

New NP dependency marking in the “second generation” IE languages

Artemij Keidan, Sapienza University of Rome

ISTAL23 – Morpho-syntactic isoglosses in Indo-European:
diachrony, typology and linguistic areas

Generations of languages

- Generation 0: PIE
- Generation 1: Vedic Sanskrit, Gathic Avestan, Homeric Greek
- Generation 2: Prakrits, Balto-Slavic, Common Germanic, partly Young Avestan and Old Persian
- Generation 3: Modern Germanic and Romance languages

Basic assumptions

- PIE and Gen1 languages
 - no morphological/syntactic distinction between **adjectival** vs. **substantival** NP modifiers
 - qualities expressed by verbs or **appositions**
- A group of Gen2 languages develop new morphological means for encoding NP modifiers

Hypothesis

- Two things to encode:
 - constituency: delimiting the **boundaries** of the NP
 - direction of dependency: **head** vs. **modifier**
- Different Gen2 languages creates new means for it
 - variability is **parametrical**

Morphological parameters

→ Locus:

- **dependent**-marking: special endings for adjectives
- **head**-marking: Persian *ezāfe*
- **double** marking: redundant article in Greek
- **zero** marking: *amicus Plato sed magis amica veritas*

Morphological parameters

→ Position:

- **prefix** (e.g. Greek article)
- **suffix** (e.g. adjectival endings in Slavic)

→ Autonomy:

- **clitic** (article, *ezāfe*)
- **bound** morpheme (endings)

Morphological parameters

→ Lexicalisation

- nominals become modifiers **contextually**
 - shown by PIE and Gen1 languages, no adjectival class
- modifiers are **lexicalised** as a paradigmatic class
 - creation of a new adjectival class

Hypothesis

- A pattern observable in a group of Gen2 languages:
 - new encoding of constituency/dependency is created
- What we have to analyse:
 - source: either **relative** or **demonstrative** pronoun, or just pronominal **endings**
 - morphological parameters

Avestan

- No separate adjective class
- Relative pronoun is used as “quasi-article”
 - relative clause with no predicate
- Links a modifier to the nominal head
 - $X \text{ REL } Y$ encodes $[X_{\text{head}} Y_{\text{mod}}]_{\text{NP}}$

Avestan

- Relative pronoun *ya-* < IE **i̯o-* is used
 - usually located between head and modifier
 - usually shows case agreement with the head

stārəm yəm tištrīm ‘the star [which is] Tištriya’

hača zəmat̄ yat̄ paθanayā “from the wide earth”

Avestan

→ Other uses:

- substantivizer of quality nouns

yā *drəguuā* “the wrong one”

- sometimes modifier comes first

yəm *Mazdəm* *Ahurəm* “Lord the Mazdā”

Old Persian

- A pattern similar to the Avestan one is observed
 - relative pronoun *haya* is used (perhaps an enlargement of Old Iranian **ya-*)
- It behaves as a quasi-article:
 - no predicate
 - sometimes case agreement with head noun

Old Persian

Gaumāta haya maguš “Gaumata REL magian”

martiya haya draujana “man REL liar”

Bardiya ... haya Kurauš puça ‘Bardiya REL Cyrus’s son’

hayā amāxam taumā “REL our family”

Dārayavauš haya manā pitā “Darius REL my father”

xšāyaθiya dahayūnām tayaišām parūnām “king of lands REL many”

Middle (and New) Persian

→ Old Persian quasi-article eventually agglutinates to the head noun (rather than to the modifier)

– hence the *ezāfe* in (Manichaean) Middle Persian

MP, ManMP *ʿy(g)* (phonetically *ī*) → New Pers. *-i*

– head-marking, clitic, phrase morpheme

X-*EZ* Y encodes $[[X_{\text{head}}]_{\text{NP}} Y_{\text{mod}}]_{\text{NP}}$

Middle (and New) Persian

→ Middle Persian (on its way from REL to EZ):

sr *y* *wysp'n wyhyh'n* “head EZ all wisdoms”

nwhz'dg *y**g* *trkwm'n* “Nuhzadag EZ interpreter”

→ New Persian (*ezāfe* fully grammaticalised, practically no overt adjectives):

lab-i *la'l* “a ruby lip” vs. *la'l-i* *lab* “the ruby of the lip”

Greek

- Adjectives are **derivatives**, no special endings
- New article is created: **ὁ, ἡ, τό** (*ho, hē, to*)
 - from IE demonstrative pronoun **so, *seH₂, *tod*
 - in Homer very often still demonstrative
 - in Homer partly overlapping with relative pronoun **ὅς, ἣ, ὅ** < IE **ios, *ieH₂, *iod*

Greek

→ Three possible orderings of {Art Adj N}

1. ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ (*ho agathos anēr*)

2. ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός (*ho anēr ho agathos*)

3. ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός (*anēr ho agathos*)

→ Article used for encoding constituency

ARTX ARTY encodes $[X Y]_{NP}$

Greek

→ Ordering n. 3 disappears diachronically

	1 st ordering	2 nd ordering	3 rd ordering
Homer	prevalent	any	some
Tragedy	prevalent	rare	some
Xenophon	prevalent	some	rare
Attic oratory	prevalent	some	any

Greek

- Parallel to Avestan and Old Persian “quasi-article”
- Demonstrative or relative is irrelevant:
 - relative vs. demonstrative meanings are “confusable”
 - partial homophony (orthographic differences are late)
 - functions are partly overlapping, especially in Homer

Slavic

- A new class of adjectives by agglutination of the relative pronoun to nominal stems
 - this pronoun is almost as short as a flexion:

jĭ, ja, je < from IE **i̯os, *i̯eH₂, *i̯od*

mōžŭ dobrŭjĭ “man good-ADJ”

vŭpadŭšaago i přezřěna “of fallen and mistaken”

