

Lat. *prae* and other supposed datives in *-ai*

1. Lat. *prae*, Osc. *prai*, Umbr. *pre* have no exact parallel elsewhere¹), but as the word cannot be explained as an Italic formation, it must be inherited. Mostly it was considered a dative, but the existence of datives in *-ai* is now very doubtful. The existence of a reduced vowel *e* that became *a* in most languages is at present doubted by most scholars. The case for a reduced *-ei-*, i.e. *-eī-*, giving *-ai-* is even weaker. The old interpretation, then, must probably be given up.

The only other possibility is to assume a laryngeal to explain the *a*-vocalism. This means a form **preh₂i*, as *|prh₂ei|* would rather have given **přh₂ei* > Lat. **porai* (or perhaps **parai*). *Prae* probably belongs together with *πάρος*, Skt. *purás*, Av. *parō* < **přh₂-ós*. That these forms contained a laryngeal is demonstrated by Skt. *pūrva-* < **přH-uo-*. That this laryngeal was *h₂* appears from *πάρος*.

For **preh₂i* an analysis as locative suggests itself. There are many adverbs in *-i* (*περί*, *ἐπί*, *κασί-(γνητος)* Hitt. *katti-*, *ἀντί*, *ἐνί*, *ἐπί*, *πρωτί*, OHG *mit(i)*, Skt. *upári*) for many of which an interpretation as locative has been proposed (e.g. Meillet, *Introduction*⁷ 192, 350f.). It should be pointed out that a locative *pr-eh₂-i* beside a genitive *pr-h₂-os* is exactly parallel to *rāj-an-i* beside *rāj-ñ-as*.²).

¹) Lith. *priē* represents **prei* as appears from *prei-kālas* and OPr. *prei*. (This form might have the locative suffix *-ei*, cf. below.)

²) These forms seem "fast regelrecht flektiert. In Wirklichkeit wird es sich aber um angetretene adverbiale Elemente handeln" (Hirt. Idg. Gr. III 18). To which may be added, I think, that from (some of) these adverbial elements the normal case endings developed.

It is usually stated that the locative singular of the *ā*-stems had *-ā + i* = *-āi*. For the original form, however, we must expect *-eh₂-i* > *-ai* (with short *a*). In the historical forms there seems no evidence for this *-ai* (unless *χαμαί* would have *-eh₂-i*, see below). The exact history of Skt. *-āyām* is not known (AiGr. III 119-121). Slavic *-ě* may be *-āi* as well as *-āi*. Lat. *Romae* requires long *a* (*-ai* would have become *-ī*, as is supposed for *humī*). Lith. *-ojė* < *-āi + en* together with the adessive, e.g. *žmonáip*, also indicates long *a* (Stang, Vgl. Gr. 199). However, it is not wholly clear whether the Lithuanian adverbs in *-ai* derive from *-āi* or *-āi* (Stang 276 and 270) and regarding OPr. *kai* Stang (287) states "Ich nehme an, daß urbalt. **kāi* im Preuß. **kū* oder **kvai* ergeben hätte und daß wir es also hier mit einem Normaldiphthong zu tun

In his discussion of forms in *-ai* that could be datives Solmsen, KZ 44 (1911) 165f., interprets *prae* as a dative with a local meaning, answering the question 'wohin', parallel to *χαμαί*, which would originally mean 'zur Erde, auf die Erde' (not 'auf der Erde')³). This interpretation of Lat. *prae* is evidently wrong. In the oldest occurrences (consider e.g. Plt. Cist. 773 *i prae, iam ego te sequar; praeire* and *praetor*) it means 'before, in front of, at the head, at a place before'⁴). Here *prae* does not indicate the aim of a movement (cf. e.g. *praeferre* as against *proferre*) and exactly fits with our interpretation of the form as a locative (as supposed Hirt, Idg. Gr. III 19; rejected without argument by Szantyr, Lat. Gr. II 268)⁵).

2. One might ask whether Lith. *prõ* does not represent PIE **preh₂*. It is mostly explained as built on *pra-* < **prõ* with secondary ablaut. This remains the more probable interpretation because of *põ* beside *pa-* (< *põ-*, Lat. *põ-situs*), where there is no evidence for PIE **peh₂*. Nevertheless it is not clear why Lithuanian created these long vowel forms (to replace older ones with short vowel; these are traces of **prõ* in Lett. *pruõ-jam*).

