

William R. SCHMALSTIEG

State College, Pennsylvania

## THE COMMON ORIGIN OF THE \*-O STEM DATIVE, ACCUSATIVE AND INSTRUMENTAL CASES

In this paper I shall propose a scenario to explain the origin of the \*-o stem dative, accusative and instrumental singular cases. Sandhi variation depending originally on whether the following word began with a vowel (V) or a consonant (C) created for an etymological single case different realizations which in the course of history adopted different functions. A partial parallel is furnished by the English possessives *my* and *mine*, which now have different functions, although originally the distribution was quite automatic *my* resulting from the preconsonantal sandhi variant and *mine* resulting from the prevocalic sandhi variant (Strang 1970, 198).

I suggest that the \*-o stem dative, accusative and instrumental singular (and in Latin, Greek and Indo-Iranian the neuter nominative singular) all derive from a single inflectional morpheme \*-oN. The accusative singular has retained the etymological pre-vocalic sandhi variant \*-oN, whereas the dative and instrumental singular have, for the most part, adopted the etymological pre-consonantal sandhi variant \*-ō. However, traces of the original \*-oN are encountered in the etymological definite dative singular masculine pronouns (Slavic) *t-om-u*, (Lith:) *t-am-ui* and in the Slavic instrumental singular ending *-omь*, where the old \*-oN- occurs in position before the etymological vowel. Both the Slavic \*-o stem dative singular ending *-ū* and the accusative singular ending *-ь* also derive eventually from varying sandhi developments of etymological \*-oN. For the Slavic dative singular ending I envision the passage of \*-oN + C > \*-un + C > \*-u + C (and with loss of nasalization in stem-stressed paradigms and subsequent generalization of the denasalized form in all paradigms) > -u. This would have a partial parallel in the situation described by Zinkevičius (1966, 77) for certain western Lithuanian dialects (Klaipėda, etc.) in which the genitive plural ending has the variants: *šàk-ũn* or *šàk-ũ* '(of the) branches' (the latter form without the final nasal). According to Zinkevičius, perhaps under the influence of the root-stressed type the second variant is more characteristic of the younger generation and in places in the east has completely ousted the first variant. For the Slavic accusative singular ending *-ь* I envision the passage of \*-oN + C > \*-un + C > \*-un + V > -ь and subsequent generalization to all the \*-o stem paradigms.

The dative plural endings Gothic *-am*, Lith. *-am(u)s*, Slavic *-omъ* bear witness to the morpheme *\*-oN-* in pre-vocalic position before the particle *\*-u-* plus the plural element *\*-s*. The plural element *\*-s* is added directly to the accusative singular *\*-oN* to give *\*-oNs* > (with loss of the nasal and compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel) *\*-ōs* > Lith. *-uos-* (as in *ger-uos-ius* ‘the good’), Lat. *-os*. (I hereby retract my 1967, 51–52 and 1968, 185 notion concerning the origin of the Lithuanian ending.) Thumb-Hauschild (1959, 36) write that the existence of the Old Indic accusative plural ending *-ān(s)* or *-ām(s)* is not evidence for the existence of Indo-European *\*-ōns*. The Old Indic *-ān* is, in their view, rather an analogical lengthening on the basis of the nominative plural *-āḥ*. I suggest that within Indo-European on the basis of the accusative singular *\*-oN* an innovating form *\*-oNs* was recreated which competed with the older form *\*-ōs* (which in turn had derived from an earlier *\*-oNs*). The two competing forms *\*-oNs* and *\*-ōs* may by way of contamination have produced the Old Indic accusative plural mentioned above. The newer ending *\*-oNs* gave Gk. *-ovς* and Slavic *\*-uNs* > *\*-ūs* > *\*-ū* > *-y*. The Slavic *\*-o* stem instrumental and accusative plural ending *-y* both deriving from *\*-oNs*, show thereby the original identity of these cases. Essentially I agree with Mažiulis’ view (1970, 160–161) that both the Lith. dat. sg. (*vilk*)-*uo* and the Lith. instr. sg. (*vilk*)-*ù* are derived from the same Baltic dative *\*-ō* (with a later circumflex in the dative ending). In Mažiulis’ view the Greek situation is somewhat more archaic than the Lithuanian in that the dative and instrumental are still expressed by a single case in Greek. Differently from Mažiulis, however, I would add the accusative singular to this mix.

