

2. The distribution of goods and lordship in Indo-European

‘Givers of goods’ and Vedic *vásu savī-*, Toch. B *saswe* ‘lord’, and Hittite *aššu šuwe-*

Timothy G. Barnes

University of Oxford

Abstract

In 1872, Theodor Benfey noticed the remarkable three-way parallel of Vedic *dātā vásu / vásūni* and *dātā vásūnām* = Avestan *voḥunəm dātārō*, *dāta vanḥuuṇəm* = Greek *δοτῆρες / δῶτορ ἐάων* (Hom., Hes.), all ‘giver(s) of good(s)/wealth’. This inherited phrase participates in a larger phraseological system. The main focus of this paper is on the formula ‘set in motion/supply the goods’, PIE **h₁o/esu-* (~ **h₁uo/esu*) *seuh₁-*, which, I argue, is reflected in: (1) the Hitt. phrase *aššu šuwai* (KUB 45.23 *pas-sim*), which appears amongst a series of “Bitten für die Genesung und das Wohlbefinden des Labarna”, (2) Vedic *vásūni savī-* ‘set in motion, supply the goods’, and (3) Toch. B *saswe* ‘lord’ < **su-su-on-* < **h₁su-suh₁-*+. Further, the use of the verb **seuh₁-* in this phrase must in turn be related to its appearance in several terms for ‘lord, chief, authority’ in Indo-Iranian: Ved. *svāmín-* (TB+) ‘lord’ << **suaH-mi-*, *sūrī-* ‘Opferherr, Herr, Schirmherr’ < **suh₁-ri-*; Proto-Iranian **h₂uaH-iaḥ-* (: Bactr. *χουαχο* etc.), **h₂uaH-išta-* (: Avestan *huuoišta-* ‘best; eldest’, Khot. *hvāšta-* ‘best, chief, master’, Sogd. *xwyštr* ‘superior, chief’, Ossetic Dig. *xestær*, Ir. *xistær* etc.).

1. Introduction

In 1872, Theodor Benfey (1809–1881) discovered a remarkable three-way phraseological parallel: Vedic *dātā vásu / vásūni* and *dātā vásūnām* = Avestan *voḥunəm dātārō*, *dāta vanḥuuṇəm* = Greek *δοτῆρες / δῶτορ ἐάων* (Homer, Hesiod), all meaning ‘giver(s) of good(s)’ (Benfey 1872: 57 n. 58). Benfey’s equation is well-known in the literature on

How to cite this book chapter:

Barnes, T. G. (2024). The distribution of goods and lordship in Indo-European: ‘Givers of goods’ and Vedic *vásu savī-*, Toch. B *saswe* ‘lord’, and Hittite *aššu šuwe-*. In: Larsson, J., Olander, T., & Jørgensen, A. R. (eds.), *Indo-European Interfaces: Integrating Linguistics, Mythology and Archaeology*, pp. 3–22. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.16993/bcn.b>. License: CC BY-NC.

“Indogermanische Dichtersprache” (e.g. Schmitt 1967: 142–148), and is also noteworthy, on the Greek side, as the likely vehicle for the preservation of the lexical archaism seen in ἑάων (Hoffmann 1976: 593–604; Nussbaum 1998: 130–145; Nussbaum 2014; and below, §3). The aim of the present contribution is to show how this ‘giver of goods’ formula is embedded in a larger phraseological system, both synchronically within Vedic, and diachronically, reaching back into the proto-language. First, the status of the formula within Vedic is assessed. This discussion will then allow us to focus on a second, related formula (represented in Vedic by the phrase *vāsūni savⁱ*- ‘impel, set in motion the goods’), and with reflexes, both direct and indirect, in Iranian, Tocharian, and Hittite.¹

Part I. Givers of goods

2. ‘Givers of goods’ in Vedic

First, I show that the Vedic phrase (which appears in two variants, the barytone type *dātā vāsu* / *vāsūni* and the oxytone *dātā vāsūnām*)² forms part of a larger synchronic system within the Ṛgveda (RV). This system has two dimensions. First, what are the other things of which a god may be a ‘giver’ (§2.1)? Second, with what other verbs do *vāsu*, *vāsūni* (along with those parallel other things) appear as direct object (§2.2)? This second topic will, in turn, form the springboard for Part II, the investigation of the formula *vāsūni savⁱ*- ‘impel, set in motion the goods’ and its Indo-European background.

2.1. ‘Giver of x’

2.1.1. Barytone *dātar*- c. acc. *objecti*

There are three examples in the Ṛgveda of barytone *dātar*- with *vāsu* ‘good(s), wealth’ as direct object.³ The barytone nomen agentis is generally

¹ I plan to treat the same material in greater detail in a chapter of my monograph on Indo-European poetics, currently in preparation. I hereby thank the organizers of the Indo-European Interfaces conference, from which this volume is drawn, for allowing me the opportunity to present these ideas on that occasion.

² On these types, see Tichy’s monographic treatment of 1995, and the brief indications at the relevant points *infra*, §2.1.1, §2.1.2.

