

E. P. HAMP

***DMÓS > *[?NMÉS]**

On rereading my note on *nāmas, namiē* (Baltistica XVI(1) 1980, 44) I realize only now that I failed to formulate precisely how I envision **déms* → **dmós* > **nmés* would have passed through an interstage **[?nmés]*. Moreover, I realize now that there exist two possible paths of development, each plausible by criteria of the standard phonetic literature but only one of which is to be preferred in the context of the systematic phonological changes in early Baltic which I have proposed as being relevant. I apologize to my readers for this oversight and negligent imprecision.

To make my formulation explicit I present the assumed developments in terms of the relevant phonetic parameters using a notation and mode of display which I adopted in my article cited from *CLS Book of Squibs* (1977) 46–8. In this notation + = closed, and – = open.

It is possible to consider a development as follows:

	*[d m V] > *[d n m V] > *[? n m V] > *[nmV]											
alveolar	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	
labial	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	
velic	+	–	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	
glottal	(+)	–	–	(+)	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	

In ordinary language, this means that there would first have occurred a velic opening (inducing homorganic nasality), then a substitution of glottal for velic closure, and finally omission of the non-distinctive glottal stop. The first event would reflect a fault in phasing.

But a better sequence would be the following:

	*[d m V] > *[? d m V] > *[? n m V] > *[nmV]											
alveolar	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	
labial	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	
velic	+	–	+	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	+	
glottal	(+)	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	

This hypothesis assumes that the first event was a change in phasing, whereby the glottal opening occurred first. The second event, which comprises continuous opening of the velic, has the appearance at first glance of a simple assimilation; and indeed phonetically it may be so regarded. But in terms of the systematic phonology, this event may equally be regarded as a blockage of the interpretation of *[ʔ n] as [(ʔ) d] in the presence of [+ nasal] of *m*. Thus the first is a purely articulatory event, while the second is crucially a perceptual event, i. e. a change rooted in perception.

It is the recognition of the rôle of perception in this change that enables us to relate it to the developments leading to *devynì* and *debesis*, and that in turn permits the integration of this development of *nãmas* into the known history of Baltic. In this way our formulations reach greater generalization; and at the same time that we gain a deeper understanding of the mechanisms at work we obey the precept of Occam.