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1. Proposal: a regular sound change in the Ingvaeonic dialects of West Germanic (OE, OFris, OS):

\[ *z \rightarrow \emptyset / \{i,*e\} - \$ \] with compensatory lengthening of preceding vowel

To my knowledge, this sound change has not been previously identified as a regular sound change (cf. e.g. Brugmann 1897, Campbell 1959).

While earlier accounts were obliged to assume that the rule of *z-deletion applied sporadically, the rule proposed here appears to have applied regularly. I claim that there is a reasonable explanation for each of the apparent exceptions.

2. A subset of the relevant data (a more extensive collection of data are in the appendix):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc</th>
<th>Goth</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>OHG</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>OFris</th>
<th>OS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*miz</td>
<td>mis</td>
<td>mèr</td>
<td>mir</td>
<td>mè</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>&quot;me (dat.)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*wiz</td>
<td>weis</td>
<td>vèr</td>
<td>wèr</td>
<td>wè</td>
<td>wi, we</td>
<td>&quot;we&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maiz</td>
<td>mais</td>
<td>meir</td>
<td>mèr</td>
<td>mà</td>
<td>mè(r)</td>
<td>mè(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mizdö</td>
<td>mizdon</td>
<td>mèta/ mèd/ mèda/ &quot;reward, payment&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hezdön</td>
<td>heorde</td>
<td>hède</td>
<td>&quot;flax fiber&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*twiznaz</td>
<td>tvennr/ twinnr</td>
<td>twíñ</td>
<td>&quot;twine; twofold&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*liznön</td>
<td>lernēn/ lernēn</td>
<td>leornian</td>
<td>lernēn</td>
<td>līnōn</td>
<td>&quot;learn&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*razdö</td>
<td>razda</td>
<td>rødōl rarta</td>
<td>reord</td>
<td>&quot;language, speech&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*huzaa</td>
<td>huzd</td>
<td>hord</td>
<td>hord</td>
<td>&quot;treasure&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bruzdaz</td>
<td>broddr</td>
<td>brort</td>
<td>brord</td>
<td>&quot;edge&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hrastnō</td>
<td>hrōmn</td>
<td>hraen</td>
<td>hraen</td>
<td>&quot;wave&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gazdaz</td>
<td>gazds</td>
<td>gart</td>
<td>(gierd)</td>
<td>gard</td>
<td>&quot;rod, prickle&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*uzdaz</td>
<td>oddr</td>
<td>ort</td>
<td>ord</td>
<td>ord</td>
<td>&quot;(spear)point, place&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mazgaz</td>
<td>megr</td>
<td>marc</td>
<td>marg</td>
<td>marg</td>
<td>&quot;narrow&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This presentation expands on a point from a longer discussion of the trend in WGmc toward the elimination of the PGmc voiced fricatives (Crist, 2001). This trend is modeled formally in Optimality Theory as the rise in relative ranking of a *VOICED-FRIC constraint. The present discussion, however, is pretheoretic.

Thanks to Don Ringe and to Jay Jasano for discussion. Any errors are of course my own.
The form \textit{zwirn} is attested in MHG but not in OHG. The OE form \textit{gierd} is said to be derived from a form \textit{*gazdi}.

3. The standardly accepted Germanic phylogeny, for reference:

![Germanic phylogeny diagram]

\textbf{Defining the problem}

4. \textbf{Distribution of PGmc \textit{*z}}

Because of the history of \textit{*z} (arising either \textit{*s} either by Verner’s Law or by assimilation to a following voiced obstruent), the segment has a somewhat lopsided distribution: it is found only in syllable codas and in word-medial onsets; never in word-initial onsets (Campbell 1959 p. 163-4).

5. \textbf{The first WGmc \textit{*z}-deletion (old news)}

Throughout WGmc, PGmc \textit{*z} deletes word-finally in unstressed syllables; this is already understood (e.g. Campbell p. 166). I assume here that this pan-WGmc rule predates and is separate from the Ingvaeonic rule of \textit{*z}-deletion proposed here.

