# The Classical Review

# The 'Dative' of the Possessor

Eustace H. Miles

## THE 'DATIVE' OF THE POSSESSOR.

THE pages of Homer abound in constructions like δεινὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν (Il. 1, 200), just as Vergil is very fond of non unquam gravis aere domum mihi dextra redibat (Ecl. 1, 35), and the like. These uses are generally explained as simply developments of the dative case: they are given as a branch of the Ethic dative (or dative of the person interested), or as a branch of the dativus commodi (or dative of the person benefited). But it must be clear that the exact present meaning of most of these uses is not adequately conveyed by these abstract expressions. The assumption that the writer, in using this case rather than the genitive of the possessor, intended to denote either that the man was interested in, or that he was benefited by, his eyes or his hand or his mind or his words or his mother or his horses, is surely untenable: the best translations render them as simple possessives, and such I believe to be not only their exact present meaning in most instances, but also their earliest known meaning in such contexts: it would, I believe, be a great relief to the conscientious translator if he could safely regard the cases in such contexts as simple possessives throughout their known history.

In examining the instances one cannot help noticing how many of them are pronouns: and I shall try to show that, at any rate in pronouns, the Indo-European case in -i had, among other uses, a use as a simple possessive.

To begin with Sanskrit, we find the dative case[1] used of the goal of motion, whether that goal be place (this is not very common) or an action: we also find it used of the result etc. (cp. the Latin predicative dative, to some extent), and with certain verbs like to give, to pay reverence, to offer salutation, to send, to give a message, etc., where we sometimes use the preposition 'to.' But I do not know of any instance where it is used in a phrase at all corresponding to Homer's ὄσσε δέ οἱ (above).

On the other hand we do find that certain pronouns have an enclitic form which is sometimes genitive (possessive, etc.) and sometimes dative (vide the above uses). The forms mē and tē would probably have been once identical with μοι and τοι.

Now if we supposed that such forms as

these (cp. οἱ above, σοι, Latin mī,[2] illī, eī, nullī, etc.) had in early times not only a dative use, but also a possessive use (which was not derived from this dative use), we should have a reasonable explanation of the existence of forms like μοι, σοι, τοι in Homer, and forms like mī, illī, eī, nullī, etc. in early Latin (e.g. Plautus and Terence), with both genitive and dative uses. For the existence of a single form of a pronoun with two or more case-meanings, of which no single one is likely to have given rise to the other two, cp. e.g. the Sanskrit uses of the enclitic nāu and vām as genitive and dative and accusative in the dual, and nas and vas as the same cases in the plural. Cp. also certain Homeric uses of the -φι- case as an instrumental, locative, dative, ablative, and genitive. (Monro, p. 148 foll.).

It seems far easier to suppose that such a wide range of meanings was the result of a still wider range of meanings being confined to certain channels than that it was the result of a single definite case-meaning.

What happened to these forms in later language?

(i.) The pronouns were still used not only as datives, but also as (chiefly possessive) genitives in poetry, where there is a tendency to preserve old constructions (cp. the survival in poetry of simple cases, without prepositions, expressing the country in or from which—a construction common in early language).

(ii.) This use of pronouns which were like 'datives' in form, and were not only 'datives' but also possessives in meaning, sometimes led to a use of nouns which were 'datives' in form, not only as 'datives' but also as possessives in meaning. It is held by many that certain nouns derived their forms for the nominative plural (e.g. oἶκοι vīcī) and genitive plural (e.g. vīcōrum) from the pronouns. The use of 'dative' forms of nouns with possessive as well as 'dative' meanings is found in Homeric uses like Ἕκτορι θυμός, and in Vergilian datives like ardet apex capitī (Aen. 10, 270), and in uses in Cicero's Letters like Cūriōnī nostrō tribūnātus conglaciat (ad Fam. 8, 6). Without attempting to deny for a moment that many classical uses not unlike this may have been derived wholly or partly from the dative meanings,

---

[1] By this I mean the dative which once probably ended in -ai (cp. δοῦν-αι dar-ei → dar-ī).

[2] mī might have had a double origin, being also descended from mihi (cp. nihil → nīl).

and without attempting to deny that the classical dative in many such uses conveyed a different shade of meaning from the classical genitive, I would only suggest here that the possessive use would help to account for certain instances of Ethic datives like laudāvit mihi frātrem.

(iii.) But as a rule such pronoun-forms came to be regarded more and more as datives, and the uses of μοι etc. became more and more datival, more and more like the uses of *e.g.* ἀνθρώπῳ in their range.

As evidence that Greek did sometimes regard the forms like μοι not merely as possessives, etc., but even as actual genitives, it will be sufficient here to mention instances like μοι...ἀνδρὸς δυστήνοιο (*Od.* 11, 75), etc., and the regular Thessalian use of -οι forms as genitives.

EUSTACE H. MILES.

