The cognates of the Hittite *ai-* and *au-* stems and thematicization

Some time ago I suggested that inheritance of the cognates of the Hittite *ai-* and *au-* stems provides the basis for explaining the first arbitrary athematic feminines, the Latin *i-* stems with nom. sg. *–ēs*, the derived nouns of the Latin fifth declension, the Baltic *ē-* stems and the Greek nouns in *–ευς, -ως* and *–ω* (Brosman 1984). According to this proposal Anatolian and Indo-European inherited eight types of diphthongal noun consisting of *ēi-, ēu-, ōi-* and *ōu-* stems of each inherited gender. In Hittite phonological mergers within the long diphthongs reduced this number to four, the common and neuter *ai-* and *au-*stems. In Indo-European identical forms of the nominative singular produced by the loss of the second element of long diphthongs caused confusion between the *i-* and *u-* stems, while identical forms among the oblique cases led to confusion between the *ē-* and *ō-* types and between the diphthongal nouns and the zero-grade *i-* and *u-* stems. Presumably because of the long vowel of their nominative singular the diphthongal nouns were soon transferred to the newly arisen third gender which later became the feminine, a development which required the inherited neuters to adopt animate forms of the accusative singular and the nominative and accusative plural and thus resulted in confusion between the originally animate and neuter nouns. Subsequently the diphthongal forms were lost throughout most of Indo-European. Four principal methods were proposed for their elimination, conversion to zero-grade *i-* and *u-* stems, transfer to the distinctively feminie *ā-* stems, thematicization and levelling of the long vowel of the nominative within the paradigm. The conversions to zero-grade *i-* and *u*-stems were held to have produced the first arbitrary athematic feminines. It was recognized that prior to the occurrence of athematic feminines referring to females, the conversion of pre-feminine or feminine diphthongal nouns would have resulted in animate (pre-masculine) or masculine zero-grade forms, since at that stage gender remained linked to form as it was in Hittite and the *i-* and *u-* stem nouns of animate form belonged to the pre-masculine or masculine gender. However, after the origin of athematic feminines with female referents had servered the link with form, the converted diph-

thongal nouns presumably would have remained feminine and thus, in the case of those with inanimate referents, would have become the first feminines which were formally indistinguishable from masculines but did not refer to females. Thematicization following the transfer to the pre-feminine should usually have produced *yā-* or *wā-* stems. In Latin confusion between inherited *ē(i)-* stems and *yā-* stem variants which they had acquired in this manner in Italic is considered to have resulted in the fifth-declension nouns with nom. sg. *–iēs*. The fifth-declension forms of the type of *fidēs* and the Baltic *ē-* stems are held to have been produced by the spread of *ē* from the nominative. The occurrence in pre-Greek of spreads of a different sort in which the vowel disseminated was combined with the resonant rather than substituted for it is regarded as explaining the Greek nouns in –ευς, -ως and –ω. The Latin *i-* stems with nom. sg. *-ēs* were alone in preserving a diphthongal type essentially unmodified.

When the proposals summarized above were first made, one of two methods suggested for their verification was taking each of the nominal classes held to have preserved traces of an inherited diphthongal type and examining the cognates of every member throughout Indo-European. The other was similar studies of the *i-* and *u-* stems in the older Indo-European dialects. In the cases of the Greek and Latin types of proposed diphthongal origin the former has been completed (Brosman 1986; 1987; 1992; 2004). The results apparently confirmed that each of the types examined was indeed diphthongal in origin, that the proposed change of gender took place and that confusion of every possible sort occurred among the diphthongal forms. A combined total of seventy-two potential cognates[1] contained fifty-five which appeared consistent with diphthongal origin, including thirteen or fourteen *i-* stems, nine *u-* stems, ten *ā-* stems, six or seven *yo-* stems, four Baltic *ē-* stems, two *wo-* stems, two *ū-* stems and single representatives of the *wā-*, *yā-*, *ī/yā-* and feminine *s-* stems, the Iranian diphthongal nouns and the Hittite common *a-* stems, as well as two instances in which a Greek noun in –ευς or -ω corresponded to a Latin *i-* stem or fifth-declension form in *-ēs* (Brosman 1992: 335; 2004: 14). This evidence appeared to confirm three of the four primary methods originally proposed for the elimination of the diphthongal nouns, conver-

