (see Thurneysen 1898, p. 212; and fn. 30 above).

5. Data for alternating labials `-f/-b-`

The small amount of well-known material to be discussed here requires at most a separation of the exceptions from the items that conform.

5.1. Material conforming to Thurneysen's law

There is no material inherited with the Thurneysen variation already in place.

The five well-known items belonging to the `-ubni/-ufni` group clearly have their suffix consonantism as a result of Thurneysen's law.
These preserve the zero grade of the suffix *-men- occasioned by the further addition of the suffix *-y-o/ä- (Feist, Lehmann). In every case the grade of the root in the Gothic words simply duplicates that of the ostensible Gothic derivational base (both being /o/ or both zero, in cases where the grade is known) and has no effect on the consonantism of the suffix, 32 which is also independent of the gender of the derivatives, and thus of their presumable original semantic bifurcation (possibly into fem. of result vs. neut. of action). 33 Thus without even bothering to consider the question of whether the *m in items like these could be affected by Verner's law, it is clear that the only possible explanation for the consonantism of the suffixes in these words is Thurneysen's law.

One item - daupubljans ›sentenced to death‹ - with no certain etymology and every prospect either of being a compound 34 or of

---

32 Flickinger's (1981, p. 71) forlorn comparison of witubni with Ved. vidmán- ignores not only the difference in word structure, but also the levelling of grades and/or accent position in the paradigms in both languages, and even the agreement between the suffix accent and the grades of root and suffix in the two recorded forms (inst. & dat. sg.) of this particular Vedic word (cf. Beekes 1995, p. 186; Macdonell 1968, p. 207–210).

33 These facts are conveniently summarized in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derivative</th>
<th>Grade of root</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraistubni</td>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>»temptation«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fastubni</td>
<td>neut.</td>
<td>»observing (rules); fasting«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witubni</td>
<td>neut.</td>
<td>»knowledge«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wundufni</td>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>»plague, illness«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waldufni</td>
<td>neut.</td>
<td>»power, authority«</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For *fraistan Gothic has fraisant, reflecting the commoner protoform. Lehmann suggests a compound fra-is-; Mann (1984–1987, col. 987 f.) appears to hesitate between this and a compound based on a PIE prefix *präi-; but in view of the semantic parallel in NHG locken «attract, tempt» beside Locke «lock of hair» (Kluge/Seebold 1989 s.v.), it may also be worth considering the possibility of an ablaut-revealing connection of fraisant with OFris. frisle (also frisle) «(lock of) hair», OE fri‰ «curly».

34 Curiously, perhaps because the development *ml- > bl- is not usually invoked for Germanic (but cf. Kluge/Seebold 1989 s.v. Blei 1; also the several Germanic bl-words for »white(n), pale, flash, mildew«, etc., beside MIR. mlicht, blicht »milk«, etc.), the etymologies that have been
simply complying in every particular with Verner's law, belongs here to the 'indeterminate' group.

5.2. Exceptions to Thurneysen's law

The only items of any interest here\(^{35}\) are the Gothic numerals \(\text{11}\) and \(\text{12}\), both of which have \(\text{-lib}^{-}\) (PIE \(*\text{lip}^{-}\) or \(*\text{lik}^{-}\)), contrasting with OHG \(\text{- lif}^{-}\) for both, as Thurneysen (1898, p. 212) points out, adding however the incorrect inference that the two OHG forms must continue the original PGm. ones. Clearly both forms of this suffix must have been present in PGm. immediately after the operation of Verner's law (cf. Ross/Berns 1992, p. 594–597), and no doubt each arose originally in only one of these numerals, the later distribution being due to levelling between consecutive numerals within the separate languages. In Gothic, equally clearly, this has proceeded in sublime disregard of Thurneysen's law.

6. Summary and conclusions

6.1. The origin of Thurneysen's law

The distribution of the items investigated above can best be summarized in tabular form. The material falls naturally into two groups according to whether the alternating suffix consonant is apical (dental or sibilant, table 1) or non-apical (velar or labial, table 2).

