da-, *pai-* "give" and the Relationship of Anatolian to PIE

Jacqueline Boley (Old Saybrook, Conn.)

It is with great pleasure that I make this brief offering to Silvin Košak on the occasion of his 65th birthday, with all good wishes for many happy returns, and endless time to devote to the study of Hittite, to which he has so much contributed.

Old Hittite contains many features that have become a bit of a battleground in Indo-European studies. They are alternately analyzed as
1) archaisms that reflect the state of the mother language PIE at an archaic stage, before it had developed into the mother of the other sister branches. In this case Anatolian is supposed to have left the parent stock a bit before its sisters; or
2) indications that Anatolian inherited exactly the same stage of PIE as its sisters, but lost many ancient structures preserved in the rest of Indo-European.

Items sparking this kind of battle include the lack of a feminine and of the aorist. The IE Perfect is often supposed to have descended into the *ḫi*-conjugation and so been lost.

It would be of paramount interest for our understanding of the history of Indo-European to know whether the strange characteristics of Old Hittite indeed give us a glimpse into the earlier parent language, or whether they are of no use whatsoever in such an inquiry. So we may ask ourselves:

What features can we isolate that are clear evidence either of one or the other of these hypotheses?

A) K. Yoshida provided one such feature of Anatolian at the recent 6th International Congress of Hittitology in Rome. He illustrated the changeover for the middle third person singular ending from the ancient suffix **-a* < **-o* to the suffix **-ta* < **-to*. The older suffix was in the process of being replaced as Old Hittite unfolded, though it is possible that the beginning of the transformation had begun already in PIE, if ancient forms such as *u̯ešta* already with the **-t-* are any indication.

Yoshida showed, I believe conclusively, that this feature must be taken as an archaism, and cannot reasonably be taken as evidence of loss. It is in fact hard to assume that the newer suffix **-to*, which eventually triumphed in all of IE, was in-

herited in Anatolian from PIE already dominant in the inflection, and that the *-o was then reinstated in Anatolian, and then removed again. The early ubiquity of the original ending -a looks like pretty uncontrovertible proof that at least this one feature of Old Hittite must have been archaic and inherited from a slightly earlier stage of late PIE. The mother language would then have generalized the *-t-, before the rest of the group separated with *-t already in vogue.

One might also point out that the spotty inflection of the neuters, which in many cases in Old Hittite show no plural is hard to reconcile with a loss theory. The neuters show a progress from quite an inert sort of inflection to a more developed one, with various plural endings, and much oblique inflection as well. They also go from taking only Acc. or oblique status, a well documented feature of less developed PIE, to functioning as subjects in the phrase. All the characteristics of the neuters in early Anatolian harmonize with the reconstructions of the neuter's nature in earlier PIE.

B) I would like to propose a further important archaism preserved by Anatolian:
As is well known, Hittite (Anatolian actually) has a verb da- <*deh₃-, cognate, among others, with Latin dō, Greek δίδωμι and Sanskrit dā-. These latter all mean "give"; Anatolian's da- however means the opposite, namely "take". The propensity of PIE (as indeed has been observed for "active" languages in general) to express opposites by the same form is an established fact. The same root in early PIE could have a "centrifugal" or a "centripetal" force, a characteristic of "active" languages[1], to which category Lehmann proposes PIE to belong. The "centrifugal" sense may be roughly defined as having reference also to some outside object, the "centripetal" as impacting only the subject[2]. In terms of PIE the existence of roots like *dō,- which expressed 'opposites' was symptomatic and widespread. It certainly is not characteristic of later IE. This is very interesting in terms of our present quest: First of all, we must take it that Anatolian left PIE before *dō- had decided for one or the other meaning. That is, *dō- must still have been used both for "give" and for "take" in the mother language, at the time that Anatolian separated from it. There is no indication in the other branches of IE that *dō- ever meant anything but "give", so that it is reasonable to assume that the sense "take" was eliminated after Anatolian left but while late PIE was still together. The fact, there-

---

1 Lehmann, p. 84ff.
2 We may note that one of the effects of this system is that a single form very often expressed what we would regard as both transitive and intransitive sense. It may be remembered that we had suggested (Boley 2001, 2005c) that hark- in Hittite had both a transitive and an intransitive use, very much parallel to Greek ἔχω. It should be of interest, therefore, as confirmation of this analysis, that this type of verb was actually a commonplace in PIE, and hence it should occasion no surprise if we find reflexes of this ancient situation in the early daughter languages.

fore, that da- is used as "take" in Anatolian would seem a clear indication of archaism in Anatolian, and equally as clearly to exclude any hypothesis of loss.

