

THE GENITIVE IN *-osio*

ROBERT S.P. BEEKES

1. Since the discovery of the Hittite genitive in *-as* of the *o*-stems, it has become clear that the PIE form of this ending was *-os*, not *-osio*. I have adduced 'theoretical' indications for this strange fact, which explain the origin of this ending (1985, 172-195). Thus e.g. Knobloch's explanation (1950-2; ergative-ending *-s* plus 'Zugehörigkeitspartikel' *io*), which is based on *-osio* as a nominal form, cannot be upheld. (It could be valid for pronominal *-osio*, but it is improbable that the process he assumes would have operated *only* in pronouns. Also it is improbable that pronominal *-osio* contains an ergative *-s*, which is precisely not found in pronouns.) And the explanation with a 'Zugehörigkeitspartikel' *io* cannot be of post-PIE date (which would explain that Hittite did not have the form), as this *particle io* hardly existed after PIE times.¹

Therefore the origin of *-osio* must be looked for in the pronouns, as has been assumed of old. Thus, the origin must be found in **tosio*.²

2. As to the analysis of **tosio*, we have rejected Knobloch's *to-s-io* above. For an analysis **tos-io* I see no ground, as the element **tos-* cannot be explained (cf. n. 6). This means that an analysis **to-sio* has the best chances.

Thus, we conclude that the genitive in *-osio* originated in **tosio*, which must be analysed as **to-sio*.

3. However, it seems that **tosio* did not exist in PIE. The following considerations point to this conclusion.

¹ Also, the assumption of a particle after *-os* (whether this is called ergative or genitive) would not explain why it was generalised only in the *o*-stems. Knobloch says it was used to disambiguate the nominative and the genitive of the *o*-stems. But this would hardly explain why *-osio* was never, i.e. in no language or subgroup, generalised in all genitives (that had *-os*). - Therefore I withdraw the suggestion 1985, 185.

² We know that **k^we* had a genitive **K^weso*. We are less sure about the other pronouns. Probably **e* had **eso* (cf. Germ. **pesa*). As *-sio* will appear in my explanation typical of the pronoun **so*, **to*, I think that all others, like **k^wo-* and **io-*, had *-so*.

- 1) Germanic **þesa* as the genitive of **to-* shows that this genitive is not based on the stem **to-*. It must be explained as **(h1)e-so* (I will omit the laryngeal in the following for the sake of simplicity) with a preposed **þ-* < **t-*. From this fact I concluded that **to-* did not have a genitive of its own (at least not the clear form **tosio*); see 1988.
- 2) The Tocharian evidence points the same way. The masculine forms have beside *s-* in the nominative singular always *c-*. This must derive from **te-*, and this can only be (the pronoun) **e-* with a prefixed *t-*, just as in Germanic. Thus Kortlandt 1983, 321, and 1987, 224f (where he also discusses Albanian forms).
- 3) The Slavic genitive, OCS *togo*, has an unexplained element *-go*. It might confirm that a genitive was created independently.
- 4) The fact that *so*, *to-* did not have a simple full paradigm (though **tosm-* was probably of PIE date, cf. Goth. *þamma*) makes it easier to understand why some subgroups, like Hittite and Italic, have at best only traces of this pronoun.
- 5) Perhaps the following consideration is relevant. If PIE had **tosio* as the genitive of one of the two most important, and probably the only two demonstratives (**so*, **to-* and **e*, **i-*), one would have expected that *-osio* was soon introduced into the nominal *o-*stems to remove the awkward homonymy with the nominative singular. But this has not happened, as is shown by Hittite, Germanic and Slavic.

Thus, we conclude that *-osio* goes back to **tosio*, but that this form did not exist in PIE. This paradox may point the way to the solution. It must mean that **tosio* was formed in several languages independently (or in a dialectgroup of PIE), which implies that the creation of this form must have been easy.

4. As **tosio* must be analysed as **to-sio*, it is natural to consider the pronoun Skt. *syá*, as was done by many scholars before.