---

[1] Words were considered potential cognates if they were semantically suitable and corresponded precisely in form apart from inflection and perhaps gradation.

sion to zero-grade forms, transfer to the *ā-* stems and, since the total number of Baltic cognates found was twelve, the spread of the long vowel of the nominative within the paradigm. Further support for the occurrence of the last development was provided by the observation that the Latin fifth-declension forms with nom. sg. *-ēs* hardly existed except as variants of the similar *i-* stems. Indeed the only noun of the type of *fidēs* certainly attested consistently as a fifth-declension form was *fidēs* itself. Nine or ten others included eight variants of *i-* stems with nom. sg. *-ēs* and, since it is attested as both a fifth-declension noun and a zero-grade *i-* stem, perhaps an additional such variant in *plēbēs, plēbis, plebs* 'common people'. The possible tenth example, *facēs* 'flame, torch', is found only in the nominative singular and thus cannot be identified as an *i-* stem or a fifth-declension form (Brosman 1986: 341).

In the case of thematicization, the occurrence among the apparent cognates of ten or eleven thematicized forms of one sort or another might be considered consistent with the proposal concerning it. However, in its case one cannot be certain whether the form actually thematicized was the original diphthongal noun or a zero-grade *i-* or *u-* stem produced by the earlier elimination of the diphthongal form by conversion to zero grade. Moreover, the virtual absence from the cognates of *yā-* or *wā-* stems resulting from thematicization following the transfer to the pre-feminine, when the confusion among the diphthongal nouns should have been at its height, raises additional questions concerning the evidence of the other thematicized forms. Although these questions have been mentioned in the past, they have not been pursued much further (Brosman 1986: 355; 1987: 337; 1992: 330, 332–3; 2004: 17). Since examination of almost all of the types of proposed diphthongal origin has left the uncertainty no closer to resolution than it was initially, it was decided no longer to await the revelation of significant new evidence but to consider more closely the material concerning thematicization which has previously been gathered in an attempt to determine whether the proposal regarding it should be accepted or rejected. That is the purpose of the present article.

Although *yā-* and *wā-* stem cognates consisted of a single example of each type, in Latin *yā-* stems were numerous as variants of the fifth-declension nouns with nom. sg. *-iēs*. As was stated at the outset, the nouns in *-iēs* apparently arose through confusion between inherited

ē(i)- stems and *yā-* stem variants which they had acquired in Italic. In support of this view it has been noted that fifty-eight forms in *-iēs* (including duplication in compounds) possessed twenty-three variants in *-yā-*, while the Latin *i-* stem and fifth-declension nouns with nom. sg. *-ēs* had none (Brosman 1987: 331–2). That the *yā-* stem variants arose separately in Italic is clear, since they and the forms of which they were variants obviously could have had no more than one apparent *yā-* stem cognate elsewhere. In fact, they had none. Although the lone *yā-* stem among the cognates, the Germanic form seen in OHG *ekka*, OS *eggja*, OE *ecg* and ON *egg* 'point, edge', corresponded to a noun in *-iēs, aciēs* 'sharpness, edge', it was not one which possessed a *yā-* stem variant (Pokorny 1959: 19; Walde-Hofmann 1938–54: 1.8) That the forms in *-iēs* thus also arose separately is consistent with their failure to have a possible cognate among the Baltic ē- stems. It thus appears that, although the diphthongal forms were rarely thematicized otherwise following the transfer to the pre-feminine, in the separate dialect of Italic thematicization was common, at least in the case of the *ē(i)-* stems.

