

Review of: Marianne Volkart, *Zu Brugmanns Gesetz im Altindischen*. (Universität Bern. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. Arbeitspapier 33.) Bern 1994, 68 p.

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

The story of Brugmann's Law (abbreviated as 'BL') is one of the most dramatic in the history of Indo-European linguistics. This Law, which states that PIE \**o* (written in 1870ies as \**a*<sub>2</sub>) yields Indo-Iranian *ā* in open syllables except for absolute auslaut, was first proposed by the great German scholar Karl Brugmann in 1876. From the very beginning, however, BL was the subject of passionate debates. Whereas such scholars as de Saussure, Streitberg and Osthoff accepted BL (it is worth noting that de Saussure already used BL throughout his *Mémoire* as early as 1879), the resistance was growing. More and more counter-examples were found so that Hermann Hirt (1913) was eventually able to present a list of 67 items. The large amount of exceptions and the severe criticism of his colleagues forced Brugmann to withdraw his Law. In 1921, Hirt wrote: "Das Gesetz ist tot, und es hat jedenfalls nicht zum Vorteil der Wissenschaft gelebt, denn wir sind dadurch verhindert worden, eine ganze Reihe von Problemen in Angriff zu nehmen" (19).

It was clear that some modification was necessary to rehabilitate BL. The first adjustment was proposed by Brugmann himself in reply to the criticism of Joh. Schmidt, who already in 1881 had pointed out exceptions like Skt. *ápas-* 'work' (Lat. *opus*) and *ávi-* 'sheep' (Lat. *ovis*). Thereafter Brugmann reformulated the Law such that it did not affect non-apophonic \**o* (i.e. \**o* that does not interchange with \**e*), for which Brugmann even postulated a separate IE phoneme \**á* (cf. 1897: 153ff.). Nowadays, we can account for the most instances of non-apophonic \**o* by reconstructing \**H<sub>3</sub>e*. This group of words with non-apophonic \**o*, for which see Lubotsky 1990, explained only a small portion of the exceptions and did nothing to alleviate the major objections against the Law. For a long time, it seemed that the amendment proposed by the Swiss scholar Edmund Kleinhaus (cf. Pedersen 1900: 87ff.) would provide the remedy. According to Kleinhaus' formulation ("Kleinhausssche Fassung"), BL only affected \**o* before the resonants *r*, *l*, *m*, and *n*. Later, Lehmann (1952) expanded the list with the semi-vowels *j* and *u*. In recent years, however, Stephanie Jamison (1983: 200ff., cf. also Sihler 1980) demonstrated that Kleinhaus' condition is superfluous, i.e. BL also operated before obstruents.

A breakthrough was achieved by Kuryłowicz in 1927 when he demonstrated that the loss of antevocalic laryngeals in Indo-Iranian was posterior to BL. In other words, the laryngeal in the sequence \**oCHV* closed the preceding syllable and the \**o* remained short. This rule explained the bulk of the exceptions and totally rehabilitated the Law.

Marianne Volkart states at the beginning of her small book that "das Ziel der vorliegenden Arbeit ist, die Gültigkeit von Brugmanns 1876 formuliertem Gesetz ... im Bereich des altindischen Nomens und Verbums zu untersuchen" (1). In Chapter 1 (1-27: Brugmanns Gesetz bei Nomina), she first reviews Hirt's list from 1913 and then my above-mentioned article (Lubotsky 1990). Chapter 2 (27-62: Brugmanns Gesetz bei Verba) discusses the vocalism of the Vedic *-aya-* formations on the basis of a recent treatment of the evidence by Jamison 1983 and by two reviewers of Jamison's book (Gotō 1988, Lubotsky 1989). In the "Gesamtergebnis" (63f.) at the end of her work, V. summarizes her findings, viz. that BL is essentially valid, that Kuryłowicz' condition is correct, that Kleinhans' formulation is superfluous, and, finally, that the restriction concerning *\*H<sub>3</sub>e* is probably correct, but uncertain because of scant evidence.

I wholeheartedly agree with most of V.'s conclusions. The presentation is lucid and the argumentation of different authors is discussed with great care. I can only hope that this work will contribute to the full acceptance of BL. In the following, I shall only indicate some minor points where, in my opinion, the argument can be improved.