³ N.b. the surface form *vāsu* is ambiguous between the regular neuter singular and the variant form of the inherited plural (i.e., with ending *-u* for *-ū*), when there is no adjective to disambiguate (AiGr III: 161 (§80), with references to earlier discussions). Since the short vowel variant is prevalent at pada end, it is possible that this originated in the phenomenon of laryngeal loss in pausa (see Jeon 2001: 87–89).

held to designate a habitual agent (*tacchīlam*, per Pāṇini 3.2.135)⁴ – see for example Tichy’s treatment (1995: passim) – but a proper assessment of this view cannot be undertaken within the compass of the present contribution. In all three instances the epithet is applied to Indra. In 6.23.3 the recipient is the *stuvant*- ‘praiser’, in 7.20.2 it is the *dāśvāñs*- ‘offerer, pious man’, and in 10.55.6 there is no overt recipient:

pātā sutām índro astu sómam prañenír ugró jaritāram ūtī

kártā vīráya súśvaya ulokám dātā vásu stuvaté kīráye cit (RV 6.23.3)

‘Let Indra be the drinker of the pressed soma, the mighty one ever leading the singer forward with his help, / the maker of the wide space for the hero (and) the soma-presser, **the giver of goods** to his praiser, even a feeble one’⁵

hántā vṛtrám índraḥ súśuvānaḥ právin nú vīró jaritāram ūtī

kártā sudāse áha vā ulokám dātā vásu múhur á dāśúse bhūt (7.20.2)

‘The smasher of Vṛtra, Indra, swollen with strength-the hero has now aided the singer with help. / The maker of the wide space for Sudās, certainly that too! – in an instant he has become **the giver of goods** to the pious man.’

śákmanā śákó aruṇāḥ suparṇá á yó mahāḥ súraḥ sanād ánīlaḥ

yác cikéta satyám ít tán ná mógham vásu spārhám utá jétotā dātā (10.55.6)

‘Through his power he is the powerful, ruddy eagle, who, as the nestless champion from of old, (has power) over the great. / What he perceives, that is truly real, not false. **He is both the winner and the giver of the eagerly sought good.**’

These three instances cannot, in turn, be separated from the instances of barytone *dātar*- with other direct objects in the same semantic sphere (cf. Tichy 1995: 263). In order not to overburden the discussion of the material, I include the full exemplification in an appendix. (It is noteworthy that in a number of these passages – as indeed in the three passages just quoted – the *tar*-agent nouns, being stylistically marked, tend to cluster together.)⁶

⁴ The whole sūtra, to be sure, distinguishes three different, but related, uses: *tacchīla-taddharma-tatsādhukāriṣu* ‘having that (action) as his habit, duty or special skill’.

⁵ The RV translations of Jamison-Brereton are given throughout.

⁶ This is also the case in Avestan: cf., e.g., the sequence *spašta nāma ahmi, vīta nāma ahmi, dāta nāma ahmi, pāta nāma ahmi, θrāta nāma ahmi, žnāta nāma ahmi, žnōišta nāma ahmi* (Yt. 1.13).

Barytone *dātár-* is found with the following accusative objects:

- with *rádhas-* ‘bounty’: *dātā rādha stuvaté* (2.22.3, said of Indra), *dātā rādhāṃsi śumbhati* (1.22.8, said of Savitar)
- with *maghá-* ‘gift, bounty, offering’: *dātā yó vānitā maghām* (3.13.3, said of Agni), *dātā maghāni maghāvā surādhāḥ* (4.17.8, said of Indra)
- with *ukthya-* (sc. *vásu*) ‘praiseworthy (good)’: *dātā jaritrā ukthyām* (8.66.2, said of Indra)

2.1.2. Oxytone *dātár-* c. gen. objecti

The oxytone stem *dātár-* is found with a similar range of genitive objects as its barytone counterpart. Agents of this type have various non-general functions expressing ability, actuality and the like; Tichy speaks of a ‘situative Funktion’ (Tichy 1995: 378 and elsewhere). As already indicated, these distinctions of meaning are worth further study in their own right but for the purposes of this study such an investigation is not a pressing concern.

A single example of oxytone *dātár-* with genitive object *vásūnām* is found, again said of Indra, and with the recipient of the gift specified by the 1pl. enclitic pronoun:

yó no dātā vásūnām índraṃ tām hūmahe vayām

vidmā hy āsya sumatīm nāvīyasīm gaméma gómati vrajé (8.51.5)

‘He who is the giver of goods to us, that Indra we invoke, / for we know his ever newer favor. Might we go to a pen full of cattle.’

Further, the oxytone form appears frequently with other direct objects in the same semantic sphere (cf. Tichy 1995: 193):

- with *rádhas-*: *tvām dātā prathamó rādhasām asy* (8.90.2, said of Indra)
- with *bhūri-* ‘much, plenty’: *bhūrer dātāram sátpatim grñīse* (2.33.12, said of Rudra)
- with *rāyí-* ‘wealth’: *índro rāyó viśvāvārasya dātā* (6.23.10, said of Indra)
- with *rāyí-* and *iṣ-* ‘refreshment, invigoration’: *tvām hí satyām adrivo vidmā dātāram iṣām | vidmā dātāram rayīnām* (8.46.2, said of Indra)

- with *vājā*- ‘prize’: *índro vājasya sthāvīrasya dātā́* (6.37.5, said of Indra); *dātā́ vājasya gómataḥ* (5.23.2, said of Agni); *sá vājasya śravasyāsyā dātā́* (8.96.20, said of Indra), *índra in no mahānām dātā́ vājānām* (8.92.3, said of Indra)
- with *dātrá*- ‘gift’: *ási bhágo así dātrāsya dātā́* (9.97.55, said of Soma)

Given the complete parallelism of the expressions involving *vāsu* / *vāsūni* with those involving the related and, in most cases, more specific material prosperity terms (*rā́dhas*-, *maghá*-, etc.), one might suggest that *vāsu* / *vāsūni* represents the general term encompassing all such items. In what follows, let us refer to *vāsu* / *vāsūni* as ‘the good(s)’ and the set of material prosperity terms encompassed thereby as ‘specific goods’.

2.2. VERB ‘the good(s)’ / ‘specific goods’

The second point to make about the synchronic system within Vedic is that ‘give’ is interchangeable with a number of other semantically similar verbs.

