

Aus der baltoslawischen Lexikologie. II
Vladimir Toporov (Moskau)

Im zweiten Teil seiner der baltoslawischen Lexikologie gewidmeten Forschungsarbeit (der erste ist für die *Festschrift R. Eckert* geschrieben worden) analysiert der Autor folgende baltoslawische lexikalische Parallelen: 1. Baltoslaw. **bald-*; 2. Baltoslaw. **dud-* : **du-n-d*; 3. Slaw. *дылда* / *dylda* und balt. *dilda*; 4. baltische Quellen des russ. *гимзѣть*; 5. Russ. *грымза*, *грымза* im baltischen Kontext.

SOME COMMENTS ON THE BALTO-SLAVIC DATIVE-
INSTRUMENTAL

WILLIAM R. SCHMALSTIEG
University Park, Pennsylvania

In this paper I take the extreme localist position that all case forms have their origin in some locative meaning. Possible exceptions are furnished by the nominative or absolute and the genitive, although I think it can be plausibly argued that even the genitive case is of 'local' origin.

I propose then that in the Indo-European languages etymologically the dative, accusative, instrumental and locative formed a single case. While I appreciate the interesting analyses of Erhart (1993: 75, 80-82), I shall take a position almost diametrically opposite to his with regard to the origin of the Indo-European case system. I propose that originally there were fewer cases in Proto-Indo-European than in the attested Indo-European languages. It is clear that it is always easier to begin with a larger inventory and by positing a series of deletions and mergers to arrive at a smaller inventory. Contrariwise some may consider it more speculative to begin with a smaller inventory of items and to assume a later larger inventory which is the result of a series of phonological, morphological and semantic splits. To posit a smaller inventory would be consistent, however, with Occam's razor: *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*. On the other hand it may be difficult to determine exactly how these later splits and contaminations took place from the phonological, morphological and semantic points of view. The excellent finely nuanced semantic analyses of the Indo-European cases presented by Haudry (1968, 1970 and 1977), show, for example, that the dative expresses an ulterior process as opposed to an existing process expressed by the instrumental (1970: 63). Analyses such as Haudry's seem to me to be correct for the attested Indo-European languages, but it seems to me that case morphology implies an earlier homogeneity of form which contrasts with the later

relative clarity attested in the case meanings in the individual Indo-European languages.

I should like to quote Mažiulis (1970: 81) who wrote that in the earliest epoch of the relationships between the Baltic and Slavic languages the nominal paradigm consisted not of the traditionally assumed seven Indo-European cases, but rather of the nominative, accusative, genitive and dative cases. The half-paradigmatic instrumental and locative cases were drawn into the paradigm considerably later than the Balto-Slavic period.

According to Kuryłowicz (1964: 197): «Maybe there was originally a case-form in **-e* uniting the functions of instr., dat. and abl., whereas the historical forms represent enlargements entailing differentiation (*e + ə, i, s, t*). It can scarcely be an accident that in the dual, which by its origin seems to be a (collective) sing.,... the instr., dat., and abl. are represented by a single case-form: Skt. *-bhyām* = instr.-dat.-abl., Slav. *-ma* = instr.-dat». Note also the interesting suggestion of Matasović (1996: 62) that the Old Irish dative singular of the *-n* stem nouns goes back to **-mi*, a form reminiscent of the Balto-Slavic instrumental singular.

Although I agree with Kuryłowicz's suggestion that there was a single case form uniting the functions of instrumental, dative and ablative, I disagree with him about the form of this (or these) original case ending(s). In addition I would add the accusative and locative to the list having that single form.

