Kenneth SHIELDS, Jr. (Millersville)

SOME COMMENTS
ABOUT THE INDO-EUROPEAN DATIVE SINGULAR

Among more traditionally minded Indo-Europeanists today, the form of the dative singular suffix reconstructed for the Indo-European proto-language is well established – *-ei* (with "an alternate in *-oi* … limited to a single category: the encl. dat.sg. of the 1st and 2nd person and reflexive pronouns, **moy*, **toy*, **soy*, which appear to be roots in **m-*, **t-*, **s-* with ending *-oy*" [Sihler 1995: 251]), cf. Szemerényi (1996: 160) and Beekes (1995: 173). However, as Szemerényi (1996: 166, n. 4) points out, such conclusive agreement is relatively recent since "the ending *-ai* [was] once almost universally accepted" (cf. Brugmann 1904: 383, Hirt 1927: 51, and Prokosch 1938: 234). The possibility of ascribing to Indo-European both *-ei* and *-ai* as dative singular desinences has been proposed by Solmsen (1911: 165-167), who sees the two as functionally specialized variants: *-ai* served as a goal (directional) case marker which also denoted purpose and *-ei* was the primary exponent of dative function.[1] In this brief paper I wish to pursue the suggestion that co-existing variants in *-ai* and *-ei* were indeed exponents of the dative singular but that they were without real functional differentiation. I offer this hypothesis within the context of some recent proposals about Indo-European morpho-syntax.

According to the tenets of what Adrados (1992: 1) has termed the "new image of Indo-European morphology," the inflectional structure of the proto-language was much simpler than assumed by traditional Brugmannian recon-struction (cf. also Lehmann 1958, 1993, Erhart 1970, 1993, Fairbanks 1977, Shields 1982, 1992). As far as noun declension is concerned, proponents of the "new image" maintain that the development of the so-called adverbial cases is an especially late, gradual phenomenon, characteristic of the period of accelerated dialectal differentiation (cf. Lehmann 1958, 1993: 151-155, Shields 1982: 33-62). Even traditional theorists like Beekes (1995: 173) feel comfortable in asserting that "the dative and the locative were probably in orgin one case" (cf.

---

[1]   This assessment has served as the basis for identifying *-ai* as the etymon of the Hittite directive suffix *-a*, cf. Dunkel (1994: 20).

also Kuryłowicz 1964: 195-196, Adrados 1987). This conclusion is supported, for example, by such evidence as the fact "that the distinction in Hittite of a locative and a directive or terminative, insofar as it existed, is secondary, an intent that never managed to prevail at best" (Adrados 1987: 29) and that the so-called locative suffix *-i is attested with dative function in Greek, Germanic, and Baltic (Erhart 1993: 25). Moreover, Aristar (1996: 208-209) demonstrates, through cross-linguistic comparison, that "the development of a dative from an earlier locative" represents a "typological trend."

The enrichment of the late, dialectal Indo-European case system was accomplished through the grammaticalization of deictic particles as inflectional suffixes.[2] As Markey (1979: 65) explains, "At an early stage of Indo-European deictic markers constituted the formal indication of grammatical categories expressing time, place and person." It was quite natural then for such deictics (or "spatial" adpreps) to evolve into adverbial case endings "when selected postpositions came to be affixed to noun stems" (Lehmann 1993: 154). This process of grammaticalization also receives firm support from typological studies (cf. Heine, Claudi & Hünnemeyer 1991: 167). "Inherent in such proposals about the gradual development of the Indo-European case system is the idea that new oppositions of cases were created by means of the specialization of morphemic variants – a process which Fairbanks (1977: 116-120) terms 'fission.' That is, the polymorphy ["die Tatsache, dass in einer Sprache immer wieder verschiedene Formen für dieselbe Funktion verwendet werden" (Wandruska 1969: 218)] which was present in the case system gave rise to additional formal case categories through the specialization of markers as exponents of original secondary functions of single case categories" (Shields 1999: 27-28). However, such polymorphy did not always result in specialization; variants could continue to co-exist with varying degrees of productivity. Ultimately, one dialect could generalize one variant at the expense of others, while another dialect could generalize still another variant (cf. the dialectal distribution of *-m and *-bh in the instrumental plural, e.g., Skt. -bhis, Lith. -mis); but multiple forms for the same case function within the same dialect remained common (e.g., dat. sg. Go. hana 'rooster' < *-i, mis 'me' < *-s).

