Linguistic Inquiry

Volume 10, Number 2
Spring, 1979
10(2) 4/79 (179–369) ISSN 0024–3892

Lachmann's Law seems to defy a rule formulation in exclusively phonological or morphological terms. Rather, it is clear that the simultaneity of phonological conditioning (root final voiced consonant) and morphological conditioning (perfect passive participle and related formations) must be incorporated in a formulation like (11):

$$(11)\quad V \rightarrow [+\text{long}] \;/\; \underset{[(+\text{voi})]}{\overset{C}{\_\_\_\_}} + \begin{bmatrix} +\text{affix} \\ +\text{perfect} \\ (-\text{active}) \end{bmatrix}$$

The truly morphophonemic (morphophonological) nature of Lachmann's Law was already stressed by Kuryłowicz (1968), and it forms the basis of the most detailed study of this Latin phenomenon, by Strunk (1976).[2]

References

Klausenburger, J. (1976) "(De)-morphologization in Latin," *Lingua* 40, 305–320.

Klausenburger, J. (1979) *Morphologization: Studies in Latin and Romance Morphophonology*, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen.

Kuryłowicz, J. (1968) "A Remark on Lachmann's Law," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 72, 295–299.

Perini, M. A. (1978) "The Latest Note on Lachmann's Law," *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 144–146.

Strunk, K. (1976) *Lachmann's Regel für das Lateinische*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Watkins, C. (1970) "A Further Remark on Lachmann's Law," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74, 55–65.

[2] For the integration of Lachmann's Law into a theory of morphologization, as an SM (semimorphological) rule, see Klausenburger (1979, 4.2). Lachmann's Law is anomalous as an SM, however, since "it does not come from phonology." The SM phase seems to be both the beginning and the end in this evolution.

Lachmann's Law Once Again

Brian Joseph,
University of Alberta

In a squib in a recent issue of this journal, Perini (1978) argues that Lachmann's Law, the diachronic process by which the root vowel of certain Latin verbs was lengthened in the passive perfect forms,[1] was not the result of a rule-addition to the grammar of Latin, as is generally supposed. Rather, he argues that "the diachronic process traditionally termed 'Lachmann's Law' was . . . the simplification of a previously existing rule"

[1] See Perini (1978) for references about Lachmann's Law. His Watkins (ms.) is available as Watkins (1971).

(p. 145), i.e. the minor rule (1),

$$(1) \quad V \rightarrow [+\text{long}] \; / \; \_\_\_\; C_0 + \begin{bmatrix} +\text{affix} \\ +\text{perfect} \\ +\text{active} \end{bmatrix}$$

which lengthened certain root vowels in the active perfect, e.g. *lēgit* 'he read' (vs. present *legit*), was simplified by the deletion of the single feature [+active],

$$(2) \quad V \rightarrow [+\text{long}] \; / \; \_\_\_\; C_0 + \begin{bmatrix} +\text{affix} \\ +\text{perfect} \end{bmatrix}$$

thereby allowing the lengthening to apply to all perfect forms, including the passive perfect.

But, if the motivation for the change was nothing more than the desire for a simpler rule, why did speakers of Latin simplify the rule in the way Perini claims, and not in some other way? For example, why was the feature [+active] dropped and not the feature [+perfect], even though an equally simple rule would have resulted in either case?

The real motivation for the change seems to be the surface pressures noted by Watkins (1971) and quoted by Perini (p. 145):

> (3) [The root vowel in the passive perfect is lengthened] where the lengthening of the root vowel is the distinctive mark of the perfect vis-à-vis the present.

It is clear that dropping the feature [+perfect] from rule (1) would *not* create a distinctive marking for the perfect forms. Under such circumstances, the root vowel would be lengthened in all relevant active forms with an affix, thus making third person singular present forms, for example, identical with third person singular perfect forms (e.g. both ending up as *lēgit*). Thus, trying to account for the change without reference to the surface effects obscures the motivation behind the change.

Perini's account may in fact be the proper formalization of these processes for a synchronic grammar of Latin, and thus may provide the correct framework in which to determine the differences between the grammars of two successive stages of Latin. However, under his account, the fact that the change took place in one direction and not in some conceivable alternative direction is wholly accidental. Recognizing the surface pressures involved in this phenomenon, as Watkins (1971) did, provides a motivation for the direction of the change. Thus, it seems that the proper way of viewing "Lachmann's Law" is to take it as being *caused* by certain surface pressures, and

ONCE A
LAW
Laurenc
Stanf

only indirectly reflected in the grammar as a formal rule simplification.[2]

References

Andersen, H. (1973) "Abductive and Deductive Change," *Language* 49, 765–793.

Jeffers, R. (1974) "On the Notion 'Explanation' in Historical Linguistics," in J. M. Anderson and C. Jones, eds., *Historical Linguistics II. Theory and Description in Phonology. (Proceedings of the First International Conference on Historical Linguistics)*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 231–255.

Joseph, B. (1975) "Laryngeal Before i/u in Greek: The Role of Morphology in Diachronic Change," in R. E. Grossman, J. L. Sam, and T. Vance, eds., *Papers from the Eleventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 319–328.

Perini, M. A. (1978) "The Latest Note on Lachmann's Law," *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 144–146.

Watkins, C. (1971) "A Further Remark on Lachmann's Law," in M. Tsiapera, ed., *Generative Studies in Historical Linguistics*, Linguistic Research, Inc., Edmonton, Alberta.

[2] See Joseph (1975) for a discussion of a similar situation in the prehistory of Greek. Jeffers (1974, especially 235–239) and Andersen (1973, especially 766–767) have further interesting remarks on the explanatory power of generative formalism with respect to historical phonological and morphological change.

Once Again Lachmann's Law

Laurence Stephens, Stanford University

For over a century, Lachmann's Law (which can trace its ancestry back to Aulus Gellius, *ob*. 175 A.D.) has been the subject of almost continuous debate. For Indo-Europeanists the controversy was "Lautgesetz oder Analogie?" Up to Kuryłowicz (1968) the predominant analysis (despite the early dissent of Osthoff (1884, 113) and later of Kent (1928)) was that the long vowels in the perfect passive participles (PPP) and related forms of Latin verbs having etymological voiced root-final obstruents arose through a natural phonetic process after an analogical restoration of voicing created the conditioning environment. To take *legō* 'I choose' as an example, the inherited PPP **lektos* is assumed to have been changed to **legtos* (**leg+tos*). Such forms then became subject to two sound changes: first, the vowel preceding the newly voiced obstruent