I assume that originally a substantive or pronoun supplied with the endings **-m* or **-i* gained a generalized locative notion. The accompanying context gave various nuances to this generalized notion, such that the meanings could be extremely diverse. With these phonological variants plus contaminations with the etymological **-m* and **-i* different forms developed with quite different meanings. Essentially, then, for the most part the consonant stems generalized the **-m* in the accusative and the **-i* in the dative. For the **-o* stem nouns the ending **-om* had the two sandhi variants **-ō* vs. **-om*. In the dative-instrumental-locative meaning these sandhi variants were competing with the ending **-oi*. As a result of a contamination of the endings **-ō* and **-oi* we have the ending **-ōi* (see Erhart 1993: 76-77, although differently from Erhart I do not see a laryngeal in this

ending)¹. In addition to the endings mentioned above we also encounter the ending **-omi*, a contamination of the endings **-om* and **-oi*. We have in sum then the **-o* stem singular cases **-om*, **-ō*, **-omi*, **-ōi*, and the **-a* stem singular cases **-ai*, **-am* (**-ām*).

Where **-om* is followed by a vowel it is retained in the dative singular, cf., e.g., the **-o* stem dat. sg. demonstrative pronoun with reduplicated ending Slavic *t-om-u*, Lith. *t-am-ui*, Gothic *þamma* (see Schmalstieg 1980: 32-33, 44-45). The Slavic **-o* stem dative singular ending *-u* results from a denasalization of **-u̯* which, in turn derives from **-om* (see Schmalstieg 1983: 73). One could imagine a situation somewhat similar to that described by Zinkevičius (1966: 77) for certain western Lithuanian dialects (Klaipėda, etc.) in which the genitive plural ending has the variants: *šāk-ūn* or *šāk-ū'* (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. There is even a third variant with a final *-m*, *šāk-ūm*, which is assumed to be a result of a generalization of the form which occurred before a labial *p* or *b*. One could imagine a similar situation for Slavic in which the **-ā* stem accusative singular originally retained the nasalization of the ending **-u̯* in an end-stressed paradigm, whereas the dative singular **-o* stem ending **-u̯* lost the nasalization in a stem-stressed paradigm. As a result of paradigmatic generalization, the ending **-u̯* became characteristic of the **-ā* stem accusative singular and the ending **-u* became characteristic of the **-o* stem dative singular.

The ending **-ō* is represented in the Latin dat. sg. *serv-ō* '(to the) slave', Old Indic *dev-āya* '(to) God' (perhaps with the addition of the same *-ya* as in the gen. sg. *dev-asya* [Thumb-Hauschild 1959: 32-33]), although I would rather propose an etymological *dev-āy-* deriving from a contamination of **-ō* and **-oi*, which would have given **-ōi*.

The ending **-oi* is represented in the Oscan dative *húrt-úi* = Lat. *hort-ō* 'garden', and in the Umbrian dative following the mono-

¹ To posit laryngeals here seems to me also to violate Occam's razor: but perhaps the laryngeal theory in general does this. If the phenomena of Indo-European can be explained quite satisfactorily without the creation of further hypothetical entities, then perhaps they should be explained this way.

The ending **-oi* is represented in the Oscan dative *húrt-úi* = Lat. *hort-ō* 'garden', and in the Umbrian dative following the monophthongization to *-e*, *popl-e* = Lat. *popul-ō* 'people' (Leumann 1977: 410).

One encounters a contamination of the endings **-ō* and **-oi* > **-ōi* in the Greek dative *phíl-ō* '(to the) friend' and perhaps in the Lithuanian dative *draūg-ui* '(to the) friend'.

In Baltic and Indo-Iranian the **-o* stem instrumental is represented by **-ō* (deriving from the etymological preconsonantal variant of the ending **-om*), thus Lith. *vilk-ù* 'wolf' (< **-ō*), Old Indic *yajñ-ā* 'sacrifice' (< **-ō*), the ending represented by (*dev*-)ena 'god' being of a later origin, probably following the pronoun *tena* (see Thumb-Hauschild 1959: 32).

In Slavic, however, the **-o* stem ending **-om* was also contaminated with the ending **-oi*, giving **-om-i*, which functions as instrumental singular in the nouns (thus [*grad-*]omь 'city') and locative singular with the pronouns (thus *t-omь*).