Now the locative singular desinence in *-i (Skt. -i, Gk. -i, Lat. -e) can easily be related to a deictic particle in *i, reconstructed on the basis of such forms as "gr. i-dé 'und,' 1. i-bi 'hier,' 1. i-ta 'so,' i-tidem, ai. i-há 'hier,' ai. i-va 'wie,' ai. i-ti 'so,' ai. i-d hervorhebende Partikel" (Hirt 1927: 11). Because of the close etymological connection between deictic particles and demonstrative pronouns (Brugmann 1911: 311), it is not unexpected that a demonstrative stem

---

[2]   Adrados (1987) posits a very different process for the derivation of such inflectional suffixes. In his view they result from the reanalysis of "the ends of pure stems which later, at times, became independent and were applied to other stems" (37).

in *i- can be ascribed to Indo-European (e.g., nom. sg. Lat. *is*, Go. *is*, Lith. *jìs*). A far less widely distributed locative ending in *-*e* is evident in Balto-Slavic (e.g., Lith. *rañkoj-e*, OCS *imen-e* 'name'), and a corresponding deictic in *e can similarly be attributed to Indo-European. Hirt (1927: 10-11) says: "Idg. *e* erscheint als Verbalpräfix, namentlich als Augment (gr. *é-pheron*, ai. *á-bharam* 'ich trug') ... und in ai. *a-sáu* 'jener,' gr. *e-keĩ* 'dort,' wohl auch in gr. *ei* 'wenn,' eig. 'da' < *e* + *i*, vielleicht auch *é-ti* 'ferner,' l. *et* 'und.' *e*- hat sich im Aind. Gen. *a-sya*, D. *a-smāi*, im Germ. ahd. *e-s*, *imu*, im Umbr. Dat. *e-smei* durch Antritt von andern Partikeln zum Pronomen entwickelt." In my view (Shields 1999), the dative singular suffix *-*ei* (e.g., Osc. *-ei*, Lat. *-ī*, OCS *-i*) represents a contamination of the particles *e and *i – a development implied by the attested contamination of these particles apart from their use in case function. Moreover, I argue there (Shields 1999) that the *-ya* element of the Sanskrit dative singular desinence *-ā-ya* is a reflex of the contamination of the same morphemes, but in reverse order, i.e., *i + *e. Although the suffixes *-*i* and *-*ei* may at some point have been integrated into emerging patterns of ablaut, I nevertheless ascribe their origin to distinctly morphological, not apophonic, processes.

It is significant that Hirt (1927: 12) reconstructs a deictic particle in *$ă$ for Indo-European. According to Dunkel (1992: 156-157), Indo-European deictic particles commonly show such long- and short-vowel variants. In support of his reconstruction, Hirt (1927: 12) says: "*a* und *ā* sind als selbständige Partikeln nicht vorhanden. Sie sind aber wohl vorauszusetzen, da *a* in Verbindung mit andern, sonst antretenden Lauten auftritt, vgl. z.B. gr. *ai* 'wenn,' gr. *aũ* '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-bhyám*, I. Pl. F. *ā-bhís*, D. *ābhyás*, G. *āsấm*, L. *āsú*, das doch wohl auf idg. *ā* zurückgeht." In Shields (1995), I construct an hypothesis about the origin of the Indo-European Proper (non-Anatolian Indo-European) feminine gender category in light of recent typological studies of the evolution of gender categories – an hypothesis which lends additional support to the reconstruction of a demonstrative in *$ā$. According to both Corbett (1991: 310) and Greenberg (1978), demonstratives play a key role in "the rise of gender systems" since they manifest concord with nouns both as anaphora and as attributive modifiers. Thus, in my opinion, "a deictic/demonstrative in *$ā$, attested widely in traditionally reconstructed feminine demonstratives (e.g., nom. sg. *$sā$: Skt. *sấ*, Gk. *hē*, Go. *sō*; *$tā$: Lith. *tà*, OCS *ta*; Lat. *ha-ec*, *ista*; Skt. *kấ*; OCS *ona*), happened to be homophonous with 'the stem element in a group of nouns, including $g^wenā$ 'woman,' which possessed natural female reference. However, since gender "classification starts with the demonstrative and only sometimes ends up in the noun" (Greenberg 1978: 80), the appearance of female-marking *-*ā* in nouns was not sufficient for a feminine gender category to arise' (Shields 1995: 106).

