

HUMAN LANDMARKS AS LANDMARKS OF DIRECTION EXPRESSIONS IN ANCIENT INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

The encoding of the semantic role of direction may display animacy based differential marking. Cross-linguistic data also show that both human and inanimate direction may be encoded in the same way as the semantic role of recipient. After briefly surveying some attested patterns in the encoding of these three semantic roles, the paper concentrates on three Ancient Indo-European languages, Hittite, Latin and Ancient Greek. Among them, only Hittite makes use of the dative case to encode direction, while in the other languages the dative is limited to the role of recipient. Homeric Greek displays a cross-linguistically infrequent pattern, with the illative preposition extending to human direction. This pattern is dropped in Attic-Ionic prose.

Keywords: recipient, human direction, inanimate direction, dative case, differential marking.

Сильвия Лураги

Университет Павии, Италия. luraghi@unipv.it

Выражение директивности в древних индоевропейских языках: кодирование направленности на человека и на неодушевленный предмет

Рассмотрение семантической роли направительности может отражать одушевленность, основанную на различиях в маркировании. Сопоставительные материалы показывают, что направительность как связанная с человеком, так и неодушевленная, может кодироваться теми же способами, что и роль реципиента. После краткого обзора засвидетельствованных моделей кодирования трех семантических ролей автор сосредоточивает внимание на хеттских, латинских и древнегреческих данных. Только хеттский язык среди перечисленных использует дательный падеж для направительности, в то время как в других языках дательный падеж ограничен ролью реципиента. Гомеровский греческий демонстрирует редкую модель с иллативным предлогом при направленности на человека. Эта модель исчезает в ионийско-аттической прозе.

Ключевые слова: реципиент, направленность на человека, направленность на неодушевленный предмет, дательный падеж, модели кодирования семантических ролей.

1. Introduction

This paper concerns the encoding of the semantic role of direction with human and inanimate landmarks in the light of possible relations with the encoding of the semantic role of recipient in some ancient IE languages. As several researchers have pointed out (e.g. Aristar 1997; Kittilä 2008; Creissels, Mounole 2011; Kittilä, Ylikoski 2011; Luraghi 2011) human participants are not good landmarks of spatial relations, due to non-prototypicality (Aristar 1997), markedness effects (Kittilä 2008), unexpectedness (Kittilä, Ylikoski 2011), lower frequency (Haspelmath 2019), or physical constraints (Luraghi 2011). Hence, they often trigger differential marking of spatial relations¹.

Luraghi, Nikitina & Zanchi (2017) argue that “the encoding of certain spatial relations depends on the type of landmark, and non-conventional landmarks (e.g. human beings) often require special types of encoding” and conclude that “with time, such differential marking may give rise to markers that are no longer obviously related to the original spatial concept”. As an example, they mention the IE dative which, according to Kuryłowicz (1964: 190) was “genetically nothing else than an offshoot of the locative used with personal nouns”.

Note however that Kuryłowicz’s claim is at odds with common development known from grammaticalization process, which shows a tendency for allative markers, rather than locatives to develop into datives, hence to encode the semantic role of recipient (Kouteva et al. 2019: 53). In addition, it partly overlooks the IE evidence, as the occurrence of the dative in direction expressions is limited in all IE languages that feature a dative case, both modern and ancient². On the other hand, the use of the dative as an allative is cross-linguistically well represented, even though several languages show differential marking of human and inanimate landmarks in direction expressions patterning in different ways with respect to recipient marking (Kittilä, Luraghi 2009).

¹ Differential marking of spatial relations has been studied especially in connection with toponyms and other nouns with spatial reference, which often require less complex marking (Comrie 1986; Aristar 1997; Luraghi 2003: 65–66; 2017).

² In Sanskrit, the dative has allative value limited to animate nouns, see Delbrück (1888:143–145). For Latin and Greek see fn. 4 and 6.

In this paper I will briefly discuss cross-linguistic patterns in the encoding of the semantic roles of human direction, inanimate direction and recipient (Sec. 2). I will then show how these patterns are represented in some ancient IE languages, taking my examples from Hittite and Latin (Sec. 3). Following this, I will focus on Ancient Greek, and discuss some changes that took place between Homer and Classical Greek (Sec. 4). The discussion of the data will highlight another factor that may (or may not) bring about differential marking of spatial semantic roles in relation with specific types of landmarks, that is, the distinction between allative and illative marking. I summarize my findings in Sec. 5).