It is also of interest to observe how Anatolian handled the creation of the verb "give", once it had decided to limit *da- to "take". The accepted derivation[3] for pai- "give" in Anatolian is the particle *pe/o "hin" as a prefix to a verb *ai-, which in the rest of IE appears in Greek αἴνυμαι "take" and Toch. A ai-/B e- "give". It is evident that it is the particle which carries the actual sense of the whole verb, namely some operation 'away' from the speaker. We might mention that da- itself was often accompanied in OH by the particle -ašta (meaning roughly "her") as reinforcement for its new purely "ablative" spin.

It may be of interest that *de, a possible base for the root *deh₃-, had a similar deictic nuance of "from"/"to" in PIE, as shown by Latin de and the Greek goal suffix -δε. The Anatolian particle *pe also becomes a sentence connective and possibly took on various marking functions, as perhaps in Hittite -pat. So did *de, as demonstrated e.g. by the Greek particle δέ, which is actually reasonably parallel to *pe in sense and use.

We might mention that the IE verb *dʰeh₁- "put" could have a similar derivation. It descended into Anatolian dai-, Latin facio/feci, Greek τίθημι, Sanskrit dhā-. There is a particle -θε < *dhe in Greek which has a very promising sense from our point of view: it is a Locative particle. This particle could conceivably be the first element in *dʰeh₁.

C) It is of interest to determine what the force of these particles is. As can be seen, some are Place Words in the later language, and one might surmise that the verbs we were just discussing take their sense from some local nuance expressed by the particle. But *de itself shows that the local nuance was in fact embryonic at best: what the particle in fact expresses is a relation to the speaker. This is in fact the only way we can reconcile having a single particle to describe both "give" and "take", "to" and "from", "hin" and "her".

In this regard, the inflection in the hi-conjugation of *dō-, *dʰē- and Anatolian pai- "give" seems significant. The Hittite hi-conjugation is most likely a repository of old middle/subject-oriented verbs that have been reinterpreted as active, something like the deponent class of Latin. It is usually related to, or by some scholars derived from, the IE Perfect. Based on the inclusion of da- and dai- "put" in the hi-conjugation in Hittite, one may surmise that in PIE *dō- and *dʰē- were at one time thought of as subject-oriented. If pai- "give" is indeed built on an ancient root *ai-, this also must have been had the same connotations (it is of interest that the

---

3 See Kimball, p. 204, with reference to Melchert's similar views.

Greek cognate of this is a middle verb), reinforced then by the addition of the deictic particle *pe*. One starts to wonder whether the *ḫi*-conjugation in Proto-Anatolian still retained some sense of a middle nuance. At any rate, these indications that the verbs were considered as subject-oriented would hardly be surprising if they indeed are built on deictic particles that indicate a specific relation to the speaker, as we suggest.

For the purposes of our quest here, it is interesting to note that *dai-* "put" is a *ḫi*-conjugation verb, but that most of its compounds are not. *te-* "say" itself has the basic root, but is of the *mi*-conjugation. The compounds *peḫute-*, *ẏete-*, *uẏate-*, etc. are all *mi*-conjugation. The rest of IE has the reflexes of $*d^heh_1$- as purely active: in Greek and Sanskrit the verb has clearly been moved over wholesale to the *mi*-conjugation.

Here is another archaism preserved by Anatolian, and again in a very live fashion. It is possible that Anatolian left PIE at a time when the middle nuance of these verbs had not been entirely lost. Whether this is so or not, however, it seems clear that $*d^h\bar{e}$- however was turning towards the *mi*-conjugation already at the time of Anatolian's departure. $*d\bar{o}$-, however, shows no sign of having moved at all yet out of the *ḫi*-conjugation.