2.2.1. Semantically similar verbs exchangeable with ‘give’

The formulaic template VERB ‘the good(s)’ is attested with a number of different verbs with similar semantics to ‘give’ filling the VERB slot. A selection of examples:

ay⁻² ‘set in motion’ (6.5.3cd *áta inoṣi vidhaté cikitvo vy ānuṣág jātavedo vāsūni*)

day- ‘distribute’ (6.30.1c *éko ajuryó dayate vāsūni*, etc.)

*dhav*ⁱ- ‘set in motion’ (3.45.4cd *dhūnuhíndra sampáranam vāsu*)

dhā- ‘place, establish’ (6.7.3cd *vaiśvānara tvám asmāsu dhehi vāsūni rājan sprhayāyyāni*, etc. etc.)

*nay*ⁱ-, *ā/abhi nay*ⁱ- ‘bring’ (6.53.2 *abhí no nāryam vāsu vīrām prāyatadakṣiṇam | vāmām grhāpatiṁ naya*, etc.)

vi bhaj- ‘distribute’ (10.85.29b *brahmābhyo ví bhajā vāsu*, etc.)

bhar-, *ā bhar-* ‘bring’ (7.77.4cd *yāvāya dvēṣa ā bharā vásūni* *codāya rādho grṇatē maghoni*, etc.)

yam-, *pra yam-* ‘give’ (8.17.10 *dīrghás te astv añkuśó yénā vásu prayáchasi* | *yájamānāya sunvaté*, etc.)

vah- ‘convey’ (1.51.3c *saséna cid vimadāyāvaho vásu*, etc.)

sav- ‘id.’, *ā sav-* ‘set in motion’ (3.56.6, 5.42.3, 7.45.3 – see below, Part II)

Most of these verbs, of course, also appear with ‘specific goods’; a detailed exemplification would be tedious: merely note, exempli gratia, to *day-* ‘distribute’ direct objects *vāryāni* (5.49.3), *maghāni* (7.21.77), *vājān* (8.2.31), and so on.

2.2.2. *tar-* agent nouns governing ‘the good(s) / specific goods’

Particularly noteworthy is the frequency of *tar-* agent nouns in the type of phraseology under examination. Thus, in addition to the formulas discussed above, viz.:

dātár- *vājasya, dātrāsya, bhūreḥ, vásūnām, iṣām, rayīṇām, rādhasām, vājānām*

dātar- *vasu, rādhaḥ, maghām, maghāni*

we also find, to semantically similar verbs (e.g. *vi-bhaj-* ‘distribute’, *vah-* ‘convey’):

vibhaktár- *vasoḥ, rādhasaḥ, rāyāḥ, maghānām*

vibhaktar- *bhāgām, vājam*

voḷhár- *iṣām*

voḷhar- *vasu*

and so on (for further examples see Tichy 1995: 193 and 263). I will argue in Part II that the divine name (*devá-*) *savitár-* has been generated from this system.

2.3. Summary

By way of summary, the basic point to draw from the material presented in this paragraph is that, from the Vedic-internal (and, broadly speaking, synchronic) perspective, we are dealing with a formulaic system, a network of phraseology involving: a set of related material prosperity terms; verbs of giving, offering, conveying, setting in motion, etc.; and the preference for a stylistically marked morphological category, the *tar*-agent noun. The ‘givers of goods’ formula is *merely one piece of this system*. A question immediately arises: if the phrase under consideration is embedded in a synchronic system in the way described, does this suggest that Benfey’s equation is a mirage? But the Avestan and especially the Greek parallel (which is patently archaic) should be enough to satisfy the sceptic that the ‘giver of goods’ formula was not coined within the recent prehistory of Vedic.⁷ Instead, this situation should lead us to ask a different question: if the ‘giver of goods’ formula is inherited into Vedic, *how many of the other elements of the Vedic system outlined in this paragraph are inherited?* In what follows, I turn the attention to one possible further ingredient of the system in PIE, represented in Vedic by the phrase *vásūni savī*- ‘impel, set in motion the goods’.

Since I will argue below that this ‘giver/impeller/etc. of goods’ phraseology is also operative “behind the scenes”, as it were, in the creation of several words for ‘lord’, it will be useful to interject two notes expanding on the two halves of the ‘giver of goods’ formula discussed in this paragraph and their relation to notions of ‘lordship’.

3. *Interiection* 1. Givers and lordship

Much has been written on giving and gift-exchange in early Indo-European societies, in the wake of Mauss’s classic *Essai sur le don*, especially as channelled by Benveniste in his influential discussions of the vocabulary of gift-exchange. Benveniste wrote of Mauss:

Il a montré que le don n’est qu’un élément d’un système de prestations réciproques à la fois libres et contraignantes, la liberté du don obligeant le donataire à un contre-don, ce qui engendre un va-et-vient continu de dons offerts et de dons compensatoires. Là est le principe d’un *échange* qui,

⁷ A full discussion of the Avestan and Greek material, however, cannot be undertaken here.

généralisé non seulement entre les individus, mais entre les groupes et les classes, provoque une circulation de richesses à travers la société entière (Benveniste 1948–1949: 7)

However, when one turns to the phraseology we have been investigating here, what is striking is how inapplicable the Maussian notion of reciprocity is, at the verbal level: in the Ṛgveda, the simplex *dā-* and its nominal derivatives (*dāna-*, *dātra-*) are used almost exclusively⁸ of one direction of the exchange: the one which proceeds from the stronger party.⁹ The divine givers are of a radically different status from the mortal recipients. Rather than a constant “va-et-vient” of gifts and counter-gifts, we have rather a situation in which the divine gift cannot be reciprocated in a commensurate way: “do ut des” is, in literal Vedic terms, impossible.

