

A NOTE ON HITTITE DA-Aḫ-ḫi

It has long been suggested that the Hittite verb da-aḫ-ḫi 'I take' is to be connected with the Indo-European root *dō- 'to give'. (See Friedrich, 1952, 201; Kronasser, 1966, 533-534; Kammenhuber, 1969, 235-236). The purpose of this paper is to support this suggestion but in a slightly different way than it has been supported in the past.

In an earlier paper I suggested an etymological connection between the Indo-European roots for 'two' and 'to give'. (See Schmalstieg, 1973, 131-132). I assume a minimorpheme *de/o- extended by an element -w producing the root *dew-/dow- (zero grade *dw-). This element -w was originally a marker possibly denoting 'then and there' and eventually became attached to the root. I have also assumed an internal Indo-European monophthongization such that *dow-C (C = any consonant) would pass to *dō-C. Since, in my opinion, *daw-C was also monophthongized to *dō-C within Indo-European, various analogical back formations could give us forms of both 'to give' and 'two' with *da-, cf. Lat. dā-tus, Armenian tam.

The zero-grade *dw- (or *du- before consonant) appears with the meaning 'two' in such words as Lat. du-bius, -plus, -plex, -pondius, etc., Latin du-cele 'two-wheeled wagon', Umbrian duti 'iterum', Pāli dutiyam 'zum zweiten Male', etc. (Pokorny, 1959, 229). With the meaning 'to give' we encounter the zero-grade in such forms as Gk. Cypriot duFānoi 'er möge geben'.¹ Pokorny, 225, writes: 'lat. duim, duīs usw. 'dem, dēs', Fut. II -duō, enthalten einen Aoriststamm *du- aus *dou-. The form *dow- in pre-vocalic position gives such forms as the Gk. Cyp. inf. doF-

¹ Cowgill, 1964, 352, has reinterpreted the Cypriote etuvanoinu as etuvan oinu and considers the latter to be a regular aorist indicative éduwan 'they gave'. He has also given a morphological explanation for dowénai (1964, 359). On the other hand I doubt his analysis of Baltic preterit forms in *-ay- as deriving from *oy- which would have been an intermediate stage between the passage of proto-Indo-European *ō to East Baltic uo. Levin, 1975, has shown that the passage of *ō to uo was not even Common East Baltic, but rather a separate development in Lithuanian and Latvian. Thus Cowgill's statement (355): "The only real evidence outside Cypriote for a root shape *dōw- is therefore the Italic dov- of Umbr. pur-douitu, Fal. douiad, Lat. duim, etc." cannot really be accepted. Lith. dāv-ė 'gave' does give good evidence for a proto-Indo-European root shape *dōv-, whatever the analysis of Gk. dow-énai may be.

enai, Lith. dāv-é 'gave'. Pokorny, 225, reconstructs an Italic optative *douim. He also lists, 229, as masculine words for 'two' Old Welsh and Breton dou. In pre-consonantal position *dow- passes to *dō- giving such forms as Gk. dí-dō-mi 'I give', Lith. dūo-ti 'to give' (< *dō-tei), Gk. dō-deka 'twelve', etc.

Contaminations of the stem forms *dw-o (Skt. dva-kā- 'je zwei zusammen', Lat. duō-dēnī, Arm. erko-tasan 'twelve') *do-w, *dō- have led to *dwō(-w) giving Skt. dvāu, dvā, with the Sievers' - law initial position variants in Vedic duvāu, duvā, Homeric Gk. dú(F)ō, Lat. duo (< *duō), Slavic dvā, etc. (See Pokorny, 1959, 228). Many more forms showing different contaminations and extensions can be found in Pokorny's dictionary under the appropriate headings.

One could propose then that the Indo-European root for 'to give' originally meant something like 'to cut in two, to divide' and hence 'to share'. One can then more easily understand the semantic development which led to the meaning of the Hittite cognate da-aḥ-ḥi 'I take'. An English sentence such as I will divide this with you can be understood to mean 'I will give some of this to you'. On the other hand the sentence We will divide this among each other can be understood to mean 'we will each take some of this'. Thus it can easily be seen how a root meaning 'two' can come to denote either 'to give' or 'to take', which would ordinarily seem to denote the exact opposite.²

² In order to explain the difference in meaning between the root in Hittite and the other Indo-European languages Benveniste, 1969, 82, proposes a shift in meaning comparable to that of to take in the English expression to take to. Originally the verb *dō- could have either meaning depending upon the syntactic construction. He writes, 82:

"Cette comparaison peut aider à retrouver le lien entre ces sens opposés. Le hittite et les autres langues indo-européennes ont diversement spécialisé le verbe *dō-, qui, par lui-même, se prêtait, selon la construction syntaxique, à l'un ou l'autre sens. Tandis que hitt. dā- s'est fixé pour 'prendre', les autres langues construisent dō avec idée de destination, ce qui revient à 'donner'.

Ceci n'est pas un artifice. 'Prendre' en indo-européen comporte plusieurs expressions qui, chacune, déterminent la notion d'une manière différente. Si l'on admet que le sens premier est celui que conserve le hittite, l'évolution qui a fixé dans le reste du domaine indo-européen celui de 'donner' devient ainsi intelligible...

I have also suggested that the root which is usually transcribed as Indo-European *dhē- or *dheǵ- was really originally *dho-y. (See Schmalstieg, 1973, 126). An internal Indo-European monophthongization led to the passage of *dho-y-C to *dhē-C. It is possible that this monophthongization did not take place in Hittite or was just beginning to take place in Hittite. In any case I suspect that the accentual pattern leading to the creation of the zero-grade in certain verbal forms was somewhat different from that which we ordinarily assume. I propose that there was a stress on the ending in all of the first person forms and the 3rd person plural. Elsewhere the stress was on the pre-final element. Evidence of this is found in the conjugations of Latin sum, fero, edo, volo and Hittite ne-ih-hi, te-ih-hi, uh-hi, thus:

Singular

	Transcription	Phonemicization	Proto-Form	Latin
1st	teḫḫi	/tehi/ or /tīhi/	*dhe-h-ói or *dhi-h-ói	sum < *es-óm
2nd	dāitti	/taiti/	*dhóy-t-oi	es < *és-es
3rd	dāi	/ta[y]i/	*dhóy-oi	est < *és-et

Plural

1st	tijaeni	/ti[y]aveni/	*dhy-óveni	sumus < *es-ómos
2nd	tāitteni	/taiteni/	*dhóy-teni	estis < *és-ete[s]
3rd	tijanzi	/ti[y]anzi/	*dhy-ónti	sunt < *es-ónt

One might object that this particular distribution of vocalism is found in the Hittite -hi conjugation which is usually thought to be a Hittite innovation as opposed to the -mi conjugation which is usually considered older. Nevertheless the plural forms of the -hi conjugation are identical with those of the -mi conjugation in the present tense. In addition the distribution of vocalism of the present tense of the verbs in question seems to be in accord with that

Les notions de 'donner' et 'prendre' sont ainsi liées dans la préhistoire indo-européenne. Il sera utile, à ce propos, de considérer une question étymologique relative à un terme déjà spécialisé, lat. emo, dont on montre plus bas qu'il signifiait 'prendre'. Dans une autre langue, on rencontre une racine de même sens, qui diffère de la forme latine par l'initiale n- germanique *nem-, gotique niman, all. nehmen 'prendre'."

Further, 85, he says that Gothic niman means 'prendre' in the sense of 'recevoir légalement' from which we get the meaning 'recevoir, avoir en partage, prendre'. Gk. némō means 'partager selon la convenance ou la loi'. One notes here that from the concept to share (= Gk. némō) we arrive at to take (= Gothic niman, German nehmen, etc.).

which we find in the Hittite preterit, a preterit which is the same for both the -hi and the -mi conjugations. Note for example the preterit forms as given below in Sturtevant, 1951, 163-164. (1st sg.) ne-iḫ-ḫu-un, pí-(e-)iḫ-ḫu-un, te-iḫ-ḫu-un; (2nd sg.) pa-it-ta, pa-iš-ta, pa-(a-)iš, da-(a-)iš, da-iš-ta; (3rd sg.) na-(a-)iš, na-i-iš, na-iš-ta, na-eš-ta, pa-(a-)iš, da-(a-)iš; (1st pl.) pí-ya-u-e-en, ti-ya-u-en, (3rd pl.) ne-i-e-ir, pí-i-e-ir. Also for the verb a-uš-zi 'sees': (1st sg.) u-uḫ-ḫu-un, (2nd sg.) a-uš-ta, (3rd sg.) a-(ú-)uš-ta, although the full vocalism of the root has been re-established analogically in the 1st pl. a-ú-me-en and the 3rd pl. a-ú-(e-)ir. But note also the imperative forms of this verb which seem to show the same alternation with zero-grade in the 1st sg. and 3rd pl. (1st pl. not given either by Sturtevant, 1952, 164, nor Friedrich, 1960, 106): (1st sg.) ú-wa-al-lu, (2nd sg.) a-ú, (3rd sg.) a-uš-du, (2nd pl.) a-uš-tin, a-uš-te-en, (3rd pl.) ú-wa-an-du. As I have shown elsewhere (Schmalstieg, 1973, 135-137 and 1972), there is reason to suspect that the Indo-European stative verbs had the suffix *-oy- in the 2nd, 3rd sg. and 2nd pl. as opposed to *-y- in the 1st and 3rd pl., cf., e.g., the conjugation of the verb 'to have' in Gothic: (1st sg.) haba, (2nd sg.) habáis, (3rd sg.) habáip, (1st pl.) habam, (2nd pl.) habáip, (3rd pl.) haband.

