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ABSTRACT

The primary concern of this paper is to advance a new thesis concerning the development of Pre-OE $^*\tilde{e}aC_0^{[i]}_{\{j\}}$ in nWS, and to argue for its descriptive and explanatory power. The proposed interpretation is schematized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-OE</th>
<th>$^*ea$</th>
<th>$^*\tilde{e}a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$i$-Monophthongization</td>
<td>$^*\alpha$</td>
<td>$^*\tilde{e}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i$-Umlaut</td>
<td>$e$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{e}$-Raising</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$\tilde{e}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early OE</td>
<td>$e$</td>
<td>$\tilde{e}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This view obtains empirical support on the following grounds:
1) Its prediction that $^*\tilde{e}a$ may be attested as $\tilde{e}$ is actually borne out by the Moore MS.
2) With the new analysis the failure of Breaking in $C_0^{[i]}_{\{j\}}$ can be made more intelligible than otherwise.
3) $^*i\tilde{o} (<\text{Gmc } ^*iu>) \mapsto i/\tilde{e}$, which has thus far defied a satisfactory account, is now subject to a principled explanation within the proposed framework.

1. Introduction\(^1\)
As is generally assumed, OE i-umlaut (henceforth i-U) gave rise to the following changes:

1. a. *e>i: e.g. *beri>biri 'he bears'
   b. *ə>e: e.g. *badı>bēd 'bed'
   c. *ū>y: e.g. *cuni>cynn 'kin'
   *dūstig>dūstig 'dusty'
   d. *ō>ǣ: e.g. *ōlī>ǣl 'oil'
   *dūb>dūb 'he does'
   e. *ā>ǣ: e.g. *stapī>stǣpe 'step'
   *dāljan>dālan 'divide'
   f. *io>ie (only in WS, otherwise unchanged)
   e.g. *gebīrdi>gebierde 'bearded'
   *sīni>sīn 'sight'
   g. *ēa>ie (WS): e.g. *fealjan>fiellan 'fell'
   *lēafjan>lēfan 'believe'
   *ēa>ē (nWS): e.g. *fealjan>fellan 'fell'
   *lēafjan>lēfan 'believe'

The purpose of this paper is to present an alternative view of the development of (lg), namely *ēa>ē / ñCo{f}, and to argue for its greater plausibility over the commonly held view.

2. A Set of Hypotheses

I postulate the following stages for the development ēa>ē:

2. ēa ([ēu]*)>ē ([ē])>ē ([ē])

This is to say that the phenomenon at issue, which has been hitherto taken to be a one-stage development,\(^3\) consists of two mutually independent changes. As a corollary, I set up a couple of further hypotheses. The first of them is:
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\[ ^*\tilde{e}a > ^*\tilde{e} / \quad C_o \{^{\tilde{i}} \}_j \]

According to (3), \(^*\tilde{e}a\) got monophthongized to \(\tilde{e}\) when followed by \(i\) or \(j\) (i.e. the same context as induced \(i\-U\)), which is for reference's sake named \(i\-Monophthongization\) (hereafter \(i\-M\)). As discussed in section 3, there is reason for assuming that in part of Angl. this change involved not only \(\tilde{e}a\) but also the remaining diphthongs (i.e. \(^*io > i; \quad \tilde{e}o > e\)). This amounts to saying that one must at any rate postulate a monophthongization for the diphthongs other than \(\tilde{e}a\) in the context \(C_o \{^{\tilde{i}} \}_j\), and that this independently required monophthongization constitutes supporting evidence for (3). (For details, see section 3 below.)

\[ (4) \quad ^*a > e / \quad C_o \{^{\tilde{i}} \}_j \] \(\equiv (lb)\)

(4) says that \(^*a\), which came about by (3), was raised to \(e\) by \(i\-U\). This assumption derives from 1) (3) and \(i\-U\) took place in the identical environment, and 2) \(i\-U\) includes the \(a\)-to-\(e\)-raising.

\[ (5) \quad \tilde{a}\-Raising \quad \tilde{a} > \tilde{e} \]