Slavic

- Very similar to Avestan and Persian, but
 - bound (not completely in the oldest sources: allows hiatus; sometimes *Gruppenlexion*)
 - dependent-marking rather than head-marking
 - after agglutination creates lexicalised adjectival class
 - no adjectives in Modern Persian

Germanic

- Creation of the so-called “strong” adjectives
 - “weak” declension does not distinguish nouns from adjectives
 - “strong” endings are of pronominal origin
 - no trace of agglutination of a pronoun

but such hypotheses have been made (Leskien 1876)

Germanic

- Modern Germanic languages have also created a definite article
 - must be considered a Gen3 feature since the source for such articles are different in each case
 - in Gothic still looks a bit artificial

Streitberg: calque vs. Sauvageot: original phenomenon

Khotanese

- Two sets of endings:
 - shorter ones for nouns (usually just one vowel)
 - longer ones, of pronominal origin, for adjectives
 - adjectival endings are in the oblique cases
 - origin is debatable: agglutination is not to be excluded

Khotanese

- Oblique endings with **nasal element**
 - perhaps from a pronominal stem **ana-* as in Slavonic *onŭ* “he”, Lithuanian *anàs* “that”

LocSg m/: *-aña, -äña*; f: *-iña*

Inst/AblSg m: *-ana, -äna*; f: *-äne, -äñi*

Khotanese

→ Oblique endings with **palatal element**

Gen/DatSg m/f: *-ye* (perhaps contraction of **-ahya*)

- diachronically unrelated to the relative pronoun *ye* < **kye*, nor to Old Iranian **ya-* or **haya-*
- but a synchronic perception of relation cannot be excluded

Khotanese

→ Examples:

ysäṣṭäye *hvaṇdä* “of/to hated man”

hastamäna *śīlna* “by best effort”

natäña *rahāśśa* “in deep secret”

Prakrit

- Locative (often absolute) has two variant endings
 - the longer one is from Sanskrit pronominal *-asmin*
- Pischel: they alternate freely or *metri causa*
- Data from Hala's *Sattasai*
 - the two forms come almost always in couple
 - group flection or dependency?

Prakrit

- Loc *-ammi* either on head or on modifier
 - but semantics is not always obvious

diṭṭhe sarisammi guṇe “viewing similar quality”

putte samāruhattammi “[when] the son [is] climbed up”

vāsuikaṃkaṇammi osārie “[being] the snake-bracelet removed”

Pāli

→ Similarly in Pāli, in Ablative and Locative (often absolute):

setamhi chatte anudhāriyamāne “[with a] white umbrella held above”

kassapamhi bhagavati “[while] Lord Kassapa”

Conclusions

- A contact-induced innovation could be suggested
 - Center of the innovation: Avestan, Persian, Balto-Slavic
 - Later contact: Germanic, Khotanese and Prakrit
 - Early contact, eventually diverging: Greek

Conclusions

- What unity can be observed?
 - Meillet 1934 connects Balto-Slavic to Avestan
 - Leskien 1876 (and others) connects Germanic strong adjectives to Balto-Slavic *jī*-adjectives
- (Also, Neckel 1990 connects Germanic article to Greek and Iranian)

Conclusions

- My suggestion:
 - similarity of Greek 3rd ordering with Persian “quasi-article”
 - similarity of Khotanese system with Slavic/Germanic
 - partial similarity of Middle Indian with Khotanese etc.
- Open question: should we consider it an isogloss or just a natural development?

Evolution types

Head **REL** Modifier

- Persian: Head-**EZ** Modifier
- Slavic, etc: Head Modifier-**ADJ**
- Greek: **ART** Head **ART** Modifier

Parameters

	<i>source</i>	<i>marking</i>	<i>status</i>	<i>position</i>	<i>adjectives</i>
Greek	demonstrative	both	clitic	pre-	old adj. class
Persian	relative	head	(increasingly) bound	-post	no adj. class
Slavic		modifier			new adj. class
Germanic					
Khotanese	pronominal endings				
Middle Indic		alternant			

References

- B. L. **Gildersleeve**, *Syntax of classical Greek*, 1900–1911 (§609 on three positions of the article)
- H. **Haider** & R. **Zwanziger**, ‘Relatively attributive: the ‘ezāfe’-construction from Old Iranian to Modern Persian’, 1984
- A. **Leskien**, *Die Declination im slavisch-litauischen und germanischen*, 1876 (p. 130ff on adjectives)
- Th. **McFadden**, ‘On the pronominal inflection of the Germanic strong adjective’, 2004
- A. **Meillet**, *Le slave commun*, 1934 (§509 on Slavic vs. Avestan relative particle)
- G. **Neckel**, *Über die Altgermanischen Relativsätze*, 1900 (on Germanic vs. Greek and Avestan article)
- H. S. **Nyberg**, *A Manual of Pahlavi. Part II: Glossary*, 1964 (p. 105ff on early forms of *ezāfe*)
- R. **Pischel**, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, 1900 (§366a on two alternating Locative endings)
- A. K. **Polivanova**, *Staroslavjanskij jazyk*, 2013 (§269ff on *-jǎ* in adjectives as clitic vs. affix)
- I. **Dyen**, ‘The homomeric argument for a Slavo- Germanic subgroup of Indo-European’, 1990
- C. J. **Ruijgh**, *Autour de “te épique”*, 1971 (§272–273 on confusion between \acute{o} and $\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Greek)
- N. **Sims-Williams**, ‘Chotano-Sogdica II’, 1990 (on Khotanese adjectival endings)
- M. L. **West**, *Old Avestan Syntax and Stylistics*, 2011 (§237ff on early forms of “quasi-article”)