---

## CONTESTED ETYMOLOGIES.

### (*Continued from* p. 94.)

VIII.—SANSKRIT *víçva* ' ALL.'

§ 1. A. Kuhn (*K.Z.* 2, 272) compared ἴσος 'equal,' deriving *víçva* from *víç* 'folk': '*víçva* ist das ihnen zukommende, gemeinsame, daher im griechischen worte der begriff der gleichheit und ähnlichkeit.'

Comparison with Lith. *visas* 'all' tantalizingly suggests itself. The phonetics, if normal, would require *\*viszva*, cf. *aszvà* : Sk. *áçvā* 'mare.'

§ 2. There is no cogent proof however of Aryan *viḱvo-* in other languages. Meister (*K.Z.* 31, 309) brings forward Ϝιππίξενος from a tomb at Tanagra, and compares this with the Doric name Βίππος and Sk. *víçva.* Who knows but that Ϝίππος is for *\*Ϝικπος* (cf. αἰ-πόλος 'goat herd' for αἰγ-πόλος), and ultimately akin to Sk. *viç-páti* 'lord of the folk,' or is related with *vip-ra* 'seer' ( √*vip* 'tremble')? I compare *vipra-vāhas* (*R.V.*) 'having the gifts of seers' with Ϝιππίξενος 'having seers as guests(?)' In Latin √*vip* appears as *vib-* in *vibrare* 'to make tremble.'[1] With Ϝιππο- we can compare *Vib-ius*, the name of a Roman gens.

§ 3. Looking at Sanskrit alone I would attach *víçva-* directly to *víç* in the sense of the citation from Kuhn given above. I believe however that *víçva* has suffered a popular change from *\*viçva*, cf. *víçvañc*, 'nach beiden (allen) seiten gewandt.' Another effective cause of change in orthography may have been *\*ça-çvant-* < *\*sm̥-çvant.*

§ 4. Now if *víçva* is a special abnormality of Indiranic (cf. Avest. *vīspo*) for *\*viçvo-* then we may compare Lith. *visas* 'all' and its Balto-Slavic cognates. In Greek (Cretic) Ϝίσϝον is apparently cognate from the standpoint of phonetics. As to its signification of 'equal,' this develops very naturally from that of 'to both sides' (cf. Sk. *viṣvañc-*).

§ 5. As I have noted above Sk. *vi-ṣu* is one of the words out of which an Aryan *vī-* 'two' has been inferred. Johannson (*B.B.* 14, 171) extends this stem to *\*evi* on the basis of Avest. *avi-* and Homeric ἔϊσος and ἐείκοσι. It is perfectly futile to regard Sk. *vī* as an apocopated form for *\*a/vi*, and compare Avest. *avi*, which corresponds to Sk. *abhí.* That this *avi* is used with the abl. in a separative relation is no argument that it is different from *avi* with the acc. in the approximative relation, for παρά with the gen, and with the acc. shows precisely the same shift in signification. As to ἐ-είκοσι and ἔ-ισος, Curtius (*Grdzg.*[5] p. 581) gives a perfectly satisfactory explanation of the incorrect assumption of ἐ- by analogy before almost any lost digamma. Schulze (*K.Z.* 29, 235) writes in this strain : ' Die fälle der vokalprothese vor digamma wie ἐϜίκοσι, ἔεδνα u. s. f. in diese frage hineinzuziehen ist baare willkür, da wir keinerlei vernünftigen grund haben, die möglichkeit eines solchen ἐ-vorschlages zu leugnen.'[2]

[1] Unless this is a compound of *vi + br-* as I have suggested in *Am. Jr. Phil.* xiii. p. 481.

[2] The statistics of ἔισος in Homer yield an interesting result. He uses fourteen times in the *Iliad* as a verse ending ἀσπίδα πάντοσ' ἐΐσην, twice ἀσπίδα ...π. ε., and once ἀσπίδι πάντοσ' ἐΐσῃ. He further uses νηὸς ἐΐσης or δαιτὸς ἐΐσης sixteen times (*Iliad* and *Odyssey*) as a verse-close, and δαιτὸς μὲν ἐΐσης once (I. 225) not at the end of a verse. There are seventeen other verse-closes of the nom. or acc. plur. of the same paradigms νηῦς ἐΐση and δαίς ἐΐση, nine in the *Odyssey* and eight in the *Iliad.* We have at Λ 337 φρένας ἔνδον ἐΐσας. On a totally different footing is B 765 σταφύλῃ ἐπὶ νῶτον ἐΐσας. There is no valid reason why we should not write πάντοσε ἴσην for the first cases cited. In all the other cases δαιτὸς Ϝίσης, say, could stand instead of ἐΐσης. Spondaic verses form, it is known, about four per cent. of Homer's verses. There was a false division of πάντοσε ἴσην to πάντοσ' ἐΐσην which never spread beyond the feminine ἐΐση, in which Johannson invites us to see a continuation of Aryan *\*evi* !