There is, however, no evidence for assuming that the raising of \(^*\tilde{a}\) to \(\tilde{e}\) occurred as part of \(i\-U^5\). This requires us to seek explanation for the historical existence of \(\tilde{e}\) in \(C_o \{^{\tilde{i}} \}_j\) elsewhere than in \(i\-U\) itself. It is desirable, moreover, that a required explanation is of independent motivation. As an obvious candidate, then, \(\tilde{a}\-Raising\) (hereafter \(a\-R\)) comes into the picture (cf. (5)). This process is originally meant to explain \(\tilde{e}\) in nWS for Gmc \(^*\tilde{a}\). My assumption is that \(a\-R\) operated on \(^*\tilde{a}\), namely the output of \(i\-M\), as well, to produce \(\tilde{e}\) as is historically attested.
The set of hypotheses put forward above can be summarized as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c|cc|c}
\text{i-M} & *e & *\bar{e} & / \ \\
\text{i-U (applicable to } *\bar{e} \text{)} & e & - & - \\
\bar{e} \text{-R}^6 \text{(applicable to } *\bar{e} \text{)} & - & - & \bar{e} \\
\text{output} & e & \bar{e} & \\
\end{array}
\]

3. Empirical Confirmation I

3.1. A Prediction and its Verifiability

In the previous section I provided a new set of hypotheses concerning \(*\bar{e}a > \bar{e}\). In what follows, then, I shall adduce evidence for its acceptability both on observational and explanatory levels.

As shown in (6), insofar as \(*ea\) is concerned, my proposed view entails no empirical consequences different from the traditional one. Under both interpretations, \(*ea > e\) is attributed to no other change than i-U. (Though it still remains arguable which subpart is held to be responsible, \(*\bar{e} > e\) or \(*ea > e\).) This is to say that the two views make the identical claim concerning the status of \(*ea\): \(*ea\) invariably should appear as \(e\) in earliest relevant documents. (Notice that i-U has established itself prehistorically.)

In contrast, as for \(*\bar{e}a\), the competing views entail mutually exclusive implications. According to the traditional one, \(*\bar{e}a\) necessarily should manifest itself as \(\bar{e}\) in earliest texts, because i-U has completed itself prehistorically. (Admittedly, in purely logical terms the possibility remains unremovable that some dialect or other did not suffer i-U, but actually no evidence is available for such a dialect. If, moreover, such a hypothetical dialect did turn out to be real, it would have no bearing on my argument here. For, the fact should remain undeniable that in
principle the traditional interpretation rules out the historical reflex *æ for *ēa.)

My alternative view, on the other hand, entails no exclusion of the possibility that *ēa realized as *æ historically. This is because there is no logical necessity that æ-R should occur immediately after i-M (and prehistorically at that). More concretely, my analysis admits of a range of chronological possibilities for the working of æ-R, some of which are empirically borne out elsewhere: æ-R may not have occurred (as in WS), it may have completed itself long before or after i-U (as in Kent). What is of particular importance in this regard is that my proposed view is compatible in principle with either situation, and that in both cases *ēa should come out as *æ. Thus, if in some nWS dialect *ēa is attested as æ in * C_o ţ[i] j[1], then, to the extent that my prediction receives empirical verification, the case will constitute supporting evidence for my interpretation (6), with its acceptability concomitantly enhanced.

3.2. Confirmation —— Support from the Moore MS——

The Moore MS is the oldest of the many MSS of Bede's Historica Ecclesiastica, and accordingly retains various archaic properties which can hardly be observed elsewhere. In this respect, the MS is an invaluable source of information which otherwise would be of no access to us. The MS at issue provides valuable data for our concern here as well. More specifically, as detailed below, in this MS *ēa appeared as æ in * C_o ţ[i] j[1], and as ūa elsewhere. In other words, in the light of the Moore MS, *æ, which is a purely theoretical construct within (6), proves to have been of real existence.

Now, let us consider in greater depth the reflexes of *ēa in * C_o ţ[i] j[1]. (7) is a list which shows every instance of the relevant word-tokens in the MS with its spelling and frequency indicated. All the head-words are for convenience's sake uniform-
ed in WS forms. In the parentheses are given relevant cognate words in other Gmc, which are intended to show that the cited forms include *ēa (<Gmc *au).

(7) Ẹadgis (cf. Goth auda-, OIce auðr): aed- 1 x
Ẹadric: ed- 1 x
Ẹadwine: aed- 11 x; æd 1 x; ed 1 x
Ẹadfrið: ead- 1 x
Ẹasica (cf. Goth ahva <*auna-): ae- 1 x
Ẹanfrið: ean- 2 x
Ẹanhere: æn 1 x
Bēde (cf. <*baudi-): baeda 2 x

Let us turn to observe how *ēa is represented in the other contexts:

(8) Ẹadbeald: aed- 3 x; ead- 4 x; audu- 2 x
Ẹadbeorht: ead- 2 x
Ẹadgýþ: ead- 3 x
Ẹadhæþ: ead- 6 x
Ẹanflæð: ean- 3 x; æan- 2 x; ðan- 1 x
Ẹata: eata 7 x
Homelēa: -lea 1 x
Mēanwar: mean- 1 x
Pēada: peada 4 x
Wuscfrēa: -rea 2 x