The power dynamics implied by this sort of giving is most clearly articulated, perhaps unexpectedly, in a passage of Classical Sanskrit drama, the *Mudrārākṣasa*, where, significantly, we find an example of the Vedic ‘giver of goods’ formulaic template (underlined):

mauryo 'sau svāmiputraḥ – paricaraṇaṇaparo mitraputras tavāhaṃ;

dātā so 'rthasya tubhyaṃ svamatam anugatas – tvam tu mahyaṃ dadāsi;

dāsyam satkārapūrvam nanu sacivaṇpadam tatra te – svāmyam atra (5.19)

‘That Maurya is the son of (your) lord – I, whose business is to serve (you), am the son of your friend;

he is a giver of wealth to you according to his own will, when attended (by you) – but you give to me;

your role as minister there is honorable servitude – here it is lordship.’

⁸ The only example of *dā-* used of a human offering to the gods I see in the RV is 10.116.5.

⁹ Thus we may take the example of *dātra-* (frequently in a figura etymologica with a form of the verb *dā-*), which without exception, in the RV, designates the gift of a divinity. In the majority of cases it is accompanied by a genitive referring to that divinity: so 1.116.6 (Aśvins), 1.166.12 (Maruts), 1.185.3 (Aditi), 4.38.1 (either Mitra and Varuṇa or Indra and Varuṇa [see Geldner ad loc.]), 6.61.1 (Sarasvatī), 7.56.21 (Maruts), 8.43.33 (Agni), 8.49.2 (Indra). Without genitive: in the formula *dātram rakṣ-* (3.54.16, 10.69.4), *dātram dā* (6.20.7, 9.97.55 [*dātrāsya dātā*]), and lastly in the phrase *iṣiṣe vāryasya...dātrāsya* (8.44.18, said of Agni). A parallel distribution applies to *dāna-* which, as is well known, refers to the gifts not of divinities, but of wealthy patrons.

In this passage of the *Mudrārākṣasa*, the speaker, Malayaketu, endeavours to convince the minister Rākṣasa to join his side against the Maurya king Candragupta. Malayaketu argues that Rākṣasa will be all but a servant at the court of Candragupta: Candragupta will be the one that gives *him* wealth (*dātā so 'rthasya tubhyaṃ*). With Malayaketu, by contrast, Rākṣasa will have the status of lord: *he* will be the one who gives (*tvaṃ tu mahyaṃ dadāsi*). In this differential model, the recipient of such a gift cannot properly reciprocate, but is instead placed in a state of obligation. The 'lord' is the one who gives, *par excellence*.

4. *Interiectum* 2. Goods and lordship: ἑάων and the derivation of Hitt. *išḫa*- 'lord', Lat. *erus* 'id.'

The second component of the Greek reflex of the 'giver of goods' formula – the gen. pl. ἑάων – has been the subject of much discussion, in particular by Alan Nussbaum (1998: 130–145; 2014). Nussbaum's discussion in the 1998 monograph has now been superseded in the details relevant here by his 2014 paper. A brief summary of the argument as it relates to ἑάων:

- (a) Attempts to derive ἑάων from (1) the exact counterpart of Avestan *van̥huuqm* – viz. **h₁uésuōm* > **ἑἑών*, or (2) the more expectable **h₁ésuōm* > **ἑόν* or **h₁eséuōm* > **ehewōn* (and so on) are beset with various difficulties.
- (b) It is possible instead to leverage evidence for both **h₁es-o*- 'good' and its abstract **h₁(e)s-e-h₂* 'good(s)' to suggest that ἑάων is simply what it looks like: the gen. pl. of a stem **ehā-* < **h₁(e)seh₂* 'good, thing of value'. Further evidence for **h₁(e)seh₂* is seen in the Lat. adj. *sānus*, which is convincingly and brilliantly derived from **h₁seh₂-no-*.
- (c) Thus in the 'giver of goods' phraseology we have semantically identical variants in the basic meaning 'goods': gen.pl. **h₁uésuōm* inherited in Indo-Iranian, **h₁(e)seh₂sōm* in Greek.

Of special relevance in the present context is the convincing derivation from this same **h₁(e)s-e-h₂* of two synchronically isolated words for 'lord' in Hittite and Latin: **h₁(e)seh₂* 'good(s), thing of value, property' → **h₁esh₂-ó-* (with possessive *-ó-*) 'propertied, proprietor' > Hitt. *išḫā-*, Lat. *erus*, both 'lord'. The 'lord' was thus, in Indo-European terms, both the one who has the goods (**h₁iósmōi h₁eseh₂ h₁ésti*, **h₁esh₂-ó-*)

and who gives (**h₃iós dédoh₃ti*, **déh₃tor-*). As I will argue in what follows, he was also the one who ‘sets in motion’ – in the sense of distributing – the goods.

Part II. The formula *vásūni savⁱ*- and words for ‘lord’

5. *vásūni savⁱ*-, *savitár*- and Tocharian B *saswe* ‘lord’

In Barnes 2013, I argued that Tocharian B *saswe* ‘lord’ was the reflex of a compound made up of the same ingredients (*mutatis mutandis*) as those seen in the Vedic formula *vásūni savⁱ*-. In this section I will summarize the argument of 2013, which I will go on to update with the new material of paragraphs 6 and 7.

5.1. Vedic examples

Three passages in the R̥gveda contain the phrase *vásūni savⁱ*- (3.56.6, 5.42.3, 7.45.3, cf. above §2.2.1):

trír á diváh savitar váryāni divé-diva á suva trír no áhnaḥ

tridhātu rāyá á suvā vásūni bhāga trātar dhiṣaṇe sātāye dhāḥ (3.56.6)

‘Three times a day, every day, o Savitar, impel valuables to us, three times daily. / Threefold riches and goods impel here. O Bhaga, o Protector, o Holy Place, position (them) for winning’

úd īraya kavítamaṃ kavīnām unāttainam abhí mádhvā ghṛtēna

sá no vásūni prāyatā hitāni candráni deváh savitā suvāti (5.42.3)

‘Rouse the best poet of poets. Wet him with honey, with ghee. / He – god Savitar – will propel to us the golden goods that have been held forth and set out.’

sá ghā no deváh savitā sahāvá saviṣad vásupatir vásūni

viśráyamāṇo amátim urūcīm martabhójanam ádha rāsate naḥ (7.45.3)

‘The overpowering god Savitar will impel good things here as the lord of goods. / Spreading wide his broad emblem, he will then grant to us the sustenance for mortals.’

