

II. *The Indo-European Dative and Locative*

EDGAR HOWARD STURTEVANT

YALE UNIVERSITY

The Indo-European dative ending *ei* and locative ending *i* are full grade and nil-grade of the same ablaut base. They were originally merely variant forms of a single case, which denoted place where, place whither, and indirect object; and this state of affairs is actually preserved in Hittite. The case ending *ai* of Greek infinitives and adverbs (*δεῖξαι*, *παρὰ*) and of the middle ending *ται*, which is to be identified with the Balto-Slavic infinitive ending *ti*, comes from the reduced grade of the same ablaut base, namely *ǵi*. Before a pause this developed into Greek *ai* and Balto-Slavic *i*; it was specialized in infinitival value because infinitives tended to stand at the end of the phrase. The adverbs in final *ai* were originally enclitics, as is shown by their lack of any full grade vowel.

There is nothing revolutionary in suggesting a connection between the Indo-European dative and locative singular. Brugmann (*Grund.* II<sup>2</sup>, 2, 122) remarks: "Das Formans *ai* des Dativ Singularis und das Formans *i* des Lokativ Singularis scheinen dasselbe gewesen zu sein, nur dass sie ablautlich verschieden waren: *ai. pitré : pitári.*" Since Solmsen's<sup>1</sup> demonstration that the Indo-European dative ending was *ei* instead of *ai*, the relationship of the two cases has become more evident in proportion as the ablaut pair *ei : i* is more frequent than *ai : i*. One may add that an example even more striking than the one cited by Brugmann is presented by Sanskrit *divé : dyávi*<sup>2</sup> = Cyprian *δύφευ* : Latin *Iove* (<\**diéu*). Less striking on account of the accent leveling are Sanskrit *n-stem* forms such as *námne : nāmani*. It is generally assumed that, except for the suffixless locatives, all other types of noun stem show the same pair of endings as the consonant stems in dative and locative singular; and so, if the two are merely ablaut variants, it follows that at an early period in the history of the parent speech there was but a single dative-locative case.

<sup>1</sup> *Kuhn's Zeitschr.* XLIV, 161-169 (1911); for references to his predecessors, see p. 161. Solmsen's conclusions have won acceptance in many quarters although not yet in all.

<sup>2</sup> Dative *dyave* is late.

On the other hand it is perfectly clear that at the close of the Indo-European period, dative and locative singular were sharply distinguished, as they are in Indo-Iranian, Italic, Germanic, Baltic, and Slavic. We are therefore compelled to assume that if there was originally but a single form for dative-locative, the two forms that resulted from the ablaut changes were during the Indo-European period specialized in different functions. There is no real difficulty in such an assumption, although it is at variance with the tendency of most Indo-European languages of the historical period to reduce the number of cases.

Neither is there any semantic difficulty in deriving the two cases from a common source. A confusion of place where and place whither is logically easy and to be observed in numerous languages (*e.g.* English *where* = Lat. *ubi* and *quo*), and equally easy and frequent is the development of a mechanism denoting place whither into a mechanism denoting the indirect object (*e.g.* Eng. *give to*, Fr. *donner à*). The only possible objection to combining these three meanings (place where, place whither, indirect object) in a single Pre-Indo-European case is that it upsets the beautiful symmetry of the three local cases (accusative = place whither, locative = place where, ablative = place whence<sup>3</sup>). Undoubtedly the accusative did denote the end of motion from very early times; but it is not unusual for a language to possess two or more means of expressing a single idea, and it is unsound method to demand greater regularity of our reconstructed Indo-European than we find in its descendants. As a matter of fact the dative as well as the accusative denotes end of motion in Sanskrit (*grāmāya gacchati* as well as *grāmaṃ gacchati*), Greek (*ψυχὰς Ἀίδι προίαψεν, ἵστον δ' ἱστοδόκῃ πελάσαν*), Latin (*mittis leto, it caelo.*), and Slavic (Ch. Sl. *idetŭ tebě krotŭkŭ* 'he comes to you as a friend').<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> I must confess that I recently (*Lang.* v, 140) cited this very symmetry against Forrer's theory of a Hittite locative in *a* of the place whither. Fortunately the validity of my argument is not affected by cancelling that appeal to prejudice.

<sup>4</sup> Other examples in Delbrück, *Grund.* iii, pp. 289 ff.