The distribution of the reflexes of *ēa as evidenced in (7) and (8) is of great significance. Obviously, *ēa corresponds to æ in *___Co{ê} and to ēa in the remaining environments. This is what my interpretation predicts in 3.1. That is, whatever dialect is represented by the MS in question had *ēa monophthongized to æ in *___Co{ê} by i-M, but (for some reason which will be clarified below) did not undergo æ-R, which leads to
the direct attestation of $\bar{a}$, an immediate output of $i$-$U$. In this way, the Moore MS provides confirming evidence for my new proposal by giving historical reality to what has thus far been little more than a theoretical construct in (7), namely $\bar{a}$. This accordingly renders (6) empirically justified.

Seen from a different standpoint, moreover, the peculiarity of $*\bar{e}a$ indicated in (7) and (8)—namely that unlike majority of nWS $*\bar{e}a$ appears as $\bar{e}$ in $*\bar{e}aC_{\{i\}j}$ is a historical fact requiring some principled explanation. This is tantamount to requiring anyone who rejects my proposed set of hypotheses adduced in (6) to offer an alternative account of equal or more plausibility for the peculiarity at issue.

Let us consider, then, whether any such alternative interpretation stands tenable.

Chadwick (1899: 96-99) assumes the following changes for the development of $*\bar{e}a$ in the context under discussion:

(9) $*\bar{e}a \succ (\text{by } i$-$U) \bar{a} \succ (\text{by } \bar{a}$-$R) \bar{e}$

On the face of it, $\bar{e} \succ *\bar{e}a$ in the Moore MS is rendered explicable by blocking the application of $\bar{a}$-$R$ after $i$-$M$. Chadwick's view, however, suffers from a serious drawback. It is, as Luick (1964: §194 Anm. 2) correctly points out, its incompatibility with the fact that in a great majority of nWS $*\bar{e}a$ appears as $\bar{e}$ and at the same time $*\bar{a}$ by $i$-$U$ surfaces as $\bar{a}$. In other words, within Chadwick's framework, $*\bar{e}a \succ \bar{e}$ necessitates $\bar{a}$-$R$ to be subsequent to $i$-$U$, but this ordering could hardly explain in a systematic way the failure of another $\bar{a}$, i.e. $i$-$U$ of $*\bar{a}$, to be involved in the raising. Thus Chadwick's interpretation turns out to be ill-articulated.

Luick (loc. cit.) takes the $\bar{a}$ at issue to be graphic variants of the normal $\langle e \rangle$. Under his interpretation, therefore, $\langle \bar{a}e \rangle$, $\langle \bar{a} \rangle$, $\langle e \rangle$ as given in (7) are variants purely in orthographic terms with no phonological realities attached to themselves. It
should be noted, however, that this assumption is of no positive motivation: all it can claim is that it is free from the chronological difficulty inherent in Chadwick's view. The lack of any sort of positive argument then militates against a committant to the interpretation in question.

Campbell (1959: § 200) goes no further than giving notice of the peculiarity under consideration, and does not offer anything approaching a speculative account of the issue.

Other historical grammars\(^a\) of OE give no mention to the fact and furthermore no learned article has ever been devoted to the issue to the best of my knowledge.

The foregoing discussion has shown that the peculiarity of the Moore MS, \(\text{\textstar{\text{\textstar{e}a}}\text{\textless}a}\) in \(\text{\_\_ C}_i\{f\}_j\), has received only passing (if any) observation and thus is subject to nothing like a principled explanation. Therefore, it can be fairly said that my proposed view on the issue is the only explanation that has been ever provided and that in this respect it can claim acceptability in terms of its explanatory power as well.

3.3. Chronology of \(\text{\textstar{a}}\text{\textless}R \text{ in the Moore MS}\)

3.2. has demonstrated that in the Moore MS \(\text{\textstar{e}a}\) was subject to monophthongization by \(i\)-M, but, unlike other nWS dialects, failed to undergo \(\text{\textstar{a}}\text{\textless}R\). In this subsection it will be shown that \(\text{\textstar{a}}\text{\textless}R\) preceded \(i\)-M in the dialect represented by the Moore MS, thereby giving rise to the unique property concerning \(\text{\textstar{e}a}\) discussed earlier.

