

Kenneth SHIELDS  
 Millersville University

## ON THE ORIGIN OF THE BALTIC AND SLAVIC *o*-STEM GENITIVE SINGULAR SUFFIX *\*-ā(d)*

It is well known that Baltic and Slavic languages attest an anomalous genitive singular suffix in the *o*-stems. According to Endzelīns (1971, 134), “the Lithuanian [e.g., *tėvo* ‘father’] and the Latvian [e.g., *tēva* ‘father’] along with the OCS *-a* in the form *duxā* ‘(of the) spirit’ has developed from *-āt* < *-o-at*, although originally this was an ablative ending, cf. Skt. (ablative) *ásvāt* ‘(from the) horse,’ Lat. *lupō(d)* ‘(from the) wolf,’ etc.”<sup>1</sup>

Despite the widely assumed connection of the Balto-Slavic suffix with the ablative of other Indo-European dialects, the vocalism of the desinence remains problematic. Beekes (1995, 192) simply notes without explanation that “Gen. Balto-Slavic has *\*-ā(d)*, which replaces abl. sg. *\*-ō(d)*”, while Szemerényi (1996, 183) asserts that “the Balto-Slavic gen. in Lith. *-o*, Slav. *-a* points in the first instance to *-ā(d)* of which *-ā-* is unexplained”. “Since an analogical origin for *\*-ā-* in the *o*-stem paradigm is unlikely”, Sihler (1995, 269) argues that “the BS evidence raises the possibility that Ital. *-ā(d)* [of the *ā*-stems] is the *o*-stem ending itself, not an imitation of the *o*-stem ending. If this is so, it would not change the usual history of the form in InIr. and Gmc., where the vowel quality is immaterial; in Ital. alone the incongruous *\*-ā(d)* was remodeled as *\*-ō(d)*. This sorting out of endings *\*-ā(d)* and *\*-ō(d)* could be what provided the catalyst for the unique Italic manufacture of a complete set of abl.sg. endings in *-V̄d*”. Schmidt (1992, 53), on the other hand, points out that OCS *-a* is derivable from *\*-ō(d)* and that the Baltic forms may show an analogical reformulation of *\*-ō(d)* on the basis of “the stem vowel *-a-*, nom. sg. *-as*, etc.” He further cites the presence of an *o*-stem genitive singular desinence in *-o* (< *\*-ō(d)*) in Celtiberian (cf. also Erhart 1993, 76) in support of this claim<sup>2</sup>. In this brief paper, I wish to present a somewhat different view of the origin of the Balto-Slavic *o*-stem genitive singular marker in *\*-ā(d)* based on some recent research of mine regarding

<sup>1</sup> Of course, “the Prussian genitive *deiwas* ‘(of) God’ is probably to be compared to Old English *dōmæs* ‘(of the) opinion’ ” (Endzelīns 1971, 134).

<sup>2</sup> Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1995, 330–332) adopt a similar position regarding the Balto-Slavic suffixes.

Indo-European noun morphology in general and the *o*-stem genitive singular in particular. In the course of my presentation, I hope to account for all the seemingly disparate pieces of evidence provided by a range of Indo-European dialects.