It should also be noted that the cognates included three masculine *yo-* or *wo-* stems with male referents which could plausibly be considered to have been thematicized as *yo-* or *wo-* stems for semantic reasons after the transfer to the pre-feminine. The forms were: Lith. *veršis* 'calf', Latv. *versis* 'bullock, ox' (: Lat. *verrēs* 'boar'), Lith. *pirmdėlys* 'first-born offspring', Lat. *filius* 'son' (: Gk. θηλώ 'wet nurse') and Lat. *patruus* 'father's brother' (: Gk. πάτρως) (Pokorny 1959: 81, 242, 829; Walde-Hofmann 1938–54: 2.761, 263–4; Frisk 1960–70: 2.482; Chantraine 1968–80: 864). It seems significant that two of the three forms are found in Latin, where thematicization is known to have occurred on a large scale. That it is also significant that the only other dialect represented was Baltic, which contributed two forms as well, appears possible but more uncertain. At any rate, the addition of the masculines to the Germanic *yā-* stem and the late Church Slavic *wā-* stem *zъlъva* 'husband's sister' (: Gk. γάλως) (Pokorny 1959: 267–8; Frisk 1960–70: 1.286–7; Chantraine 1968–80: 208) would bring to five the number of cognates thematicized following the transfer. However, the occurrence of five or six *yo-* or *wo-* stems with inanimate referents suggests that the forms thematicized prior to the transfer were at least as numerous as those thematicized later and thus were of a frequency which still seems to call for an explanation.

Another question concerning the apparent examples of early the-maticization is raised by the fact that they were predominantly, if not exclusively, neuter. Of the five or six forms, four may be identified as neuter, while no certain example of a masculine occurred. The reason for the imprecise figure given for the total number is that it was not possible to determine the gender or declension of OLith. *sėris* 'thread' (: Lat. *seriēs* 'series, row, chain'), which could have been either an *i-* or a 'contracted' *yo-* stem (Pokorny 1959: 911; Walde-Hofmann 1938–54: 2.473; Brosman 1987: 333). From the present point of view resolving this uncertainty would be of little import, for if it could be established that *sėris* was indeed a *yo-* stem, its original gender would remain unknown because of the loss of the neuter in Lithuanian. The case of the other form of uncertain gender, MIr. *āge* 'limb, joint, pillar, prop' (: Lat. *compāgēs* 'joining, joint', Gk. παγεύς 'support, pedestal'), is much the same, since the neuter was lost in Middle Irish through a process which began in late Old Irish (Pokorny 1959: 788; Lewis-Pedersen 1937: 159). That all four forms of known gender were neuter is remarkable, since Hittite evidence indicates that the diphthongal nouns were largely animate (Kronasser 1966: 205–7) and under ordinary circumstances one would expect that prior to the transfer to the pre-feminine animate and neuter diphthongal forms would have been thematicized in roughly the same proportions. The four neuters were ON *saeti*, OHG *gisāzi* 'seat' (: Lat. *sēdēs*), OHG -*strewi* 'litter' (: Lat. *struēs* 'heap'), Got. *kuni*, OHG *kunni* 'race, family' (: Lat. *prōgeniēs* 'descent, progeny') and OHG, OS *saro*, OE *searu* 'armor, equipment' (: Lat. *seriēs*) (Pokorny 1959: 885–6, 1030, 375, 911; Walde-Hofmann 1938–54: 2.507–8, 607, 475). As can be seen, a third curious aspect of these forms is that they were confined to Germanic. Although one might for this reason be inclined to consider suspect their authenticity as examples of early thematicization, it will not be necessary to be concerned with this question, for it will shortly be seen that there is a more cogent reason for rejecting them as cognates.

I have previously made the tentative suggestion that the neuter *yo-* and *wo-* stems resulted from the thematicization of secondary *i-* and *u-* stems which had been produced by conversions of diphthongal nouns to zero grade before the loss of the second element of long diphthongs and thereupon became subject to the processes by which the neuter *i-* and *u-* stems as a whole were reduced to near extinction (Brosman 1992: 332–3). It was noted that since the confusion between

the diphthongal and zero-grade nouns was caused by identical forms among the oblique cases, loss of the second element of long diphthongs was not necessary for it to occur. Therefore, although conversions to zero-grade were presumably greatly accelerated by the expansion of the overall confusion resulting from the loss, they could occasionally have taken place prior to its occurrence and thus to that of the transfer to the pre-feminine. That such a development occurred in early Indo-European in at least one instance is indicated by the evidence of the neuter *ai-* stem *hastai* 'bone', one of two Hittite diphthongal nouns with known Indo-European cognates, and its neuter *i*-stem correspondences, one of which may have emerged as thematicized in Gk. ὀστέον 'bone' (Pokorny 1959: 783). As has been pointed out previously, most neuter *i-* and *u-* stems produced by early conversions of diphthongal forms to zero grade should be expected to have been eliminated in their turn (Brosman 1986: 338). Although it was long thought that the extreme rarity of neuter *i-* and *u-* stems in Indo-European reflected original conditions, it is now known from Hittite evidence that the neuter *i-* and *u-* stems were actually fairly numerous originally and that their near absence from Indo-European thus must have resulted from their elimination on a large scale. If the neuter thematicized forms arose in this manner, the possible lack of masculine *yo-* and *wo-* stems could be explained by the fact that there was no tendency to eliminate the animate *i-* and *u-* stems and thus no specific motive for their thematicization.