2. Direction and recipient marking

In several languages the dative case or prepositions that encode the dative relation also has allative function, as in Turkish (1a, b), in Finnish (2a, b), and with prepositions in Italian (3a, b) (examples adapted from Kittilä & Luraghi 2009). Note that in Finnish and Italian the occurrence of the same morpheme in direction and in recipient expressions depends on the type of inanimate landmark: while some landmarks show the same marking as recipients (allative case in Finnish, preposition *a* in Italian), other take illative marking (illative case in Finnish, preposition *in* in Italian).

- (1a) *Hasan istasyon-a/ şehir-e git-ti*
 H. station-DAT town-DAT go-PAST
 ‘Hasan went to the station.’
- (1b) *Mariem Hasan-a bir paketi ver-di*
 M. H.-DAT a parcel give-PAST
 ‘Mary gave a parcel to Hasan.’
- (2a) *Ville men-i asema-lla / kaupunki-in*
 V. go-3SG.PAST station-ALL town-ILL
 ‘V. went to the station / to town.’
- (2b) *Ville anto-i paketi-n lapse-lla*
 V. give-3SG.PAST parcel-ACC child-ALL
 ‘Ville gave the parcel to the child.’
- (3a) *Paolo è andato alla stazione /in città*
 P. is gone to.the station in town
 ‘Paul went to the station / to town.’
- (3b) *Paolo ha dato il pacco a Maria*
 P. has given the parcel to M.
 ‘Paul gave the parcel to Mary.’

When it comes to motion toward human landmarks, the three languages follow different directions: while in Turkish the dative also extends to this type of relation (1c), Finnish features an adpositional phrase (2c), while Italian features a dedicated preposition, *da* (3c) (Luraghi 2009a).

- (1c) *çocuk öğretmen-e git-ti*
 child teacher-DAT go-PAST
 ‘The child went to the teacher.’
- (2c) *lapsi men-i opettaja-n luo*
 child.NOM go-3SG.PAST teacher-GEN to
 ‘The child went to the teacher.’
- (3c) *Il bambino è andato dal maestro*
 the child is gone to.the teacher
 ‘The child went to the teacher.’

Among the Indo-European languages that feature a dative case, the dative is not normally used to encode the direction of any type of motion performed by the agent, even though in transfer events the recipient is indeed the endpoint of a transfer (so there is motion implied, but the moving entity is not the agent, but the theme). In several languages, human and inanimate directions show selection differences for the preferred preposition, as Russian, in which we find a three-fold encoding (3a-c)³.

- (3a) *Rebenok pošel k učitelju.*
 child.NOM went to teacher.DAT
 ‘The child went to the teacher.’
- (3b) *Ja pošla na vokzal / v gorod.*
 1SG.NOM went to station.ACC / into town.ACC
 ‘I went to the station / to town.’
- (3c) *Maša dala paket Ivanu.*
 M..NOM gave parcel I.DAT
 ‘Mary gave a parcel to John.’

Turkish, Finnish, Italian and Russian show three different patterns (adapted from Kittilä & Luraghi 2009):

³ This does not mean that the preposition *k* ‘to, toward’ in Russian cannot be used with inanimate landmarks: it can, but it is not the basic motion preposition that corresponds to English *to* with inanimates.

- A. *human direction = inanimate direction = recipient* (Turkish)
 B. *human direction ≠ recipient = inanimate direction* (Finnish; Italian)
 C. *human direction ≠ inanimate direction ≠ recipient* (Russian)

Notably Finnish and Italian show pattern (B) in case of allative / *a* marking of inanimate direction and pattern (C) in case of illative marking (Italian *in*). On the other hand, in Russian, as in Finnish and in Italian, inanimate markers can take illative marking with the preposition *v*, but, contrary to the other two languages, this does not change the overall pattern.

3. Hittite and Latin: two divergent patterns

As I remarked above, the IE dative does not usually indicate direction, either with inanimate or with animate landmarks. As exception is constituted by Hittite, which features pattern A, as in (4a-c).