For many years I have conducted a great deal of my scholarship (e.g., 1982a, 1991, 1991/2, 1992, 1995, 1996, 1997a, 1997b, 1998, 1999a, 1999b, 2000, Forthcoming a, Forthcoming b) within the context of what Adrados (1992, 1) calls “the new image” of Indo-European morphology – the theoretical viewpoint that the inflectional complexity associated with the traditional Brugmannian reconstruction of Indo-European should be ascribed only to developments within the period of accelerated dialectal differentiation. In regard to noun declension, Adrados (1985, 31) thus asserts that “ohne Zweifel gab es im PIE keinen Plural” (cf. also Lehmann 1974, 201–202), while Lehmann (1993, 154) maintains that “the evidence in the Anatolian languages supported by that in dialects like Germanic ... indicates that we cannot assume the set of inflections for eight cases ... that have traditionally been posited on the basis of Sanskrit” and that “the cases expressing adverbial relationships (instrumental, dative, ablative, locative, and the genitive in some uses) are late”, belonging to developments in “late Proto-Indo-European and the individual dialects” (1958, 182–183). The lack of an obligatory non-singular number category in nouns into the dialects themselves is evidenced by such data as the variety in attested non-singular inflectional suffixes and the variable number specification of non-singular suffixes within dialects (e.g., the Hittite genitive suffixes *-an* and *-aš*); and the combined genitive-ablative function of the *o*-stem desinence *\*-ā(d)* of Balto-Slavic<sup>3</sup> speaks not for case syncretism but for the original formal unity of these cases (a unity still widely attested in the consonant stems). The gradual enrichment of the dialectal Indo-European case system came about through the grammaticalization of deictic particles (cf. Markey 1979, 65), or adpreps, whose “original lexical form may remain as an autonomous element”, subject to further linguistic changes, including subsequent grammaticalization (Hopper & Traugott 1993, 116–117).

Another significant theoretical assumption which underlies my proposal regarding the origin of the Balto-Slavic genitive singular marker *\*-ā(d)* is the late emergence of the *o*-stem declension itself. On the basis of the pioneering work of Specht (1947) concerning reconstructed Indo-European vocabulary, Lehmann (1993, 247) emphasizes that “the addition of *e/o* to bases, in the so-called thematic inflection, was a feature of late Proto-Indo-European and the early dialects”. Brosman (1998, 65), too, maintains that “the origin of the *o*-stems was more recent than that of the other Proto-Indo-European nominal classes apart from distinctively feminine forms” –

---

<sup>3</sup> As Endzelīns (1971, 132) notes, in the Baltic languages “the genitive has taken over the function of the ablative case (just as in the Slavic languages and Greek)”.

a conclusion which he supports by citing “the absence from their paradigm of a quantitative ablaut and a shift of accent”, their distinctiveness “in origin from athematic nouns” manifested through a nominative-accusative neuter singular in *\*-m* as opposed to *\*-∅* elsewhere, and “the extremely small number of precise correspondences between the *o*-stems [of Indo-European Proper] and the *a*-stems of Hittite”. Because of the relative recentness of the *o*-stem declension, it is not surprising that “there is no common IE form for the gen. sg.”, demonstrated by the attested diversity of dialectal forms (cf., e.g., Lat. *-ī*, Skt. *-syo*, Go. *-is* < *\*-eso*) (Burrow 1973, 256).

The grammaticalization of deictic particles as markers of the genitive case is especially well established typologically when one considers the close etymological connection between the expression of genitive and locative functions. Lyons (1968, 500) points out that “in many, and perhaps in all, languages existential and possessive constructions derive (both synchronically and diachronically) from locatives”, and Heine (1997, 85) reaches the same conclusion: “Looking at other languages that have grammaticalized locative constructions, we may say that it would be very surprising indeed if it should turn out that the two were not diachronically related, more precisely, if the possessive meaning were not historically derived from the locative meaning”. Since genitive markers are derivable from deictic particles, it follows that they also bear a close formal relationship to markers of other adverbial cases (especially the dative-locative and instrumental), which also have grammaticalized deictics as etyma, and to demonstrative pronouns, which frequently derive from deictic particles (cf. Brugmann 1911, 311; Markey 1979, 66–67).