Not included in table 1 are the \(\text{l}^d\) items of 3.0–3.0.2 since the argument to be presented below emerges sufficiently clearly, I believe, without the help of this not wholly relevant material (see table 3 and associated discussion below).\(^{36}\) The counting of the items has proposed to date seem not to include an appeal to the zero grade of PIE \(*\text{mel}^{-}\) \(\text{>speak}^{-}\) as in NHG \(\text{melden} \text{>report}^{-}\) (Kluge/Seebold 1989 s.v.), zero grade in Russ. \(\text{mölvi}^{-}\) \(\text{>say}^{-}\) (Vasmer/Trubačev 1986–1987 s.v.); cf. also Russ. \(\text{kuda meles}^{-}\)? (lit.) \(\text{>which direction are you grinding in?}^{-}\) = \(\text{>what are you implying?}^{-}\) = \(\text{>what are you saying?}^{-}\).

The complete immunity of the adverbial suffix \(\text{-ba}^{-}\) from Thurneysen's law is probably due to recent origin in Gothic by way of a compounding element and so provides no information on the susceptibility or otherwise of PIE asperae to this law (cf. Heidemanns 1996, p. 273).

For similar reasons of fairness to alternative views, and also in view of the uncertainty raised by Ebbinghaus's emendation for \(\text{parihis}^{-}\) (cf. 4.3.1.3 above), the \(\text{-eig}^{-}\) items (eight conforming vs. nine exceptions) have been included in the figures for table 2.

\(^{35}\) Proposed to date seem not to include an appeal to the zero grade of PIE \(*\text{mel}^{-}\) \(\text{>speak}^{-}\) as in NHG \(\text{melden} \text{>report}^{-}\) (Kluge/Seebold 1989 s.v.), zero grade in Russ. \(\text{mölvi}^{-}\) \(\text{>say}^{-}\) (Vasmer/Trubačev 1986–1987 s.v.); cf. also Russ. \(\text{kuda meles}^{-}\)? (lit.) \(\text{>which direction are you grinding in?}^{-}\) = \(\text{>what are you implying?}^{-}\) = \(\text{>what are you saying?}^{-}\).

\(^{36}\) For similar reasons of fairness to alternative views, and also in view of the uncertainty raised by Ebbinghaus's emendation for \(\text{parihis}^{-}\) (cf. 4.3.1.3 above), the \(\text{-eig}^{-}\) items (eight conforming vs. nine exceptions) have been included in the figures for table 2.
not been entirely consistent: e.g. *weitwodei* and *weitwodeins* have been counted separately, *liuhadei(ns)* as a single item, but this has probably helped to assign some sort of weighting to variants of this type (which are actually homographic in some forms, e.g. acc. sg.). A more thorough study might seek to establish the relative frequencies of the various forms in speech; but since the ecclesiastical texts available to us can hardly count as samples of daily Gothic chitchat, it is very questionable whether such a labour would be rewarded by any real increase in the reliability of our conclusions. Many other details of the material are no doubt open to criticism and revision, but I believe the general picture represented by the above figures is reliable, despite the overall smallness of the figures for the purposes of statistical computation.

Table 1: Distribution of Thurneysen-relevant material with apical suffix consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altern. suffix conson.</th>
<th>Material conforming to Thurneysen's law</th>
<th>Exceptions to Thurneysen's law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Verner</td>
<td>Due to Thurneysen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Distribution of Thurneysen-relevant material with non-apical suffix consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altern. suffix conson.</th>
<th>Material conforming to Thurneysen's law</th>
<th>Exceptions to Thurneysen's law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Verner</td>
<td>Due to Thurneysen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5/6?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the two apical (sibilant and dental) categories, despite the above provisos, I think there is a clear preponderance of material that has in all probability acquired the Thurneysen variation as a direct result of Verner's law. Even in the worst case scenario in which 100% of the 'indeterminate' items had their suffix consonantism determined by Thurneysen's law, the situation immediately post-Verner is that, of the attested items, 34 already conformed to the Thurneysen pattern against 22 (= 3 + 13 + 6, the totals in the remaining three columns) that did not, or a ratio of better than 3:2.