D) The whole way Anatolian forms verbs is in fact of great interest from an IE point of view. First of all, verbs could rarely be formed directly on particles, as one may infer from *uẏa-* "come".

It looks very much as if originally in PIE there was a small number of base verbal roots, that had a fairly wide, even vague, range of meaning, which then were pinned down by means of additional particles. Anatolian $*da$- and $*te$- were two of these roots. Thus we find that the root $*d^heh_1$- is supposed to have descended, in Anatolian, into such diverse verbs as *dai-* "put"; *te-* "say"; *peḫute-* "lead (away)", which is supposed to be based on two particles $*pe$ and $*h_2u$ (both meaning 'away') + $*d^heh_1$-; *uẏate-* "bring (towards the speaker)" < $*ẏo$ + $*d^heh_1$-; *ẏete-* "build" < particle $*ẏe$ (a relative of *u-* on which *uẏa-* "come" is constructed) + $*d^heh_1$; and even *ẏerite-* "fear", which may be a blending of two roots, *ẏeri-* (or is this a locative as Kimball, p. 149 suggests?) + $*d^heh_1$-; etc. *da-* also is used as a base: note also *u-da-* and *pe-da-* to mean "bring towards the speaker" or "bring away (from the speaker)". Kimball (p. 148-9) mentions that the compounds of $*d^heh_1$- have no plene in the verbal part of the syntagm, suggesting that the first element of the compound was accented, although the spelling of that first element often leaves this ambiguous. In any case, it would appear that the attached particle was the main carrier of the verbal nuance. At least it reinforced the deictic slant of the base root which seems very amorphous in sense. See also e.g. *pai-* "go", based on $*pe/o$

+ $*i$-, or *pai-* "give" itself.

This tallies with what is known about the PIE Verb: the V does not seem to have much color. It is a well known fact that the earliest PIE Verb is indifferent to tense, aspect, transformation, transitivity, active and passive; in fact, almost every function that we deem inherent in a verb. There was no one established verb for each sense, as we are used to: there were on the contrary many roots with similar or identical meanings. The color and specific sense is lent the V by the particles associated with it. It looks therefore as if the V itself was not expressing a specific nuance, but rather was a general deictic base that could be pushed one way or another by the addition of further particles. Anatolian seems to be mirroring the mentality of an earlier phase of PIE, in which particles played a much greater part in the language than later IE demonstrates[4]. There is abundant evidence[5] that in barely historical PIE the plain "local" particles, later the Place Words, took on a great amount of verbal indications, with or without the presence of a verb in the phrase. It is attractive for instance to analyze "tmesis" as showing the tail end of this function of the simple particles. Earlier verbal roots may well have been formed from combinations of these or similar elements. As they were cast in stone and became roots, other particles were coined to specify them. In an early stage of development of the PIE root, these Particles could even be single consonants that were essentially welded to the Root. A further stage is shown us by Anatolian, when Particles were attached to these old established roots as prefixes or the like, as may be seen in the prefixes e.g. in *pai-* "go", *peḫute-*, *ẏete-*, etc., just discussed. There are also Particles which could take up a station independent from the V. This last type of Particle, the canonical Place Words, were still very much divorced from the verb in PIE and Anatolian and literal in their meaning even at the time of Old Hittite. They later took on all the task of specifying the V, and eventually, in the historical era, ended up forming virtual compounds with it.

What is particularly important is that in all these cases the particles carried most if not all of the verbal content themselves. It would almost seem as if the Particles as a category renewed itself, as the individuals changed character and became part of the roots. But eventually the old rationale for their existence was buried, in the historical IE languages.

E) A last but not least piece of evidence pointing to a slightly earlier departure from PIE of Anatolian: Particles in PIE had two main positions open to them, namely initial (usually accented), or enclitic/proclitic and unaccented[6]. Inter-

---

4   Boley 2004b, §2, §3.

5   See Boley 2004c, §C.3b, §H.4b, Concluding Remarks and passim.

6   Boley 2004b, §2, §3.

estingly, it turns out that Anatolian is the group which shows this most clearly; the rest of IE has the indications of this situation quite a bit more buried, prompting suspicions that for the other groups it is much more remote. In Anatolian[7], in fact, we have direct alternations, such as the Luwian sentence connective *pa-* and the Hittite particle *pe*, both written with plene (indicating accent), as opposed to Luwian *-pa*, Hittite *-pat* (probably) which are enclitic. See also Luwian *a-* as against Hittite *-a* (both sentence connectives), and their probable spin-offs, the pronouns *a-* and *-a-*. We might also cite *mān* "when" as opposed to the potential enclitic *-man*, and, last but not least, the PWs like *appa* and *anda(n)*, as contrasted with the sentence particles *-ap(a)* (which may be from the same root as *appa*) and *-an*, which is probably cognate with the first element in *anda(n)*[8].