Since I have published a number of scholarly pieces (1991, 1997a, 1997b, 2000) which demonstrate the probable etymological relationship between various genitive suffixes of Indo-European and the early dialects and reconstructed deictic elements, I shall provide here only an example or two of such connection and refer the reader to those primary sources. First of all, the genitive singular suffix *\*(e/o)s* widely attested in the athematic stems (e.g., Skt. *-as*, Gk. *-os*, Lat. *-is*) can be related to a deictic of the same form. Although Hirt (1927, 13–14) reconstructs a deictic in *\*se/o* primarily on the basis of the demonstrative in *\*so-* (cf. Skt. *sá[s]*, Gk. *ho*), I argue in Shields (1992, 29) that such evidence as the archaic Hittite enclitic third person singular pronoun *-aš*, an etymological demonstrative (Sturtevant 1933, 198), leads to the reconstruction of *\*(e/o)s* as the etymon of the particle and to the conclusion that *\*so-* constitutes “the contamination of *\*(e/o)s* and the deictic *\*o* [cf. Hirt 1927, 11–12] or ... the thematization of *\*(e/o)s*”. The reconstruction of a particle in *\*(e/o)s* is further supported by its apparent grammaticalization as a locative marker, i.e. *\*-s* (e.g., loc. pl. *\*-su* < *\*-s* + deictic *\*u* [Hirt 1927, 11–12]: Skt. *-su*, Lith. *-su*, OCS *-sb*;

\*-si < \*-s + deictic \*i [Hirt 1927, 11]: Gk. -si). Moreover, the genitive (plural) suffix \*-on (e.g., Hitt. -an [sg./pl.], Lat. -um, Gk. -ōn < \*-o-on, Skt. -ām < \*-o-on) is paralleled by a deictic in \*(e/o)n, with reflexes in “die *n*-Demonstrativa \*no-, \*eno-, \*ono-, \*oino-, \*aino- (e.g., Skt. aná-, OCS onъ, Lith. anà-s [Brugmann 1911, 335–336]) and in locative affixes like the Tocharian locative desinences in A -am, B -ne and the Hittite adverb ending -an (e.g., dagan ‘at the bottom’) (Shields 1982b; 1992, 29–30). Less productive genitive suffixes with homophonous deictic elements include the morpheme \*-T (= *t* or *d*), attested in the Hittite demonstrative pronoun genitive desinences -etaš (sg.) and -enzan (pl.), in the Tocharian B genitive singular noun endings -ntse and -mtse (cf. Schmalstieg 1980, 72), and in the Celtiberian genitive singular marker -o (< \*-ō-d). The existence of a corresponding deictic in \*(e/o)T is implied by the demonstrative stem \*to- (e.g., Skt. tá-d, Gk. tó) and by such forms as “lit. tè ‘da,’ gr. tē ‘da, nimm’; dazu l. is-te, abg. kŭto ‘wer’ ” (Hirt 1927, 12). Houwink Ten Cate (1967, 12) posits a parallel locative case ending in \*-t/-d on the basis of the locative suffix found in Old Hittite enclitic possessive pronouns (e.g., a-u-ri-iš-mi-it ‘in your (pl.)/their watchtower’). Recently I have proposed (1997b, 2000) that, within the *o*-stem declension itself, the problematic genitive plural ending -ē of Gothic derives from a deictic in \*ē/ō (Hirt 1927, 11) and that the genitive singular suffix -ī of Italic (Lat. -ī) and Celtic (OIr. -i) is a reflex of a deictic in \*ī (Hirt 1927, 11)<sup>4</sup>. I should emphasize again that the variability in the number specification of these two desinences is irrelevant in light of the late emergence of the non-singular as an obligatory morpho-syntactic category.

Now Hirt (1927, 12) reconstructs a deictic element in \*ā̃ for the Indo-European proto-language. More recently, Dunkel (1992, 156–157) verifies that Indo-European deictics frequently show such variation in vocalic length. In support of his reconstruction, Hirt (1927, 12) argues: “*a* und *ā* sind als selbständige Partikeln nicht vorhanden. Sie sind aber wohl vorauszusetzen, da *a* in Verbindung mit andern, sonst angetretenden Lauten auftritt, vgl. z.B. gr. *ai* ‘wenn,’ gr. *au* ‘wiederum,’ l. *au-t* ‘oder,’ got. *au-k*, d. *auch* ‘noch dazu,’ l. *ad* ‘zu,’ l. *ab*, gr. *an*, got. *an* usw. ... Ein Pronomen *ā* findet sich im Indischen I. D. Abl. Du. *ā-bhyām*, I. Pl. F. *ā-bhis*, D. *ābhyás*, G. *āsām*, L. *āsú*, das doch wohl auf idg. *ā* zurückgeht.” In Shields (1995) I reconstruct a deictic/demonstrative form in \*ā̃, “attested widely in tradi-