A more recent proposal would provide the basis for another possible means of explaining the neuter thematicized forms. It held that before initial syllabics the loss without a trace of the laryngeal plural suffix produced within every athematic declension neuter plural forms identical to those of the singular (Brosman 2000: 11–2). Since among the *o-* stems the neuter plural was wholly distinct from the singular, thematicization offered a simple remedy for the resultant confusion among the nominative-accusative forms of the athematic neuters. The originally rare neuter *o-* stems were therefore expanded appreciably as the consequences of the confusion among the athematic neuters were reduced by reducing, primarily through thematicization, the number of such forms (Brosman 2000: 16). As was noted when these developments were proposed, one could explain in this way the virtual elimination of the neuter *i-* and *u-* stems, among which the confusion should have been unusually great, since the occasional

lengthening of nom.-acc. sg. *-*i* and *-*u* upon the loss of a following initial non-syllabic laryngeal would have resulted in singular forms in *-*ī* and *-*ū* identical to the plural variant produced before initial non-syllabics (Brosman 2000: 12–3, 16). Since the neuter diphthongal nouns were athematic, they too should relatively often have been thematicized, though presumably not on the same scale as the zero-grade forms. Because of the gradation of the original stem one therefore might regard Gk. ὀστέον as more likely to have resulted from the thematicization of the unmodified diphthongal cognate of *hastai* than of a zero-grade form stemming from it. However, since the two proposals discussed here are not mutually exclusive, they could under most circumstances be considered as possible supplements, rather than alternatives, to one another.

Although each of the suggested explanations appears plausible, both apparently must be rejected, at least as a means of accounting for the forms being considered here. The reason is that, as was indicated earlier, the four neuter *yo-* or *wo-* stems in question apparently should be rejected as cognates of original diphthongal nouns. In this connection it is pertinent that Lat. *sēdēs, struēs, prōgeniēs* and *seriēs*, the nouns of presumed diphthongal origin to which the *yo-* or *wo-* stems are held to have been related, all seem clearly to have been original verbal abstracts. That *prōgeniēs* and *seriēs* originated as action nouns could be considered probable in the absence of supporting evidence, since aside from a sizeable minority of adjectival abstracts in *–itiēs*, the fifth-declension forms in *–iēs* were almost exclusively verbal abstracts in origin (Brosman 1987: 330–1). However, in their cases confirmation is provided by the occurrence beside them of the verbs *prōgignō* and *serō* and, although each had been partially concretized, by their retention of traces of their original abstract meanings 'descent' and 'series'. The abstract origin of the *i-* stems *sēdēs* and *struēs*, which occurred beside the verbs *sedeō* and *struō*, has been noted previously by Ernout (1965: 24–5, 28) and Kuryłowicz (1966: 19). Although the same is not true of the *u-* stems (Kronasser 1966: 205), that the diphthongal *i-* stems were associated with verbal abstracts has long been recognized, for all three attested varieties of that type, the Hittie *ai-* stems, the Latin *i-* stems with nom. sg. *–ēs* and the Greek nouns in *–*ω, have been found to display such a connection (Sturtevant 1937: 61–2; 1951: 69; Friedrich 1960: 39; Kronasser 1966: 204–5; Ernout 1965: 23–8; Kuryłowicz 1966: 19–20; Schwyzer 1939: 478). In Indo-European the forms of

both inherited genders emerged as feminine. However, an examination of the Hittite evidence (Brosman 2005: 189–92) has made clear that it was only the animate forms, not the diphthongal *i-* stems as a whole, which were associated with action nouns. It found that of thirty-six nouns in the dictionary of Friedrich (1952–66) and its supplements which occurred as *ai-* stems, twenty-three were common, nine neuter and four variable. The common nouns included ten to thirteen, or approximately half of the total of twenty-three, which were apparently verbal abstracts in origin, whereas it seemed safe to say that none of the neuters had originated in that manner. The only possible example of an *ai-* stem action noun which did not occur consistently as common was *hukmai-* 'exorcism', a variable noun of uncertain derivation which was usually common but is attested once as neuter (Friedrich 1952–66: 1.73; Puhvel 1991: 326).