It was only the subsequent reanalysis of the deictic/demonstrative as an expo-
nent of the feminine category and as possessing a concord relationship (anapho-
ric and attributive) to nouns in *-ā which ultimately led to the establishment of
the feminine gender in Indo-European Proper" (Shields Forthcoming).[3]

Since Indo-European did indeed have a deictic in *ā̆, since that deictic
could have easily played a role similar to that of *i and *e in the development of
adverbial (specifically dative-locative) cases, and since polymorphy is a natural
and well attested result of the grammaticalization of deictics in the appearance
of Indo-European adverbial cases, it seems to me that co-existing inflectional
variants involving both *-e, *-i and their contamination and *-ā̆ can be posited
for the dative-locative case in late Indo-European and the early dialects. As a
locative case morpheme, *-a may very well show reflexes in "fossilized" adver-
bial forms like Gk. háma 'at the same time, at once,' pará 'beside,' and – in
contamination with the particle *i – khamaí 'on the ground' (Sihler 1995: 348)
and paraí 'near, beside' (Beekes 1985: 125).[4] In Shields (Forthcoming), I argue
that the deictic *ā̆ in uncontaminated form can serve as the etymon of the Hittite
directive suffix -a since the directive is simply a secondary function of the
locative (cf. Blake 2001: 172). In regard to the desinential use of the contamina-
tion of *-a and *-i, the Homeric Greek athematic infinitives in -ai (a dative-
locative marker) provide more significant testimony (cf. -sai, -sthai). Of course,
these infinitive forms have engendered great debate about the origin and
antiquity of the a-vocalism of their inflection, especially since Greek also attests
fossilized datives in *-ei (e.g., Diwei-philos 'dear to Zeus,' cf. Sihler 1995:
251). However, the fundamental issue underlying this debate has been miscon-
strued – the issue at hand is not which of the two suffixes represents the original
Indo-European dative singular affix, as is commonly asserted (cf. Burrow 1973:
233), but simply if and how it is reasonable to ascribe both to Indo-European
and early dialectal sources. The "new image" view regarding the origin of the
adverbial cases quite reasonably addresses this issue of if and how. Obviously,
the phonological ambiguities inherent in the reflexes of *-ai in many dialects
make it impossible to identify definitively whether these dialects attest *-ei, *-
ai, or both. Thus, in regard to Sanskrit, Thumb and Hauschild (1959: 36) lament
the fact that "im DSg. haben die kons. Stämme durchweg die Endung -e, die auf
idg. -ai oder -ei zurückgeht."[5] However, the independent derivation of *-ai and

---

[3]   See Shields (1982: 63-93) for my views about the origin of the feminine stem-
      elements in nouns.
[4]   Lat. prae is frequently compared to Gk. paraí, although semantic parallels between
      the forms are not perfect (Dunkel 1994: 26-27).
[5]   Similarly, although adverbs like OP semmai 'downward' and Lith. žemaĩ 'low
      down' are cited in support of a dative-locative in *-ai (Beekes 1985: 126), "these
      adverbs prove nothing about the original vowel color since they can just as easily
      reflect an ending *-oi" (Dunkel 1994: 27). However, since, as Sihler (1995: 251)

*-*ei* through established morphological processes renders untenable the objection that the testimony of the Greek forms must be discounted because *-*ai* cannot be related to *-*ei* and *-*i* "by any theory of ablaut" (Sihler 1995: 251). The rejection of the Greek evidence through positing the influence of a laryngeal on an original *e*-vocalism (e.g., Beekes 1985: 126) remains unconvincing to those who hold more conservative views of the number of laryngeal consonants in the Indo-European phonological inventory, and dismissing the antiquity of Greek fossilized adverbs in *-*a(i)* because of the development of vowel harmony between the vowel of the root and the vowel of the suffix (cf. Dunkel 1994: 26-30) is *ad hoc* indeed.