To determine that \(\text{\textstar{a}}\text{\textless}R\) operated prior to \(i\)-U depends on examining whether the then extant \(\text{\textstar{a}}\) (<Gmc \(\text{\textstar{a}}\)) manifested itself as \(\text{\texttilde{e}}\). In the following are given word-forms containing Gmc \(\text{\textstar{a}}:\)

\(\text{\textstar{\textstar{Elge}} (cf. OHG \text{\textstar{\textstar{a}la}})}: e \ 3 \ x\)
\(\text{\textstar{D\text{\textstar{\textstar{a}}da}} (cf. OHG \text{\textstar{\textstar{t\textstar{a}t}}})}: e \ 1 \ x\)
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-\textit{flæd} (cf. OHG \textit{flät}): e 17 x; æ 1 x
-\textit{Ræd-} (cf. OHG \textit{rāt}): e 1 x
-\textit{ræd} (cf. OHG \textit{rāt}): e 35 x; æ 1 x
-\textit{Swæf-} (cf. OS \textit{swāf}): e 2 x; æ 1 x; ĕ 1 x
-\textit{Mād-} (cf. MHG \textit{māde}): e 1 x

From (\textcircled{10}), it follows that Gmc æ was subject to the raising and therefore that æ-R occurred in the dialect recorded in the Moore MS. It is in order next to confirm that æ by \textit{i}-U (<*ā) was exempt from the raising:

(\textcircled{11}) \textit{Hāþ} (cf. Goth \textit{haiþi}): ae 2 x
-\textit{hāþ} (cf. Goth \textit{haiþi}): ae 11 x; ĕ 1 x; e 3 x
-\textit{Sāþ} (cf. Goth \textit{saiws}): ae 4 x

It is justified, therefore, to assume that the Moore MS underwent æ-R, \textit{i}-M and \textit{i}-U in that order. By postulating that chronology, then, we can provide a principled explanation of the peculiarity at issue without recourse to any ad-hoc device.

4. Empirical Confirmation II

4.1. 'The Failure of Breaking' in Anglian

As is generally held, Pre-OE was subject to Breaking prior to \textit{i}-U. This change took the following shape:

(\textcircled{12})

\[
\begin{align*}
&*æ>ea / \{lC \quad rC \quad w\} \quad \{X \quad (C) \quad (C) \quad \}
&*a\text{ll}>e\text{all} \text{ 'all'} \\
&*b\text{aran}>\text{bearn} \text{ 'child'} \\
&*\text{ehta}>\text{eahta} \text{ 'eight'} \\
&*c\text{newes}>\text{cnewes} (\text{sg. gen. of } \text{cnēo} \text{ 'knee'}) \\
&*\text{erbe}>\text{eorbe} \text{ 'earth'} \\
&*\text{eh}>\text{eoh} \text{ 'horse'}
\end{align*}
\]
In Angl., however, as Campbell points out, Breaking seems to have been blocked when \( i \) or \( j \) came about in the next syllable. This is indicated by the appearance of monophthongs, rather than of otherwise expected diphthongs. The examples below substantiate this:

(13) 
\[ *i \{w \} \quad \text{nowel} \ (<*niwil) \text{ 'prostrate'} \text{ (Campbell: §154)} \]
\[ \quad *i \{rC \} \quad \text{i: smirwan} \ (<*smirwjan) \text{'smear'} \text{ (VP 145/5, etc.)} \]
\[ \quad *e(x) \{C \} \quad \text{nést} \ (<*nēhist) \text{'nearest'} \text{ (VP 72/17, etc.)} \]

It is interesting to note in this connection that Campbell and others do not admit 'the failure of Breaking' for the following vowels:

(14) \*e; \*i; \*æ

It is required at this point to re-examine the appropriateness of this interpretation.

First, \*e. The \*e in question derives from Gmc \*e. It deserves particular attention in this regard that Gmc \*e was raised to \( i \) when followed by \( i \) or \( j \) in the next syllable (cf. Krahe and Meid: §35). This, in conjunction with the fact that the resultant defective distribution of \( e \) remains undisturbed throughout Pre-OE, leads us to assume that \( e \) was not in existence in \( \quad C_0 \{i \} \) at the time of the working of Breaking. In other

words, \( ^*e_{\alpha}C_{\sigma} \{i\}_{j} \) constitutes a structural gap in Pre-OE. From this, it follows that \( ^*e \) had in structural terms no bearing on 'the failure of Breaking' by virtue of its defective distribution. Seen in this light, it is more reasonable to say that \( ^*e \) has been prevented from being involved in Brekaing, than to say that it did not give rise to 'the failure of Breaking'.