It is usually assumed that in the dual we encounter a syncretism of the instrumental and the dative, but it seems to me that the dual could well represent an earlier situation before the instrumental and dative became separate cases. Thus one encounters in Slavic the dative/instrumental **-o* stem dual ending (*grad-*)oma '(to, with) two cities', which represents the etymological **-om* plus the dual ending *-a*. In Lithuanian one encounters the dative *diev-ám* '(to) two gods' vs. the instrumental *diev-aĩ* '(with) two gods', but the difference in stress pattern is probably under the influence of the plural where we encounter the dat. *diev-áms* vs. the instr. *diev-aĩs*. The original Baltic **-o* stem dative/instrumental dual ending cannot be exactly determined, but we do know that there must have been some final vowel, since in the Lithuanian dual forms attested above the final **-m* would have otherwise coalesced with the preceding vowel and become a nasal vowel. The dative plural *-amus* is attested in Mažvydas (Stang 1966: 183-185) and Slavic has a dat. pl. *grad-omь* '(to) the cities'. Thus, for the Balto-Slavic **-o* stem nouns one can assume an etymological dative singular ending **-om* to which some other morphemes were added to form the dual and plural.

It is well known that the plural cases are frequently formed on the basis of the singular cases through the addition of the phoneme

**-s*, cf. Gk. acc. sg. *lúk-on* 'wolf', acc. pl. (Cretan) *luk-on-s* (Buck 1933: 180), Old Prussian acc. sg. *deiwan* 'God', acc. pl. *deiwan-s*.

The **-o* instrumental plural forms in Baltic and Slavic show quite different derivational histories. Baltic *-ais* derives from **-oi* plus the pluralizing **-s*, whereas Slavic *-y* shares the fate of the accusative plural which derives from **-om* plus the pluralizing **-s*, i.e., **-oms* > **-uns* > **-us* > **-ūs* > **-ū* > *-y*. The Slavic **-jo* stem instrumental plural in *-i* could be either a fronted counterpart of *-y* or else derived from **-jois*, cf., e.g., Lith. inst. pl. *mėdžiais* '(with the) trees'.

One notes that in Sanskrit the **-o* stem dative, instrumental and ablative dual are represented by *dev-ābhyām* '(to, with, from) two gods', an ending which is the result of multiple contaminations. First the ending *-bhyām* was added to the form **dev-ā*, possibly the original dat./instr. sg. form, cf. *yajñ-ā* above. The element *-bhyām* in turn derives from the adverbial **-bhi-* plus *-ā* (< **-ō*) contaminated with *-m* (< **-om*).

Old Indic instr. pl. *dev-āih* '(with the) gods' resembles superficially Lith. *diev-aĩs*, but is more likely derived from a contamination of **-ō* and **-oi* > **-ōi* plus the pluralizing **-s*, cf. the dat. sg. *dev-āya* '(to) God'. In other words the Old Indic instrumental plural is a pluralized form of the dative-instrumental singular ending **-ōi*. In a sense the Lithuanian and Old Indic forms are parallel in that the Lithuanian form presupposes a dative/instrumental singular **-oi*, whereas the Old Indic form presupposes a contaminated dative/instrumental singular **-ōi* (actually attested in the dat. sg. Gk. *lúk-ō* '(to) the wolf', and Lith. *vilk-ui*). Thus Mažiulis (1970: 160-161) compares Gk. dat. sg. ...*sùn phíl-ō* 'with a friend' with Lith. inst. sg. ...*su draug-ù* and Gk. dat. pl. ...*sùn phíl-ois* 'with friends' with Lith. inst. pl. ...*su draug-aĩs*. Mažiulis writes that Greek is more archaic than Lithuanian, since it has retained one and the same form for the dative and instrumental from antiquity, whereas Lithuanian has separated the two cases.