Consequently, I believe that these figures support the view that derivatives containing apical suffixes ostensibly conforming to Thurneysen's law were inherited by Gothic from the operation of Verner's law in sufficient quantity to engender a feeling among speakers that this inherited 'Verner/Thurneysen variation' supplied a criterion for well-formedness in suffixal derivation. Consequently this inherited phonetic variation began to spread to other similar derivatives that did not originally have it, first to those with suffixes based on apical spirants and later to those with suffixes based on the two peripheral (labial and velar) spirant categories. Neither of the latter two categories were likely to have given rise to such a development themselves since *-p-suffixes were rare to non-existent in PIE (Brugmann 1906, p. 386, fn. 1) and *-k-suffixes, as we have seen, seem almost invariably to have had the PIE accent in positions not conducive to the development of Germanic forms alternating on the basis of voice. The difference in the success rates of this spread among labials vs. velars seems to be identifiable with the much larger quantity of non-conforming Verner-determined material in the velar group, although it is also possible that [+anterior] represented a favoured feature in this context.

The figures demonstrating the preponderance of material with Verner-outputted Thurneysen variation could certainly be improved by including the material of 3.0 rejected as unaffected by Thurneysen's law since this material more than doubles the Verner-outputted conforming total to 70 vs. a worst case increase of the immediately post-Verner non-conforming items to 32 (= 3 + 13 + 16, see table 37).

The question of well-formedness of suffixes can be readily illustrated from the distribution of NHG -heit/-keit (Wright 1907, p. 151 f.); cf. also the replacement of NHG -bar with -lich for stems ending in b (e.g. unhaltbar vs. ungläublich), and the like.

Very likely it was due to both these factors acting in concert, together no doubt with other factors that we can hardly even guess at.
3), yielding a ratio of better than 2:1. The figures have been obtained by adding to Thurneysen's (1898, p. 211) 25 conforming examples (vs. six exceptions) with -iupa and two with -ida, as well as his (ibid.) three distinct conformers with -pwa (vs. one exception with -dw) and five conformers (vs. two exceptions) with -pro, our newly discovered *fulliupa (cf. 3.0.1 above) and the hitherto disregarded >exception< gaidw. Quite possibly table 3 represents a truer picture of the situation that set the Thurneysen restructuring in motion. Still better approximations to the truth could be obtained by doing a comparative lexico-statistical analysis of material with these suffixes in other early Germanic dialects in order to form an estimate of what proportion of the total may have been preserved in the Gothic texts.

Table 3: Distribution of Thurneysen-relevant material with apical suffix consonants augmented by non-Thurneysen items of 3.0f.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix details</th>
<th>Material conforming to Thurneysen's law</th>
<th>Exceptions to Thurneysen's law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to Verner</td>
<td>Due to Thurneysen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i/pa-da-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-p/dw-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-br-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some points of interest in the figures – not all of which, admittedly, are likely to stand up to rigorous statistical analysis – are:

(1) Exceptions to Thurneysen's law (including even piwadw, cf. 3.0.2 above) all involve >unexpected< voiced consonants. Only the -iupa material departs from this principle, which is perhaps another reason for not regarding it as belonging to the Thurneysen corpus.

(2) The preponderance of voiced consonants among the Verner-output suffix material conforming to Thurneysen’s law is to be expected, since the material necessarily descends from protoforms with a minimum of three syllables. Since a voiceless spirant is generated in a suffix by accent on only one of the three, etc., syllables of the protoform and a voiced spirant by accent on any of the other two, etc., syllables, we can in general expect the Verner-output material to contain at least two voiced spirant suffixes to every voiceless spirant one.
(3) Despite the preponderance of voiced consonants among the Verner-output apical material, and the small figures involved, there is a relatively good balance between the voiced and voiceless alternants in this group. Without this balance there would have been no Thurneysen's law.

(4) It has been shown that the spread of the Thurneysen distribution was achieved by both voicing and devoicing of suffix consonants, just as Suzuki (1992) claimed. Actually it is only devoicing – which was a particular focus of Suzuki's attention – that has been shown to operate at all places of articulation. However, not too much weight should be placed on this, since it is likely that some of the gaps in the picture would be filled in if more was known about the doubtful indeterminate material.

6.2. The chronology of Thurneysen's law: implications for Verner's law in Gothic

The proposal that a few items, viz. liuhada, liuhadei and arhvaznos, may have their determining (i.e. root final) voiceless consonant due to the failure of Verner voicing furnishes confirmation that the process involved here was not a reversal or elimination of voicing but simply the arrest of the implementation of voicing.