5.2. Interpretation of the Vedic material

In principle, one might suppose that these three instances simply play upon the divine name *savitár*-. But there are compelling reasons for

supposing the reverse, namely that the divine name itself has been generated from this and other phraseology characteristic of the divinity, involving the verb *savⁱ*-. Tichy writes:

Die Benennung *savitár*- ‘Antreiber’ ist durch die charakteristische Wirkung motiviert, die der betreffende Gott bei Sonnenaufgang auf alles bewegte und unbewegte Leben ausübt. (1995: 198)

This – which is indeed the traditional understanding – is correct in general outline, but it is rarely noted that the ‘Antreibung’ which is in fact characteristic of *savitár*- in the hymns themselves is, in the vast majority of cases, not the quickening effect of the sun on the natural world, but rather precisely the setting-in-motion by a divine authority of ‘the goods’ bzw. ‘specific goods’ of various kinds. In other words, the answer to the question: “what does *savitár*- *savⁱ*-?” is, somewhat unexpectedly:

| Object | Recipient | Passages |
|--|---|-------------------|
| <i>amṛtatvám</i> ‘immortality’, <i>bhāgám uttamám</i> ‘finest apportionment’ | <i>devébhyaḥ</i> ‘the gods’ | 4.54.2 |
| <i>amṛtatvám</i> ‘immortality’ | <i>vaḥ</i> (sc. <i>ṛbhúbhyam</i>) ‘you (the Rbhus)’ | 1.110.3 |
| <i>bhūri vāmám</i> ‘desirable abundance’ | <i>dāśúṣe</i> ‘the sacrificer’ | 6.71.4 |
| <i>saúbhagam</i> ‘good portion’ | – | 4.54.6 |
| <i>kṣayāṁ ... paśtyāvataḥ</i> ‘die flußreichen Wohnsitze’ (Geldner) | <i>bṛhádgbhyaḥ párvategbhyaḥ</i> ‘the lofty mountains’ | 4.54.5 |
| <i>rātnāni</i> ‘treasures’ | <i>dāśúṣe</i> ‘the sacrificer’ | 5.82.3 |
| <i>sarvātātīm</i> ‘wholeness’ | <i>asmágbhyam</i> ‘us’ | 3.54.11, 10.36.14 |
| <i>śreṣṭham váreṇyam bhāgám</i> ‘most beautiful, choice apportionment’ | <i>naḥ</i> ‘us’ | 10.35.7 |
| <i>bhadráṁ</i> ‘the good’ | <i>dvipáde cátuṣpade</i> ‘biped (and) quadruped’ | 5.81.2 |
| <i>váyāḥ</i> ‘strength’ | <i>yájamānāya sunvaté</i> ‘the sacrificer, the (soma-) presser’ | 10.100.3 |

Only with the upasarga *prá* do we find the meaning ‘set in motion, enliven’: at 1.157.1 (*jágat*), 1.124.1 (*prásávid dvipát prá cátuṣpad*

ityaī), 4.53.3 (*prasuvánn aktúbhīr jágat*), 7.45.1 (*bhúma*). Indeed, the form *prasavitár-* or *prasavītár-* (4.53.6, etc.) is attested in precisely this meaning.

5.3. Tocharian B *saswe* ‘lord’

The phrase *vásūni savⁱ-* suggests in turn the analysis of Toch. B *saswe* ‘lord’ as < pre-PT **su-sū-o(n)-*, ultimately deriving from a verbal governing compound **h₁su-suh₁-* ‘setting in motion the good’, i.e. distributing, giving out wealth. On the “zeroed-out” first compositional member **h₁su-^o* (to acrostatic **h₁ósu- / h₁ésu-*), see now Nussbaum 2014: 231.

6. Further Indo-Iranian examples

To this dossier we may now add an important further group of Indo-Iranian words studied – unbeknownst to me in the 2013 article – by Sims-Williams and Tucker 2005.

6.1. Iranian **h₂uaH-*

Iranian attests a set of primary comparatives and superlatives built descriptively to a Proto-Iranian **h₂uaH-*:

- (a) comparative **h₂uaH-īah-* (via **h₂uāīah-aka-*) in Bactrian *χουαχο* (*χουαχο*, *χαιαχο*) ‘elder’ as well as in the morphologically renewed *χουαδαπο* ‘id.’.
- (b) superlative **h₂uaH-išta-* (with vocalism remodelled as **h₂uāīīšta-* after the comparative **h₂uāīah-*) in Avestan *huuoīšta-* ‘best; eldest’, Khotanese *hvāṣṭa-* ‘best, chief, master’, Sogd. *xwyštr* ‘superior, chief’, Ossetic Dig. *xestær*, Ir. *xistær* ‘elder, eldest, biggest (finger, i.e. the thumb)’.

What is **h₂uaH-*? Sims-Williams writes:

A connection with the root *hū-*, OIA *savⁱ-* (*sū-*) ‘to impel’ was proposed by Bartholomae (1901: 127 n. 3; 1904: 1856): “Superl[ativ] zum V[erbum] **hav-*; eig[entlich] ‘der am meisten Anregung gibt, der autoritativste’”.

Bartholomae’s interpretation, somewhat implausible on its own, derives strong support from Tucker’s interpretation of Vedic *svāmín-* ‘lord’.