Mažiulis (1970: 142) writes that an example of the use of the instrumental with locative meaning may be encountered in the dialect (Rokėnai) use of the instrumental *gal-ù* with the meaning of *gal-è* 'at the end'. Mažiulis writes that whereas the expression *galù nāmo* 'behind the house' seems to some as being synonymous with *ažù nāmo*, the same cannot be said for *terpù mėdžiais* 'among the trees'

'behind the house' seems to some as being synonymous with *ažū nāmo*, the same cannot be said for *terpū mēdžiais* 'among the trees' and *ažū mēdžiais* 'beyond the trees'. Similarly according to Zinkevičius (1966: 401) in Miežiškiai one encounters the adverbialized instrumental *šilū* for the locative singular *šilė* 'in the pine forest' and the form *vidū* 'in the middle'. The Baltic ending in **-ō* would seem to correspond to the Latin ending in *-ō* (*bello* 'during war'). Haudry (1977: 96) notes that in Vedic the instrumental may have a perlocative meaning, e.g. *antárikṣeṇa pat-* 'to fly through the middle space'. Similarly Slavic shows the perlocative meaning, cf. Old Church Slavic *съхождааше рѣтъмъ тѣмъ* '(a certain priest) was coming down that road'. It is also possible, however, to use the instrumental with a simple locative meaning, cf. modern Russian *krugóm* 'around', *dorógoju* 'under way', Pol. *dolineczką wymokło* 'it became damp in the valley'. The usual explanation is that the perlocative meaning is primary and that the locative meaning is secondary (Vondrák 1928: 286-287). Of course, one could reverse the argumentation and assume that the perlocative interpretation is the result of a later semantic narrowing. In other words, there is no way of knowing whether a certain meaning is the result of a semantic expansion or the result of a semantic narrowing. A locative origin for the instrumental would not be surprising. French *avec* 'with' may derive either from Lat. *ab hoc* 'from this' or *apud hoc* 'with, at, by this' (Elcock 1975: 99). One notes the example of English *by* the agentive meaning of which seems to have developed from the locative meaning (Hirt 1934: 133).

Lending support to Mažiulis' notion is the fact that in Slavic the instrumental singular of the **-o* stem noun (*grad-omъ*) is the same as the locative singular of the demonstrative pronoun (*t-omъ*). The formal identity of the pronominal locative singular and the noun instrumental singular provides evidence that both originally had a common meaning.

On the other hand the Slavic instrumental singular of the deictic pronoun (*t-ěmъ*) seems to derive from an old dat.-loc. ending **(t)-oi* (encountered in the nominal loc. sg. [*grad*]-*ě*) contaminated with the instrumental singular ending **-mъ*, thus **t-oi-mi > t-ěmъ*. Vaillant (1958: 370) suggests that the stem in *-ě-* is due to analogy with the plural form *t-ěmi*, but gives no reason why this wouldn't have taken place in the dative singular as well (cf. dat. pl. *t-ěmъ*). Specht (1933:

-na. I agree with this suggestion, but I would propose that element **toi* was an old dat.-loc. form in **-oi* as in Slavic.

One notes that in Lithuanian also the loc. sg. masc. **-o* stem demonstrative pronoun has the form *tamè* which presupposes an original **t-om-* plus the addition of the substantive **-o* stem loc. sg. ending *-è*. This seems to assure the existence of the element **t-om-* in the locative singular masculine demonstrative pronouns of Balto-Slavic.

The usual explanation of Old Indic dat.-abl. pl. *dev-e-bhyaḥ* is that it is by analogy with the pronoun, cf., e.g. the masc.-neut. dat.-abl. pl. *te-bhyaḥ* (see Thumb-Hauschild 1959: 36). On the other hand one could derive it from the stem *dev-e-*, actually encountered in the locative (which in turn derives from the old dat.-instr.-loc. **-oi*) plus the ending *-bhyaḥ*.

It is clear that for the Lithuanian *-i* and *-u* stem nouns the instrumental plural is derived merely by the addition of *-s* to the instrumental singular, thus instr. sg. *av-imi* 'sheep', *kárt-imi* 'pole', *dang-umi* 'sky', dual *av-iṃ̃*, *kárt-im*, *dang-uṃ̃*, vs. instr. pl. *av-imi-s*, *kárt-imis*, *dang-umi-s*. Note also the dative plurals *av-īm(u)s*, *kárt-im(u)s*, *dang-ùm(u)s*, dual *av-īm*, *kárt-im*, *dang-ùm*. In the dat.-instr. dual forms there was presumably originally some final vowel which was later lost, but which prevented the coalescence of *-m* with the preceding vowel passing then to a nasal vowel, similar to that encountered in the accusative singular. In the instrumental then we encounter pl. *-mis*, dual *-m*, sg. *-mi* and the dative pl. *-m(u)s*, dual *-m*. I propose etymological dative singular forms **av-īm*, **kárt-im*, **dang-ùm*. At least in accent classes (1) and (3) the dative would have been exactly the same as the accusative, so that this dative was later replaced by the attested *āv-iai*, *kárč-iai* and *dañg-ui* on the basis of parallels from the **-jā* and **-o* stems respectively.

