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Collectives in –jë in Slavic

This paper refutes the received opinion that the Slavic collective suffix –jë should be derived from a putative PIE suffix *–iyo–. It is argued that the suffix –jë is a regular development of the PIE collective formant *–ey– / –i–, discovered by N. Oettinger (1995, 1999). Besides Greek and Hittite, this suffix was preserved in Slavic in its original function; moreover, Proto-Slavic appears to be the only Indo-European language where the suffix remained at least partially productive.

There was a primary nominal suffix –jë in Proto-Slavic, used for deriving neuter nouns with abstract and collective meaning. This suffix is used to derive abstract nouns from adjectives, e.g. veseljë »joy« from vesel, and it is especially productive in deriving abstracts from participles in *–l– and *–n–, e.g. dëlanjë »activity« from dëlant »done«. However, a large number of collective nouns are derived with this suffix from other nouns, e.g. OCS kamenjë »stones« from kany »stone« (cp. Lith. akmuõ, OCS listvie (Croat. lišće) »leaves« from list, »leaf« (cp. Lith. láškas), OCS korenjë (Croat. korijenje) »roots« from koren »root«.

The received opinion (Brugmann 1902–4: 188–9, Meillet & Vaillant 1934: 357–8, Sławiński 1974: 86, Jurišić 1992: 52–4) is that the suffix –jë can be derived from the putative PIE suffix *–iyo–, and this conclusion is reached on the basis of such parallels as, e.g. OCS ustjë »mouth (of a river)«: L östium, or OCS sanjë »dream«: L somnium. However, this argument is rather weak on closer inspection.

To begin with, there was never a suffix *–iyo– in PIE. The shape of the suffix was actually *–yo–, and this suffix is reflected in Proto-Slavic as *–jë (e.g. in OCS běl’jë »white colour« from běl’ »white«. Only in Old Indic do we find the disyllabic form –iya–; however, this form of the suffix is regular in nouns
derived from the feminine stems in –i– < *–iH– (Burrow 1973), but it was extended analogically to other stems as well. Thus, OInd. –iya– is actually derivable from *–iHo–, and this suffix would have been reflected as */Gcc je//, rather than *je in Proto–Slavic.

Secondly, old PIE neuters with barytone accentuation became masculines in Proto–Slavic, as Illič–Svityč has shown (1963), e. g. *dhwórom »gate« (OInd. dvóram, L forum) > OCS dvors. Therefore, all of the putative cognates of Slavic derivatives in –je would have to be oxytona, and in Old Indic we find that neuters in –iya– are, as a rule, never oxytona (Burrow 1973: 185).

Thirdly, the suffix *–(i)yo– is not used to form collectives in any other Indo–European language. If OCS sanje is indeed derivable from the same proto–form as L somnium, the specialization of collective meaning in Slavic would have to be accounted for.

The Baltic parallels of this Slavic suffix are not well established. Baltic languages form collectives with different suffixes (Ambrazas 1992), and those formations that might correspond to the Slavic collectives in *–je do not have collective meaning. Kuryłowicz hesitatingly suggested (1968: 156): »So ist es höchstwahrscheinlich der Typus alys, bégis dem slaw. *pitrje gleichzustellen«. Lithuanian words such as alys »horse« and bégis »act of running« are mostly masculines in –io–, but, as Endzelins noted (1971: 90), at least some of them were originally i–stems. In some cases, a trace of the original inflexion is preserved, e. g. in Lith. bégé, a by–form of bégis with the same meaning. Lith. bégé is most easily derived from PIE *bhegwaz, an i– stem with the lengthened grade in the Nom. sg. In a similar manner, Lith. énis »frost«, corresponding exactly to PSI. *imje »id.« (Croat. inje etc.), is attested with genitives in both –ies and –io, i. e. as both i– and yo–stems. Not in a single case, to my knowledge, does a Slavic collective in –je correspond to the Lithuanian stem in –ys. As is generally agreed, it is Lithuanian stems in –ys that are most straightforwardly derived from *–yo– ( *–iH–o–), e. g. ožys »goat« < *h2eg’iH–o–. Thus, the Baltic data teach us only that Slavic –je cannot be from *–yo–, and that Slavic collectives in –je could, in principle, be related to some Baltic i–stems.

