

Eric P. HAMP

THE NOMINATIVE SINGULAR OF *r*-STEMS

Witold Mańczak<sup>1</sup> will perhaps be somewhat relieved to learn that I now no longer believe that the truly original PIE form of the nominative singular was *\*-ē*. But I continue to find it much too costly a solution to choose immediately the route of independent innovations in the separate branches, even if it were only in Balto-Slavic and Indo-Nuristani-Iranian that we needed the solution. *Entia non multiplicanda sunt...* Moreover, we must first bend every effort to relate the behaviour of these kindred branches and also that of the partially identical *r*- and nasal-stems. Only if our reasoning meets with direct empirical or principled refutation may we abandon a unified explanation. Secondly, I cannot on principle subscribe to an argument of irregularity; in the spirit of Leskien, which continues today also in properly understood variationist theory, I insist that we must discover the intersecting context which conserves the principle of regularity.

Mańczak will see<sup>2</sup> that I find the most inclusive and explanatory formulation of the relevant phenomena to be the assumption that pre-IE *\*-VRs* > *\*-V:R*, that with recessive accent the vocalism surfaced as *\*o*, and that when not oxytone the final resonant in these overlong PIE syllables dropped. The way was then open for dialects (e. g. Helleno-Armenian) to restore the final *\*-R*, as I have stated elsewhere, either from *\*-é:R* or from the underlying lexical *\*R*. The condition remaining to be specified is the retraction of the accent in *\*bhráHte:*, i. e. *\*bhráHter-*, guaranteed by Indic, Greek, and Germanic.

Baltic and Slavic, on the other hand, generalized the form in *\*-e:* without *\*-r* regardless of the accent.

I do not agree at all with the explanations offered for Slavic *brat* and *bratrъ*. Of course, *brat* cannot be a simple reduction of *bratrъ*, at least if we are to preserve any notion of regularity and orderly explanation. I contend that we must here bear in mind two important facts: the merger in the Slavic kinship system of the surface

<sup>1</sup> See W. Mańczak, Ancien Prussien *brote*, *brāti*, *duckti*, – Baltistica, XXVIII (2), 1993, 55–63.

<sup>2</sup> From: The Germanic *r*-stem nominative singular, – Historische Sprachforschung, 103, 1990, 102–103; Albanian *dhē* ‘earth’, – Ibid., 289–92.

terms for 'sibling' and 'cousin', and the parallel anomaly to *bratrē* found in *sestrá*. The last two must be in origin perfectly regular adjectival or appurtenance formations, *\*bhrātr-o-s* and *\*sesr-ā́*, just as I have claimed for Albanian *motrë* 'sister' < *\*mātr-ā*. The Slavic semantics and duplicate form is founded on the merger in kinship terminology, while the Albanian lexical displacement (and truncation of a noun phrase) arises from the social structure and terminology of a Southeast European village<sup>3</sup>. Thus only *brat* is to be derived ultimately from *\*bhráHte*: itself.

In discussing the Indic (and Iranian), as well as the Armenian, reflexes of 'daughter', Mańczak gives no consideration to the important Prasun and Nuristani forms that I have discussed<sup>4</sup>. Besides, his picture of the Armenian side is incomplete; and he fails to take account of the important new Gaulish evidence in *duxtir*, not to mention Old Irish *Der-*, on which see MSS 33, 1975, 39–40.

Mańczak's assumption that my argument has any connexion with Bartoli's lateral areas is totally misplaced.

---

<sup>3</sup> See E. P. H a m p , *Alb. vajzë, motrë*, – *Studi Albanologici Balcanici, Bizantini e Orientali in onore di Giuseppe Valentini S. J.*, edd. C. M. Roncaglia & G. B. Pellegrini, Firenze, 1986, 109–10.

<sup>4</sup> Szemerényi's argument on the duplication of laryngeal reflex has no force since precisely that is found in Indic *máhi* = Greek μέγα.