

# Strong adjectives, and similar phenomena, in the II generation IE languages

Artemij Keidan, Sapienza University of Rome

Pisa – Oxford, Joint Colloquia in Indo-European Linguistics:  
Variation and Contact in the Ancient Indo-European languages

# Problem setting

- The conference is about variation and contact
  - Contact phenomena are often under our eyes
- NP modifier marking: no adjective class in PIE
  - Different strategies in the “II generation” IE languages
  - Common initial innovation: contact?

# “Generations” of the IE family

- Generation 0: PIE
- I Generation: Vedic Sanskrit, Gathic Avestan, Old Persian, Homeric Greek
- II Generation: Prakrits, Middle Iranian varieties, Common Slavic, Common Germanic
- III Generation: Modern Slavic, Germanic and Romance languages

# Basic assumptions

- PIE and I Gen. languages
  - no morphological/syntactic distinction between **adjectival** modifiers and **nominal** epithets
- Qualities expressed by stative verbs or nominal epithets
  - no class of primary adjectives can be reconstructed

# Basic assumptions

- ➔ Many nominals are either N or A
  - RV *devà-* ‘god’ (N), but also ‘devine’ (A)
  - OCS *drugŭ* ‘friend’ (N), but also ‘other’ (A)
- ➔ Same endings for N and A
  - Degree suffixes can add to bare roots: RV *yájīyāms* ‘sacrificing better’

# Hypothesis

- This system was unstable
  - Nominal flections underwent phonetic deletion
  - Constituency and dependency needed a better marking
- Many II Gen. languages form new adjectives...
  - ...or equivalent means of marking the NP modifiers

# Hypothesis

→ A common solution was:

$$N_{\text{HEAD}} + N_{\text{MOD}} \rightarrow N_{\text{HEAD}} + \text{REL} + N_{\text{MOD}}$$

→ Grammaticalisation took different paths

- but can be described uniformly with parameters

→ What parameters?

- Those describing the way dependency is marked

# Morphological parameters

→ Locus of marking:

- **dependent**-marking: special endings for adjectives
- **head**-marking: Persian *ezāfe*
- **double** marking: redundant article in Greek
- **alternant** marking: perhaps in Prakrit



# Morphological parameters

- Position with respect to the stem:
  - **pre**-posed (e.g. Greek article)
  - **post**-posed (e.g. adjectival endings in Slavic, Persian *ezāfe*)
- Degree of morphologic autonomy:
  - **clitic** morpheme (article, *ezāfe*)
  - **bound** morpheme (adjectival endings)

# Morphological parameters

→ Source:

- **relative** pronoun
- **demonstrative** pronoun
- pronominal **endings**

...this distinction could be late

# Avestan

- Relative pronoun *ya-* < IE *\*i̯o-* is used as “quasi-article”
  - no verb
  - no correlative
  - case **agreement** with the antecedent N

# Avestan

## → Distribution

- more frequent and complex in Young Avestan
- some examples also in Vedic

...but the case attraction is scarcely attested

# Avestan

→ Usually located between head and modifier:

*stārəm yəm tištrīm* ‘the star Tištriya’

*hača zəmaṭ yaṭ paθanayā* ‘from the wide earth’

*raocābīš [...] yāiš ahurahē mazdā* ‘with the light of AM’

*yā drəguuā* ‘the evil one’

# Vedic

→ Few examples with case agreement

*aditir ya duhitar tava* ‘Aditi, the daughter of yours’

*pári ṇaḥ pāhi yád dhánam* ‘protect of us what the wealth’

*paúruṣeyaṃ vadhám yám* ‘death caused by men’

# Old Persian

- As in Avestan but relative pronoun *haya* is used
  - perhaps from Indo-Iranian *\*sa-* + *\*ya-*
  - case agreement with antecedent is well attested

# Old Persian

*Gaumāta haya maguš* ‘Gaumata the magian’

*martiya haya draujana* ‘the lying man’

*Bardiya [...] haya Kurauš puça* ‘Bardiya, the son of Cyrus’

*hayā amāxam taumā* ‘our family’

*Dārayavauš haya manā pitā* ‘Darius, my father’

*xšāyaθiya dahayūnām tayaišām parūnām* ‘king of many lands’



# Middle Persian

- OP *haya-* agglutinates to the head noun
  - hence the *ezāfe* in (Manichaean) Middle Persian
    - MP, ManMP *y(g)* (phonetically *ī*) → New Pers. *-i*
  - head-marking, clitic, phrase morpheme
  - can be nested

# Middle Persian

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

*sr* *y* *wysp'n wyhyh'n* 'the head of all wisdoms'

*nwhz'dg* *y* *g trkwm'n* 'Nuhzadag the interpreter'

*nwg* *'spsg* *y* *nyw frzynd* *y* *whmn* 'the new bishop, the worthy son of Wahman'

# Middle (and New) Persian

- In New Persian the *ezāfe* is fully grammaticalised
  - no overt noun/adjectives distinction

*lab-i laʔl* ‘a ruby lip’

*laʔl-i lab* ‘the ruby of the lip’