Next, \( ^*i \). (15) is the only word-form that satisfies the condition for Breaking and at the same time is followed by \( i \) in the next syllable:

(15) \textit{gelihte 'alleviate, (VH 12/3) <*(ge) lihtjan}  
\textit{cf. WS gelihtan; OHG lihten}

This clearly points to the fact that \( ^*i \), together with (13), participated in the so-called 'failure of Breaking'.

Finally, \( ^*a \). The reflex of this sound is doubtlessly \( e \) (cf. (1g) nWS), but not \( ea \), which fact is indicated by the monophthongal status of the former. This makes us wonder why Campbell, in the presence of the unambiguous monophthongization, does not treat \( ^*a \) in parallel with (13). This may be understandable, however, by taking the following into account. Traditionally, it has been the prevailing view that \( ea \) from \( ^*a \) by Breaking changed into \( e \) by \( iU \). (Note that (1g) exemplifies this view.) With such an interpretation entertained as a major premise, little consideration can be given to work out a hypothesis that, insofar as it is followed by \( C_{\sigma} \{i\}_{j} \) (even if \( C_{\sigma} \) is a breaking-triggering segment) \( a \) as it stands is subject to \( i-U \), but not in the form of \( ^*ea \). It is worthy of particular emphasis, however, that the traditional view along this line is based on no firm empirical support. This is tantamount to saying that no empirical evidence is at hand to speak against subsuming \( ^*a \) under (13). This issue, however, awaits detailed discussion in 4. 3.

The foregoing argument has revealed that there is reason to assume that virtually all the diphthongs eligible for Breaking
were exposed to the monophthongization in the relevant contexts. It should be recalled that (13) (and (15) by extrapolation) is ascribed to 'the failure of Breaking' in the traditional account. This is to say that Breaking applied in the breaking-environment as far as i or j did not follow. This does not, however, mean that this is the only possible interpretation. My assumption is that the monophthongization in *____C_o \{i\}_j is responsible for the so-called absence of Breaking. What is worth stressing here is that the observation of the relevant facts could not determine the superiority of one analysis over the other. Thus, in purely observational terms, (13) and (15) could be no less plausibly ascribed to the monophthongization in *____C_o \{i\}_j than to 'the failure of Breaking'. What the new proposal just given entails as empirical consequences will be dealt with in 4.3.

4.2. *io>i/____C_o \{i\}_j

4.2.1. Problems

In this subsection, I will examine the behavior of *io (<Gmc *iu) in *____C_o \{i\}_j. For ease of exposition, I will first give an outline of the subsequent argument. *io, unlike the other diphthongs, was subject to monophthongization with additional restrictions imposed on the nature of the immediately following C. The thus far attempted explanations of this phenomenon (mainly those by Luick and Campbell\cite{10}) are inadequate. Within my framework explored up to this time the change at issue can be viewed as part of a more inclusive phenomenon, i.e. i-M. My analysis is, furthermore, judged to be superior. Therefore, io should be held to be subject to i-M in parallel to the other diphthongs, though with some extra phonological conditions added to the immediately following C.

To start with, let us examine which *ioC_o \{i\}_j remained un-
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changed and which got monophthongized:

a. elþiodig 'foreign' (VP 138/12, etc.)
   pëostro 'darkness' (VP 38/13, etc.)
   onšion 'sight' (Li, etc.)
   geþiodan 'join' (VP 67/26, etc.)

b. cíčen 'chicken' (Li, etc.)
   lihtan 'give light' (VP 104/39, etc.)
   tíhið 'he draws' (Luick: § 192)
   flihið 'he flees' (Luick: § 192)

As is indicated, the monophthongization took place only when C immediately following the diphthongs is represented by \(<\text{h}>\) or \(<\text{c}>\). The following two subsections, 4.2.2. and 4.2.3., then, are devoted to a critical review of the major competing accounts thus far proposed.

4.2.2. A Critique of Luick

Luick (1964: § 192 Anm. 2), in order to explain (16b), sets up a chain of changes as follows:

\[ \text{i}u(=*ïo) > \text{i}y(=*ïe)) > \text{i} / \text{---} \begin{cases} \text{C} \\ \text{-back} \end{cases} \begin{cases} \text{i} \\ \text{j} \end{cases} \]

Luick starts from the hypothesis that \(<\text{h}>\) and \(<\text{c}>\) at issue represent palatals, rather than velars. He then assumes that *ïo, when followed by palatals plus i or j, became *ïy by \(i\)-U together with others followed by nonpalatals plus i or j, and that later only the former case underwent \(i\)\(y\)>i while the latter reverted to \(ïo\).

