

Kenneth SHIELDS, Jr. (Millersville)

LINGUISTIC TYPOLOGY AND THE INDO-EUROPEAN CAUSATIVE

Abstract. On the basis of formal correspondences and typological data, it is argued in this brief paper that an etymological connection probably exists between the Indo-European dative suffix **-ei* and the Indo-European causative element **-ei-* via a morpheme which Song (1996) describes as “*PURP*.” Most significantly, the paper demonstrates how typological data can serve a primary role in reconstruction rather than a merely evaluative one.

Keywords: etymology, Indo-European, causative, dative, typology.

In Shields (2011), I describe the conventional ways in which linguistic typology has been recently employed in historical/comparative linguistics. Most significantly, it has been utilized as a means of assessing the plausibility of reconstructions; that is, reconstructions which conform to established typological formulations are to be more highly valued than those which do not. In addition, historical/comparative linguists have acknowledged its value as an adjunct to the reconstruction process when traditional comparative and internal methodologies cannot be applied to a body of data. An excellent case in point involves the reconstruction of proto-language word order patterns since syntactic reconstruction cannot strictly employ classical correspondence sets. Finally, linguistic typology provides historical/comparative linguists with insight into what Fox (1995: 194) calls “laws of language development,” or the general principles of how languages evolve. In this sense, linguistic typology becomes, in itself, a primary subject matter of historical/comparative linguistics. However, on the basis of this latter use of typology, I have pointed out in Shields (Forthcoming) that still another application of this rich area of study may present itself to historical/comparative linguists. In short, “linguistic typology can at times ... bring to light heretofore unrecognized explanatory formulations for phenomena in particular languages or linguistic stocks.” That is, because “the degree of cross-linguistic similarity that recent studies have uncovered suggests that forces in language are pushing toward the selection of particular source material and

movement along particular paths propelled by certain common mechanisms of change” (Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1995: 17), such paths of linguistic development can be sought in the prehistories of languages or linguistic stocks in which they may not, at first glance, be evident. I wish to illustrate this point by considering a possible, typologically-motivated etymology of the causative verbal suffix of Indo-European.

The traditional reconstruction of the Indo-European causative construction posits “the root, with or without extensions, hav[ing] the vowel /o/, followed in the next syllable, by stressed /e/, followed by /y/ with thematic endings” (Purczinsky 1995: 371). In other words, its primary affixal marker is a suffix in **-ei-* which is attached to an *o*-grade root and which is followed by thematic person markers, cf. “PIE **mon-éi-e* ‘to warn’ (‘to cause to consider’): Lat. *moneō* PIE **uort-éi-e* ‘to cause to turn’: Skt. *varáyati*, OCS *vratiti*, Goth. (*fra*-)*wardiþ* ‘to cause to turn around’” (Beekes 1995: 229). Although “the root in most forms is in the *o*-grade, ... some old-looking forms have zero instead. The type is conspicuous in InIr., and prominent in Gmc.” (Sihler 1995: 504).

In his important work *Causatives and Causation: A Universal Typological Perspective* (1996), Jae Jung Song presents a diachronic model for the origin of causative affixes. Admitting that the model “is subject to further modification” as more data are observed, he argues that causative affixes result primarily from “the functional take-over of the causative function by the element” which he terms *PURP* (1996: 83), although an element called *AND*, which nonetheless “seems to be an extremely poor source of causative affixes,” can also underlie them etymologically (1996: 84).¹ According to Song, *PURP* “is a schematic of various instantiations such as dative, locative, allative, directional, goal, benefactive, and purposive case markers. Most of these markers are found to express a sense of goal or purpose through metaphorical extension, and others, perhaps, more directly. They all thus register the presence of the term *PURP* in one way or another” (1996: 85). In other words, *PURP* seems to be classic deictic particles or adpreps expressing ‘goal’ or ‘purpose’ as well as the various grammaticalizations (e.g., case markers) they subsequently undergo.² In Song’s view, the process by which *PURP* comes to express causative function involves four suc-

¹ This element, as its name implies, represents a marker of coordination. Since it has no relevance to what follows, it will not be discussed further.