6.2. Vedic *svāmín-* ‘lord’.

Vedic *svāmín-* ‘lord’ is argued by Tucker (Sims-Williams & Tucker 2005: 595–602) to derive from the same root, again in “state II” **suaH-* < **sueh₁-*.¹⁰ Originally this was a *-mi-* stem **suaH-mi-* < **sueh₁-mi-* according to Tucker (cf. OAv. *dāmi-*, etc.).

6.3. Vedic *sūrí-* ‘Opferherr’

One can go further. I think we can add Vedic *sūrí-* ‘Opferherr, Herr, Schirmherr’ < **suh₁-ri-*, as (with different details) already in PW s.v.:

- (1) (von *1 su*) a) (eig. Antreiber) Veranstalter, Auftraggeber, derjenige, welcher Priester u. s. w. zu einer ihm zugute kommenden heiligen Handlung veranlasst und dieselben belohnt.

As in the material given in §6.1–2, the meaning is in the basic sphere of ‘person endowed with authority’. Formally, this is preferable to setting up a unique compound with second member **-Hri-*. The formation is that seen in e.g. *bhūrí-*, Gk ἱδρίς < **uid₁-ri-* and elsewhere (AiGr II/2: 859 (§688)).

6.4. Phraseologisches?

The Iranian nasal infix present **hu-na-H-* is attested twice in Old Avestan (Y.31.15, Y.35.5), both times with *xšaθrəm* ‘power, command’ as the direct object:

yā draguuāitē xšaθrəm hunāitī (Y.31.15) ‘who delegates power to the deceitful one’

*xšaθrəm ... aibī dadamahicā cīšmahicā *hūuqnmahicā* (Y.35.5) ‘we ... assign, commit and delegate the power’¹¹

J. Narten writes (Narten 1986 ad Y.35.5):

Daß die beiden altavestischen Belege das Präsensstammes *hunā-* / *hun-* das gleiche Objekt haben, kann Zufall sein. Doch ist nicht auszuschliessen, dass *xšaθrəm hū* ebenfalls ein alter Terminus der Herrschaftsübertragung sein könnte, vergleichbar dem Ausdruck *kšatráṃ dhā* / *xšaθrəm dā*.

¹⁰ The ablaut patterns shown by the root are an interesting topic in their own right, but one which cannot be pursued here.

¹¹ The translations are those of Humbach 1991.

As Narten remarks (earlier in the same note), this recalls the Vedic constructions of *savⁱ*- with the recipient in the dative and as object various ‘specific goods’, abstract as well as material: precisely the material surveyed above. As a possible ‘alter Terminus der Herrschaftsübertragung’ it also recalls the later, Vedic-internal development of the verb *savⁱ*- in the sense ‘consecrate’: indeed, it might be noted, the very same combination appears – independently! – in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa *sūyate ha vā asya kṣatram yo dīkṣate kṣatriyaḥ san* (8.5.1) ‘his royal power is consecrated, who being a *kṣatriya* consecrates himself’.

Much more could be said about this and related uses of Vedic *savⁱ*- / Avestan *hū-*,¹² but the key point to note is the obvious relationship between, on the one hand, the designations for persons endowed with authority built to this root in Iranian and Vedic discussed in this paragraph, and, on the other, the Vedic and Tocharian phraseology discussed above in §5.

7. Hittite *aššu šuwai*

We can add one further reflex of the ‘impel, set in motion the goods’ formula, this one from Hittite, a source which guarantees a fascinating antiquity for the phraseology under investigation. Hittite attests a phrase which appears to combine (*mutatis mutandis*) the very same elements discussed in §5, found in the 2sg. imperative as *aššu šuwai*, corresponding to 2pl. *šuwatten*. Let us first canvass the attestations.

7.1. Attestations

The phrase is attested in the assembly of prayers for the health of the king collected under the heading of CTH 458.10.1. These are generally agreed to represent new script (NS) copies of an Old Hittite (OH) original. The verb appears in the imperative, both 2sg. and 2pl.:

LU AZU ma-al-ti a-aš-šu-u ša-[ku]-wa-at[-te-et la-a-ak]

nu la-ba-ar-na-an a-aš-šu šu-ú-wa-i [e][-eš-ri-iš-še-et ne-wa-a-aḥ]

¹² For example, it seems possible to analyse the OP royal name *Uvaxš(a)tra-* (: Κυαξάρης) as a φερέοικος type **huua-xštra-*. For the zeroing-out of second member, see perhaps Av. *bixədra-* < **dui-gHtra-* besides Ved. *gātrá-* < **gaHtra-*, Av. *ərəduuaʃna-* < **fštna-* besides *fštāna-*, Ved. *stāna-*, (: Gk παρ-θένο-); the origin of this phenomenon is presumably to be sought in some analogy with the pattern seen e.g. in Ved. *jānu-* °-*jñu-* et sim.

na-an EGIR-pa ma-ia-an-ta-aḥ (KUB 41.23 ii 9–11, ed. Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 458.10.1 (INTR 2013-02-05), plus CHD S s.v. *šūwaye-*, *šūwaya-*, *šūwai-* 2. (p. 541))

CHD translate “the exorcist priest recites: ‘incline your kind eyes and **watch the Labarna favorably**; renew his frame and make him young again’.” Fuscagni has a different rendering: “Der AZU-Priester rezitiert (folgendermaßen): [Neige] wohlwollend d[eine] Augen! **Fülle Labarna mit Wohl!** [Erneuere seine] G[estalt!] Mache ihn wieder kräftig!” (see below §7.2 for further discussion).

Parallel passages exist in several related texts:

[... nu la-b]a-ar-na-an a-aš-šu šu-wa-at-t[e-en (KBo 59.183 iii 3, part of the same text CTH 458.10.1)

nu la-b]a-ar-na-an a-aš-šu šu-wa[-i(a) e-eš-ri-še-et]

[ne-wa-a-a]ḥ n-an EGIR-pa GURUŠ-aḥ (Bo 3995 ii 14–15, CTH 458.10.3 ed. Fuscagni).

The phrase *a-aš-šu šu-wa-at-te-en* also appears twice at KBo 12.18 i 5–7 (plus duplicates).

A related sequence is found in the MH prayer to the Sun Goddess of the Earth (CTH 371), uttered by an officiant on behalf of the king:

a-aš-šu-u IGI^{HLA}-KA la-a-ak LI-IM [la]-ap-li-ip-pu-uš kar-ap na- [...]

[L]UGAL-un an-da a-aš-šu ša-ku-wa-ya nu a-aš-šu ut-[tar]

[i]š-[ta]-ma-aš

“Neige deine gütigen Augen! Hebe (deine) tausend Wimpern und [...] blicke den [K]önig gütig an!

<Neige deine Ohren> und [h]öre (sein) gutes Wort!” (trans. Rieken)¹³

7.2. Interpretation

As indicated in the survey of passages just given, there is disagreement as to the interpretation of the verb *šūwai*, 2pl. *šūwatten*. One may compare the formulation of CHD s.v. *šūwe-*: “due to similar spellings in later Hittite, attribution of forms to *šūwaye-* ‘to see’, *šū(wa)-* ‘to fill’

¹³ Further literature in Lebrun 1980: 83–91; Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 371.1 (accessed 18 January 2016).

or *šuwe-* ‘to push’ is sometimes problematic”. Let us consider each of these three possibilities in turn:

- (a) *Pace* Fuscagni, ‘fill’ can be eliminated – there is no evidence for a stem *šuwai-* to the verb *šū-*, *šūwa-* ‘fill’; at KUB 24.10 iii 12 the sg. imp. *šu-wa-a-i*[d-du (OH/NS) is to *šuwe-* ‘push’; see Kloekhorst s.v. *šūe/a-^{zi}*, followed by CTH s.v. *šū-*, *šūwa-*.
- (b) In context a form of *šūwaye-/šūwaya-/šuwai-* ‘look’ clearly makes excellent sense. Indeed, this seems to be how the phrase was understood by Hittite speakers, to judge by its apparent replacement in Middle Hittite with the phrase attested in the passage of CTH 371 given above (*ḫaššun anda aššu šakuwaya* ‘blicke den [K]önig gütig an!’). However, it is suspicious that this is the **only** context in which the verb *šūwaye-/šūwaya-/šuwai-* ‘look’ takes an accusative direct object.
- (c) Formally, a form of the verb *šuwe-* ‘to push’ is equally possible, since the confusion with the *hatrae-* class which the form *šuwai* displays is also found in OH/NS mss. in forms of the 3sg. written *šu-wa-a-iz-zi*.¹⁴ *šuwe-*, of course, is uncontroversially the Hittite reflex of PIE **seuh₁-*.

Taking (b) and (c) together, it might be suggested that the phrase **h₁o/esu-* (~ **h₁u_o/esu*) *seuh₁-* did indeed give Hittite *aššu šuwe-* ‘impel a good, a favor’, and that this phrase was in turn misunderstood or reanalysed by speakers, within the history of Hittite, as containing the verb *šūwaye-/šūwaya-/šuwai-* ‘look’. This would have been facilitated by the semantic development of the verb *šuwe-* from ‘set in motion, impel’ > ‘push (away), banish’.¹⁵

8. Summing up

To sum up the results of Part II of this study, I have argued for:

- (a) A three-way set: Vedic *vāsūni savⁱ-*, Toch. B *saswe* < **su-su-o(n)-* < **h₁su-suh₁-*+, OHittite *aššu šuwe-* < PIE **h₁o/esu-* (~ **h₁u_o/esu*) *seuh₁-*.

¹⁴ See the material in Oettinger 2002: 293–298, esp. 296.

¹⁵ The syntax of the phrase is still difficult under this supposition, but it is difficult under any interpretation.

- (b) **seuh₁*- as an element in terms for ‘lord, chief, authority’: again Toch. B *saswe* ‘lord’; Ved. *svāmín*- ‘lord’ < **suaH-mi*-, *sūrī*- ‘Opferherr, Herr, Schirmherr’ < **suh₁-ri*-; Proto-Iranian **h₂uaH-ia_h*- (: Bactr. *χουαχο* etc.), **h₂uaH-išta*- (: Avestan *huuoišta*- ‘best; eldest’, Khot. *hvāšta*- ‘best, chief, master’, Sogd. *xvyštr* ‘superior, chief’, Ossetic Dig. *xestær*, Ir. *xistær* etc.).

Returning, by way of conclusion, to the ‘giver of goods’ formula with which we started, it may be said that the Indo-European ‘lord’ was the one who both possessed and distributed good things. The act of distributing could be referred to by using various verbs, of which **deh₃*- and **seuh₁*- are the most prominent, but others listed in §2.2.1 above are also likely to have been used. Many further connections may be made; one thinks, to take one example, of Old English poetic formulas such as the standing epithets of lords *synces brytta* ‘distributor of treasure’ (*Beo.* 607, 1170, 1922, 2071 and elsewhere) and *beaga brytta* ‘distributor of rings’ (*Beo.* 1487, etc.), and in general the near obsession with treasures, rings and the like, and their distribution, which is characteristic of Old English poetry¹⁶ – but this would be a topic for another paper.