The adverbial forms in *-õ* are often plausibly explained as instrumentals (Meillet, Introduction⁷ 350, Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. 550). For *prõ* we must then assume a form **pr-oh₁* (*h₁* as instrumental ending because of *-ẽ|õ* < *-eh₁|oh₁* from the *e|o*-stems). In that case there is no closer relation between *prõ* and *prae* (Note that **prh₂-oh₁* would have given Lat. **porõ*). If *prõ* contained the same laryngeal as *prae*, we must assume **proh₂*, but this reconstruction remains only a phonetic possibility.

haben". Also the Lettish equivalent *ká* seems to represent **kājē* and so to demonstrate that the form was a locative originally. Of course, the long *a* could be due to generalization of the suffix *-ā-*.

³) A. Pagliaro (St. It. Fil. Cl. 8 (1930) 57) defended Solmsen's point of view. Cp. Dressler (Fs. Brandenstein 45): "Pagliaro ... setzt synchron völlig unerklärliche Richtungsdativ an und nimmt die diachronische Unwahrscheinlichkeit von zwei indogermanischen, formal und funktionell geschiedenen Dativmorphemen (*-ei* : *-ai*) in Kauf."

⁴) English, French and German cannot easily express this notion, as far as I know (German *vorne* seems a good equivalent, but it is out of use); in Dutch *voorop*, *vooraan* exactly matches *prae*.

⁵) Benveniste discussed *pro* and *prae*, Trav. Cercle lingu. Copenhague 5 (1949) 178ff. = Problèmes de lingu. génér. 1966, 132ff. He emphasizes another aspect of *prae* ("non pas 'devant' mais 'à l'avant' ... marquant la partie antérieure d'un objet conçu comme continu"). Note about *pro*: "est un 'en avant' réalisé par un mouvement de sortie ou d'expulsion hors d'un lieu supposé intérieur ou couvert (cf. *prodeo*, *progenies*)".

3. Lat. *prae* was, together with *παρά*, *χαμαί*, *πάλαι*, and the infinitives ending in *-ai* explained as dative, because *-ai* was originally considered as the (only) dative ending and because *-ai* was not well established as a locative ending (see § 4). Though at present the dative in *-ai* seems to have been given up by most scholars (e.g. Szemerényi, Einführung in die vgl. Sprachw., 149), the interpretation of the forms mentioned seems not to have much proceeded. It may, therefore, be useful to consider the other forms again.

Παρά belongs to the same root as Lat. *prae*. This word, too, is better interpreted as a locative (Schwyzer-Debrunner 492: 'vor(?); neben, nahe') then as a dative. As regards the form, if we assume *-ai* < *-eh₂i*, the root form *παρ-* can only be explained by assuming (unmotivated) *pr-* before vowel. The form as a whole can represent **prh₂ei*. As is well known, *-ei* occurs in adverbs with a local function (Schwyzer 622,5 *οἴκει*, *πεῖ*; on *οἴκει* recently Hamp, IF 75, 1970, 105f.). In a fine article Mus.Helv. 29 (1972) 65–73 Risch demonstrated that the forms *ἀθρεῖ*, *ἀσπουδεῖ*, *ἀνιδρωτεῖ*, *τριστοιχεῖ*, *πανδημεῖ* etc. (Schwyzer 623,9) had originally *-ei* (as shown by the inscriptions; *-i* originated from *-ιστι -αστι*). (I withdraw the relevant passage in Development of the PIE Laryngeals in Greek 160.) The type is also found in Sanskrit, e.g. *aviré* 'without a man', *askambhané* 'ohne Stütze' and Avestan *anarəθe* 'ohne Pflichterfüllung'. Risch considers the type as an original locative (cf. *αὐτονυχεῖ* 'in the same night', Skt. *anudré* 'auf wasserlosen Boden, (>) ohne Wasser'). In Greek the form always has final accent, as in Sanskrit, but here the adjectives have also final accent except *avitra*: *aviré*. We may therefore safely posit an IE locative ending *-ei* which had the accent. If we then find zero grade of the root (stem) before this ending, this agrees with the place of the accent⁶). A form **prh₂éi* > *παρά*, then, is perfectly possible as a locative.

⁶) It might be objected that these forms seem to have the thematic vowel *e* or *o*. But these might originally have belonged to the ending. Perhaps Balt. **prei* has locative *-ei* (beside **peri*). If *διπετέος ποταμοῖο* indeed means 'am/im Himmel fliegend > fließend' (see R. Schmitt, Dichtung u. Dichterspr. 211–236, who rejects Treu's hypothesis; Humbach's connection, KZ 81, 1967, 276–283, with *διερός* is improbable because of the meaning of the word—see Chantraine, Dict. étym. s.v.—and because of the formation: *μαρός/μυαι-*, *κρατερός/κραται-* and *ιερός/ιαρός* are all unclear themselves and do not prove a regular (PIE or) Greek type of word formation), the form *διπετέης* must be very old (because of the total meaning and *δι-* 'heaven') and may have had a locative *διφει-*. Skt. *divé-dive* could also continue an old locative **divéi* (Dressler, Fs. Brandenstein 39–47).

The form *πάροι(-θε)* could in the same way derive from **prh₂-oi* (*h₂* does not affect the timbre of the *-o-*, see Die Sprache 18, 1972, 117-31⁷⁾).

4. As to the form, *χαμαί* could be most easily explained as **gh^(s)ḡh₂-ei*, but a stem in *h₂* is not well established: *χαμάζε* may be analogical, the formation of *χαμάδις*, *χθαμαλός* and *χαμηλός* is not clear, other languages have no evidence at all for it. Ruijgh's suggestion, *Lingua* 28 (1971) 166, that it is the locative of a neuter *s*-stem, **χάμασ-ι* (with *χάμαζε* < **χάμασ-θε*) has nothing for it; both *s*-stem and neuter cannot be demonstrated.

This form is also considered to be a dative (Schwyzer 622, 4; Frisk). This dative would then have a local meaning, indicating the direction (direktiv-final, Schwyzer-Debrunner 140). The word means 'on the earth', indicating both a rest and a movement ('auf der Erde', resp. 'auf die Erde'). The second meaning would in this view be the original one. But it is quite as possible that the first meaning is the original one. In fact the reverse development seems better attested. E.g. *ποῖ* (which is according to all scholars a locative) means 'whither', but in Aeolic it still has the meaning 'where', too (Schwyzer-Debrunner 157e, Buck, Gr. Diall. 102f.). *Ποῦ*, which means 'where' in classical Greek, is in New Greek also used for 'whither' (Schwyzer 621, 3, „wie frz. *où*”). „Neben der Ruhelage bezeichnen (sekundär) die Richtung *ἐκεῖ ἔνθα ὄψι . . .*“ (Schwyzer-Debrunner 157e). It seems therefore well possible that *χαμαί* originally was a locative.

This was also the view of Kretschmer, *Glotta* 25 (1934) 248. He, however, explained the form as **χαμι* with *-αι* after *καταί*, which is not probable. Compare also Hirt, *Idg. Gr.* III 50: „Es ist überaus

⁷⁾ *Παράι* could be explained as analogical after *καταί*-, but at present it is not clear which form is the older one. It is not probable that the *-ι* was added in Greek, as the *-ι* of *ούτοσί* etc. has a clear deictic function which is not evident here.

Παρά itself is the most difficult form. I would suggest a basic form **prh₂-é*, with the same *-e* as is found in *τῆλε* (Schwyzer 631). This element too probably had a locative meaning, as may be concluded from the meaning of *τῆλε* and from the variants *τηλόθι*, *τηλοῦ*, Boeot. *πίλνι* (< *-οι*). (Hamp, l. c., assumes *-e* as the older form of *-ei*, but as the bare stem *-ο* > *-e*.) (There is no evidence for an instrumental ending *-e*: the Lat. ablative in *-e* may be a locative in *-i*; the Sanskrit gerunds in *-ya*, *-tya* are pausa-forms of an ending *-eh₁*, cf. Kuiper, Shortening of Final Vowels in the RV, 7-10.)

Aeol. *παρο*, Myc. *paro* may represent **prh₂-o*, with *-o* as a variant of this *-e*? Or is it rather a dialectically coloured *-a*?

merkwürdig, daß man diese Form immer als Dativ aufgefaßt hat.“ Benveniste, *Origines* 96ff., also calls it a locative, on the ground that the dative ending was *-ei*, *-i*. Taken strictly this is no argument, as *-ai* might have been a dative ending too. His explanation as a ‘cas indéfini’ (of a neuter?!) with the *i* that ‘interchanges’ with *r/n*, seems rather improbable to me as far as I understand it. (“On partira de **χαμά*, d’après *χαμάζει*, *χαμάθεν*.”) Here an interchange *r/n(i)* is too easily assumed, as is done by many after him. (The comparison with *τάλαρος/τάλανος/ταλαί-πωρος* is an *obscurum per obscurius*.) However, the observation that *χαμαί* is a locative seems not to have been accepted (e.g. Frisk).

It is instructive to survey the course of the research. Originally *χαμαί* was taken as a locative (e.g. Osthoff, MU 2.29, 113; 4.283n, 320n). Then Osthoff changed to a dative, because (1) De Saussure (*Système prim.* 92) supposed that the dative ending was *-ai* (on the basis of *ἴδμεναι* — *vidmáne*) and because (2) a locative ending *-ai* had little to support it (*Zur Geschichte d. Perf.* 195). It should be noted that Osthoff (to whom the dative interpretation goes back) changed his opinion on the basis of the *form* of the endings, not of the meaning of the words. At present our appreciation of the forms has changed in many ways. Also it appears that for the meaning the most evident interpretation was that as locative, which was only given up for reasons that now have lost their value.

5. *Πάλαι* too has the double *a*-vocalism which could be easiest explained from **h^uh₂-ei*. Here again there is no indication elsewhere of *h₂*.

Again a dative has been posited, but here it is hardly possible to imagine a ‘direktiv-finalen Dativ’. Evidently Schwyzer (548,5) and Frisk (2.465), who both add a question-mark, are aware of this difficulty. On the other hand a locative gives an easy interpretation (Frisk: „somit urspr. ‘am Ende’ (eig. ‘am Wendepunkt der Laufbahn’), ‘in der Ferne, in ferner Zeit’“).

6. The infinitive endings in *-ai* are more difficult. They are: *-(ε)ναι*, *-μεναι*, *-σαι* and *-σθαι*. Of old *-μεναι* was compared with Skt. *-mane*, *-σαι* with Akt. *-se*, Sanskrit forms which are certainly datives. I have no solution to these problems, but the present situation may be briefly recalled.

The comparison of *-μεναι* with *-mane* is not allowed. For the Greek form occurs only in Lesbian, and as Thessalian and Boeotian (and Doric) have *-μεν* (and Ionic *-(ε)ναι*), it is probable that *-μεναι* was

created in Lesbian (cf. now P. Wathelet, *Les Traits éoliens dans la langue de l'épopée grecque*, 315–24). With it one of the two indications for a dative in these forms disappears.

As *-μεναι* disappears, we must consider where *-(ε-)ναι* originated. It is possible, though not sure, that *-εναι* originated from contamination of *-εν*, in Myc. *-e* in *terejae* and perhaps in Arcadian, and *-ναι*. In that case only *-ναι* remains to be explained. Formally one could suggest a locative in *-n-eh₂-i*, but I see nothing that points to a laryngeal. (There are old forms in *-neh₂*, as *πρωή*, Av. *kaēnā* etc.) One could only compare the other Greek infinitive endings, *-en*, *-sen*, *-men* (against *-xen* see e.g. Wathelet, l.c.), which are probably locatives (Schwyzer 809)⁸). This would confirm the interpretation of *-ναι* as a locative. As is well known, Vedic uses locatives as infinitives (e.g. *-sani*, with which compare *-sen* in Greek).

The interpretation of *-αι* as a particle (Meillet, BSL 32, 189ff.) was elaborated by Benveniste, Origines 130f. It is no more than a possibility (which does not convince me).

The form *-σαι* is as difficult. A form *-s-eh₂-i* remains to be proved. But one of the most obvious interpretations seems to me that the *a*-vocalism was secondarily introduced (from the indicative), as probably happened in the optative (where the 'Aeolic' forms *a* *-ει* etc. will be older). In that case the original form may have been *-s-ei* (dat.) or *-s-i* (loc.).

The history of *-σθαι* is wholly unknown.