The earlier WGmc sound change applies across the board, and has major consequences for WGmc morphology, since \textit{*z} was very common among PGmc inflectional suffixes.

After this Proto-West-Germanic sound change, \textit{*z} exists only word-medially in syllable onsets, and in the codas of stressed syllables (whether in stressed monosyllables or in the stressed initial syllable of polysyllabic words).

6. \textbf{Rhotacism}

\textit{*z} never survives as such into the historical WGmc languages. In all cases where it survives the WGmc deletion and the Ingv. deletion, it rhotacizes to \textit{r}, merging with original PGmc \textit{*r} (Campbell 1959 p. 166; Steblin-Kamenskij 1963).

It might be tempting to suppose that rhotacism precedes the two z-deletions, since the deletion of /\textit{r}/ in codas is attested in other languages, e.g. modern English. However, this cannot be the case; original \textit{*r} never deletes in the relevant environments (\textit{*miz, *wiz > *mez, *wêz > OE mê, wê “me, we”, but *hêr > OE her “here”). The deletion of \textit{*z} is clearly sensitive to the original \textit{*r/\textit{z} contrast.}

Although \textit{*z > r} also occurs in NGmc, it can be shown that this is a parallel rather than shared innovation. There are sound changes unique both to NGmc and to WGmc which depend on the contrast between \textit{*z} and \textit{*r}; hence the two branches must have developed separately for a while before both underwent the merger between original \textit{*r} and \textit{*z}. In NGmc, the sound change in question is \textit{*ai > a: / \textit{h, r}\} (but not before
*z; Olcel *sair > sār “wound”, but *maizan > meiri “more”; Noreen, 1904, p. 75). In WGmc, the sound changes are the two deletions of *z themselves.

(I deliberately overlook the second person pronouns which appear in Gothic as izwis, izwara; for discussion of the special WGmc development *zw > *ww, see Stiles 1986, p. 92-3.)

7. Distinguishing the two deletions
The deletion of *z has been thought of as a single sound change. Previous accounts of the deletions of *z do not distinguish what I am treating here as two separate sound changes. For example:

“Between a vowel and consonant r usually remains, e.g. hord, reord ... but it is lost with compensatory lengthening in OE háð- hair (cf. ON haddr), méð reward (beside meord), twín linen (cf. Ger. zwirn), cf. OS línon learn, MD hede hards of flax (beside OE leornian, heordan ...). ... z is lost in West Gmc. finally in unaccented syllables, e.g. many n.s. and n.p. inflexions, the unaccented pronominal words OE we, ġe, he me, ġe, hwe.”

(Campbell 1959 p. 166)

So far as I know, Brugman (1897) comes the closest to solving the problem; he recognizes that there appears to be some kind of connection with preceding front vowels, but says:

Bei vorausgehendem palatalen Vocal erscheint im Westgerm. auch Wegfall des z.
So as. línan: ahd. lirnên; ags. twín: mhd. zwirn ... Eine allseitig befriedigende Erklärung ist für diese Erscheinung ... noch nicht gefunden.

8. Some observations
a. Non-final *z-deletion never occurs after back vowels in any WGmc language; not even one exception.

b. Non-final *z-deletion never occurs outside OE, OFris, OS, with the sole exception of OHG méde, etc. “reward, payment”.

9. Problematic forms:

OHG měta/miata/mieta (Secondary *z-deletion doesn’t otherwise occur in OHG)
OFris, OS mé(r) (*z should have been deleted completely, but it is variably present as r)
OE meord, heorde (Deletion of *z unexpectedly fails)
OE leornian, OFris lernên/lirnên (same)

In the case of OHG měta, I claim that this is simply a loan-word from Ingveonic into OHG. It would hardly be remarkable for the word for “payment” to be borrowed in a trade situation.

The variable presence of r in OFris, OS mé(r) can be explained straightforwardly in terms of analogical restoration of r (*z) on the model of the comparative and superlative adjectives *maizan, *maistra, and perhaps on the analogy of the general comparative adjectives as well. In the case of OE, this restoration has not yet occurred in the earliest written records, but it later happens in the full light of history.