Hock (1991: 597) clearly enunciates a well known maxim in linguistic reconstruction: "it would be a violation of Occam's Razor to reconstruct anything but what is found in the majority of languages." Yet, he is quick to add an important caveat: "unless other evidence requires reconsideration." I believe that the reconstruction of the dative-locative case morpheme of Indo-European must take into consideration such "other evidence" – specifically, current reevaluations of the nature and evolution of the adverbial cases in late Indo-European and the early dialects. Despite the indeterminacy of the data provided by many dialects, there is sufficient evidence to reconstruct a dative-locative suffix in *-*ă(i)*, although it is a far less productive morpheme than the co-existing desinences *-*ei* and *-*i*.

Kenneth Shields, Jr.
Millersville University
P.O. Box 1002
Millersville, PA 17551-0302
USA

References

Adrados, F.
1987. "On the Origins of the Indo-European Dative-Locative Singular Endings", [in:] M. Jazayery & W. Winter (eds.), *A Festschrift in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé*, 29-41, Berlin: de Gruyter.
1992. "The New Image of Indoeuropean: The History of a Revolution", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 97, 1-28.

---

points out, the distribution of the variant *-*oi* appears to be largely limited to the enclitic pronouns, these Baltic forms likely show reflexes of *-*ai*.

Aristar, A.R.
    1996. "The Relationship Between Dative and Locative: Kuryłowicz's Argument From a Typological Perspective", *Diachronica* 13, 207-224.
Beekes, R.S.P.
    1985. *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
    1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*, Amsterdam & New York: Benjamins.
Blake, B.
    2001. *Case*, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Brugmann, K.
    1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Strassburg: Trübner.
    1911. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Vol. 2.2, Strassburg: Trübner.
Burrow, T.
    1973. *The Sanskrit Language*, Rev. ed., London: Faber & Faber.
Corbett, G.
    1991. *Gender*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dunkel, G.
    1992. "Die Grammatik der Partikeln", [in:] R. Beekes, A. Lubotsky & J. Weitenberg (eds.), *Rekonstruktion und Relative Chronologie*, 153-177, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
    1994. "The IE Directive", [in:] G. Dunkel, G. Meyer, S. Scarlata & C. Seidl (eds.), *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch*, 17-36, Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
Erhart, A.
    1970. *Studien zur indoeuropäischen Morphologie*, Brno: Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis Facultas Philosophica.
    1993. *Die indogermanische Nominalflexion und ihre Genese*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
Fairbanks, G.
    1977. "Case Inflections in Indo-European", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 5, 101-131.
Greenberg, J.
    1978. "How Does a Language Acquire Gender Markers?", [in:] J. Greenberg, C. Ferguson & E. Moravcsik (eds.), *Universals of Human Language*, Vol. 3, 47-82, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Heine, B., Claudi, U. & Hünnemeyer, F.
    1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hirt, H.
    1927. *Indogermanische Grammatik*, Vol. 3, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Hock, H.
    1991. *Principles of Historical Linguistics*, 2nd ed., Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Kuryłowicz, J.
    1964. *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Lehmann, W.
    1958. "On Earlier Stages of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection", *Language* 34, 179-202.
    1993. *Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics*, London: Routledge.
Markey, T.L.
    1979. "Deixis and the *u*-Perfect", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 7, 65-75.
Prokosch, E.
    1938. *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*, Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.
Shields, K.
    1982. *Indo-European Noun Inflection: A Developmental History*, University Park: Penn State Press.
    1992. *A History of Indo-European Verb Morphology*, Amsterdam & New York: Benjamins.
    1999. "Sanskrit Dative Singular -*āya* and Its Indo-European Connections", *Historische Sprachforschung* 112, 26-31.
    Forthcoming. "On the Origin of the Old Hittite Directive", *Historische Sprachforschung*.
Sihler, A.
    1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Solmsen, F.
    1911. "Zur Geschichte des Dativs in den idg. Sprachen", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 44, 161-223.
Szemerényi, O.
    1996. *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, 4th ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Thumb, A. & Hauschild, R.
    1959. *Handbuch des Sanskrit*, Pt. 2, 3rd ed., Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Wandruszka, M.
    1969. "Polymorphie und Polysemie", [in:] U. Engel, P. Grebe & H. Rupp (eds.), *Festschrift für Hugo Moser*, 218-232, Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann.