

W. R. SCHMALSTIEG

LITH. *dúoti* = HIEROGLYPHIC HITTITE *tuwa*

I have already pointed out elsewhere (1973, 130; 1980, 153) that the Lithuanian morphophonemic alternation encountered in the infinitive and the preterit of *dúoti* "to give" is of fundamental importance for the analysis of the development of the Indo-European phonological system.

The earliest form of many of the Proto-Indo-European roots consisted of a consonant plus a single ablauting vowel. I should remark here that I would not limit ablaut to the two vowels *\*e* and *\*o* as is commonly done, but I would include also an earlier *\*a*. Although Szemerényi does not espouse such a notion, I owe the thought that the earliest Proto-Indo-European ablaut may have been *\*e/o/a* to his 1964 article. I posit, therefore, such early minimorphemes as, e. g., *\*de/o/a-* "to give" and *\*dhe/o/a-* "to put", etc. Each of these minimorphemes could be extended by *\*-w* or *\*-y*, but the attested Indo-European languages show us, for the most part, the reflexes of *\*dow-* (or *\*daw-*) "to give" and *\*dhoy-* (or *\*dhay-*) "to put".

When these morphemes (or morpheme sequences) occurred in preconsonantal position the final diphthong was monophthongized. When the morphemes occurred in prevocalic position the final phoneme was rendered by its preconsonantal variant. Thus:

- |                   |                     |      |              |   |                 |   |               |
|-------------------|---------------------|------|--------------|---|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 1A. <i>*daw-</i>  | (or <i>*dow-</i> )  | plus | <i>*-tei</i> | > | <i>*dō-tei</i>  | >   | <i>dúo-ti</i> |
| 1B. <i>*daw-</i>  | (or <i>*dow-</i> )  | plus | <i>*-ē</i>   | > | <i>*daw-ē</i>   | >   | <i>dāv-ė</i>  |
| 2A. <i>*dhay-</i> | (or <i>*dhoy-</i> ) | plus | <i>*-tei</i> | > | <i>*dhē-tei</i> | >   | <i>dě-ti</i>  |
| 2B. <i>*dhay-</i> | (or <i>*dhoy-</i> ) | plus | <i>*-ā</i>   | > | <i>*dhay-ā</i>  | (but later the element <i>*dhay-</i> was replaced by <i>*dhēy-</i> bringing the vocalism into line with that of the infinitive stem). |               |

Therefore, we encounter the analogical preterit *děj-o* rather than the phonologically expected *\*daj-o*. This seems to follow the principles of a general Baltic development, since for the most part the preterit stems and the infinitive stems correspond and the lack of such a correspondence such as noted in the verb *dúoti* presents an irregularity which is the result of the retention of an archaism.

Now the zero grade of a stem *\*daw-* (or *\*dow-*) would be, of course, *\*du-*, which is attested in the hieroglyphic Hittite 3rd sg. present *tuwa* "places, puts" or the 3rd sg. preterit *tu(wa)-ta* (Dunaevskaja, 1969, 82 – 83)<sup>1</sup>. Also cognate is Lycian *tuweti* "er stellt auf". (See Neumann, 1969, 389.) It does not seem difficult to imagine the transfer of meaning from "to give" to "to put, to place". Certainly the movement of the hand to give an object to someone is similar to the movement of the hand to place something somewhere. One notes, for example, that Laroche, 1960, 40, gives as the phonetic reading for his symbol no. 65 (a raised hand), *tuwa-* with, of course, the meaning "to put, to place". The following symbol, no. 66 (p. 41), is also a hand and is described by Laroche as "la main qui donne". The phonetic reading for this symbol is *pi* which means "to give". I should also like to point out that in Slovene the verb *dati* "to give" is used in contexts where in most European languages the verb "to put" would be used. Note the following examples from the Slovene Academy Dictionary, 1970, 338: (1) *dati knjigo na mizo* "to put a book on the table", (2) *dati obleko v omaro* "to put clothes in the closet", (3) *dati robček na usta* "to put a handkerchief to the lips", (4) *dati roko okrog vratu* "to put the arm around the neck".

Thus there seems to be good evidence to connect the Lith. *dúoti* (and cognates in other Indo-European languages such as Gk. *dídōmi*, Skt. *dádāmi*, etc.) with hieroglyphic Hittite *tuwa*.

### Excursus on arguments from language typology

It may be objected that I have furnished an example of the semantic change of "to give" to "to put" from only a single language, viz., Slovene. I would take this opportunity to state that an example from a single language is sufficient to show the possibility of any kind of linguistic change. Adding more examples does not make the fundamental plausibility any greater. I thereby reject my earlier views on the importance of language typology. For example, in 1976, 239, I wrote that it was unlikely that Old Prussian *asmai* functioned both as a 1st singular and 1st plural form. Wright, 1905, 297, says that in certain English dialects 'm is used instead of *are* as a predicate for the pronouns *we*, *ye* and *they* and Wright gives the example *wəm* "we are". Possibly the same Old Prussian form *asmai* functioned as a 1st singular and a 1st plural copulative verb.

The existence of a language does not depend upon the characteristics of the language but upon the existence of a population speaking that language. And the exist-

<sup>1</sup> The appearance of the vocalic variant *-u-* of the semivowel followed by the consonantal variant *-w-* is the expected Sievers' law reflex in word-initial position.

ence of the population speaking the language depends upon such things as military successes and racial fertility, not the nature of its language. Thus if the Teutonic knights had been somewhat more successful it seems quite likely that there would have been no Baltic languages at all. Would this have made the Baltic languages typologically impossible? There are also problems connected with counting languages. Samogitian Lithuanian seems to differ from standard Lithuanian far more than do the Scandinavian languages, Norwegian, Danish and Swedish among themselves. Do we count the latter as three separate languages and Lithuanian as a single language? Thus the statistical counts used in language typology are virtually meaningless. The preponderance of the Indo-European languages over the Caucasian languages may say something about the military prowess of the Indo-Europeans, but it does not prove that languages of the Indo-European type are more natural to the human spirit than Caucasian languages. Likewise the lack of attestation of a linguistic phenomenon does not mean that this is impossible. It may merely mean that a population speaking such a language with this phenomenon has disappeared or that the phenomenon will appear in the future. The range of the existing does not necessarily exhaust the range of the possible.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dunaevskaja, I. M. 1969. *Jazyk xettskix ieroglifov*. Moscow, Nauka.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1960. *Les hiéroglyphes hittites. Première partie. L'écriture*. Paris, Centre national de la recherche scientifique.
- Neumann, Günter. 1969. *Lykisch. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Erste Abteilung. Der nahe und der mittlere Osten. Vol. II. Fascicle 2. Pp. 358–396*. Leiden, Köln, E. J. Brill.
- Schmalstieg, William R. 1973. *New thoughts on Indo-European phonology*. KZ 87. 99–157.
- Schmalstieg, William R. 1976. *Studies in Old Prussian*. University Park and London, The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schmalstieg, William R. 1980. *Indo-European linguistics: A new synthesis*. University Park and London, The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Slovene Academy Dictionary = *Slovar slovenskega jezika*, Vol. 1, ed. by A. Bajec, J. Jurančič, et al. 1970. Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.
- Szemerényi, Oswald. 1964. *Structuralism and substratum – Indo-Europeans and Aryans in the Ancient Near East*. *Lingua* 13.1–29.
- Wright, Joseph. 1905. *The English dialect grammar*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.