In the cases of OE meord, heorde, I notice that the failure of secondary *z-deletion is found in both the cases where *d follows (so far as I know, these are the only cases of this kind). Continental Pre-OE was originally spoken in Jutland at the northern periphery of the Ingveonic continuum; so perhaps the application of the rule in polysyllabic words did not spread this far north. The existence of OE méð beside meord is not surprising if Old English is the product of some degree of dialect mixture, as is generally assumed.
As for OE *leornian, OFris *lernēn/lirēn, there are at least two possible explanations. One possibility is to extend the explanation above so that in northernmost Ingvaeonic, secondary *z-deletion fails not only before *d but also before *z as well, in which case OE *twēn must hail from a closely related dialect further south.

There is a second possibility: namely, that the the *z was originally deleted throughout Ingvaeonic in *liznōn, but was later restored by analogy with the related causative verb *laizijanā “to teach” (Goth. laisjan, OHG lēren, etc.) This restoration could have happened either together or separately in OE and OFris; it could also have happened only in OE and have been reintroduced into OFris as a loan by Christian missionaries from England.

10. Possible problems

Torp (1909) lists the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE. wād n. (engl. woad)</td>
<td>OE. cēn m. “pine, fir, spruce”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFris. wēd</td>
<td>MLG. kēn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLG. wēt, wēde</td>
<td>OHG. chien, kien, kēn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG. MHG. weit m.</td>
<td>MHG. kien m. n. “fir, spruce; splinter or torch (of such wood)”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHG. Waid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If these reconstructions of *z are correct, then the High German forms are problematic, since *z-deletion would seem to have occurred here, contrary to prediction. One loan word (meta) is not very bad, but the argument becomes weak if loans must be posited for these two words as well.

How secure is the reconstruction of *z for these two forms? In the case of *kizna, the word is not attested in any Germanic languages outside WGmc. It has been proposed to connect this word with Russian sosnā (in glaring violation of Grimm’s Law, since *k > *h in Germanic; see Ringe 1984 for critical discussion) and with OFr. giūs “fir” (where the consonants at least fit; but I am told that the vowel in the OFr. form reflects an original long vowel). I follow Ringe (1984) in simply considering this a WGmc word of unknown origin which happens to contain an apparent WGmc *ę₂.

In the case of *waizda, the argument for the existence of *z is that there is a medieval Latin word waisdo (among other spellings); Feist 1909 and Torp 1909 suggest that this could be a loan from an unattested Gothic word *uizdila, with zero-grade ablaut. This is not impossible, but it would be a stretch to base any strong conclusions on such a supposition. Feist (1939) revises his earlier view and suggests that this is simply a Wanderwort; we might not be able to tell which are the donor and recipient languages. Kluge (1999) remarks “Die Vermutung, daß alle diese Wörter aus ein unbekannten Sprache entlehnt sind, liegt nahe.”

It should be noted in this connection that Webster’s 1913 Unabridged Dictionary (Gutenberg online version) lists the cognates Dan. vaid, veid, Sw. veide. If these words are real, they would presumably argue against reconstructing *z for this word since geminate *dd would be predicted as the NGmc outcome for *zd, unless there is some degemination in later NGmc which I am not aware of. However, I have not been able to confirm these words in any of the several dictionaries of Danish or Swedish I have consulted, nor in any other etymological discussions of this word; so the entire sub-argument is probably moot. Rejecting *z in this reconstruction can still be argued solely on the argument above.

10. Relative chronology

*z > 0 / {i,*e} - $ must follow the Ingvaeonic lowering *i > *e / - *z.

*z > 0 / {i,*e} - $ must precede the Ingvaeonic chain vowel shift which included the change *ai > *a:, since the *i element of the diphthong triggers secondary z-deletion.