There are, however, two suspicious points about Luick's view. Firstly, no evidence is adduced for *ïo>ïy by \(i\)-U in Angl. Although the process under discussion is witnessed in WS, there at eWS time the alleged sound is consistently differentiated from unumlauted *ïo (<ïo) by means of distinct spellings
(⟨ie⟩ for the former and ⟨io⟩ or ⟨eo⟩ for the latter). Thus, the postulation of WS *io>y is well-founded. In contrast, this is not the case with Angl., (and the entire nWS for that matter), where no such scribal evidence is obtainable. Therefore, it is highly dubious to posit *io>y in Angl. in the absence of supporting evidence.

Closely associated with this is the second difficulty, which concerns the fact that the reverse process iy>i in must be posited immediately after the operation of iy>i. This ill-motivated complication of the change itself speaks against the tenability of the thesis: the reverse process is solely designed to patch up the inadequacy concerning the purported i-U, i.e. iy>i, whose output, as its later development exhibits, converged to the unumlauted io, and thus shows no sign of being distinct from io. From the above, it can be reasonably concluded that Luick's thesis about *io>i is of no independent motivation and only leads to an implausible complication of the picture with the reversal of the process A>B>A involved. Therefore, it must be placed out of consideration.

4. 2. 3. A Critique of Campbell

Let us move on to examine Campbell's treatment. According to his analysis, (16b) is a result of Smoothing, which occasioned monophthongization when velars came around with optional r or l preceding:

\[
\text{[18]} \quad \left( \begin{array}{c} \tilde{e}a \\ \tilde{e}o \\ \text{io} \end{array} \right) > \left( \begin{array}{c} \tilde{e} \\ \tilde{e} \\ \text{i} \end{array} \right) / \left\{ \begin{array}{c} r \\ l \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} k \\ \gamma \\ x \end{array} \right\}
\]

This change requires as a necessary condition the following C to be a velar as opposed to a palatal. This restriction is substantiated in the following way: e\text{a} (18) gets raised to e after becoming e\text{e} by Smoothing. The application of Raising\textsuperscript{12}, however,
is confined to ã produced by Smoothing, and accordingly ã of another source, i.e. i-U of *ã remains unaffected. This difference in eligibility for the raising is ascribable to whether the following consonant is a velar, i.e. [+back] or a palatal, i.e. [−back]. The reason is that Palatalization, a sound change of well-established status, no doubt occurred prior to Smoothing (cf. Campbell, 1959: §§ 426-42; Luick, 1964: 637), and further that every instance of velars following the unraised ã (i.e. i-U of ã) meets the condition for Palatalization. Hence, it can be assumed that these velars had been already exposed to Palatalization and thus were no longer velars when Smoothing came into effect. The consideration along this line can be summarized in the following derivations:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(19) & *fācni & *bēacn \\
i-U & fācni & - - - \\
i-Reduction^{13} & fācne & - - - \\
Palatalization & fācne & - - - \\
Smoothing & - - - & bēcn \\
Raising & - - - & bēcn \\
Output & fācne ‘deceitful’ & bēcn ‘beacon’ \\
& (VP 11/3, etc.) & (VP 77/43, etc.)
\end{array}
\]

(At this point we need not concern ourselves with an exact chronology of Palatalization. What is of importance here is that before the working of Smoothing the velars following ã produced by i-U were subject to Palatalization.)

The foregoing line of reasoning is shared by Campbell (Campbell, 1959: § 233). What is at stake in this regard is the chronology of Smoothing. In what follows, it will be demonstrated that empirical facts are at variance with the chronology of Smoothing which the attempt at ascribing (16b) to Smoothing as Campbell does inevitably presuppose. In other words, to place Smoothing in the correct chronology as the facts dictate would
preclude us from discriminating between the raised \( \alpha \) and the unraised \( \delta \) in the required way. Thus, it is of no validity to account for (16b) by an appeal to Smoothing.

Let us consider in some detail how Campbell runs into difficulties. He leaves the exact chronology of Smoothing unspecified. Yet, his specific remarks on the contexts of Smoothing and its chronological relationships with some other processes (see (2) below) enable us to extrapolate in an unambiguous way the chronology of Smoothing within his framework, which can be represented as in (20).

(20) a. Medially Palatalization did not take effect in the context \( V_{\text{+back}} \), even if \( i \) or \( j \) follows in the next syllable. Cf. Campbell, 1959: §§233, 422 note 4. (Notice in this connection that OE diphthongs end in a back vowel.)

b. Smoothing was preceded by Palatalization. Cf. *ibid.*, § 428 note 3.