7. *Conclusion.* Lat. *prae* requires a basic form **preh₂-i*, that seems a locative, which is in perfect agreement with the meaning of the word; a dative seems out of the question. As to *παράι*, *χαμαί*, *πάλαυ* the forms could originate from *CR_h-h₂-ei* (if they did not have *-eh₂-i*), though for the last two words a laryngeal cannot be proved. These forms might have the element *-ei*, which occurs with locative function in adverbs. For all forms a locative seems the best interpretation as regards their meaning. Of the infinitives in *-αι* *-μεναι* seems a Lesbian creation, for *-ναι* (that could phonetically be *-n-eh₂-i*) a locative finds some support in the fact that the other Greek infinitives, in *-en*, *-sen*, *-men*, will be locatives too. The aorist infinitive in *-σαι* may have analogical *a*-vocalism. Of the origin of *-σθαι* nothing is known.

⁸ Benveniste, Origines 96, considers them as 'cas indéfinis'. Here again I agree with Dressler (Fs. Brandenstein 41n. 26) "Daß . . . vielleicht auf einen frühidg. casus indefinitus zurückgehen könnten (Benveniste, Origines 87ff.) ändert m.E. nichts an ihrer (spät)idg. Klassifizierung als Lok. bzw. Akk."

As regards the dative in *-ai*, *prae paraí χαμαί πάλαι* now disappear as evidence as they are locatives. *-μεναι*, too, loses its value. Only *-ναι* and *-σαι* (*-σθαί*) could now be adduced, but there is no evidence that they are old datives, and they are not sufficient for setting up a separate ending⁹).

Prinsenlaan 23, Oegstgeest,
Netherlands

R.S.P. Beekes

⁹) For the dative we find the ending *-ei*, for the locative *-i* but perhaps also *-ei/-oi* (see note 5). It is not sure whether the *-i* to which Greek and some Germanic datives point is a locative used as dative or an ablaut form of the dative (Meillet, Introduction⁷ 294). On the basis of Pedersen's distinction between protero- and hysterodynamic inflectional types Kuiper (Notes on Vedic Noun-Inflexion 4) postulates a proterodynamic dative ending (*-éC*)-*i*. It has therefore been supposed that dative and locative ending developed from one form. On this assumption—but only on *this* assumption, and this is of course a very hypothetical one—the question whether our forms are locatives or datives would not be relevant. If the assumption is right—and I would not exclude that possibility—the locative will be the original function. This would mean that the 'direktiv-finale Dativ' cannot have been the original meaning of the dative as suppose Schwyzer-Debrunner (p. 140).

The locative also had forms without ending. We may then, very tentatively, reconstruct the forms in the protero- (PD) and hystero-dynamic (HD) paradigms:

PD	<i>CéC- C-s</i>	<i>sūn- u-s</i>	HD	<i>CéC-ēC</i>	<i>pit-á</i>	<i>πατ-ήρ</i>
	<i>CéC- C-m</i>	<i>- u-m</i>		<i>CC-éC-η</i>	<i>-ar-am</i>	<i>-έρ-α</i>
	<i>CC-éC-s</i>	<i>- o-s</i>		<i>CC- C-os</i>		<i>- ρ-ός</i>
dat.	<i>CC-éC-i</i>	<i>(-av-e)</i>		<i>CC- C-éi</i>	<i>- r-é</i>	<i>(- ρ-ί)</i>
loc.	<i>CC-éC-i</i>	<i>-av-i</i>		<i>?CC- C-éi</i>	<i>(-ar-i)</i>	
	<i>CC-éC</i>			<i>-ēC</i>		

We make the following remarks. Kuiper has made probable that the locative with long suffix originally belonged to the HD inflection (Notes 53–55). This agrees with the stem form found in the nominative of that type. To the PD type belongs the form with the normal grade of the suffix, which is normal in that type (though not in the nominative). Thus we find for the PD dative a form that is identical to the locative of that type. In Sanskrit *-e < -ei* was generalized in the dative ending. In the *u*-stems, where the HD inflection died out, the HD locative was taken over by the PD type. The change of both the PD dative and locative may have occurred to differentiate the forms. In the stems ending in a stop or *r l m n* the PD type died out, but for the locative the PD forms was taken over. If we are right in assuming a locative ending *-ei*, this will have belonged to the HD type (cf. **di- μ -ei*). This would confirm that dative and locative endings were identical (but different stem forms were also used in locative function).