*z > 0 / {i,*e} - $ must precede rhotacism, since original *r does not delete in this environment, as noted.
Appendix: PGmc words with *z in stressed codas

The following words were collected from the online version of Torp (1909) (http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~kurisuto/germanic/pgmc_torp_about.html) by searching for “z” in the first or second word of each entry. Since the online version is only partially corrected, it is possible that there might be a form or two not caught by this search; it is also possible that a new cognate set or two might have been discovered since 1909. Excluded are a few words which do not survive into WGmc. Otherwise, this list is fairly complete.

Instances of *z in unstressed (non-initial) syllables are not included, since these were uniformly deleted throughout WGmc and are not candidates for the second *z-deletion under discussion here.

The following is essentially a translation of the relevant entries from Torp, with various revisions of my own.

*z preceded by a front vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc.</th>
<th>*wīz “we”, nom. plur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goth.</td>
<td>weis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON.</td>
<td>ver (OSwed. vi(r))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS.</td>
<td>wi, we, ps. auch wir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFries.</td>
<td>wi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE.</td>
<td>wē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModE.</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG.</td>
<td>wir, wir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHG.</td>
<td>wir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ig. vei-s. Cf. skr. vay-im wir.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc.</th>
<th>*līznōn “to learn”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS.</td>
<td>līnōn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFries.</td>
<td>lirna, lerna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE.</td>
<td>leornian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModE.</td>
<td>learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG.</td>
<td>lirnēn, lernēn, lernōn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG.</td>
<td>NHG. lernen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Torp includes an alternate PGmc form *līznōn to account for the long vowel in the OS form. However, this can be explained as the regular compensatory lengthening from *z-deletion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc.</th>
<th>*laizijanā “to teach”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goth.</td>
<td>laisjan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS.</td>
<td>lērian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFries.</td>
<td>lēra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE.</td>
<td>lēran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG.</td>
<td>lērran, lēran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG.</td>
<td>lēren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHG.</td>
<td>lehren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON. lēra is a loan from OE. Causativ zu līsan.

Included here as the possible source for the analogical restoration of *z in OE leornian (see main text).

| PGmc. | maiz adv. comp. “more” |

5
Comparative and superlative of the adjectival forms:

PGmc. maizan “greater, more” sup. maista.
Goth. maiza, maists größer, größt
ON. meiri, mestr
OE. mär, mest
OFries. OE. màr, mèst
NHG. mehr, meist

German. ma-is, ma-is-ta, formell comp. und sup. zu mèria, der Bedeutung nach zu mekila. Vgl. ir. máo, móo größer.

Torp lists an OHG form mè alongside mèr. This would be problematic for the sound change proposed here, but as far as I can determine, OHG mèr is a ghost word. I can find no reference to it in Schützeichel (1969), Braune/Ebbinghaus (1969), or Wright (1888).

Torp also lists an alternative PGmc form *mais. I see no need for this; the devoicing of the *z in Gothic is regular.

PGmc. *tvizna “to each (je zwei)”
ON. tvennr, tvinr “twofold”
OE. twān n. “Leinwand (canvas, screen)”
ModE. twine
MLG. twernen
OHG. zwirnen, zwirnon
MHG. zwirn m. “doubly spun twine”
NHG. Zwirn

Cf. lat. bini (aus dvisno-).

PGmc. *tviznōn, -ēn “to twine”
ON. tvinna “to double, duplicate”
ModE. twine (verb)
MLG. twernen
OHG. zwirnēn, zwirnōn
MHG. zwirnen “twist together twice, twine”

PGmc. *þriza “threefold, the three (je drei)
ON. þreinmr, þrinnr “threefold”, pl. “the three”

Cf. lat. terni dass.

This wouldn’t even be relevant, except that Clark Hall (1962) lists OE forms þrīnna and þrīnen “three-fold”. He doesn’t show the vowel on the second one as long. A recoinage in OE?