This pronoun is clear only in Sanskrit. Supposed traces elsewhere are rather uncertain. It is not necessary to discuss them here.³

Skt. *syá* is a rather queer pronoun for several reasons:

- 1) It is used almost only adjectivally, in the Rigveda.
- 2) It is found in only very few case forms in the Rigveda. We find frequently (15 times and more):

nom.	sg.	<i>syá</i>	<i>syā́</i>	<i>tyád</i>
acc.	sg.	<i>tyám</i>		<i>tyád</i>
nom.	du.	<i>tyā́</i>		
nom.	pl.	<i>tyé</i>		

³ For possible *sia-* in Hittite see Neu 1983, 167 (*sietani, sieł, siez*).

Five forms occur 2 to 4 times; five others occur once only. So the pronoun is largely limited to the, mostly masculine, nominatives, and the (masculine and neuter) accusative singular.

- 3) The pronoun is, I would say, 'superfluous'. It does not have a clear meaning opposed to other Sanskrit pronouns, especially *sá* and *eṣá*. "Ausser Gebrauch gekommen ist es wohl einfach darum, weil es neben *ayám eṣá sá* entbehrlich war." (AiGr. 3, 545).
- 4) It has few if any cognates (as an independent pronoun) in other languages.

These facts, and the paradox of section 4, may lead to an explanation of the origin of this pronoun.

From 2) I conclude that this pronoun originated from a single, uninflected nom. sg. **sio*. This would not be surprising as **so* was probably also originally an isolated form.

From 1) I conclude that it was the attributive form of **so*. This leads to an analysis **s-io*. This is the generally adopted analysis. Only Schwyzer (1929, 365 n. 1) thought that **sio* was derived from a form **si*. However, both this form **si* and a derivative in *-o* are very doubtful.

All other scholars analysed **sio* as **s-io*, i.e. a form derived from **so*. In this case *-io* is either considered as the well known adjectival suffix *-io-*, or identified with the relative pronoun. Ultimately the two may be identical, and the matter is not very important here. (Knobloch may be right in considering it an element with the same *origin* as the relative.)⁴

This analysis of **sio*, then, is not new. It may find its confirmation when we try to combine it with the origin of the genitive in *-osio*.

5. Specht (1944, 363f), following Van Wijk, explained **to-sio* from juxtaposition of **to* and **sio*. This explanation has been rejected, because two nominatives would not make a genitive.

Still it is very tempting to identify the 'ending' **-sio* with the pronoun. I want to suggest that – the attributive – **sio* came to function as the genitive of **so*.⁵

⁴ I abandon the view (1982-3, 215f) that the disyllabic forms are relevant to the pre-history of the pronoun. - Kortlandt objects that there is no evidence for a form **io*. There is only **ios*, which he considers the thematic inflection of the pronoun **i-*. I do not think that this objection is decisive. (I am not sure that **i-* would have been inflected rather than **h₁e*, cf. **h₁eso*, **h₁esmei* etc. In passing I may suggest that Hitt. *-a(-as* etc.) is a thematisation of **h₁e*, i.e. **h₁os*.) I think that it is evident that **sio* is a derivative of **so*. - I am indebted to Kortlandt for criticism of an earlier version.

⁵ One might assume a parallel neuter **i-io(d)* from **io(d)*, but **tio-* will rather have been made analogically.

Thus we would have had:

nom.	so	tod
acc.	tom	tod
gen.	sio	
dat.	to()smei	
etc.		

(Note that the genitive was older than the *-sm-* forms, as otherwise we would expect **to-smos*.)

It is easy to understand that **sio* was reshaped into **tosio*, simply by prefixing *to-*. (Forms of the type **to-smei* must date from PIE, as they are found in many languages.) On the other hand it is also understandable that in some languages **sio* was abandoned as being too irregular. Some languages used **e-so* with a prefixed *t-* (Germanic, Tocharian).