- (4a) *namma*^{URU} *Palhuissaz* EGIR-*pa* *INA*^{URU} *KU.BABBAR-si* *uanun*
 then P.ABL back Hattusa.D/L go.PRT.1SG
 ‘Then I went back from Palhissa to Hattusa.’

(AM Vs ii 7 = Goetze 1933: 44)

- (4b) *nu= sse* 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pai*
 CONN 3SG.DAT 6 shekel silver give.PRS.3SG
 ‘(He) gives him six shekels of silver.’

(HG § 10 =Friedrich, 1959).

- (4c) *LUGAL-i* *para* I-ŠU *paizzi*
 king.D/L PREV once go.PRS.3SG
 ‘(He) goes forth once to the king.’ (StBoT 25 43 i 11–13 = Neu 1980).

Old Hittite features a dedicated allative case, usually called directive, that encodes direction limited to inanimate landmarks (4d) (Starke 1977). It thus shows a fourth pattern (D).

- D. *human direction = recipient ≠ inanimate direction*
 (4d) LUGAL-*s=a* ^{URU}*Arinna* *paizzi*
 king.NOM PTC A.DIR go.PRS.3SG
 ‘The king goes to Arinna.’ (StBoT 25 4 Vs ii 9)

Latin, in its turn, shows pattern (C)⁴. While transfer verbs take the dative (5a), direction with inanimate landmarks is indicated by *in* and the accusative (5b), while animate landmarks trigger differential marking with *ad* and the accusative (5c)⁵.

- (5a) *quibus illi agros dederunt*
REL.DAT.PL DEM.NOM.PL field.ACC.PL give.PRT.3PL
'... to whom they gave lands.' (Caes. Gal. 1.28)
- (5b) *Ita ... in oppidum revererunt*
thus in town.ACC return.PRT.3PL
'Thus they returned to the town.' (Caes. Gal. 7.82)
- (5c) *idem princeps civitatum ... ad Caesarem*
same.NOM chief.NOM state.GEN.PL to C.ACC
reverterunt
return.PRT.3PL
'The same chiefs of states returned to Caesar.' (Caes. Gal. 1.31)

4. Focus on Ancient Greek

Ancient Greek is similar to most IE languages in that the dative does not extend to direction, but occurs with verbs of transfer (6a)⁶.

- (6a) *theós pou soi tó g' édōken*
god.NOM INDEF 2SG.DAT DEM.ACC PTC give.AOR.3SG
'A god gave you this.' (Hom. *Il.* 1.178)

Both with inanimate and with animate landmarks, direction is encoded by prepositional phrases. In this respect, patterns vary depending on the author and on the language stage. With inanimate landmarks, one finds *eis* with the accusative (6b) at all language stages.

⁴ By the most part, alleged occurrences of the plain dative in direction expressions are hardly qualifiable as adverbials, because they are connected with some specific verbs, such as *appropinquare*, which are perhaps bivalent. A frequently quoted (and isolated) poetic example which involves *ire* is occurs in the Aeneid (Verg. Aen. 5.451: *it clamor caelo* "the noise rises toward the sky"). See Luraghi (2010: 31–32).

⁵ As noted for Russian *k* (cf. fn. 2), Latin *ad* too may be used with inanimate landmarks, but it is not the basic way to encode direction.

⁶ The Greek dative has a limited allative function, when it occurs as the second argument of some motion verbs and mostly animate nouns (Luraghi 2003: 51).

- (6b) *élthōn* *es klisíēs* *Agamémnonos*
 go.PTCP.AOR.NOM to hut.ACC A.GEN
 ‘When you have gone to the hut of Agamemnon.’ (Hom. *Il.* 2.9).

In Homer, the preposition *eis* with the accusative also occurs with human landmarks (6c).

- (6c) *all’ es mèn Menélaon egō kélomai ...*
 but to PTC M.ACC 1SG.NOM order.PRS.M/P.1SG
eltheîn
 go.INF.AOR
 ‘But I order (you) to go to Menelaus.’ (Hom. *Od.* 3.317–318)

In Herodotus, *eis* occurs with verbs of motion such as *érkhomai* ‘go’ and *eîmi* ‘go’ to encode direction with human landmarks only if they are plural (6d).

- (6d) *eléluthas es philous*
 go.PF.2SG to friend.ACC.PL
 ‘You have come to friends.’ (Hdt. 1.35.4).

With singular human nouns or pronouns, another preposition occurs, *pará* with the accusative (6e). This is also the prepositional phrase that encodes direction with human landmarks in Attic (6f).

- (6e) *kai tina aggeliéphoron elthónta Dareiou*
 and INDF.ACC messenger.ACC go.PTCP.AOR.ACC D.GEN
par’ autón
 to DEM.ACC
 ‘A messenger from Darius having come to him.’ (Hdt. 3.126.2)
- (6f) *autòs dè dè hōs tís genēsómenos*
 DEM.NOM PTC PTC PTC INT.NOM become.PTCP.FUT.MID.NOM
érkhēi parà tòn Prōtagóran?
 go.PRS.3SG to ART.ACC P.ACC
 ‘And what is it that you yourself hope to become when you go to Protagoras?’ (Pl. *Prt.* 312a);

The preposition *pará* takes three cases in Ancient Greek, and indicates the basic spatial relations of location (with the dative), direction (with the accusative) and source (with the genitive) (Luraghi 2009b). Its meaning is ‘nearby.’ With all cases, it shows a

preference for human landmarks. In direction expressions it also occurs in Homeric Greek (6g).

- (6g) *eîmi* *par'* *Héphaiston*
 go.FUT.1SG by H.ACC
 'I will go to Hephaestus.' (Hom. *Il.* 18.143).

Notably, *pará* with the accusative does not seem encode direction with inanimate landmarks: a limited number of occurrences in Homer can be explained as indicating location or motion alongside a landmark, rather than in its direction (Luraghi 2003: 135–137). On the other hand, in Homer both location and source expressions introduced by *pará* with the dative or the genitive often feature inanimate landmarks (Luraghi 2003: 131–135).

After Homer, *pará* increasingly becomes a dedicated preposition for spatial relations with human landmarks, as inanimate landmarks, which are very infrequent in Herodotus, virtually disappear both with *pará* and dative and with *pará* and genitive in Attic prose (Luraghi 2003: 138–143). The parallel extension of *pará* with accusative to become the standard prepositional phrase for direction with human landmarks resulted in the ongoing dropping out of *eis* as marker of direction with human landmarks.

Hence in Ancient Greek one can see a change from a type that we had not encountered in the languages examined thus far (E), represented in Homer but cross-linguistically infrequent (Kittilä & Luraghi 2009), to type (C), represented in Attic-Ionic prose.

E. *animate direction = inanimate direction ≠ recipient*

The Homeric data deserve more attention in light of the meaning and the etymology of *eis* (or *es* in Ionic). This preposition has no direct cognates in the other IE languages, but is an innovation of a number of Ancient Greek dialects, which derives from the inessive preposition *en* 'in' through the addition of *-s*. The form *ens* is also attested in the dialect of Crete; elsewhere the nasal has disappeared, determining compensatory lengthening of the vowel (the writing *ei* stands for [e:]) (Luraghi 2009b). It follows that *eis* must be taken as having an illative, rather than allative, meaning.

As well known, the preposition *en* 'in' is one of the most widely attested adpositions/preverbs of the Indo-European languages, and it is cognate with English *in* among others. In Homeric Greek, as well

as in Classical Greek, *en* could only take the dative, a heritage of the ancient Indo-European locative that had merged with the dative in Greek (Luraghi 2003: 51–52). In the other Indo-European languages, however, cognates of *en* could also take the accusative and express direction. The alternation between location and direction, indicated by the accusative and the locative, or the case that replaced it, is quite typical of the Indo-European languages, including Latin, the Slavic and the Germanic languages.

Ancient Greek, with the newly created preposition *eis*, featured three prepositions with different cases, *en*+dat, *eis*+acc and *ek*+gen to express inessive, illative and elative (Luraghi 2009b). It lies outside the scope of the present paper to discuss the animacy features of possible landmarks of *en* and *ek* (see Luraghi 2003 for discussion); in any case, it is remarkable that Homeric Greek allowed the illative preposition in direction expressions with human landmarks. Indeed, as noted in Luraghi (2009a), an illative marker implies that the entity which moves to a landmark will eventually occupy a portion of the space in which the landmark is located. However, under normal circumstances human beings cannot be conceived as being coincident in space with other entities.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have discussed the encoding of three semantic roles, recipient, inanimate direction and human direction in some ancient IE languages. I have especially concentrated on Hittite, Latin and Ancient Greek. Even a small number of languages shows a variety of patterns in the encoding of these three semantic roles. I summarize the findings in Table 1.

Table 1. Marking of human direction, inanimate direction, and recipient

TYPE	<i>human direction</i>	<i>inanimate direction</i>	<i>recipient</i>	LANGUAGE
A	case (DAT)	case (DAT)	case (DAT)	Hittite
D	case (DAT)	case (DIR)	case (DAT)	Old Hittite
C	PP (ALL)	PP (ILL)	case (DAT)	Latin
E	PP (ILL)	PP (ILL)	case (DAT)	Homeric Greek
C	PP (+HUM)	PP (ILL)	case (DAT)	Attic-Ionic Greek

References

- Aristar, A. R. 1997: Marking and hierarchy types and the grammaticalization of case-markers. *Studies in Language* 21(2). 313–368.
- Comrie, B. 1986: Markedness, grammar, people, and the world. In: Fred R. Eckman, Edith A. Moravcsik & Jessica R. Wirth (eds.), *Markedness*, 85–106. New York: Plenum.
- Creissels, D., Mounole, C. 2011: Animacy and spatial cases: Typological tendencies, and the case of Basque. In: Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi & Jussi Ylikoski (eds.), *Case, animacy and semantic roles*, 155–182. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Delbrück, B. 1888: *Altindische Syntax*. Halle (repr. 1968, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
- Friedrich, J. 1959: *Die hethitischen Gesetze*. Leiden: Brill.
- Goetze, A. 1933: *Die Annalen des Mursilis*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung
- Kittilä, S. 2008: Animacy effects on differential Goal marking. *Linguistic Typology* 12. 245–268.
- Kittilä, S., Luraghi, S. 2009: Differential marking of spatial relations: the case of direction with human landmarks. Paper read at ALT 8, University of Berkeley, July 25, 2009.
- Kittilä, S., Ylikoski, Ju. 2011: Remarks on the coding of goal, recipient and vicinal goal in European Uralic. In Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi & Jussi Ylikoski (eds.), *Case, animacy and semantic roles*, 29–64. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kouteva, T., Heine B., Hong, Bo., Long, H., Sun Yat-sen, Narrog, H., Rhee, S. 2019: *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* 2edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1964: *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Winters.
- Luraghi, S. 2003: *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases. A Study of the Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Luraghi, S. 2009a.: A model for representing polysemy: The Italian preposition *da*. In: Jacques François, Eric Gilbert, Claude Guimier, Maxi Krause (éds.), *Actes du Colloque Autour de la préposition*, 167–178. Caen: Presses Universitaires de Caen.
- Luraghi, S. 2009b: The evolution of local cases and their grammatical equivalent in Greek and Latin. In Johanna Barðdal & Shobana Celliah, eds., *The Role of Semantics and Pragmatics in the Development of Case*, 283–305. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Luraghi, S. 2010: Adverbial Phrases. In Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *A New Historical Syntax of Latin*. Berlin/ New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2010, 19–107.
- Luraghi, S. 2011: The coding of spatial relations with human landmarks: From Latin to Romance. In Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi & Jussi Ylikoski (eds.), *Case, animacy and semantic roles*, 209–234. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Luraghi, S. 2017: Differential goal marking vs. differential source marking in Ancient Greek. In: Silvia Luraghi, Tatiana Nikitina & Chiara

- Zanchi (eds.), *Space in diachrony*, 119–145. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Luraghi, S., Nikitina, T., Zanchi, C. 2017: Space in diachrony: An introduction. In Silvia Luraghi, Tatiana Nikitina & Chiara Zanchi (eds.), *Space in diachrony*, xi–xvii. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Neu, E. 1980. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*. Wiesbad: Harrassowitz.
- Starke, F. 1977: *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen*. Wiesbad: Harrassowitz.