<sup>4</sup> I would suggest that the \*-ō- of the Celtiberian genitive suffix -o may very well be a reflex of the *ō*-variant of the deictic \*ē/ō. As an adverbial case ending, the *o*-stem ablative singular in \*-ōd simply represents a specialization of one of the functions of the older genitive-ablative in \*-ōd. Such specialization was made possible through the appearance of additional exponents of the *o*-stem genitive-ablative case, e.g., \*-ī in the ancestor dialects of Latin and Old Irish.

tionally reconstructed feminine demonstratives (e.g., nom. sg. *\*sā*: Skt. *sā́*, Gk. *hē*, Go. *sō* ...)" (1995, 106), which served to establish pronominal concord in the newly emerging feminine gender of Indo-European Proper. Moreover, in Shields (Forthcoming a, Forthcoming b), I point out that, in light of "the new image" view of Indo-European morphology, there is sufficient evidence to reconstruct a dative-locative case suffix in *\*-ā̃(i)* (cf., e.g., Homeric Greek athematic infinitives in *-ai*) as a co-existing alternate of more productive dative-locative markers in *\*-ei* (< *\*-e* + *\*-i*) and *\*-i* (cf., e.g., dat. sg. *\*-ei*: Osc. *-ei*, Lat. *-ī*, OCS *-i*; loc. sg. *\*-i*: Skt. *-i*, Lat. *-e*) and that *\*-ā̃(i)* itself derives from the grammaticalization of the deictic particle *\*ā̃* in sometime contamination with the deictic particle *\*i*.

Therefore, I believe it is reasonable to propose that the deictic particle in *\*ā̃* also was subject to grammaticalization as a genitive marker in the late-emerging *o*-stem declension and was subsequently contaminated with the functionally equivalent suffix *\*(e/o)T*. This particular manifestation of such a process of grammaticalization is attested, of course, in the Balto-Slavic genitive in *\*-ād*. Thus, although the genitive marker *\*-ād* is very limited in its dialectal distribution, this desinence results from a very common developmental principle which widely affected the *o*-stems and other declensional classes in Indo-European and the early dialects.

## DĖL BALTŲ IR SLAVŲ KALBŲ *o* KAMIENO VIENASKAITOS KILMININKO SUFIKSO *\*-ād* KILMĖS

### *Santrauka*

Baltų ir slavų kalbų *o* kamieno gen. sg. sufikso *\*-ād* kilmė aiškinama remiantis „naujuoju požiūriu“ į ide. morfologiją. Teigiama, kad šis sufiksas atsirado gramatikalizuojant deiktinę dalelytę *\*a*, kuri kontaminavosi su deiktine dalelyte *\*(e/o)T*. Taip susiformavo vienas iš vėlesnės nominalinės paradigmos fleksinių elementų. Dėstomą aiškinimą remia tai, kad toks procesas yra patikimas tipologiškai ir dažnas ide. kalbose bei ankstyvosiose tarmėse.

### REFERENCES

- Adrados, F., 1985, Der Ursprung der grammatischen Kategorien des Indoeuropäischen, – Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte, B. Schlerath & V. Rittner, eds., Wiesbaden, 1–52.
- Adrados, F., 1992, The New Image of Indoeuropean: A History of a Revolution, – Indogermanische Forschungen, XCVII, 1–28.
- Beekes, R. S.P., 1995, Comparative Indo-European Linguistics, Amsterdam etc.
- Brosman, P., 1998, On the Origin of the PIE *o*-Stems, – Folia Linguistica Historica, XIX, 65–78.