Probably only the Indo-European *\*-o* stem nouns showed an original morphological difference between the ablative and the genitive. In other stems the genitive case in *-es*, *-os* and *-s* also had ablative meaning (Brugmann / Delbrück 1911, 163–164). The study of Hittite and Tokharian did not alter this conception very much. Hittite has two *\*-o* stem ablative endings, viz., *-az* (possibly derived from the adverbial suffix *\*-tos* and then spread to other stems) and a second one homonymous with the gen. sg. *-aš*, this latter certainly the original ablative undifferentiated from the genitive (Kronasser 1955, 101–103; Sturtevant 1951, 88–89). In Later Avestan also the *-t* of the etymological *\*-o* stem ablative spread to other stems (Reichert 1909, 168; Sims-Williams 1998, 142). The Tokharian A and B ablatives (different from each other) are apparently derived within that language family itself, see van Winkens (1979, 254–256).

I agree with the old suggestion that the ablative ending represented by Old Lat. *-od* and Old Indic *-āt* both derive from the addition of the dental element to the etymological dative-instrumental in *\*-ō* (see Mažiulis 1970, 106 with literature).

Wackernagel and Debrunner (1975, 90–91) note that the Old Indic *\*-o* stem instr. sg. ending *-ena* (which comes from the pronoun) coexists with an apparently earlier ending *-ā*. They write that the fact that *-ā* is old is shown by the fact that it appears in isolated adverbs, e.g., v. *sānā* ‘since ancient times’, from the word *sāna-* ‘old’, *paścā* ‘behind’, cf. also *paścāt*. This last example is interesting, because it is evidence of the derivation of the ablative case from the instrumental. Meillet (1964, 322) wrote: ‘La possession d’une finale d’ablatif singulier distincte de celle du génitif est l’une des caractéristiques du type thématique. Le fait pourrait être dû à la fixation d’une postposition *-d(-t)* indiquant le point de départ, cf. lat. *dē*’. According to Specht (1947, 371): ‘Die Entwicklung wäre dann so vor sich gegangen, dass sich aus dem pronominalen idg. *\*me-d*, *\*tue-d* (= ai. *mat*, *tvat*) eine Endung *-ed* loslöste, die mit dem Stammvokal *e/o* ein *-ēd* oder *-ōd* ergab’. Mažiulis (1970, 104) wrote that both the ablative singular form, e.g., Lat. (*GNAIV*)-*OD* and (*RECT*)-*ED* (adverb) ‘*rectē*’ < *\*-ō/ē* + *\*(o/e)d* and the instrumental singular form, e.g., Lith. (*vilk*)-*ù* (< Lith. *-úo*) or Old Indic (*paśc*)-*ā́* (adverb) ‘behind’ < Indic *\*-ē* derive from Indo-European *\*-ō/ē*. As mentioned above since the ablative is original only in the *\*-o* stem nouns, I propose that the Latin consonant stem ablative in *-ē* is of analogical origin, viz., acc. sg. *servom* ‘slave’: abl. sg. *servō* :: acc. sg. *regem* ‘king’: abl. sg. : x and x = *regē*. Other Latin ablatives are also analogical, see Baldi (1991, 314) and Kühner / Holzweissig (1974, 396).

Mažiulis (1970, 106) writes that the Lith. gen. sg. (*vilk*)-*o* (= Latv. *vilka*, Old Slav. *vlbk-a*) is to be derived not from Indo-European *\*-ōd* but from Indo-European *\*-ō*. According to Mažiulis (1970, 21) stressed Indo-European *\*ō* gave Baltic *ō* which passed to Old Prussian *ō*, Lith. and Latv. *uo* whereas the unstressed variant passed to Lith. *ō* = Latv. *ā*. His suggestion would explain the difference between the Baltic (and Slavic) genitive ending *\*-ā* (Lith. *-o*) and the Baltic dative-instrumental in *\*-ō*. Shields (2001) gives a different explanation for the Baltic *\*-o* stem gen. sg. ending, an explanation which would also explain the difference between this case and the instrumental singular.

The original meaning of the accusative case was extremely broad. Kryško (1997, 252) wrote that A. V. Popov (1881) showed with many examples that the accusative in the Indo-European languages can perform all the functions which other cases perform and showed that the object function of the accusative is the result of the refinement and differentiation of the primary ‘independent’ (circumstantial-defining) meaning of the accusative, the case of the object in the broad sense, indeed, not an object, but a disseminator of the action.