# Greek

- New article is created:  $\acute{\omicron}$ ,  $\acute{\eta}$ ,  $\tau\acute{\omicron}$
- from IE demonstrative pronoun  $*so$ ,  $*seH_2$ ,  $*tod$
  - in Homer very often still demonstrative
  - In homer partly overlapping with the relative

$\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\eta}$ ,  $\acute{\omicron}$  < IE  $*\underset{\cdot}{i}os$ ,  $*\underset{\cdot}{i}eH_2$ ,  $*\underset{\cdot}{i}od$

# Greek

→ Three patterns of N, A and Art are attested:

1. ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ (Art A N)

2. ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός (Art N Art A)

3. ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός (N Art A)

→ Pattern 3 resembles Iranian “quasi-article”

– Gaumāta *haya* maguš vs. Ζεὺς ὁ κύριος

# Greek

→ Examples of post-nominal *ὁ*, *ἡ*, *τό*

πρὸς Κροῖσον *τὸν* Λυδῶν βασιλέα ‘to Croesus, the king of Lydians’ (*Cyropaedia* 1.5.3)

Βίας *ὁ* Πριηνεύς ‘Bias from Priene’

→ Example of verbless *ὄς*, *ἦ*, *ὅ*

Τεῦκρός θ’*ὄς* ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν τοξοσύνη ‘Teucer, the best of Achaeans in bowmanship’ (*Il.* 13.313)

# Greek

- Demonstrative vs. relative:
  - the two pronouns are almost homophonous
    - both were called ἄρθρον ‘joint’ by the Greeks
  - functionally overlapping
    - in general and in Homer (plus some dialects)

# Greek

→ Demonstrative as relative

εἶπω **τά** με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει

‘I say what the mind in the breast bids me’

→ Relative as demonstrative:

**ὄς** γὰρ δεύτατος ἦλθεν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων

‘for he was the last to reach home of the brazen-coated Achaeans’



# Greek

- Distribution varies diachronically
    - verbless relatives only in Homer
    - post-nominal article disappears gradually from Homer onwards
- virtually no examples in the Attic oratory

# Greek

	ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ	ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός	ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός
Homer	common	any	common
Herodotus	common	rare	some
Thucydides	common	rare	some
Tragedy	prevalent	some	some
Aristophanes	prevalent	some	rare
Xenophon	prevalent	some	rare
Attic oratory	prevalent	common	any

# Slavic

- Long adjectives by agglutination of *jǐ, ja, je* < IE *\*i̯os, \*i̯eH<sub>2</sub>, \*i̯od*
  - dependent marking
  - bound rather than clitic (but hiatus and internal inflection are allowed)
  - conjunction reduction is allowed
  - today short adjectives are rare

# Slavic

→ Examples:

*mōžŭ dobrŭjŭ* ‘the good man’

*mōža dobrajego* ‘of the good man’

*vŭpadŭšajego i prĕzŭrĕna* ‘of the fallen and despised one’ (*Suprasliensis*)

# Lithuanian

→ Similar to Slavic, but different distribution

*gẽrą jį šùnį* ‘good dog’ (Acc.)

– short adjectives are normal, long are rare

mostly in idioms

# Germanic

- Creation of the so-called **strong** adjectives
  - strong endings are of pronominal origin
  - perhaps, originally agglutinated pronouns
  - the definiteness is reversed with respect to Slavic

# Prakrit

- Locative (often absolute) has two variant endings
  - the longer *-ammi* from Skt pronominal ending *-asmin*
  - the shorter *-e/-i*, from Skt nominal ending
- Distribution: alternant
  - in Hala's *Sattasai* every long ending agrees with a short one

# Prakrit

- Pischel
  - free, or *metri causa*, alternation
- Woolner
  - The two often come together
- My proposal
  - phrasal marker of dependency?



# Prakrit

→ Loc *-ammi* either on head or on modifier

*diṭṭhe sarisammi guṇe* ‘viewing similar quality’

*putte samāruhattammi* ‘[when] the son [has] 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’

# Khotanese

- Two sets of endings in Late Khotanese:
  - 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 Slavic *onŭ* ‘he’, Lithuanian *anàs* ‘that’

LocSg m: *-aña*, *-äña*; f: *-iña*

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

# Khotanese

→ Examples:

*ysäṣṭäye hvə'ndä* 'of/to hated man'

*hastamäna śīlna* 'by best effort'

*natäña rahāśśa* 'in deep secret'

# Conclusions

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

# Conclusions

- Common innovation, not IE inheritance
  - different pronominal sources are used
- Distinguishes unrelated languages of II generation
  - isogloss or just a natural development?
- Different outcomes in modern languages
  - same initial innovation

# Evolution types

Prototype	Head <b>REL</b> Modifier
Persian	Head <b>EZ</b> Modifier
Slavic, Germanic, Prakrits, Khotanese	Head Modifier- <b>ADJ</b>
Greek	Head <b>ART</b> Modifier



# Parameters

	<i>source</i>	<i>locus</i>	<i>autonomy</i>	<i>position</i>
Greek	demonstrative or relative	double	clitic	pre-
Persian	relative	head	(increasingly) bound	-post
Slavic				
Germanic	pronominal endings (pronouns?)	modifier		
Khotanese				
Middle Indic		alternant?		