The Hittite evidence indicates that since the Latin forms were verbal abstracts, their etyma would have occurred as animate prior to the transfer to the pre-feminine and thus should not be expected to have produced neuter forms through their thematicization or conversion to zero grade in either their original form or that of a *u-* stem variant. One therefore can apparently be confident that the four neuter *yo-* or *wo-* stems did not stem directly or indirectly from a diphthongal noun. In the case of the lone *wo-* stem, OHG, OS *saro*, OE *searu*, an additional impediment to diphthongal origin is that the diphthongal *i-* stem abstract could not have acquired a *u-* stem variant until the loss of the second element of long diphthongs had taken place. Since the transfer to the pre-feminine presumably was carried out shortly thereafter, there should have remained only a brief interval during which thematicization as a neuter could have occurred.

In view of the evidence that the four neuters should no longer be included among the apparent cognates of original diphthongal nouns, it seems safe to say that they are to be explained as independent derivatives containing the same root as the related forms of presumed diphthongal origin. In the cases of the three *yo-* stems such an explanation does not seem remarkable, for the neuter *yo-* stems, like the animate diphthongal *i-* stems, were associated with verbal abstracts (Brugmann 1906: 629–30).

Both of the two possible examples of early thematicization of uncertain gender were also related to diphthongal forms which may be presumed to have been original verbal abstracts. Like OHG, OS *saro*,

OLith. *sėris*, which could have been either an *i-* or a *yo-* stem, is held to have been connected to Lat. *seriēs*. The other form, MIr. *āge* 'limb, joint, pillar, prop', has been linked to Lat. *–pāgēs* in *compāgēs* 'joining, joint'. As Sturtevant (1937: 61–2) and Ernout (1965: 25) have noted, *–pāgēs*, which occurred beside the verb *pangō* 'fasten, fix, join', was presumably an original action noun which had been largely, but not entirely, concretized. As indicated earlier, *āge* was apparently also related to Gk. παγεύς 'support, pedestal', held by Frisk (1960–70: 2.526) and Chantraine (1968–80: 895) to have been connected to πήγνυμαι 'fasten, fix, join', which contained the same root as *pangō* (Pokorny 1959: 788). It thus appears that παγεύς was a wholly concretized form stemming from a variant of the source of *-pāgēs* produced by the confusion between the diphthongal *i-* and *u-* stems, since the Latin evidence of an original abstract indicates that the diphthongal *i-* stem was the earlier form.

As congeners of verbal abstracts *sėris* and *āge* could plausibly have been original neuter *yo-* stems which arose through independent derivation, as did the three such forms discussed earlier. If it did not originate in this manner, *sėris* is much more likely to have been an *i-* stem than a masculine *yo-* stem, since the other apparent cognates of diphthongal forms included twenty-two certain zero-grade *i-* or *u-* stems and (in *āge*) a single uncertain masculine *yo-* or *wo-* stem with an inanimate referent. At any rate, as a *yo-* stem it clearly is too uncertain to be included among the forms of apparent diphthongal origin. In the case of *āge* the only alternative to the neuter form is a masculine *yo-* stem, which could, however, have originated in two different ways. One is of course the early thematicization of an animate *i-* stem, diphthongal or zero-grade. The other is the thematicization of a pre-masculine or masculine zero-grade form produced between the transfer to the pre-feminine and the origin of athematic feminines referring to females by the conversion to zero grade of a pre-feminine or feminine diphthongal noun. However, although a masculine *yo-* stem could have originated in this manner after the transfer to the pre-feminine, it could not serve as an example of thematicization as a means of eliminating the diphthongal forms, since in such an event the method of elimination would have been conversion to zero grade. Because most of its possible explanations would exclude the thematicization of an unmodified diphthongal noun, *āge* also seems too uncertain to be included among the apparent results of such a development.