Sanskrit and Greek paradigms of the verb 'to go' have the full grade vocalism in the singular: 1st sg. Skt. emi, Gk. eími, 2nd sg. Skt. eṣi, Gk. éi, 3rd sg. Skt. eti, Gk. eísi; but the zero grade in the dual and plural: 1st pl. Skt. imaḥ, Gk. ímen, 2nd pl. Skt. itha, Gk. íte, 3rd pl. Skt. yanti, Gk. íasi. This distribution of vocalism is commonly thought to be original, but I would point out here that this rather regular distribution of vocalism can be explained as an analogical regularization to emphasize the contrast between the singular and the non-singular. Thus the full grade stem vocalism of the 2nd and 3rd sg. was extended to the 1st person (which had originally had zero-grade vocalism) and the zero grade vocalism of the 3rd plural and all of the numbers of the first person was extended to the 2nd and 3rd dual and the 2nd plural. It is certainly easier to imagine this kind of analogical extension which goes from the irregular to the regular than an analogical extension explaining the reliquary vocalism of the Latin and Hittite verbs mentioned above.

I would assume, however, that the paradigm of da-aḫ-hi was originally similar in ablaut relationships to the paradigm of teḫhi given above, but that in the course of time these ablaut relationships were lost as a result of analogical leveling. The only place where the etymological ablaut relationship is retained is in the 1st plural where we still find du-um-me-ni, tum-me-e-ni, tumum-me-ni 'we take' to be transcribed probably as /tumeni/ (< *du-méni [with -m- replacing -w- after -u-]). (See Kronasser, 1966, 533).

The 1st pl. /tumeni/ presupposes the zero-grade form *du- of the root *dow-/dew-, a root which, used as a numeral denoted 'two', and when used as a verb originally denoted 'to divide'. The etymological labial element has been lost elsewhere in Hittite in the verbal conjugation of da-aḫ-ḫi in the numeral ta-a-an 'second', and ta-a-i-ú-ga-aš 'two-year old'. Nevertheless the proposed derivation of Hittite da-aḫ-ḫi, Gk. dí-dō-mi, etc. from a root denoting 'to divide, to share' explains (1) the apparent divergence in meaning in Hittite and the other Indo-European languages and (2) the aberrant 1st pl. du-um-me-ni with the vocalism -u- beside the newer 1st pl. da-a-u-e-ni.

REFERENCES

- Benveniste, Émile (1969): *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Vol. 1. Économie, parenté, société. Paris, Les éditions de minuit.
- Cowgill, Warren (1964): The supposed Cypriote optatives duwánoi and dōkoi. *Language* 40, 344-365.
- Friedrich, Johannes (1952): *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- Kammenhuber, Annalies (1969): *Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch und Hieroglyphenluwisch*. *Handbuch der Orientalistik, II, Erste Abteilung*. Leiden, Köln, Brill.
- Kronasser, Heinz (1966): *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*. Vol. 1. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.
- Levin, Jules F. (1975): Dynamic linguistics and Baltic historical phonology. *General Linguistics* 15, 144-158.
- Pokorny, J. (1959): *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1. Bern and Munich, Francke Verlag.
- Schmalstieg, William R. (1972): Denominative verbs with the suffix -j-. *La linguistique* 8, 123-136.
- Schmalstieg, William R. (1973): New thoughts on Indo-European phonology. *KZ* 87:99-157.
- Sturtevant, Edgar (1951): *A comparative grammar of the Hittite language*. Rev. ed. New Haven and London, Yale Univ. press.

Povzetek

OPAZKA O HETITSKEM DA-AḪ-HI

Ide. koren *dō- je prvotno pomenil "razdeliti na dva dela", odtod v večini ide. jezikov "dati", v hetitiščini pa "vzeti". Prevoj v konjugaciji glagola da-aḫ-hi je bil prvotno tak kot pri teḫhi; izpričano stanje je rezultat analogije.