PGmc. *mizdō(n) f. “reward, payment, fee”
Goth. mizdō f. “reward”
OS. mēda, mieda f. “payment”
OFries. mēde, mūde f. “reward, rental, payment, gift”
OE. mēd und meord f. “reward, payment”
ModE. meed
OHG. miata, mēta
MHG. miete f. “payment, reward, bribe”
NHG. Miete


_Torp of course assumes the old view that the long vowel in the WGmc forms arises from PIE *mēizdāh > PGmc *mēzdō(n). However, Ringe (1984) refutes the long-standing notion that there was an *ē₂ in PGmc. In this case, the apparent *ē₂ is simply the product of the regular compensatory lengthening._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc.</th>
<th>*hezdon f. “coarse flax or hemp fiber, oakum”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFries. MLG.</td>
<td>hede f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE.</td>
<td>heorde f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModE.</td>
<td>hards (=coarse refuse of flax or similar fiber)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Cf. lat. caesaries “head-hair”, skr. kēsara m. “hair, mane”. Uncertain. OE. heorde könnte auch germ. hezōn sein; Wz. hes = ig. kes kratzen, kämmen, s. hes 3._

_Torp lists an additional PGmc form *haizdon giving rise to the long vowel in the OFries, MLG forms. Once again, this can simply be the regular compensatory lengthening. Torp reconstructs *i as the vowel, but I am told that this is inconsistent with the Gk cognate._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc.</th>
<th>*kizna m. n. “resinous wood”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE.</td>
<td>cēn m. “pine, fir, spruce”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLG.</td>
<td>kēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG.</td>
<td>chien, kien, kēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG.</td>
<td>kien m. n. “fir, spruce; splinter or torch (of such wood)”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Cf. Ir. gius (< *gisosto) “fir, spruce”_

See main text for comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc.</th>
<th>vaida (vaizda) n. “woad”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE.</td>
<td>wād n. (engl. woad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFris.</td>
<td>wēd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLG.</td>
<td>wēt, wēde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG. MHG.</td>
<td>weit m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHG.</td>
<td>Waid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Daneben german. vaizda (woraus mundartl. vaida?), vgl. mlat. vaizda und got. (ablaudend) vizīla. Das Verhältnis zu lat. vitrum und gr. ἴοστις ist unklar._

See main text for comment.

*z preceded by a back vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc.</th>
<th>*uzdaz m. “point, ‘place’”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ON.</td>
<td>oddr gen. odds m. “point, place”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OS. ord m. “point, edge (blade)”

OE. ord m. “point, spearpoint”

OHG. MHG. ort m. n. “point, corner, edge (part, piece, small coin).”

Perhaps PIE. ud-dho > uzdho, from ud (s. út) and the root dhé “to set”.

**PGmc.** *hazdaz m. “head-hair”

Ablauting form *hezda in

OE. wunden-heord “having curled hair (?)”

Cf. asl. kosa “hair”, kosmū “head-hair”, nsl. kosem “bundle of flax (Flachsbund).” — ir. cass (i.e. *kasto-) “curl, tress”. From this could also be drawn OE. heordan pl. (engl. hards of flax), MDut. herde “flax fiber”. Cf. gr. χόρτος Werg.

*It isn’t clear to me how OE. heordan could arise from *kasto- without a high front vocoid to first umlaut the vowel before the Breaking.*

**PGmc.** *huzda n. “hidden treasure”

Goth. huozd n. “treasure”

ON. hodd

OS. hord, horð, hornth n. “treasure, closed or hidden interior”

OE. hord m. n. “treasure, amassed wealth”

ModE. hoard

OHG. MHG. hort n.

Cf. Gr. ἁρτός m. cavity, vulva; Lat. custos “a guard”.

**PGmc.** *hraznō f. “source”

ON. hrōnn f. “wave”

OE. hraen, hærn f. “wave, sea”

Ablauting

MHG. rünne f. “storm surge?”

Cf. gr. ἁρύνη

Llexer (1986) does in fact list rünne “Sturmwoge, Sturm”; the word is real. Torp includes the question mark, perhaps indicating that the cognation is uncertain (and I agree that it is uncertain). If I am understanding, Torp is implicitly assuming that the MHG form reflects an original zero grade.