(22)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>*āhti ‘property’</th>
<th>*nēah ‘near’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i-U</td>
<td>( \alpha )hti</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatalization</td>
<td>( \alpha )hti</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-Reduction</td>
<td>( \alpha )ht</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>( n)ēh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>( n)ēh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>( \alpha )ht (VP 134/4, etc)</td>
<td>( n)ēh (VP 5/6, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of particular interest here is a possible chronology between \( i \)-U and Palatalization. \( i \)-U must precede Palatalization within Campbell’s framework, which explains (16b) on the basis of Smoothing. There are, however, several facts\(^{14}\) which cast doubt on his assumed chronology. (22) is just one of them:
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(i) *licōjan 'like'

    i-U     lićējan
    Palatalization lićējan
    Others  lićian
    Output  *lićian

In Campbell's chronology, *licōjan became *licējan by i-U, then licējan by Palatalization and finally *lićian [li: tʃian], which is actually not the case, however: -c- remained unaffected by Palatalization, retaining [k] (cf. Campbell, 1959: §429; Hogg, 1979: 107). This amounts to requiring Palatalization to precede i-U if a correct derivation is to be given to forms like *licōjan: (cf. Hogg, 1979: 107)

(ii) *licōjan

    Palatalization  ---
    i-U            liicējan
    Others         lićian
    Output         lićian

To set up the chronology, palatalization < i-U, as is required, would, however, leave the raised ə and the intact ə indiscriminated with respect to Raising. The reason for this is that Palatalization does not affect velars in *ā __ i by virtue of (20a) and consequently ə (i-U of *ā) stands before a velar. This would then counterfactually involve the ə at issue in the raising to ̃ as well as the ə by Smoothing. Thus, Campbell's framework leaves us no possibility of explaining both (16b) and the behavior of ə with regard to the raising at the same time.

It should be clear by now that Campbell's account of (16b) by means of Smoothing remains unjustifiable in that his assumed chronology, i-U < Palatalization, goes counter to the facts.16

4. 2. 4. A New Explanation
It has been demonstrated in 4.2.2. and 4.2.3. that neither Luick’s nor Campbell’s explanation for (16b) can bear scrutiny. In this subsection, then, I shall offer an alternative interpretation. To this end, I postulate the following sound change:

$$\begin{align*}
\mathcal{H} & \rightarrow i/ \\
\{h\} & \mathcal{C}_o \{i\} \\
\{c\} & \mathcal{J}_o \{j\}
\end{align*}$$

It is in order here to confirm that (16b) actually fall in the domain of $\mathcal{H}$. For the sake of convenience, I reproduce (16b) as $\mathcal{F}$ below with relevant Pre-OE reconstructed forms (which constitute inputs to $\mathcal{H}$) cited:

$\mathcal{F}$ ciecen $\rightarrow$ ciec in cf. WS ciec; OIce kjuk-ling
flitio < flitioh in cf. Goth bliuk-
liehtan $\rightarrow$ liehtjan in cf. WS liehtan; Goth liuhtjan
tihi $\rightarrow$ tihih in cf. WS tieh; Goth tiuh-

Obviously, all the instances of $*\text{i}o > i$ in question are correctly analysable as $\{h\} \mathcal{C}_o \{i\}$.

It is required next to see that my explanation is free from all the difficulties inherent in Luick’s and Campbell’s, respectively. By doing so, my interpretation, which has just proved to be adequate on an observational level, will be entitled to claim acceptability on a higher level as well. Firstly, in my thesis no necessity arises to posit a highly implausible reversible change, i.e. $*\text{i}o > \text{i}y > \text{i}o$ for $*\text{i}o$ which was not involved in the monophthongization to $i$: $*\text{i}o$ in question should be considered unaffected by any process throughout Pre-OE. Secondly, unlike Campbell’s view, my interpretation stands compatible with the correct chronology, i.e. Palatalization $< \text{i-U}$, and the plausible specification of the context for the process. 17

To sum up, it has been argued that my proposed analysis of $\mathcal{F}$ on the basis of $\mathcal{H}$ is superior to the so far proposed ones in that it is free from the difficulties with the latter.
4.3. Summary

In 4.1 it was revealed that 'the failure of Breaking' (henceforth A-change) is reducible to the monophthongization in \( \text{Co}\{\text{i}\}_{\text{j}} \). In 4.2, it was argued that the monophthongization of \(*i\circ (<\text{Gmc } *i\text{u})\) (henceforward B-change) should best be described as \( io > i/\text{Co}\{\text{i}\}_{\text{j}} \). What implication then do these two changes have for \( i\)-M (C-change), which has been postulated in 1.? Both A- and B- changes contribute to enhancing the plausibility of C-change on the following grounds:

1) A-, B- and C-changes all occurred at the same date, or more precisely in Pre-OE after Breaking and before \( i\)-U:

2) They share the context, i.e. \( \text{Co}\{\text{i}\}_{\text{j}} \), though with some slight difference in further phonological conditioning:

3) They implement the same process, namely monophthongization.