References

- AiGr = Jacob Wackernagel [& Albert Debrunner]. 1896–1954. *Altindische Grammatik*. 3 vols. in four. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Barnes, Timothy G. 2013. The etymology and derivation of Tocharian B *saswe* ‘lord’ and *ñakte* (: A *ñkät*) ‘god’. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 14. 31–54.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1901. Arica XIV. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 12. 95–150.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Benfey, Theodor. 1872. *Ueber die Entstehung des indogermanischen Vokativs*. Göttingen: Dieterich.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1948–1949. Don et échange dans le vocabulaire indo-européen. *L’Année sociologique* 3. 7–20.

¹⁶ Friendly reminder of Riccardo Ginevra in the discussion after the paper.

- CHD = Hans Güterbock et al. (eds.). 1980–. *The Hittite dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1976. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Vol. 2. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Humbach, Helmut [in collaboration with Josef Elfenbein and Prods O. Skjærvø]. 1991. *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the other Old Avestan texts*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Jamison-Brereton = Stephanie Jamison & Joel Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jeon, Soon-Hwan. 2001. Die Nominaldeklinaton in der Sprache des Rigveda und ihre indogermanischen Grundlagen. Dissertation, University of Regensburg.
- Lebrun, René. 1980. *Hymnes et prières hittites*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Narten, Johanna. 1986. *Der Yasna Haptanhāiti*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Nussbaum, Alan. 1998. *Two studies in Greek and Homeric linguistics*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Nussbaum, Alan. 2014. The PIE proprietor and his goods. In H. Craig Melchert et al. (eds.), *Munus amicitiae: Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*, 228–254. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 2002. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums. Nachdruck mit einer kurzen Revision der hethitischen Verbalklassen*. Dresden: Verlag der TU Dresden.
- PW = Otto Böhtlingk. 1855. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch, herausgegeben von der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, bearbeitet von Otto Böhtlingk und Rudolph Roth. St. Petersburg: Eggers.
- Rieken, Elisabeth et al. (eds). s.d. hethiter.net/: CTH 371.1 (accessed 18 January 2016).
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1967. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas & Elisabeth Tucker. 2005. Avestan *huuōišta-* and its cognates. *Indogermanica* [FS Klingenschmitt], 587–604. Taimering: Schweiger.
- Tichy, Eva. 1995. *Die Nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Appendix: Complete list examples of the “givers” template in the Ṛgveda

- 6.23.3 *pātā sutām indro astu sómam prañenīr ugró jaritāram ūtī*
kártā vīráya súṣvaya ulokām dātā vásu stuvatē kīráye cit
- 7.20.2 *hántā vṛtrám indraḥ śúśuvānaḥ právin nú vīró jaritāram ūtī*
kártā sudāse áha vá ulokām dātā vásu múhur á dāśúse bhūt
- 10.55.6 *śákmanā śákó aruṇāḥ suparnā á yó mahāḥ śúrah sanád ánīlaḥ*
yác cikéta satyám ít tán ná mógham vásu spārhám utá jétotá dātā
- 2.22.3 *sākām jātāḥ krátunā sākām ójasā vavakṣitha*
sākām vṛddhó vīryaiḥ sāsahír mýdho vícarṣaṇiḥ
dātā rádhha stuvatē kámyam vásu
saínam saścād devó devām satyám indram satyá índuḥ
- 1.22.8 *sákhāya á ní śīdata savitá stómyo nú naḥ*
dātā rádhāmsi śumbhati
- 8.66.2 *ná yám dudhrá várante ná sthirá múro máde suśiprám ándhasaḥ*
yá ādṛtyā śásamānāya sunvatē dātā jaritrá ukthyām
- 3.13.3 *sá yantá vipra eṣām sá yajñānām áthā hí śáḥ*
agnīm tám vo duvasyata dātā yó vānitā maghám
- 4.17.8 *satrābhānam dādhyṣim túmram indram mahám apārām vṛṣabhām*
suvájram
hántā yó vṛtrám sánitotá vájam dātā maghāni maghāvā surádhāḥ

ad 2.1.2. oxytone type *dātár-* c. gen. objecti:

- 8.51.5 *yó no dātā vásūnām indram tám hūmahe vayám*
vidmā hy āsya sumatīm návīyasīm gaméma gómati vrajé

and with other direct objects in the same semantic sphere:

- 8.90.2 *tvám dātā prathamó rádhāsām asy ási satyá išānakṛt*
tuvidyumnásyā yújyá vṛñmahe putrásya śávaso mahāḥ
- 2.33.12 *kumārás cit pitāram vāndamānam prāti nānāma rudropayāntam*
bhūrér dātāram sátpatiḥ grñṣe stutás tvám bheṣajá rāsy asmé
- 6.23.10 *evéd indraḥ suté astāvi sóme bharádvājeṣu kṣáyad ín maghónaḥ*
ásad yáthā jaritrá utá sūrír indro ráyó viśvāvārasya dātā

- 6.37.5 *índro vājasya sthāvīrasya dātēndro gīrbhīr vardhatām vṛddhāmahāḥ*
índro vṛtrām hāniṣṭho astu sátvā tá sūrīḥ pṛṇati tūtujānaḥ
- 5.23.2 *tām agne pṛtanāśāhaṃ rayīm sahasva á bhara*
tvām hí satyó ádbhuto dātā vājasya gómataḥ
- 8.96.20 *sá vṛtrahéndraś carṣaṇīdhīt tām suṣṭutyā hávyam huvema*
sá prāvitā maghāvā no ‘dhivaktā sá vājasya śravasyāsyā dātā
- 8.92.3 *índra ín no mahānām dātā vājānām nṛtūḥ*
mahāñ abhijñv á yamat
- 8.46.2 *tvām hí satyām adrivo vidmá dātāram iṣām*
vidmá dātāram rayīnām
- 9.97.55 *sām trí pavítrā vītātāny eṣy ánv ékaṃ dhāvasi pūyámānaḥ*
ási bhágo ási dātrāsya dātási maghāvā maghāvadbhya indo