Thus the syntactic accusative meaning is new, one which in my view arose when the old present and / or imperfective intransitive verbs of the old split ergative

stage gained in transitivity and Indo-European became a nominative-accusative language. For example, the original meaning of goal of motion is encountered in the so-called accusative of direction, cf. Lat. *domum ire* (replaced in late Latin by *in (ad) domum*), Gk. οἶκον (δόμον) ἵεναι ‘to go home (to the village)’ (H o f m a n n, S z a n t y r 1972, 49). D e l b r ü c k (1893, 177) gives the examples: *gramam* (acc.) *gacchati* vs. *grāmāya* (dat.) *gacchati* ‘he goes to the village’. These latter sentences furnish a good example of the phonological as well as the morphological differentiation of the etymological ending *\*-om*. The older *\*-om* is reflected in the acc. *gra-m-am* and the newer *\*-ō* is reflected in the dat. *grāmā-ya*, where the particle *-ya* helps distinguish the old semantic dative case from the new syntactic accusative case.

Common in the Indo-European languages is the use of either the accusative or instrumental object of a verb, cf. Old Indic *akṣair* (instr. pl.) or *akṣān* (acc. pl.) *dīvyati* ‘plays dice’ (R e n o u 1984, 292). Likewise many Lithuanian verbs can govern either the accusative or the instrumental case, (see the Lithuanian Academy Grammar, III, 55). In such a pair as *linguoja galva* (instr.) ‘shake the head’ and *linguoja galvą* (acc.) one can see the etymological identity of the accusative and instrumental in the *\*-ā* stem nouns. The nasalization was lost in the instrumental probably in unstressed final position originally. The difference between the instrumental and accusative derives then from different generalizations of ending *\*-aN < \*-āN*. The earlier meaning is reflected in the instrumental case, whereas the later more transitive meaning is reflected in the accusative case. Note the example: *aklai sèkti vadù* (instr.) or *aklai sèkti vādą* (acc.) ‘to follow the leader blindly’ (S e n n / S a l y s 1957, 632). The accusative form *vād-ą* reflects the etymological ending *\*-oN* and the instrumental form *vad-ù* reflects the etymological ending *\*-ō* (etymological sandhi doublet). A split in the case usage occurred after *sèkti* gained in transitivity sufficiently to create an accusative case complement. Essentially a sequence such as *\*sek<sup>w</sup>etoi uod-oN* (acc. sg.) ‘follows the leader’ developed a sandhi doublet *\*sek<sup>w</sup>etoi uod-ō* which was morphologized. The older form phonologically *\*uod-oN* adopts the newer accusative or syntactic meaning. The older meaning is retained in the phonologically more recent *\*uod-ō*. Note that the cognate Old Indic verb *sac-* can be used with different meanings with the accusative, instrumental or dative cases (D e l b r ü c k 1888, 131, 142). The Greek cognate was used with the dative by Homer (Odyssey 11,372): οἱ τοι ἄμ’ αὐτῶ Ἴλιον εἰς ἄμ’ ἔποντο ‘who followed thee to Ilios’, but later with the accusative case (S c h w y z e r 1966, 70).

K r y s ’ k o (1997, 253) writes that the double accusative is a relic showing the polyfunctionality of the accusative case. The double accusative expressions may then have supplied part of the impetus for the differentiation of the cases. The different meanings of the accusative are encountered, for example, in Latin, e.g.,

(archaic) *circumdare murum* (acc.) *urbem* (acc.) ‘to surround the city with a wall’ (H a u d r y 1977, 163). At a later date this would be replaced by *circumdare urbem* (acc.) *muro* (abl.). The Latin ablative *muro* is used here with instrumental meaning. The accusative form *mur-um* reflects the etymological ending *\*-oN* and the ablative form *mur-o* reflects the etymological ending *\*-ō* which derived from an earlier *\*-oN* (etymologically sandhi doublet). This is an example of the morphologization of etymological sandhi doublets.