In order to demonstrate this, let us begin by assuming the opposite, i.e. that the peculiarities of Verner in Gothic were indeed due to a reversal of voicing. Now if items like liuhada, liuhadei and arhvaznos, contributed to the genesis of Thurneysen's law, then Thurneysen's law must have come into being later than the reversal. If that is so, then it is a little odd that pewisa and magap, with their old voiceless spirants, retained their Verner voicing, apparently for no particular reason, and thus came by chance to comply so neatly with the Thurneysen alternation when it eventually came to the language. On the other hand if Thurneysen's law preceded the reversal, we would have to suppose that it mysteriously failed to apply to the liuhad-group, so that when the reversal set in it simply happened to pull these few items neatly into the Thurneysen line, without, however, affecting the magap group. For the latter, it does not seem possible to claim inhibition of the reversal due to the voiceless spirant already occupying the following syllable, because this would be contradicted by hauhipa and wehipa (Thurneysen 1898, p. 211), unless of course we acquiesce in the levelling theory for the -ipa suffix after all.
There are several possible approaches to this little teaser, assuming we wish to retain the notion of a reversal rather than an arrest of Verner voicing in Gothic. One is to dismiss it on the account of the small number of cases, pointing to the two \(-iβa\)-exceptions just mentioned, which lose their solitary, erstwhile putatively voiced spirant, as well as other exceptions, such as \(ubizwa\) and \(piwadu\), where both voiced spirants are retained.

Another approach is simply to conclude that the \(liuhad\)-group must have all had root accent after all. This seems to be quite plausible in the case of \(arhaznos\), as we have seen. For \(liuhada\) it would be possible but not particularly advisable to point to the somewhat uncertain evidence (cited by Brugmann 1906, p. 401) of Gk. \(μητίετα, \ἄριδείκετος\) (but this probably has the accent typical for a compound) and (Boeot.) \(καιέτα\) (which may have advanced its accent from the first syllable by the usual Greek rules if the long final vowel is genuine).

These difficulties are easily resolved under the proposal that the voicing of lenited spirants generated by Verner's law was simply arrested, as explained in my previous paper (1998). They are also resolved by Voyles's early East Germanic accent retraction, which is also alluded to in my 1998 paper (p. 197). However, my hypothesis possesses two distinct advantages by comparison with that of Voyles, viz. (1) in my hypothesis the critical process affecting Gothic, i.e. the arrest or abandonment of the Verner voicing process, can be tied to a historical or archeological event, viz. the 3rd century Gothic migration; (2) my hypothesis of Verner lenition applying to all categories of Germanic consonants, when combined with a slight change of viewpoint regarding Normier's (1977) hypothesis of a Germanic Nebenton, provides, for the first time, an intra-Germanic linguistic motivation for the Germanic accent shift, as follows. The Verner lenition caused non-lenited consonants to become signposts of accent on the immediately following syllabic nucleus in two environments: (a) immediately before Normier's Nebenton and (b) word/root initially. Thus the non-lenition that began as a function of word/root initial position became reinterpreted as a sign of word accent, whereupon any later accent in the same word was eventually given up. In ON \(vedr\) Kortlandt (1978c, p. 112, and 1988, p. 4) has in fact unwittingly adduced an example of a post-Verner non-lenited aspera (cf. Schwzyzer 1939, p. 533, and Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954, p. 725, for the commonness of 1st syllable accent in nouns containing this suffix in Greek – especially neuters – and Vedic). Some evidence supporting my wider view of the Verner lenition I hope to present in due course.

\[39\] They are also resolved by Voyles's early East Germanic accent retraction, which is also alluded to in my 1998 paper (p. 197). However, my hypothesis possesses two distinct advantages by comparison with that of Voyles, viz. (1) in my hypothesis the critical process affecting Gothic, i.e. the arrest or abandonment of the Verner voicing process, can be tied to a historical or archeological event, viz. the 3rd century Gothic migration; (2) my hypothesis of Verner lenition applying to all categories of Germanic consonants, when combined with a slight change of viewpoint regarding Normier's (1977) hypothesis of a Germanic Nebenton, provides, for the first time, an intra-Germanic linguistic motivation for the Germanic accent shift, as follows. The Verner lenition caused non-lenited consonants to become signposts of accent on the immediately following syllabic nucleus in two environments: (a) immediately before Normier's Nebenton and (b) word/root initially. Thus the non-lenition that began as a function of word/root initial position became reinterpreted as a sign of word accent, whereupon any later accent in the same word was eventually given up. In ON \(vedr\) Kortlandt (1978c, p. 112, and 1988, p. 4) has in fact unwittingly adduced an example of a post-Verner non-lenited aspera (cf. Schwzyzer 1939, p. 533, and Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954, p. 725, for the commonness of 1st syllable accent in nouns containing this suffix in Greek – especially neuters – and Vedic). Some evidence supporting my wider view of the Verner lenition I hope to present in due course.