One of the counter-examples against BL adduced by Hirt is Av. *staman-* 'mouth or jaw (of a dog)', cf. Gr. στόμα 'mouth'. V. (4) correctly indicates that this word is irrelevant for BL since CLuv. *tūm(m)an(t)-* 'ear, orifice' (cf. also MW *safn* < *\*stamn-* < *\*stH<sub>3</sub>-mn-* 'underjaw') clearly points to the PIE reconstruction *\*stH<sub>3</sub>-mn-* since CLuv. *-u-* cannot reflect PIE *\*o* (see recently Melchert 1994: 73f.; this is a decisive argument against Rasmussen's reconstruction *\*stom-n-* / *\*stam-n-* in 1989: 241ff.). Hitt. *išstaman-* 'ear' can reflect the full grade of the root. On the other hand, the short *a* in Av. *staman-* still requires an explanation. V. follows the analysis of Zucha 1988: 44, who starts from a zero grade *\*stH<sub>3</sub>-mn-* and tries to arrive at the Avestan word through a chain of analogical changes after the loss of the laryngeal. As V. observes, this analysis is problematic in several respects (even Lindeman's variant does not help), but she sticks to the reconstruction of zero-grade in Avestan, which, in my opinion, is unnecessary.

As a rule, Indo-Iranian formations with the suffix *\*-m(e)n-* have full grade in the root (cf. AiGr. II/2: 762ff.), even if Greek and Celtic have zero grade, as in the word for 'name'. Of course, *\*steH<sub>3</sub>-mn-* must have given Avestan *\*stāman-*, but, as is well known, the quantity of Avestan vowels is not very reliable, long and short vowels often interchanging, cf. the materials presented for Gāthic in Beekes 1988: 41ff. Considering the fact that Av. *staman-* only occurs in two passages in the *Vīdēvdāt*, viz. V 13.30 *stamanəm hē adāṭ nīāzaiien* 'they should then bind (it) to his (sc. the dog's) mouth / jaw' and V 15.4 *yaṭ vā aēte garəma x<sup>v</sup>arəθa stamanəm vā hizuuṣm vā apa.dažat* 'or when this hot food will burn (the dog's) mouth or tongue...', we may assume that the short vowel is secondary. On the other hand, one of the sources of unetymological short *a* in Avestan is shortening before a clitic, which is attested in such forms as *aḡharə-cā* next to *āḡharə*; *caθβaras-ca* next to *caθβārō*; *aiθīs-cīṭ*, etc. (cf. Hoffmann 1975: 266ff. for a discussion). Since in both passages *stamanəm* stands before a clitic, this rule may be responsible for the short *a*.

V. (7) does not discuss Sanskrit deverbative formations with the suffix *-a-*, where BL does not seem to operate. I refer the reader for a detailed account of Skt. *a*-formations and problems connected with BL to Lubotsky 1988: 59ff., especially 71ff.

After a review of Hirt's list, V. (10) concludes that there is only one word in the whole list of 67 items which she cannot explain, viz. Skt. *rāsa-* 'sap, juice', *rasā-* 'liquid'. In fact, however, Lat. *rōs* 'dew' and the different stems in Skt. unambiguously show that PIE *\*(H)ros-* was a root noun, so that the Skt. formations may be of a more recent date than BL. Cf. Skt. *dāma-* 'house', which is explained by V. in a similar fashion as a recent thematicization of the root noun *dām-* (2f.).

V. (17) convincingly shows that TS 1.5.10.2 *tvátpitārah* 'having you as father' is an archaism, being a regular reflex of PIE *\*-pH<sub>2</sub>tores* (cf. Gr. compounds in *-πάτορες*) with BL. More of these cases can be found in AiGr. II/1: 100f. Important for the chronology of BL are bahuvrīhi compounds in *-jāni-* (*bhádrajāni-* 'having a beautiful wife', *yúvajāni-* 'having a young wife', etc.) because they seem to show that vocalization of laryngeals in the final syllable preceded BL, i.e. *\*-g<sup>w</sup>onH<sub>2</sub>-* > *\*-g<sup>w</sup>oni-* > *\*-gāni-* → *\*-jāni-*.