I would point out that the **-ā* stem dat. dual is Lith. *galvóm* '(to) two heads', instr. *galvōm* and the dat. pl. is *galvóm(u)s*. Similarly in Slavic one encounters the dat./instr. dual *glav-ama*, and the dat. pl. *glav-amъ*. I propose then, that there was originally an **-ā* stem dat. sg. **galv-ām* which was replaced by **galv-āi* to distinguish the dative from the accusative and instrumental which both originally also had the form **galv-ām*. The Lith. **-ā* stem instrumental and accusative singular are etymologically the same. The accusative deri-

ves from unstressed **-ām* and the instrumental derives from a generalization from those accent classes (2 and 4) which originally had the stressed de Saussure's Law/Brugmann's Law endings where **-ām* passed to *-ā* and then to *-ā̄*. The etymological nasalized form is preserved in the instr. sg. **-ā̄* stem definite adjective *balt-ā̄-ja* as opposed to the acc. sg. *bált-ā̄-ja*. There is an interesting parallel between the Baltic **-ā̄* stem accusative and instrumental singular which show etymologically the same ending **-ām* on the one hand and on the other hand the Slavic **-o* stem accusative and instrumental plural which show etymologically the same ending **-oNs > -y*.

The close relationship between the meaning of the Indo-European dative and instrumental cases has long been known. Thus, for example, Haudry (1982: 169) writes that the instrumental comes into contact with the dative in forms such as Vedic *ūtī* which can mean 'with the aid' or 'to the aid'.

Green (1913: 52-53) gives the following Sanskrit examples of the dative of agency:

a. with past participles in *-ná* and *-tá*:

- (1) *yás tē drapsáh skannah*
(dat.)

whichever to you drop spilled 'which drop is spilled by you'.

- (2) *akṛtam yát tē asti*
(dat.)

not done which to you is 'what you have not yet accomplished'.

- (3) *vibhvánē kṛtō*
(dat.)

by a skilled artificer made 'made by a skilled artificer'.

- (4) *idám ma uditám kṛdhi*
(dat.)

this by me be uttered effect 'effect that this be uttered by me'.

b. finite passive verb:

- (5) *prá mē pánthā dēvayānā ādṛśran*
(dat.)

by me paths god trodden on were seen 'the paths trodden on by the gods were seen by me'.

- (6) *mátsy ápāyi tē madah*
(imperative) (dat.)

be merry has been drunk by you intoxicating drink 'be merry, thou hast emptied the intoxicating drink'.

Thus Green's view (1913: 29) that there was «...an active and comparatively extensive interrelation between the dative and the instrumental» is certainly justified. But the interrelation goes back to an original identity, an identity which was lost as the meanings of dative and instrumental began to be differentiated in different contexts and in some instances morphological means were found to strengthen these differences.

References

- Buck Carl Darling, 1933, *Comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Elcock W.D., 1975, *The Romance languages*, London, Faber and Faber.
- Erhart Adolf, 1993, *Die indogermanische Nominalflexion und ihre Genese*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 73.
- Haudry Jean, 1968, *Les emplois doubles du datif et la fonction du datif indo-européen*, "Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris", 63, 141-159.
- , 1970, *L'instrumental et la structure de la phrase simple*, "Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris", 65, 44-83.
- , 1977, *L'emploi des cas en védique*, Lyons, Editions L'Hermès.
- , 1982, *Préhistoire de la flexion nominale indo-européenne*, Lyons, Institut d'études indo-européennes de l'Université Jean Moulin.
- Hirt Hermann, 1934, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, Pt. 6, Syntax I, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- Kuryłowicz Jerzy, 1964, *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- Leumann Manu, 1977, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, Munich, C.H. Beck.

