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naissance correspond la régénération baptismale, qui fait du baptisé
un enfant de Dieu et de l'Église; à la maturité, le sacrement de
confirmation, qui fait du confirmé un parfait chrétien, un soldat”
(col. 1051).

One difficulty, though not a serious one, occurs. St. Cecilia
addresses a group newly baptized (but not confirmed) as “Cristes
owene knyghtes” and goes on to urge them, in St. Paul’s words,
to put on their armor and persevere in the battle (379-390). Are
merely baptized Christians, then, “soldiers of Christ”? If so,
how can we confine this term to those confirmed? It is true that
this type of speech is not unknown in reference to Baptism (see,
for instance, St. Cyril of Jerusalem in Migne, P. G., XXXIII,
443). The answer is, as St. Thomas Aquinas indicates, that all
Christians must indeed fight against their spiritual enemies (and
so in the wide sense all can be called soldiers of Christ); but
Confirmation’s special effect is precisely to call them to battle
and to prepare them for it “quasi ex officio” (Summa Theologica,
Pars III, Q. LXXII, Art. V, ad 1 and 2). In the case of Tiburce,
an inspection of Chaucer’s source in the light of constant Christian
teaching and terminology leaves no doubt whatsoever:
Tiburce is
baptized, is instructed for a week while he is wearing the white
baptismal garment and then is “consecrated a soldier of Christ.”
In such a context, the latter phrase could have only one meaning
for Chaucer and for us: Tiburce received the sacrament of Con-
firmation.

Cyril A. Reilly

Loras College,
Dubuque, Iowa

GOTHIC IUP ‘āwō’

The solutions offered to date (see, for example, Feist³ 298a and,
more recently, Walde-Hofmann³ 2.616, 1952) for the etymology of
this word are not in all respects satisfying: Everything points to
the presence of an apparent IE *b in the etymon of this form.
This interpretation has several disadvantages:

1. Except for the Keltic forms found in OIrish uabar ‘Eitelkeit,’
all other IE forms of the vast tribe illustrated by Goth. uf, ufar,
and ubizwa (Feist\textsuperscript{3} 509 and 508a), with which it is semantically desirable to associate the form in question, show IE \textit{*p}.

2. The other Gmc. forms with Gmc. \textit{p} (e.g. OE \textit{up}, \textit{upp}) show gemination, whatever its debated source, which means that for them we are not forced to assume Gmc. \textit{p} < IE \textit{*b}.

3. Feist (298a) tries to bolster his assumed IE \textit{*ubo} by appealing to Lat. \textit{sub} and \textit{ab}, as against super and Gk. \textpi\textomicron\textomicron. This involves great complexities within Italic which need only be alluded to here: Lat. \textit{ab}, Umbr. \textit{ap} (cognate lacking in Oscan), Lat. \textit{ob}, Osc. \textit{op} (cognate lacking in Umbrian), and Lat. \textit{sub}, Umbr. \textit{sub}, Osc. \textit{sup} are not consistent amongst themselves; against Gk. \textpi\textomicron\textomicron, \textlambda\textomicron, \textnu\textomicron, if we were to assume syncope of the final vowels, on the basis of the treatment of Italic \textit{-k} and \textit{-t} (by syncope) we should expect universal voiceless stops; if we were to assume original forms in \textit{-C}, on the basis of the development of original \textit{*-t} we should expect consistent voicing. Perhaps the simplest solution is to start with IE alternates \textit{*hapo}~\textit{*hap}; \textit{*Eopy}~\textit{*Eop};\textsuperscript{1} \textit{*swpo}~\textit{*swp}. With syncope we then get Italic \textit{*ap}~\textit{*ab}; \textit{*op}~\textit{*ob}; \textit{*sup}~\textit{*sub}. These assumptions, framed on several grounds, make a form with IE \textit{*b} unnecessary.

4. Everyone knows about the rarity of \textquoteleft{}IE \textit{*b}.\textquoteright{} The tendency today, supported by consideration of present-day views on structural patterning in phonemic systems and by the near absence of cases that cannot be explained otherwise, is to posit for earlier IE a complete blank in the pattern where, a priori, we might look for a \textit{*b} phoneme. This is not the place for guesses as to the earlier developments leading to this blank.

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{h} and \textit{E} here represent IE phonemes currently referred to as \textquoteleft{}laryngeals\textquoteright{}, the properties of which are stated in the discussion that follows. \textit{E} is a cover-symbol for one of two phonemes where from the evidence we cannot tell which of the two known e-colouring laryngeals it actually was. For simplicity's sake I follow in this paper the notation of E. H. Sturtevant (\textit{Hittite Grammar}, New Haven, 1951), as modified by W. Lehmann (\textit{Proto-Indo-European Phonology}, Austin, 1952). Though I consider that the Anatolian subgroup was the first known dialect to leave IE, I do not thereby bind myself to the Indo-Hittite hypothesis as conceived by Sturtevant; I therefore prefer to label reconstructions simply as \textquoteleft{}IE\textquoteright{}, and, for that matter, since we do not as yet know at what rate the laryngeals were lost in early dialect stages, many reconstructions may apply equally well to post-Anatolian IE.
Following the lead suggested by Skt. *pibati*, and its cognates, where by assuming a voiced laryngeal *ɣ* an acceptable reconstruction *pγ-pγ-ety*, with present-tense reduplication, can be framed, we may in isolation posit for *iup* an IE *Eewpy*- form. Since according to current theory no IE form began with a vowel, we must here posit an *e*-colouring laryngeal, which I write *E*. If we are still to associate our form with *uf*, etc., we must assume we have here a suffix containing a laryngeal, to which in general there is naturally no objection.

There is, however, a further objection now opened which we were not previously in a position to raise, a difficulty centering on the initial laryngeal.

In a paper which I intend to publish shortly and in which I deal in detail with the fate of the IE laryngeals in Albanian, I show that IE *h* (the *a*-colouring laryngeal that does not appear in Hittite as *b*(h)) gives in initial position Albanian *h*-.. In the dialect of the village of Vaccarizzo Albanese, in the south of Italy, a dialect I happen to know well that retains common Albanian *h* with great fidelity, the reflex is *ɣ*-. The Geg (northern Albanian) form for ‘mount’ is *huppy*, while Vaccarizzo has *γip*-. There is no good reason, except for our Gothic form, to dissociate this from Gothic *uf*, Hittite *upzi* ‘rises (of the sun),’ etc. If we accept this identification we must reconstruct IE *huppy*-.. The full grade would have been *hawpy*- (*hawp*), and this clashes formally, however seductive the semantics are, with *Eewpy*- above.

If the above reasoning is correct, a choice must be made. In view of the several difficulties above outlined and of its isolation, for the time being *iup* cannot be considered connected with *uf* and its numerous brethren.
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**FIGUIÈRE AND LA ROCHEFOUCAULD**

Here are some parallelisms, never to my knowledge reported, between *l'Esprit fort, ou les armes du sage* (1650), by le Sieur de Figuière, and the *Maximes* of La Rochefoucauld (1665):