\[40\] Responses from colleagues indicate that two key features of my conception of Verner's law may not have emerged as clearly from my 1998
Indeed, as is also suggested in my 1998 paper, the persistence of uniquely Gothic items like *liuhada* may have acted as the trigger for Thurneysen’s law. Possibly against this, however, is the suggestion paper as I would have wished. These are (1) that the complete implementation of the voicing that resulted from the Verner’s law lenition extended over a considerable period and was probably completed in Germanic generally after the 3rd century Gothic migration; and (2) that the lenition of the PIE consonants I refer to as asperae, which resulted in voiced spirants, was a feature of Verner’s law, not, as some would have it, Grimm’s and that Grimm’s law as it applied to the non-lenited allophones of these consonants – viz. the loss of the PIE feature of implosion – took place in some dialects after the completion of the voicing by Verner’s law. However, the phonetic incongruity of the proposal that a series of murmurs should be more strongly voiced than a series of plain voiced stops, together with other factors discussed at length in my 1997 and 1998 papers, dissuades me from adopting the notion that has been entertained in some circles that Verner’s law essentially applied voicing to a series of aspirated stops (Bernard Mees, pers. comm. July 1998, p. 7). Kluge’s law, which I understand has been advanced in support of this view (Bernard Mees, pers. comm. Oct. 1998, p. 2), represents in all probability a syllable-final merger of all three PIE stop series in PIE/pre-Gm. mediae in the specific environment before (consonantal) nasal and therefore, despite seductive appearances to the contrary, has nothing in common with Verner’s law, which was a process of lenition. Verner and Grimm are thus intertwined in my conception according to the following conventionalized chronological scheme (D’ = implosive, D = plain voiced stop, T = plain voiceless stop, T’h = voiceless aspirated stop, P = voiceless spirant, D = voiced spirant, D = lenis T, D = lenis P; the dialectal split in stages VII and VIII is on the basis of stop vs. spirant voiced apical with eventual concomitant [a] = alveolarity vs. [d] = dentality of apical stops):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Asperae</th>
<th>Mediae</th>
<th>Tenues</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>D’</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>D’</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Grimm begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>D’/D’</td>
<td>D/T’?</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>D’</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>D’/D’</td>
<td>T/D’</td>
<td>P/D’</td>
<td>Verner begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>D’/D’</td>
<td>T/D’?</td>
<td>P/D’D</td>
<td>Gothic merger lapses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>D’/D’</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P/D’</td>
<td>Verner completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>D’/D’/D’ [a] T</td>
<td>P/D’D</td>
<td>resuffle of voiced obstruents (Grimm dialectally completed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D/D/D’ [d] T</td>
<td>P/D’D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>D/D/D’ [a] T</td>
<td>P/D’D</td>
<td>Grimm finally completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D/D/D’ [d] T</td>
<td>P/D’D</td>
<td>(with loss of implosion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
implicit in the solidly voiced profile of the exceptions to Thurneysen's law to the effect that once the lenited spirants had become voiced, they became immune to the law, since this carries with it the further implication that the law came into being originally as an alternative or 'corrective' principle for assigning lenition/nonlenition rather than voicing itself (this is despite the evident end result alluded to in 6.1 [4] above). In this form Thurneysen's law (or at least its beginnings) would thus have predated the general lapse of the process of voicing of the lenited spirants in Gothic, an interpretation that can certainly be applied to the instances catalogued above under 2.2, 3.2 and 4.2 as complying with Thurneysen's law in defiance of Verner's.

The material for the labials need not be an argument against this despite the relatively common assumption (see Suzuki 1992, p. 34; Woodhouse 1998, p. 204) that the obstruent that arose from the *ra of the compound suffix was ab initio voiced. After all, the dissimilation that gave rise to this obstruent under unknown conditions of accentuation may have gone beyond nasality and included also the voicing feature, especially in any case involving a (putative) Verner or Thurneysen nonleniting environment.
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