² Hazelkorn (1983: 110) emphasizes the diverse range of functions which can be assumed by deictic particles by citing developments in Finno-Ugric: “Deictic particles, which originally referred to participants in the communication act and to their location, came to be used as definiteness markers [i.e., as demonstratives, personal pronouns, possessive suffixes, and subject agreement markers in verbs], in order to indicate the focus of the utterance. In subsequent developments, these same elements came to be interpreted as, on the one hand, person markers, and, on the other hand, accusative markers, plural markers, etc.”

cessive stages, each of which can be attested in extant languages (1996: 82-83). At Stage I, a noncausative purposive construction is used to express causation. Here a verb serving as a ‘cause’ of another verbal action via the structural implications of a separate purposive marker “is absolutely necessary.” To illustrate Stage I, Song cites Korean, in which “subordinate clauses of purpose are marked by *-ke*” (1996: 91). He observes that this purposive marker “appears between the element of [Vcause] [i.e., the ‘causal’ verb] and that of [Veffect] [i.e., the verb which results] in the so-called ‘syntactic causative construction’:

Kim ssi-ka ai-til-i kojpu-ha-ke ha-əss-ta
 Kim Mr-NOM child-PL-NOM study-do-PURP cause-PST-IND
 ‘Mr. Kim made the children study’” (1996: 86).

At Stage II, “the strengthened association” between *PURP* and causation means that [Vcause] becomes optional, while at Stage III the latter disappears entirely, rendering *PURP* a genuine causative morpheme (1996: 82-83). By Stage IV, the element *PURP* “becomes formally or morphophonically reduced to an affix, which is then attached to the element of [Veffect].” That is, it becomes “a fully **derivational** causative affix,” with “no grammatical traces available that indicate that ... *PURP* is not the original element of [Vcause]” (1996: 83).

Examples of formal correspondences between goal and/or purpose (i.e., directional) morphemes and causative markers are numerous in the world’s languages. For example, Song (1996: 92) notes that “in Kxoe there is a causative suffix in the form of *ká*. The directional preposition in this Central Khoisan language is no other than *ká*.” Likewise, the Southern Pomo causative suffix *-q-* parallels two directional morphemes containing *-q-*: *-qla-* ‘downward’ and *-qlo-*, *-ql-* ‘upwards’; and Southern Agaw, a Cushitic language, shows a causative suffix in *-s-* beside an homophonous dative(-instrumental) desinence (Song 1996: 92). Heine & Kuteva (2002: 200) adopt the same viewpoint, though they express it with different terminology, when they assert: “This appears to be an extremely widespread process whereby locative markers are grammaticalized to markers of cause.”

Now it is interesting that a dative (singular) suffix in **-ei* is traditionally reconstructed for Indo-European. As Sihler (1995: 251) thus points out: “For the dative singular of cons. stems Ved. *-e* and OL *-ei* (L *-ī*) point to a diphthong which might be IE **-ey*, **-oy*, or **-ay* Certain G[reek] dialect forms such as *diwei-philos* ‘dear to Zeus,’ Myc. *tu-ka-te-re* (*t^hugaterei*) ‘to the daughter,’ *po-de* (*podēi*) dat. sg. ‘foot,’ and O[scan] forms in *-ei*, point to PIE **ey*” (cf. also Beekes 1995: 173 and Szemerényi 1996: 160). According to Kuryłowicz (1964: 190-191) the Indo-European dative and locative were originally manifestations

of the same case category – a conclusion made plausible by typological evidence, according to Aristar (1996). From the point of view of Indo-European morphophonology, the traditionally reconstructed dative singular suffix **-ei* and the traditionally reconstructed locative singular suffix in **-i* (cf. Skt. *-i*, OCS *-i*, Lat. [*> abl.*] *-e*) were simply allomorphic variants (ultimately ablaut variants) of the same desinence. That this dative-locative case also had a directive function is supported 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), for the attempt at a distinct formal directive case in *-a* in opposition to a locative in *-i* did not survive Old Hittite. In short, it appears, then, that Indo-European possessed a nominal case suffix in **-ei* with distinctly ‘goal’ or ‘purposive’ implications.