In Lithuanian we encounter the instrumental case as the second object with the verb ‘to choose’, e.g., *išrinko Urboną seniūnu* (instr.) ‘they chose Urbonas as village elder’ (Lithuanian Academy Grammar, III 37) whereas in a similar construction in Old Indic we find the double accusative: *agnīm* (acc.) *hótāraṃ* (acc.) *prá vr̥ṇe* ‘I choose Agni priest’ (M a c d o n e l l 1916, 304). I propose that the sandhi variant *\*-ō* (> Lith. *-u*) replaced the original *\*-oN* (> Old Indic *-am*), the reflex of which was retained in Old Indic as the accusative case.

H a u d r y (1977, 158) gives the following example of the double accusative from the Rig Veda (10.80.7) *agnīm mahām* (acc.) *avocāmā suvr̥ktīm* (acc.) ‘à Agni nous avons adressé un hymne-bien-tourné’. In this regard Elizarenkova’s Russian translation is instructive: К Агни (dative) обратились мы с великолепной песней (instr.). The prepositions are etymologically secondary so in fact we would have a dative and instrumental replacing the two accusatives of an earlier epoch represented by Old Indic.

According to H a u d r y (1977, 172) Gk. βάλλειν can be translated either by ‘to throw’ or ‘to hit, to reach’. Thus βάλλειν λίθον ‘to throw a stone’ vs. βάλλειν τινὰ λίθῳ ‘to hit, to wound someone with a stone’. I propose that it was just exactly the existence of an original double accusative construction which led to the morphologization of the sandhi alternant *\*-ō* as a dative-instrumental (in Greek later reinforced by the etymological locative ending *\*-i*).

Another syntactic relic is Lat. *tē* (acc.) *litterās* (acc.) *doceō* ‘I teach you letters’ which can be compared with the Georgian example below. T s c h e n k é l i (1958, 5) gives the example: *mama ajlevs švil-s pul-s* ‘The father gives the son the money’ in which both *švil-s* ‘son’ and *pul-s* ‘the money’ are in the dative case. In Georgian the dative with present tense verbs can function both as the marker of the direct and the indirect object. T s c h e n k é l i (1958, 365) writes that typically, but not necessarily, the indirect object is a person and the direct object is a thing. Typologically Georgian is much like what I propose for early Indo-European, viz. dative objects in the present tense and ergative constructions in the aorist and imperfect tenses.

The double accusative with factitive verbs is widely represented in the Indo-European languages, cf., e.g., Old Persian *hya Dārayavaum* (acc.) *xšāyaθiyam* (acc.)

*akunauš* ‘who made Darius king’ (Kent 1953, 80). Old Indic furnishes the example: *tēsām pūṣānam adhipām akarot* ‘he made Pūṣān their lord’ (Macdonell 1916, 304). Compare the Latin example: *Ciceronem* (acc.) *consulem* (acc.) *creaverunt* ‘They made Cicero consul’ (Woodcock 1959, 12). Note that a Russian translation of this might be: *Сделали Цицерона* (acc.) *консулом* (instr.), in which we see an instrumental case replacing an old accusative. Šukys (1976, 83) suggests that the substitution of the instrumental for the accusative in the original double accusative construction is incorrect, viz. the use of *padaryk mane galingu* (instr.) ‘make me powerful’ instead of the correct *padaryk mane galingą* (acc.) is under the influence of neighboring languages. Certainly the double accusative construction is older, but the instrumental might have developed naturally in such constructions with the meaning of ‘in the capacity of, as’, as in Slavic. The Greek sentence with a double accusative: *φίλ-ον* (acc.) *τὸν Φίλιππον* (acc.) *ἠγοῦντο* ‘they considered Philip a friend’ (Brugmann/Delbrück 1911, 631) might be translated into Russian as *считали Филипа* (acc.) *друг-ом* (instr.) < *-омь*. The modern Russian \*-o stem instrumental singular morpheme *-ом* < *-омь* is etymologically, of course, a variant of the same case we see in the Old Persian and Indic accusative *-am* and Gk. *-on*.

The foregoing considerations support the thesis that the dative, instrumental and accusative cases reflect a former morphological identity which was later destroyed by the assignment of different meanings to the various sandhi variants, mostly the accusative to \*-oN and mostly the dative and instrumental to \*-ō.