Therefore, I propose another origin of the Proto–Slavic collectives in –je, namely, the PIE collective suffix *–ey– / –i–. This suffix was discovered by Norbert Oettinger (1995) in Hittite, but with clear reflexes in other IE languages, especially in Greek, cp. the parallelism of Hitt. haštāi »bone« with G (Homeric) ostēon, both of which can be derived from PIE collective *h2osth1ey. This collective suffix is also hidden in some archaic formations of nouns denoting substances and cereals, e. g. L mel, G méli »honey« < PIE *mel–i–(t), or G álphi »barley« < PIE *h2elbh–i–(t) (Oettinger 1999). I have argued elsewhere (Matasović 2004: 60) that this suffix could be the source of the Luvian –mo–tion–suffix –i–, and of the PIE pronominal plural ending *–i (e. g. L ilít, OCS ti, Lith. tie < PIE *to–i).
Already in PIE, the original suffix *–ey– was occasionally enlarged by a secondary thematic *–o–, e.g. in Gornéon «bird» < *h3ern–ey–o–m, and it would be tempting to think that this development would fit the Slavic data as well. So, for example, PSl. *injje would be derivable from *injeyom, with the change of *–ey– to /Gcc j– before vowels, as in *treyes »three« (OInd. trayas) > OCS trje. We would have to assume that old collectives in *–ey– were thematized in Slavic, as they occasionally were in Greek. On the other hand, although Lith. ūnis could, in principle, represent the thematic proto–form *injeyom (remodeled as an i–stem), it could also be from the undervected collective with Nsg. *inji and Gsg. *injes. The loss of the neuter gender in Lithuanian meant that this form had to be adjusted to one of the existing masculine or feminine declensional patterns, but the vacillation between the genitives in –io (masculine) and –ies (feminine) shows that this word had been neuter in Proto–Baltic. This observation leads us a step further. The Slavic collectives in *–ižje could also be derivable from athematic neuter i–stems with the neuter nominative–accusative plural ending *–h2: PIE *iHneyh2 would have given Balto–Slavic *oneya, from which we would have *injjo > OCS injje quite regularly. The reflex of the word–final laryngeal as OCS –o (–e after j) is assured by the vocative ženo »woman« from *gwenh2 (cp. Nsg. žena from *gweneh2).2

Therefore, Slovene o–kôstje < *ob–kostje »skeleton« might be directly comparable3 to Hitt. haštai rather than to G ostón.

The suffix *–ey–h2 (or *–ey–o–) > *–ižje– was presumably inherited in some words, and then spread analogically to others, thus becoming productive. It could be original, e.g. in OCS ljudje »men« (synchronically an i–stem, plurale tantum but originally a collective), cp. Lith. liaudis »people«, Proto–Germanic *leudi–4 (OHG liut(i), etc.); it might also be inherited in OCS ovo{te »fruits« < *ob–vokt’ižje, (Croat. voce), cp. Goth. us–wahsts »growth« < PIE *h2wog–s–ti–, but it is probably analogical in kamenje »stones«, since no traces of an i–stem is found outside Slavic.

If the above inferences are correct, the collective suffix –ižje represents a remarkable archaism of the Slavic languages. The formation of collectives with this suffix has remained productive in Slavic, whereas we find only traces of such formations in other branches of IE languages.

---

1 Of course, one also has to take into account that word–final *–m was lost in neuters (or replaced by the pronominal ending *–d) very early, perhaps even during the Balto–Slavic period (Kortlandt 1994), certainly before the raising of *–om to *–um (as in the accusative sg. of thematic masculines, e.g. *wlkwom > OCS vl.kw > wolf). Thus, the direct proto–form of OCS injje would have been *injo(d) rather than *injom.


3 This assertion should be taken cautiously, because the initial *k– in Slavic is unexplained. It is even possible that OCS kosto and Slov. okostje are from an altogether different etymon PIE *kosto– (OIr. coss »leg«, L costa »rib«, etc.), but even in that case the formation of the collective in Slovene would be parallel to the one in Hittite.
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