Less numerous but somewhat more difficult to reconcile with the traditional scheme are dative forms carrying the meaning of place where or time when, as in Sanskrit *divé divé* 'day by day,' Latin *rūrī* 'in the country,' *Karthāginī* 'at Carthage,' *temperī* 'in time,' etc.<sup>5</sup>

Nevertheless it must be admitted that these considerations scarcely carry us beyond a "non liquet." The fact that the Sanskrit dative *pitré* and locative *pitāri* must be identified as to stem and may be identified as to ending does not quite prove that the ending must be the same. And it is possible to derive the dative of the end of motion from the grammatical use of the dative, as Delbrück did. Additional evidence is needed.

Hittite has a single dative-locative case, which performs the very three functions that we were tempted to assume for an early stage of Indo-European, namely place where, place whither, and indirect object. This case usually ends in *i*, which may represent either original *i* or any *i*-diphthong with short prior element, and consequently it is frequently impossible to tell whether a Hittite dative-locative corresponds to an Indo-European dative or to an Indo-European locative. In certain instances, however, a decision is possible. Hittite *weteni* 'in the water' has full grade of the second syllable, and hence it goes with Sanskrit locatives like *nāmani*. On the other hand *haddulanni* from \**hadulatni*, beside nom. *haddulatar* 'health,' shows nil-grade of the suffix, and is therefore to be compared with Sanskrit datives like *nāmne*. Dative-locatives from *o*-stems, such as *antuhsī* from *antuhsas* 'man,' must have original final *ei* or *oi*, since *ōi* would become *ai*; <sup>6</sup> in this declension we have occasional forms like *pete* 'in the place' (: Gk. *πέδον* 'ground'), whose final *e* cannot represent original *i*. In the *i*-declension we have *suppai* from *suppis* 'pure' and *lenkai* from *lenkais* 'oath,' which must contain an

<sup>5</sup> H. Hirt, *Indogerm. Gramm.* III, p. 50, traces such forms to his locative ending *ai*. M. Leumann, *Stolz-Schmalz, Gram. Lat.*<sup>5</sup> p. 273, invokes the influence of *o*-stem locatives.

<sup>6</sup> See *Lang.* VI, 31-35.

original long diphthong ending in *i*. As I have shown (*loc. cit.*), these must correspond with the Indo-European locatives in *ēi*. Hittite *i*-stems also show dative-locative forms like *suppiya* and *linkiya*, whose *a* must represent Indo-Hittite *ei* (see below, p. 25). No doubt we should reconstruct Indo-Hittite *\*leṃghiei*,<sup>7</sup> with the inflectional type seen in Sanskrit *pátye* from *patiṣ* 'master' and in Greek *πόλιος* from *πόλις*; the ablaut base *eiēi* would normally yield *iei*.<sup>8</sup> The *u*-stem dative-locative *assawi*, from *assus* 'good,' must be parallel to the Sanskrit dative *śātrave*, from *śatruṣ* 'enemy'; both represent *-oueī*, a contamination of *-ōui* and *-uēi*.

The additional evidence of Hittite justifies us in assuming for Indo-Hittite and for the Pre-Indo-Hittite period of the ablaut changes a dative-locative case with the functions of the Hittite dative-locative. The ablaut changes produced the two endings *ei* and *i*, which are attested both by Hittite and by Indo-European. During the Pre-Indo-European period the forms with ending *i* were specialized in the strictly locative function of the place where. The other two meanings continued to be expressed by the ending *ei* throughout the Indo-European period and into historical times in Indo-Iranian, Greek, Italic, and Slavic. There was, however, an increasing tendency to restrict the forms in *ei* to the "grammatical" force, and to use the accusative for the place whither.

So far we have left out of account the case-forms in *ai*, which are most clearly represented by Greek infinitives of the types *ἐνεῖκαι*, *δεῖλαι*, *εἰδέναι*, *δοῖναι*,<sup>9</sup> *δόμναι*, *φέρεισθαι*, *ἦσθαι*. In view of these Greek forms it is natural to assume original *ai* for Sanskrit *nir-āje* 'to drive out,' Latin *agī* 'to be driven' (cf. *ἐνεῖκαι*), Sanskrit *jīṣé* 'to conquer,' Latin *darī* 'to be given'

<sup>7</sup> For the root, cf. Greek *ἐλέγχω* 'prove, disprove.'

<sup>8</sup> It is possible to identify Hitt. *suppiya* with Skt. *agnaye*, from *agnis* 'fire,' as I did in *Lang.* vi, 31; but a form with full grade in successive syllables (*\*ṃgnéjei*) cannot be original, and it is safer not to assume it unnecessarily.

<sup>9</sup> The Cyprian infinitive should be written thus to match Skt. *dāvāne*. The short vowel, an analogical substitute for *a* from *e*, would require a following *μ*; see *A.J.P.* L, 360-369.

(cf. *δειξαι*), Sanskrit *dāvāne* (cf. *δοφεναι*), Sanskrit *dāmane*, Latin imperative *daminī* (cf. *δομεναι*).

I have found reason (*Lang.* VII, 242-251) to consider the middle ending seen in Greek *ται*, Sanskrit *te* and Hittite *ti* an original infinitive. If so, it may plausibly be identified with the Balto-Slavic infinitives in *ti*.<sup>10</sup> Finally, there are a few stereotyped case forms functioning as adverbs: Greek *χαμαί* 'on the ground, to the ground,' *καταί* 'down,' *παραί* 'beside,' Latin *prae* 'before.'

As we noted at the outset, Brugmann was inclined to consider the ending *ai* the full grade form of the locative ending *i*, and the adverbs just cited seem to support such a conclusion; cf. *περί*, *per* : *παραί*, *prae*, Latin *nēmō* (< \**ne-hemo*) : *χαμαί*. On the other hand the Greek infinitives in *αι* whose structure is clear regularly appear after full grade of either root or suffix. Such forms as *διδόναι*, *τιθέναι*, and *δεικνύναι* are probably relatively late analogical creations.<sup>11</sup> The history of the infinitives in *σθαι* is so uncertain that they had better be left out of consideration entirely. Some of the Sanskrit infinitives which have been grouped with our Greek forms (see above, p. 21) show weak grade of the stem (Skt. *jīṣé*, *dṛṣé*, etc.); but they may contain original *ei*. The majority of the Sanskrit forms, like the Greek, show strong grade in suffix or root or in both.

Since, then, the infinitives generally show a strong grade in the stem, and since we already have in *ei* the full grade of the dative-locative ending and in *i* the nil-grade, one naturally asks whether the *αι* of Greek and the cognate finals of the other languages can represent the reduced grade of *ei*, namely *ǝi*. The difficulty is that *ǝi* very early became *ī* before a consonant and *i* (many scholars write *i̯*) before a vowel.<sup>12</sup> There remains, however, the position before a pause, and so we must inquire whether original *ǝi* in that position could yield the recorded forms. There is no difficulty with Greek

<sup>10</sup> See below, p. 23.

<sup>11</sup> See Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gramm.* p. 412 and references.

<sup>12</sup> See H. Güntert, *Indogermanische Ablautsprobleme*, pp. 97 ff., 107 ff.; H. Hirt, *Indogerm. Gramm.* II, pp. 87, 95 ff.

and Latin, where alone *ai* appears, for schwa secundum regularly becomes *a* in both. In Indo-Iranian also the normal development is to *a*, and consequently Sanskrit *e* from *ǝi* is not surprising. The Slavic infinitive ending *tī* (Primitive Slavic *tī̃*) can readily be combined with the Greek middle ending *ται* on the basis of Indo-European *ǝi*, and the same thing holds for Lithuanian *tī*, which may represent primitive Baltic *tī̃*.<sup>13</sup>

Since we have to assume that *ǝ* survived in most positions as a separate sound down to the close of the Indo-European period, it is probable that it survived in our endings also. As far as Greek, Italic, and Indo-Iranian are concerned it would be easy to assume an Indo-European change of final *ǝi* to *ai*; but, while the Balto-Slavic infinitives do not definitely disprove this, it is less satisfactory to assume for them a change of *ǝi* to *ī* through *ai* than directly. At any rate it will be convenient to write *ǝi* instead of *ai* in Indo-European and Indo-Hittite reconstructions. My article in *Lang.* vii, 242-251 should be corrected accordingly.

If we conclude, then, that *ǝi* before a pause survived in Indo-Hittite and Indo-European we see at once why that ending came to be used particularly in infinitives. Undoubtedly the infinitive of purpose is a peculiarly archaic construction, and in this value the Veda regularly places the infinitive at the end of the phrase.<sup>14</sup> In early Greek also the infinitive stands at the end of the phrase much more frequently than the dative of substantives; in the first book of the *Iliad* 54 per cent of the infinitives appear to be followed by pauses, but only 20 per cent of the datives of substantives.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> This is certainly more satisfactory than Endzelin's suggestion (*Lettische Grammatik*, p. 710) that the common Baltic infinitive ending is a dative-locative in *tī*. It makes for simplicity to identify Baltic *tī*, Slavic *tī*, and Gk. *ται*. The dialectic Lithuanian infinitive ending *tie* may represent full grade *tei* as Endzelin thinks, and this may be recognized in Skt. middle forms with weak grade of the root (e.g. *dviṣṭe*). The ending *tǝi* was generalized in Gk. *ται*, but there is no proof of a similar development in Skt.

<sup>14</sup> See Renou, *Gramm. Sanscrite*, pp. 297 f.

<sup>15</sup> It would be interesting to know whether this tendency to put the infinitive at the end of the phrase was maintained in later Greek; but that question is not

The observation that a dative-locative in Greek *ai* or Latin *ae* belongs at the end of the phrase suggests an explanation for the weak grade of the stem in the adverbs *χαμαί*, *καταί*, *παραι*, and *prae*. They were originally enclitics, and so they contain no full grade syllable. A trace of this usage is preserved in the order of the Latin colloquial phrase *ī prae* 'go ahead,' which is common in Plautus and Terence. Greek *χαμαί* also stands at the end of the phrase in Aeschylus, *Eum.* 261, Aristophanes, *Ach.* 869, *Eq.* 155, Aristotle, *H.A.* ix, 29, 1, and elsewhere.

If we are to recognize in our infinitives and adverbs reduced grade of the ending in the position before a pause, we should expect to find some traces of the same grade in the forms it would take in the interior of the phrase. The antevocalic form, however, would be indistinguishable from the nil-grade *i*; and so we need search only for the anteconsonantal ending with *ī*. There are many Homeric datives in long *ι*; but some of them, at least, should be read with *ει*. In particular *Διτ̄* is surely to be connected with Cyprian *Διφει-*, since the radical vowel and the later accent both demand full grade. In such words as *κράτεϊ*, *σθένεϊ*, *νηϊ*<sup>1</sup> one must assume *ī* from Indo-European *ī* or else suppose that *ει* was introduced by analogy. In Vedic Sanskrit alone do we find forms that cannot readily be disposed of otherwise; e.g. *utī* 'to help,'<sup>16</sup> and locatives such as *vaktarī* and *tanuvī*.

In Hittite I would recognize as forms in original *3i* only the medial endings *tī*, *rī*, and *nī*. The first of these, as already stated, is identical with Greek *ται*, Sanskrit *te*, and Balto-Slavic *ti*. In Hittite it is always preceded by another formative element (e.g. *es-ha-ti* 'I sat,' *ar-ta-ti* 'he arrived,' *es-a-ti* 'he sat,' *kis-anta-ti* 'they became'), and it seems likely that in the

---

important for our present point. In the second book of the *Iliad* I find 41 per cent of the infinitives before pauses, and the same proportion in the ninth book. In the third book the proportion is 52 per cent. In the first thirty chapters of Herodotus only 37 per cent of the infinitives are followed by pauses.

<sup>16</sup> Brugmann, *Grund.* II, p. 1415, considered this an instrumental from a stem in *tī*.

inherited forms this preceding suffix carried the accent. The endings *ri* and *ni* are also preceded by suffixes that seem originally to have carried the accent (*e.g.* *iy-ahha-ri* 'I arrive,' *es-a-ri* 'he sits,' *es-anta-ri* 'they sit,' *war-a-nni* 'it burns').

The forms that function as infinitives in our Hittite texts must end in original *ei* or *i*. The common type, *tiyanna* 'to come,' *arnuwanna* 'to bring,' *kunanna* 'to strike,' is a case form of a verbal noun in *tar* (*tiyatar*, etc.); hence we have nil-grade of the suffix, and must assume full grade of the ending.<sup>17</sup> The change of original final *ei* to *a* before an initial vowel of the next word implies an intermediate stage *ai*. This is somewhat surprising since *e* remains before *y* in *neyari* 'he turns': Sanskrit *neyate*; perhaps we should assume that original *ei* before a vowel remained, while *ei* before a consonant became *ai*, and in our infinitives the anteconsonantal form was generalized. When, consequently, this *ai* came to stand before initial *a* of the next word its second element was lost.

The other common Hittite infinitive (usually called a supine) ends in *wanzi* or *manzi* (*e.g.* *saruwawanzi* from *saruwai-* 'sack,' *wahnumanzi* from *wahnu-* 'turn'). Since it is only before original *i* that *t* becomes *z*,<sup>18</sup> we must trace these to Indo-Hittite *unt̃i* and *mnt̃i*. We should expect *wenzi* and *menzi* from Indo-Hittite *uent̃i* and *ment̃i*; but evidently the nil-grade of the suffix was generalized.

For fear some reader may miss a treatment of the so-called suffixless locatives, I will say that I agree with Hirt and others in considering these forms, as well as the vocatives and the stem-forms used as prior members of compounds, as a survival from the period before the noun inflection existed. We shall probably never know why these forms survived in uncompounded words only as locatives and as vocatives.

<sup>17</sup> Correct my assumption of original *ai* (*Lang.* vi, 25).

<sup>18</sup> See *Lang.* iv, 227-231.