This is another item to add to our cart of archaisms for Anatolian.

F) To sum up: It looks as if Anatolian holds remnants of earlier linguistic traits in a more live form than in the rest of IE. These cannot be taken as evidence of loss. On the contrary, they must be considered conclusive proof that Anatolian derives from a slightly earlier stage of PIE than its sisters:

1) It is quite impossible to take e.g. the old middle ending *-a* isolated by Yoshida or the use of *da-* as "take" as evidence of loss. They must be archaisms.

2) The middle nuance of "give/take" and of the *ḫi*-conjugation may not have been altogether lost at the time of Anatolian's departure from PIE: it is hard to say. But it is clear that certain verbs, most notably the verbs for "give/take" and *d^heh_1*- "put", were in (the ancestor of) the *ḫi*-conjugation when Anatolian left PIE – by contrast, the rest of IE has "give" and "put" as purely active *mi*-conjugation verbs. One can even pinpoint the stage of Anatolian's departure from PIE to a precise time when *d^heh_1*- "put" is already moving over to the *mi*-conjugation, while *deh_3*- has not made a move in that direction yet.

3) The direct alternations in Anatolian between the freestanding particles and their enclitic versions reflect a slightly earlier stage of PIE that from the rest of IE is only visible in bits and pieces, after being assembled by careful reconstruction.

All these features seem a clear sign that Anatolian is archaic by nature and not by loss.

This does not mean that Anatolian is so far removed from the rest of IE that it isn't in the nature of a sister of the other branches, but it is an elder sister. After all, if Yoshida's data speak true, the middle third singular ending *-to* had already begun its spread into the territory of *-o* before Anatolian left the group. And again, *d^heh_1*- "put" had probably also begun to move into the *mi*-conjugation at that

---

7 Boley 2004d, §E.

8 Boley 2004c, §E 7.

time. Anatolian therefore left just as certain central changes that determined the development of the rest of IE were just starting up, and it is therefore not that far removed from its sister branches.

We must take seriously the notion that the battle alluded to way back at the beginning of this paper is inclining towards the archaism camp, and that this analysis is very likely to be preferable in the case of the other debated features, such the lack of a feminine and aorist and the development of the perfect.

Texts Cited

Boley, Jacqueline

2000   Dynamics of Transformation in Hittite – The Hittite Particles *-kan*, *-asta* and *-san* (IBS 97), Innsbruck.

2001   An Intransitive *ḫark-*?, Akten des IV Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg 4.-8. Oktober 1999 (= StBoT 45), 40-50.

2002   The Function of the Accusative in Hittite and its Implications for PIE, IF 107, 124-151.

2004a   The Storyteller's Art in Old Hittite. The Use of Sentence Connectives and Discourse Particles, RANT 1, 67-110.

2004b   Historical Basis of PIE Syntax – Hittite Evidence and Beyond. Part Two: The Particles, IF 109, 140-182.

2004c   Tmesis and Proto-Indo-European Syntax (IBS 116), Innsbruck.

2004d   How Old Hittite Changed the World, GS Forrer, 187-205.

2005a   The World of Early Proto-Indo-European and Linguistic Universals, IF 110 (2005), 1-40.

2005b   Riflessioni sulla Logica e sul modo di pensare antichi, RANT 2, 41-59.

2005c   More on Intransitive *ḫark-*, Hethitica XVII.

Kimball, Sara E.

1999   Hittite Historical Phonology (= IBS 95), Innsbruck.

Lehmann, Winfred P.

2002   Pre-Indo-European (= JIES, Monogr. 41), Washington, DC.