This reconstruction explains, to my mind, the remarkable points of the pronoun *syá*. An attributive form could easily become an adjective. The restricted number of cases in which the pronoun occurs may reflect its origin as an uninflectable form. And it explains notably that the pronoun does not have a different meaning from *sá* (*ešá*). It is also understandable that not many languages developed it into a separate pronoun. Note further that the interpretation here given explains also why *-sio* only belonged to **so*, **to-* (whereas the other pronouns had *-so*).

The advantage of the theory proposed here is that it explains the origin of Skt. *syá* and of **tosio* at the same time. Also it does not contradict earlier views, but rather incorporates them.⁶

Robert S. P. Beekes
Rynsburgerweg 88
NL - 2333 AD LEIDEN
NETHERLANDS

⁶ I cannot accept Markey's explanation of *-osio* (1980). He states that pronouns did not originally have a genitive: "At the earliest stage, however, both demonstratives and relatives lacked a possessive formation [i.e. a genitive] which would have been redundant, for their primary function was one of deixis." So far I agree. He then goes on as follows: "As a result of the ongoing influential reciprocity between noun and pronoun, the pronouns acquired a possessive; the *old* gen.-abl. *-os*, subsequently pronominalized by the addition of the pronominal suffix *-yo-*, cf. Skt. *an-ya-* and Lat. *al-iu-*, Skt. *íá* and *t-yá-*." However, there is no indication whatever that the pronouns ever had a genitive in *-os*. We find *-sio* and *-so* (see below) against nominal *-os*. Also, it is not clear why this ending would have got the suffix *-yo-* (whereas in Skt. *-an-ya-*, Lat. *al-iu-* this is clear, as it is in *-t-ya-* (**s-io*) in my interpretation).

Markey denies the existence of a (pronominal) genitive ending *-so*. This cannot be upheld. For Greek, where it is clear if only in *ἐμέο* etc., see Beekes 1986. OCS *česo* "is

REFERENCES

- Beekes, R.S.P.
 1982-3 "On laryngeals and pronouns", *KZ (ZVS)* 96:200-32.
 1985 *The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection*, (Innsbruck).
 1986 "Hom. *ἐμειῶ*, Myc. *toe* and the PIE nominal and pronominal genitive singular", *FS E. Risch*. (Berlin), 365-71.
 1988 "The genitive singular of the pronoun in Germanic and Indo-European", *Beitr. z. Gesch. d. deutsch. Spr. u. Lit.* 110, 1-5.
- Knobloch, J.
 1950-2 "Zur Vorgeschichte des indogermanischen Genitivs der *O-Stämme* auf *-sjo*", *Die Sprache* 2:131-49.
- Kortlandt, F.H.H.
 1983 "Demonstrative pronouns in Balto-Slavic, Armenian and Tocharian", *Dutch contributions to the 9th int. congr. of Slavists: linguistics* (Amsterdam), 311-22.
 1987 "PIE *s in Albanian", *Dutch Stud. in South Slavic and Balkan Lingu.* (*Stud. Slav. a. Gen. Lingu.* 10) (Amsterdam), 219-226.
- Markey, T.L.
 1980 "An historical necessity: non-paradigmatic paradigms. The IE *syo*-genitive", *FoLH* 1, 97-108.
- Neu, E.
 1983 *Glossar zu den altheth. Ritualtexten*. StBot 26. (Wiesbaden).
- Schwyzler, E.
 1929 *FS J. Schrijnen*
- Specht, F.
 1944 *Der Ursprung der idg. Deklination*. Deklination. Göttingen.

a nonce formation wherein *-o* results from analogy with *togo*, segmented as *tog-o...*" This again presupposes a pronominal genitive in *-os* (if I understand the author well), for which there is no indication, certainly not in the historical forms. This suggestion is not enough to discard the evidence of Slavic, which undoubtedly points to an old *-so*. The explanation of the Germanic endings from *-sio* is phonetically improbable. I abstain from discussing the Tocharian evidence.