Matasović Ranko, 1996, *Old Irish dative singular of neuter n-stems*, "Studia Celtica Japonica", 8, 59-63.

Mažiulis Vytautas, 1970, *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai (Deklinacija)*, Vilnius, Mintis.

Palmer L.R., 1968, *The Latin language*, London, Faber and Faber.

Schmalstieg William R., 1980, *Indo-European linguistics: A new synthesis*, University Park and London, Pennsylvania State University Press.

—, 1983, *An introduction to Old Church Slavic*, Columbus Ohio, Slavica.

Specht Franz, 1933, *Weiteres zur Geschichte der pronominalen Flexion*, "Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung", 60, 254-271.

Stang Chr. S., 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsø, Universitetsforlaget.

Thumb Albert, Hauschild Richard, 1959, *Handbuch des Sanskrit*, Part II. Formenlehre, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.

Vondrák Wenzel, 1928, *Vergleichende Slavische Grammatik*, Vol. 2, 2nd ed. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Vaillant André, 1958, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, Vol. 2, Lyons, IAC.

Zinkevičius Zigmantas, 1966, *Lietuvių dialektologija*, Vilnius, Mintis.

Some comments on the Balto-slavic dative-instrumental

William R. Schmalstieg (University Park, Pennsylvania)

The existence of the same or similar phonological sequences in different cases, e.g., dative, instrumental and locative, in the attested Indo-European languages reflects an earlier period when the meanings of the cases were not so clearly delineated. The relatively clear and separate functions of the attested case endings derive from various contextual usages which are very difficult to recover with the existing techniques of historical linguistics.

BALTEN IN DER ETHNOGENESE DER SLAWEN

ANDREJ PLETESKI

Ljubljana

Ausgangspunkte.

Alle bisherigen Modelle, die sich auf eine selbstverständliche feste Dreiergruppe von Ethnos, Sprache und archäologischer Kultur gründeten, waren mehr oder weniger erfolglos, und zwar aus mehreren Gründen. Die ethnische Bestimmung ist Sache der geistigen Sphäre des menschlichen Daseins und muß nicht unbedingt einen materiellen äußeren Niederschlag finden. Ich werde das Problem der ethnischen Bestimmung des einzelnen übergehen und mich auf den Ethnos als Ganzen konzentrieren. Die Auffassung des Ethnos vor tausend Jahren und noch früher war nicht so beschaffen wie heute. Die sinnvollste Definition des damaligen *Ethnos (gens)* ist meines Ermessens *eine Gruppe von Menschen, die durch ein rechtlich-ideologisches System vereinigt waren*, wobei ich beispielsweise Religion, Tradition als Teile der Ideologie betrachte. Teil dieses ideologischen Systems konnte, aber mußte nicht unumgänglich auch die Sprache sein. Eine solche Ethnosbestimmung ermöglichte auch einen mehrmaligen Wechsel der Identität des einzelnen, was wir ausnahmsweise anhand der schriftlichen Quellen verfolgen können. Auch große Bevölkerungsgruppen wechselten beinahe ebenso spielend die ethnische Zugehörigkeit, was z.B. in der Ethnogenese der germanischen Völker vielfach anschaulich bezeugt ist. Welche diejenigen Eigenschaften des rechtlich-ideologischen Systems sind, die die Archäologie aufzuspüren vermag, wissen wir, um die Wahrheit zu sagen, noch nicht mit Sicherheit. Der archäologische Erkenntnisprozeß steckt größtenteils noch in der intuitiven Anfangsphase. Aber schon jetzt ist zu ersehen, daß die Archäologie hier nicht völlig machtlos ist. Das Werkzeug, mit dem sie größere Menschengruppen zu erforschen versucht, heißt *archäologische Kultur*. Diesen Begriff gebrauche ich im Sinne von *Menge von Eigenschaften der Spuren menschlichen Daseins, die man in einem Raum feststellen kann und die sich von anderen derartigen Mengen*