- Brugmann, K., 1911, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, II 2, Strassburg.
- Burrow, T., 1973, The Sanskrit Language, Rev. ed., London.
- Dunkel, G., 1992, Die Grammatik der Partikeln, – Rekonstruktion und Relativ Chronologie, R. Beekes, A. Lubotsky & J. Weitenberg, eds., Innsbruck, 153–177.
- Endzelīns, J., 1971, Comparative Phonology and Morphology of the Baltic Languages, trans. by W. Schmalstieg & B. Jēgers, The Hague.
- Erhart, A., 1993, Die indogermanische Nominalflexion und ihre Genese, Innsbruck.
- Gamkrelidze, T. & V. Ivanov, 1995, Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans, trans. by J. Nichols, Berlin etc.
- Heine, B., 1997, Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework, Chicago.
- Hirt, H., 1927, Indogermanische Grammatik, III, Heidelberg.
- Hopper, P. & E. C. Traugott, 1993, Grammaticalization, Cambridge.
- Houwink Ten Cate, P., 1967, The Ending *-d* of the Hittite Possessive Pronouns, – *Revue Hittite et asianique*, XXIV, 123–132.
- Lehmann, W., 1958, On Earlier Stages of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection, – *Language*, XXXIV, 179–202.
- Lehmann, W., 1974, Proto-Indo-European Syntax, Austin.
- Lehmann, W., 1993, Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics, London.
- Lyons, J., 1968, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, Cambridge.
- Markey, T. L., 1979, Deixis and the *u*-Perfect, – *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, VII, 65–75.
- Schmalstieg, W., 1980, Indo-European Linguistics: A New Synthesis, University Park.
- Schmidt, K. H., 1992, Contributions from New Data to the Reconstruction of the Proto-Language, – *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures*, E. Polomé & W. Winter, eds., Berlin etc., 35–62.
- Shields, K., 1982a, Indo-European Noun Inflection: A Developmental History, University Park.
- Shields, K., 1982b, The Origin of the Tocharian Locative Suffixes, – *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, CII 1, 129–131.
- Shields, K., 1991, Comments about the *o*-Stem Genitive of Indo-European, – *Historische Sprachforschung*, CIV, 52–62.
- Shields, K., 1991/2, The Emergence of the Non-Singular Category in Indo-European, – *Lingua Posnaniensis*, XXXIV, 75–82.
- Shields, K., 1992, A History of Indo-European Verb Morphology, Amsterdam etc.
- Shields, K., 1995, On the Origin of the Indo-European Feminine Gender Category, – *Indogermanische Forschungen*, C, 101–108.
- Shields, K., 1996, Old High German 1<sup>st</sup> Pl. *-mēs*, – *International Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis*, I, 283–292.
- Shields, K., 1997a, On the Origin of the Slavic Pronominal Genitive Singular Ending *-go*, – *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics*, XLI, 83–91.
- Shields, K., 1997b, The Gothic Genitive Plural in *-ē* Revisited, – *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures*, IX, 239–249.
- Shields, K., 1998, The ‘New Image’ of Indo-European Morphology and the Origin of Latin 2<sup>nd</sup> Plural Deponent-Passive *-minī*, – *General Linguistics*, XXXVI, 131–140.
- Shields, K., 1999a, Germanic Dative Personal Pronouns in *\*-s*, – *Folia Linguistica Historica*, XX, 25–35.
- Shields, K., 1999b, Sanskrit Dative Singular *-āya* and Its Indo-European Connections, – *Historische Sprachforschung*, CXII, 26–31.

Shields, K., 2000, Indo-European *o*-Stem Genitives in \*-ī, – *Lingua Posnaniensis*, XLII, 145–150.

Shields, K., Forthcoming a, On the Origin of the Old Hittite Directive, – *Historische Sprachforschung*.

Shields, K., Forthcoming b, Some Comments about the Indo-European Dative Singular, – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia*.

Sihler, A., 1995, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, New York etc.

Specht, F., 1947, *Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination*, Göttingen.

Sturtevant, E., 1933, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Philadelphia.

Szemerényi, O., 1996, *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Oxford.