The growing recognition among Indo-Europeanists that the markers of the so-called adverbial cases of Indo-European like the dative-locative were probably in origin grammaticalized deictic particles lends additional support for the status of Indo-European **-ei* as an example of *PURP*. As Markey (1979: 65) maintains, “At an early stage of Indo-European deictic markers constituted the formal indication of grammatical categories expressing time, place and person” (cf. also Shields 1997, 1999, 2005). Typological support for the ubiquity of this grammaticalization is provided by Heine, Claudi & Hünemeyer (1991: 167). It is significant, then, that Hirt (1927: 11, 15) reconstructs a deictic particle in **ei* for Indo-European based on forms like “gr. *ei* ‘wenn,’ eig. ‘da.’” Moreover, because of the close etymological connection between deictic particles and demonstrative pronouns (Brugmann 1911: 311), it is also significant that an original demonstrative stem in **ei-* is attested in such forms as OLat. *eis* ‘he,’ Skt. *ay-ám* ‘he,’ and OIr. *ē*.³ Hirt (1927: 15) astutely identifies **ei* itself as a contamination of the deictic particles **e* and **i* (cf. 1927: 10-11), and although the dative-locative suffix **-ei* was ultimately integrated into emerging Indo-European ablaut schemes, its origin, I believe, is to be traced to this contamination of **e* and **i*. The existence of a distinct locative suffix in **-e* in Baltic (cf., e.g., Lith. *rañkoj-e* ‘hand’) and Slavic (cf., e.g., *kamen-e* ‘stone’) implies that the deictics **i*, **e*, and their contamination **ei* were all subject to grammaticalization as markers of the dative-locative case.

The point which emerges from this discussion, of course, is that typological evidence exists to support the view that the primary causative suffix ascribed to Indo-European is probably related etymologically to the traditionally reconstructed dative singular desinence **-ei*. No previous analysis of either morphosyntactic category of which I am aware posits such a relationship. Clearly, it is the typological evidence which leads to this reasonable conclusion about pre-

³ It is widely acknowledged that demonstratives served as third person personal pronouns in Indo-European (cf. Beekes 1995: 207). These dialectal forms reflect this use.

stages in the evolution of Indo-European morphology. Thus, the role played by typology in the reconstruction process here is primary, not merely evaluative.

Kenneth Shields, Jr.
Millersville University
English Department
P.O. Box 1002
Millersville, PA 17551-0302, USA
[kshields@millersville.edu]

References

- Adrados, F.
1987. "On the Origins of the Indo-European Dative-Locative Singular Endings," [in:] M. Jazayert & W. Winter (eds.), *A Festschrift in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé*, 29-41, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- 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.
1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- Brugmann, K.
1911. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Vol. 2.2, Strassburg, Trübner.
- Bybee, J., R. Perkins & W. Pagliuca
1995. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago, U of Chicago P.
- Fox, A.
1995. *Linguistic Reconstruction: An Introduction to Theory and Method*, Oxford, Oxford U P.
- Hazelkorn, L. T.
1983. "The Role of Deixis in the Development of Finno-Ugric Grammatical Morphemes," *Working Papers in Linguistics* 27, 89-139.
- Heine, B., U. Claudi & F. Hünemeyer
1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*, Chicago, U of Chicago P.
- Heine, B. & T. Kuteva
2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge U P.

- Hirt, H.
1927. *Indogermanische Grammatik*, Vol. 3, Heidelberg, Winter.
- Kuryłowicz, J.
1964. *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*, Heidelberg, Winter.
- Markey, T. L.
1979. "Deixis and the *u*-Perfect," *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 7, 65-75.
- Purczinsky, J.
1995. "The Indo-European Causative: Evidence for Chronology," *Word* 46, 369-376.
- Shields, K.
1997. "The Gothic Genitive Plural in *-ē* Revisited," *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures* 9, 239-249.
1999. "Sanskrit Dative Singular *-āya* and Its Indo-European Connections," *Historische Sprachforschung* 112, 26-31.
2005. "Some Comments about the Indo-European Dative Singular," *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 10, 157-163.
2011. "Linguistic Typology and Historical Linguistics," [in:] J. J. Song (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, 551-567, Oxford, Oxford U P.
Forthcoming. "Linguistic Typology and the Indo-European Pronominal Stem **ei-*," *Studia Indo-Europaea*.
- Sihler, A.
1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, Oxford, Oxford U P.
- Song, J. J.
1996. *Causatives and Causation: A Universal-Typological Perspective*, London, Longman.
- Szemerényi, O.
1996. *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, 4th ed., Oxford, Clarendon P.