Thus, the postulation of C-change receives enhanced plausibility by virtue of the noted close affinities in A-, B-, and C-changes and of the fact that the outputs of A- and B-changes are directly observable in a body of texts.

Going one step further, I would like to subsume these three changes under a single phenomenon. In other words, A-, B-, C-changes should be regarded as different subparts of a more inclusive process. This renders more intelligible than otherwise the fact that separate but similar changes occurred approximately in the same context at the same date. Therefore, it can be assumed that the dialect in question (i.e. Angl.) underwent \( i\)-M in a generalized form:

\[
\begin{align*}
(21) \quad \ \begin{pmatrix}
*io \\
*io \\
*\text{eo} \\
*\text{ea}
\end{pmatrix} & < \begin{pmatrix}
\text{i} \\
\bar{\text{e}} \\
\text{a}
\end{pmatrix} / \begin{pmatrix}
\text{h} \\
\text{c}
\end{pmatrix} \text{Co}\{\text{i}\}_{\text{j}}
\end{align*}
\]
5. Conclusion

This article claims that \( \tilde{\epsilon}aC_0 \{ \tilde{\epsilon} \} \) was subject to the following processes in nWS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>*( \epsilon )</th>
<th>*( \tilde{\epsilon} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i-Monoph.</td>
<td>*( e )</td>
<td>*( \epsilon )</td>
<td>*( \tilde{\epsilon} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-U</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tilde{\epsilon} )-R</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>( \tilde{\epsilon} )</td>
<td>( \tilde{\epsilon} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>( \tilde{\epsilon} )</td>
<td>( \tilde{\epsilon} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has been argued that the above claim receives empirical justification from three sources:

1) the Moore MS
2) 'the so-called failure of Breaking'
3) \( *\tilde{\iota} > \iota \).

NOTES

* I owe a special debt of gratitude to Prof. Dr. Kazuo Araki (Nagoya University) for valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper.

1 The following abbreviations are employed throughout this paper:
- Angl. (Anglian), eWS (early WS), Gmc (Germanic), Goth (Gothic), i-U (i-Umlaut), Li (Lindisfarne Gospels), MHG (Middle High German), nWS (non-WS), OE (Old English), OHG (Old High German), Olce (Old Icelandic), OS (Old Saxon), PGmc (Proto-Gmc), VH (Vespasian Hymns), VP (Vespasian Psalter), WGmc (West Gmc), WS (West Saxon).

2 Simply for ease of exposition, I shall by compromise assume the traditionally entertained phonetic values for OE diphthongs. For my new thesis on this issue, see Suzuki (1983).

3 This view is shared by almost all the historical grammars cited in note 9 of this article, with the exception of Prins (1972) and Wyld (1927), both of which, however, fail to offer any justification for their unique speculations.
4 Dresher (1978: 183) mentions a process somewhat similar to $i$-M. However, the similarity is just a matter of superficial observation. Dresher's process has quite different (and rather ad-hoc) motivation: synchronically-oriented, it is devised to derive second weak verbs, and confined to short diphthongs in its scope of operation.

5 Cf. $*\text{dæd} \rightarrow \text{dæd} '\text{deed'}$; $*\text{ræs} \rightarrow \text{ræc} '\text{physician'}$

6 At this point we need not determine the exact chronology between $i$-U and $\text{æ}$-R. For details, see the next section.

7 It is generally assumed that the Moore MS represents Durham dialect, belonging to Northumbrian. For other philological details, see Ström (1939).

8 The list is my own contribution with reference to Sweet (1885) and Ström (1939).


10 Bülbbring also holds his own thesis, but it would take us too afield to treat it here. For details, see Suzuki (MS).

11 Notice that the difference in subsequent development also speaks for differentiating between $i$-e and $i$-o.

12 Notice that the process in question is different from $\text{æ}$-R.

13 The unstressed $i$ became $e$ in eOE. Cf. Campbell (1959: § 369).

14 For a detailed discussion, see Hogg (1979).

15 The exact specification of these processes are of no concern here.

16 Another deficiency of Campbell’s view is that its presupposed characterization of Palatalization in terms of its triggering context is ill-founded. For details, see Suzuki (MS).

17 Cf. note 16.
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