While reviewing the evidence for *\*o* < *\*H<sub>3</sub>e*, which does not become lengthened in accordance with BL, V. (26<sup>97</sup>) mentions one possible counter-example, suggested to her by Rasmussen (per litt.; see Rasmussen 1989: 167), viz. Skt. *styāyate* 'to become solid, stiff', which Rasmussen reconstructs as *\*stiH<sub>3</sub>-eie-* (the third laryngeal follows, according to him, from Gr. *σῶμα* 'corpse', reconstructed as *\*(s)tiH<sub>3</sub>-mn-*) and assumes that Skt. *ā* is due to BL. This apparent counter-example is far from convincing, however. First of all, the connection of Gr. *σῶμα* with *styāyate*, suggested by Thieme, seems semantically far-fetched. (I further strongly disagree with the development *CiH<sub>3</sub>C* > Gr. *CiōC*.) It seems much more natural to connect Skt. *styā-* with Gr. *στέαρ* 'hard fat, suet, dough' < *\*steH<sub>1/2</sub>i-r* and probably also with other words for 'dough', viz. Gr. *στοῦς*, OIr. *taís*, *taes*, OCS *těsto*, OHG *deismo*, which all point to PIE *\*(s)teH<sub>2</sub>i-(s)-*. For this reason I have suggested (Lubotsky 1988: 104) to consider the root of this family to be an *i*-enlargement of *\*steH<sub>2</sub>-* 'to stand', cf. for the semantics also RV *stíyā-* 'stagnant, quiet water', AV *stīmā-* 'sluggish, slow'. Moreover, there is no evidence whatsoever for the suffix *\*-eie-* in *styāyate*. The present *styāyate* occurs in Vedic only in AVP 2.39.1 *tat ta āpyāyatām tat te niṣṭyāyatām soma rājan* 'let it (scil. soma-juice) swell up and become coagulated [or become quiet?] for thee, o king Soma', repeated four times in VS(M) 6.15, 38.18 in the form *ta āpyāyatām niṣṭyāyatām* (note that the accentuation *styāyate* given by Mayrhofer in KEWA, s.v., and by Rasmussen, is unattested). Apart from this formula, we only find the gerund *niṣṭyāya* in an unclear passage in TS 6.2.4.1. Since *styāyate* is attested in a fixed collocation, it seems likely that this is a nonce form, parallel to *āpyāyatām*.

In Lubotsky 1990 I gave the following chronology of BL: 1) BL; 2) palatalization of the velars; 3) *\*e, o* > PIIr. *\*a*; 4) merger of the laryngeals. If the compounds in *-jāni-* are to be explained in the way described above, vocalization of laryngeals in the final syllable must

precede BL. At p. 27, fn. 98, V. writes: "Wie Lubotsky auf die Reihenfolge von 1 und 2 kommt, ist nicht klar". The order of BL and palatalization is based on the fact that palatalization as a phonemic process is simultaneous with the merger of *e*, *o* in PIIr. \**a* (i.e. 2=3). In other words, we cannot know when the phonetic palatalization started, but it became phonemic at the moment when the conditioning factor, i.e. the difference between \**e* and \**o*/\**a*, disappeared.

### References

- AiGr.: J. Wackernagel - A. Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik*. Göttingen.
- II/1: J. Wackernagel, *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition*. Nachträge von A. Debrunner. 1957.
- II/2: J. Wackernagel, *Die Nominalsuffixe*, herausg. v. A. Debrunner, 1954.
- Beekes, R.S.P. 1988: *A Grammar of Gatha-Avestan*. Leiden.
- Brugmann, K. 1876: Zur Geschichte der stammabstufenden Declinationen, Erste Abhandlung: Die Nomina auf -*ar*- und -*tar*-. *Curtius' Studien* 9, 361-406.
- 1897: *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, ed. 2. *Erster Band: Einleitung und Lautlehre*. Straßburg.
- Gotō, T. 1988: Review of Jamison 1983. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 31, 303-321.
- Hirt, H. 1913: Fragen des Vokalismus und der Stammbildung im Indogermanischen. *IF* 32, 236-247.
- 1921: *Indogermanische Grammatik II: Der indogermanische Vocalismus*. Heidelberg.
- Hoffmann, K. 1975: *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, ed. J. Narten. Band 1. Wiesbaden.
- Jamison, St.W. 1983: *Function and Form in the -áya-Formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda*. Göttingen. 59
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1927: Les effets du *ə* en indoiranien. *Prace Filologiczne* 11, 201-243.
- Lehmann, W.P. 1952: *Proto-Indo-European phonology*. Austin.
- Lubotsky, A. 1988: *The system of nominal accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden.
- 1989: The Vedic -*aya*-formations. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 32, 89-113.
- 1990: La loi de Brugmann et \**H<sub>3</sub>e*. *La reconstruction des laryngales (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fascicule CCLIII)*. Liège-Paris, 129-136.
- Mayrhofer, M. KEWA: *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. 4 vols. Heidelberg, 1956-1980.
- Melchert, H.C. 1994: *Anatolian historical phonology*. Amsterdam - Atlanta.
- Pedersen, H. 1900: Wie viel laute gab es im indogermanischen? *KZ* 36, 74-110.
- Rasmussen, J.E. 1989: *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck.
- Schmidt, Joh. 1881: Zwei arische *a*-laute und die palatalen. *KZ* 25, 2-179.
- Sihler, A.L. 1980: Review of Kuryłowicz: *Problèmes de linguistique indo-européenne*, Wrocław 1977, *Language* 56, 870-77.
- Zucha, I. 1988: *The nominal stem types in Hittite*. Oxford University Ph.D. dissertation.