1. Since the early days of laryngeal theory there has been disagreement about the question whether a PIE *H₂ merged with *H₁ and *H₃ in the neighbourhood of *o (e.g., Saussure, Kuryłowicz, Cowgill, Beekes) or coloured a contiguous *o to *a (e.g., Benveniste, Kuryłowicz, Lejeune, Lindeman). In his review of Beekes’ dissertation (Lingua 26, 1971, 181 - 198), Ruijgh lists the following arguments in favour of the latter view:

(1) Perfect πέπηγα<πέπαγα, λέλήθα<λέλαθα cf. ἔρρωγα, πέποιθα. These forms can hardly be explained otherwise than by assuming that -ō- developed phonetically from *-oH₂. They provide a model for the analogical introduction of the present tense vocalism in the perfect: “il est facile de rendre compte de formes telles que κέκευθα (:κεύθω ‘cacher’) à partir du type λέλαθα (: λαθω ‘être caché’); noter la parenté sémantique entre les deux verbes” (p. 190).

(2) Compounds ἰππαμολγός<*H₂ηmόλγο-, στραταγός<*H₂ηγό-. This phonetic development created the model for the analogical introduction of the long vowel in such forms as ἐπημιοβός<ἐπαμιοβός next to phonetically regular ἐπαμιοβός.

(3) 1st sg. ending -μαι next to 2nd sg. -σοι and 3rd sg. -τοι. I think that we have to start from *(m)ai, *(s)toi, *(t)toi. The problem is that *(ai does not necessarily continue *H₂oi, though this is a reasonable reconstruction.

(4) Expected o-grade in ἄγος, ἀνεμος, ἄρωμος, φήμη<φάμα, cf. τροφός, πότμος, πορθμός, λόχμη. As for ἄνεμος, Lat. animus, I am inclined to disagree both with Ruijgh’s *H₂enH₁mos and with Beekes’ *H₂enH₁mos and to posit *H₂nH₁emos, cf. κάλαμος<*kH₂emos and νηνεμίη<*H₂nH₁em-. Arm. holm is probably of non-IE origin. In ἀρωμός we may assume zero grade, as Ruijgh remarks himself, cf. OHG, ON, Old. Arm. I think that the o-grade in ἄγος and φήμη is hardly open to doubt.

2. Beekes has returned to the matter in a separate article (Die Sprache 18, 1972, 117 - 131), where he regards the following cases as certain:

(1) βωμός, cf. ἔβην.
(2) φωνή, cf. φημί.
(3) ποιμήν, πών, cf. Lat. pāscō.
(4) ἡδξαι, cf. ἡγων.
(5) πτόσσω, cf. πτήσσω.
(6) ὁγκος, cf. ἀγκάλη, ἀγκῶν.
(7) ὅκρις, cf. ὕκρος.
(8) οἰωνός, cf. Lat. avis.
To these we may add δῦμος (cf. ἄγω), δῦρο (PIE \*H₂omr̥, \*H₂ner-), ἄγωγή ἀκωκή (cf. ἤδωδη, ἄκωπη < \*HCoHC-). In view of the examples where \*H₂ colours a neighbouring \*o to \*a, Ruijgh suggests: “Il vaut donc mieux expliquer les cas isolés de mots tels que βω-μός, φω-νή, δῦ-μος comme résultat d’une apophonie plus récente, qui n’a pas réussi à pénétrer plus profondément dans le système de la morphologie grecque”. Here I agree with Beeckes: “It is not probable that isolated cases are due to a recent reshaping” and “for some good cases such an analogical secondary ablaut cannot possibly be taken into consideration” (p. 120). Beeckes’ examples appear to belong to an older layer.

3. Since both points of view rest upon considerable evidence, neither can be refuted: they must be integrated into a single consistent theory. I agree with Ruijgh that \*H₂ coloured a contiguous \*o to \*a in Greek. However, I agree with Beeckes that the relevant instances do not date back to the Indo-European proto-language. The simplest assumption is that the opposition between the laryngeals was neutralized in the neighbourhood of PIE \*o, where they merged into \*H₃, and that \*H₂ was restored in certain productive categories in Proto-Greek. Thus, we have ἄγος < \*H₂ogós, φήμι < \*bhoH₂meH₂, βεβήκα < \*βεβάκα < \*g₉-oH₂ (cf. δέδουκα) on the analogy of ἄγω < \*H₂eg-, φημί < \*bheH₂-, βίβημι < \*g₉-eH₂ - next to ὀμος < \*H₃og- < \*H₂og-, ἄγωνή, φωνή, βωμός < \*-oH₂ < \*H₂. The analogical development must be dated before the loss of the laryngeals because the latter eliminated the motivation for it. Semantically, the restoration of \*H₂ in φήμ "saying" and the preservation of the old ablaut in φωνή "voice" is quite acceptable. The a in πάρος < \*prH₂ós (Skt. purāh) was probably taken from πάρτ after the loss of the laryngeals. The original reflex was preserved in Aeolic τόμοντες < \*tmpH₁ontes. The timbre neutralization of the laryngeals in the neighbourhood of \*o has its analogue in Shuswap, which offers the closest typological parallel to the PIE laryngeals. In this language, all consonants which are members of pairs exhibiting the rounding-correlation are rounded before and after the rounded vowel (cf. A. H. Kuipers, The Shuswap Language, The Hague 1974, p. 22). As in Shuswap, the opposition between \*H₃e- and \*H₃o- was apparently not neutralized in Proto-Indo-European: initial \*H₂ and \*H₃ were preserved as h before \*e but lost before \*o in Armenian, while \*H₁ was always lost before a vowel, e.g. ἥτο < \*H₃ed- (original s-stem, cf. Lat. odor), ἤνωια < \*H₃eui-peH₂- (cf. Lat. ovis, pāstor), but orb, orjīc, orēc, ost (cf. δρπανός, δρχις, δρρος, δζος, OHG ars, ast). There is zero grade in oskr < \*H₃stu-er (cf. δστεν). For ὦμος, Arm. ḫum, Skt. āmāh I would suggest PIE \*H₂oH₃mós, Lat. amārūs < \*H₂H₃m-, OIr. om < \*H₂H₃e/om-.