*The PGmc gloss “source” (“Quelle”) does not make a great deal of sense; perhaps Torp mistakenly wrote “Quelle” for “Welle”.*

**PGmc.** *gazdaz m. “prickle, point; rod”

Goth. gazds m. “prickle”

ON. gaddr m. “prickle”

OS. gard “staff, rod”

OHG. gart, cart

MHG. gart m. “prickle, stick for driving (animals)”

Cf. OSl. žrűdū “flimsy pole”). Basic meaning: “rod, pole”. Cf. Ir. gat (d. i. *gazdo-) “rod” and gas f. (d. i. *gasta) “sapling, sprout, shoot”. — lat. hasta “rod, shaft, spear”.

*English “goad” isn’t connected; it is simply a separate word.*
PGmc. *bruzdaz m. “blade, edge”, *brazda, *brezda m. “edge”
ON. broodr m. “point, sprout”
OE. brod m. dass.
OHG. brot, prort m. “skewer, projectile, edge, rim (Bord), forepart of a ship”
MHG. brot
Norw. vernac. bradd m. “shore, edge”
OE. brecord. bred m. dass.
OHG. brart m. “edge, forepart of a ship”
(Possibly connected are Germ. barda and burda “edge, seam”, from *barzda, *burzda? See ber 3). Cf. Ir.
brot m. “prickle”, cymr. brathu “to prick, bite”.

PGmc. * nazjan “to heal, rescue, sustain”
Goth. (ga)nasjan “to make healthy, heal, rescue”
OS. nerian “to save”
OFries. nera “to nurture”
OE. nerian “to save, protect”
OHG. nerjan, nerren, neren
MHG. nergen, neren, nern “heal, sustain the life of, save, protect, nourish”
NHG. nährnen “nurture, nourish”
Causative to *gagesan. Cf.
ON. nara (= Germ. nazén) “to live”, aldr-nari (= nazan) m. “life-sustainer (=fire)”
OS. lifnara f. “food, nourishment”
OE. ealdor-nuru f. “saving of a life”
OHG. nara
MHG. nare f. “salvation, rescue, nourishment, sustenance”

PGmc. *mazgaz m. “marrow”
ON. mergr g. mergjar m. “marrow in a bone”
OS. marg n.
OFries. merch, merg m. n.
OE. mearg m. n.
ModE. marrow
OHG. marg, marag, marc, marac g. marges, marages
MHG. marc g. marges n.
NHG. Mark n.
Cf. OSl. mozgū “brain”. — Skr. majjān m., majjā f. “marrow”. Perhaps also ir. medg (aus mejghā) f.
“whey”, cf. russ. mozga “blood”; and OSl. mēzga “sap, juice”, nsl.: “(tree) sap”, klruss. mjazok “marrow”,
mjazka “(tree) sap”.

PGmc. *razna n. “house”
Goth. razn n. “house”
ON. rann n. “house”
OE. ærn n. “house”; cf. ræsn n. “plank, ceiling”
OFries. ransa
Cf. Ir. árus “dwelling”.

PGmc. *razdō f. “voice, sound”
Goth. razda f. “voice, pronunciation, speech”
ON. rōdd f. “sound, voice, vowel”
OE. reord f. “voice, sound, speech”
OHG. rarta f. “voice, modulation”

PGmc. *razdô f. “food, meal”
OE. reord f., gereord n. “meal, feast, food”, gereordian “feed, entertain, feast”
ON. greddir “feeder, satisfier” (from a verb. *gredda = *ga-razdian),
grenna “to feed” (derived from a noun *grœnn).
Perhaps from the basic root ras (s. ras 3), cf. the double meaning of Germ. vesan.

PGmc. *uz-laga m. n. “fate”
ON. or-log n. pl. “fate”
OS. orlag and orlagi
OE. orleg n. “fate”
OHG. orlac m., urliga f. (?) dass.

PGmc. *vala-kuzjon f. “valkyrie”
ON. valkyrja f. “valkyrie”
OE. wælcyrig “erinys (one of the Furies), sorceress”
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