## IDE. O KAMIENO DATYVO, AKUZATYVO IR INSTRUMENTALIO BENDRA KILMĖ

### *Santrauka*

Indoeuropiečių o kamieno vienaskaitos datyvas, akuzatyvas ir instrumentalis yra kilę iš vienos morfemos \*-oN. Dėl sandžio, nelygu ar kitas žodis prasidėjo balsiu (V) ar priebalsiu (C), iš etimologiškai bendros formos atsirado skirtingų realizacijų, būtent \*-oN + V > \*-ōN + V (t. y. niekas nepakito), bet \*-oN + C > \*-ō + C. Dažniausiai \*-oN tapo vns. akuzatyvo, o \*-ō – vns. datyvo ir instrumentaliao rodikliu.

## REFERENCES

Baldi Ph., 1999, *The foundations of Latin*, Berlin, New York (Trends in linguistics, Studies and monographs, 117).

Brugmann K., B. Delbrück, 1911, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanschen Sprachen*, II 2, Strassburg.

Delbrück B., 1888, *Altindische Syntax*, Halle a.S.

- Haudry J., 1977, *L'emploi des cas en védique*, Lyons.
- Hofmann J. B., A. Szantyr et al., 1972, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Munich.
- Kent R. G., 1953, *Old Persian: Grammar, texts, lexicon*, New Haven (American Oriental Series, XXXIII).
- Kronasser H., 1955, *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*, Heidelberg.
- Krys'ko V., 1997, *Исторический синтаксис русского языка: Объект и переходность*, Moscow.
- Kühner R., F. Holzweissig, 1974, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, I, Hannover, Repr. of 1912 ed.
- Lithuanian Academy Grammar – *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, III. Sintaksė, Vilnius, 1976.
- Macdonell A. A., 1916, *A Vedic grammar for students*, Bombay etc.
- Mažiulis V., 1970, *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai*, Vilnius.
- Meillet A., 1964, *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, University, Alabama, Repr. of 1937 ed.
- Поров А. В., 1881, *Синтаксические исследования*, Воронеж, Non vidi.
- Reichelt H., 1909, *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Renou L., 1984, *Grammaire sanscrite*, Paris.
- Ригведа, Мандалы, IX–X, 1999, Т. Ja. Elizarenkova, translator, Moscow.
- Schmalstieg W. R., 1967, A note on certain Balto-Slavic accusatives, – *Baltistica*, III (1), 47–55.
- Schmalstieg W. R., 1968, The development of common East Baltic word-final *-an*, – *Baltistica*, IV (2), 185–193.
- Schmalstieg W. R., 1997, The origin of the neuter nominative-accusative singular in *\*-om*, – *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, XXV (3/4), 401–408.
- Schmalstieg W. R., 2000, Lithuanian and Indo-European parallels, – *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, XXVIII (3/4), 385–398.
- Schmalstieg W. R., 2001, La triplice origine del nominativo singolare indoeuropeo, – *Res Balticae*, VII, 23–32.
- Schwyzler E., 1966, *Griechische Grammatik*, II. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik, vervollständigt und herausgegeben von A. Debrunner, Munich.
- Senn A., A. Salys, 1957, *Wörterbuch der litauischen Schriftsprache*, III, Heidelberg.
- Shields K., 2001, On the origin of the Baltic and Slavic *o*-stem genitive singular suffix *\*-ād*, – *Baltistica*, XXXVI (2), 165–171.
- Sims-Williams N., 1998, The Iranian languages, – *The Indo-European Languages*, ed. by A. Giacalone Ramat and P. Ramat, London and New York, 125–153.
- Specht F., 1947, *Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination*, Göttingen.
- Strang B., 1970, *A history of English*, London.
- Sturtevant E. H., 1951, *A comparative grammar of the Hittite language*, New Haven and London.
- Šukys J., 1976, *Taisykliai vartokime linksnius*, Kaunas.
- Tschenkéli K., 1958, *Einführung in die georgische Sprache*, Zürich.
- Thumb A., R. Hauschild, 1959, *Handbuch des Sanskrit*, II, Heidelberg.
- Van Windekens A. J., 1979, *Le tocharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*, II 1. La morphologie nominale, Louvain.
- Wackernagel J., A. Debrunner, 1975, *Altindische Grammatik*, III. Nominalflexion-Zahlwort-Pronomen, Göttingen.
- Woodcock E. C., 1959, *A new Latin syntax*, Cambridge.
- Zinkevičius Z., 1966, *Lietuvių dialektologija*, Vilnius.