The elimination of all of the forms which had been regarded as the possible results of early thematicization leaves only the five mentioned first, the Germanic *yā-* stem, the Slavic *wā-* stem and the three Baltic and/or Latin *yo-* or *wo-* stems with male referents, as plausible potential examples of the thematicization of diphthongal nouns. In view of the small number of such forms it seems clear that the original proposal concerning thematicization should be considered incorrect. It held that the diphthongal nouns, which prior to the loss of the second element of long diphthongs had been as susceptible to thematicization as any other athematic type, would have become much more susceptible after the phonological change had disrupted their paradigms (Brosman 1984: 357). It appears instead that, although the diphthongal forms presumably could be thematicized on occasion, as could any athematic noun, the confusion which arose among them did not generally cause their thematicization to a degree that was any greater than ordinary. Since one still cannot be certain that some of the five apparent examples which remain did not stem from the thematicization of secondary zero-grade forms, it indeed seems possible that the thematicization of unmodified diphthongal nouns actually was relatively rare.

The only certain exception to the general conclusion stated above was the separate dialect of Italic, where thematicization has been seen to have occurred on a large scale. Since one of the *yo-* or *wo-* stems with male referents was confined to Latin, the number of forms potentially subject to more widespread thematicization is thus reduced to four. Whether Baltic was also an exception, though to a lesser extent, is not clear. Among the Baltic cognates the two apparent instances of thematicization were as numerous as the *ā-* stems and perhaps the *i-* stems, the number of which depended on the uncertain history of *sėris*. They were certainly outnumbered only by the four *ē-* stems mentioned previously. That thematicization occurred relatively frequently in Baltic thus appears possible but because of the limited evidence available is uncertain.

Although thematicization apparently should be rejected as a primary means of elimination of the diphthongal nouns, *yā-* or *wā-* stems (and *yo-* or *wo-* stems with male referents) may continue to be included among the forms consistent with diphthongal origin, though they are perhaps as likely to have resulted from the thematicization of a secondary zero-grade form as of a diphthongal noun. The evidence considered here indicates merely that such forms should be expected to

be few. Their status should thus be similar to that of types such as the feminine *s-* stems, which to date have supplied a single form of apparent diphthongal origin, Lat. *glōs* 'sister-in-law', which may be presumed to have resulted from the transfer to the *s-* stems within pre-Latin of the *ō(u)-* stem corresponding to Gk. γάλως 'husband's sister' because of its identity in the nominative singular. The same is not true, however, of *yo-* or *wo-* stems with inanimate referents. From what has been seen here, it appears that the masculines among the latter should be regarded as too uncertain to be cited in support of diphthongal origin. In the case of the neuters on the other hand, it seems likely that, as has been true thus far, they will usually be identifiable with considerable certainty as stemming instead from independent derivation. The reason for this view is that a large majority of the Indo-European *i-* stems consisted of verbal abstracts and, although the same is not true of the *u-* stems, among Indo-European substantives *i-* stems were much more numerous than *u-* stems (Brugmann 1906: 167–9, 179–80). Another point to be considered in this connection is that, despite their irrelevance with respect to the forms examined here, the two developments discussed earlier as possible explanations for the production of *yo-* or *wo-* stems from neuter diphthongal nouns continue to appear plausible. It thus seems likely that each occurred on at least a few occasions, as one of them apparently did in the case of Gk. ὀστέον. However, as that case suggests, it is probable that in most instances such early developments would have wholly eliminated the diphthongal neuter from Indo-European prior to the loss of the second element of long diphthongs and thus would have rendered the *yo-* or *wo-* stems produced in this manner impossible to identify without the unlikely aid of an attested Hittite cognate. It therefore appears that even in the absence of semantic evidence, neuter *yo-* and *wo-* stems should not be considered reliable indications of diphthongal origin.

References

Brosman, Paul (1984): The IE cognates of the Hittite *ai-* and *au-* stems. In: Journal of Indo-European Studies 12: 345–65.
–, (1986): Latin *fidēs* and the *i-* stems with nom. sg. *-ēs*. In: Journal of Indo-European Studies 14: 334–63.
–, (1987): The Latin fifth-declension nouns with nom. sg. *-iēs*. In: Journal of Indo-European Studies 15: 327–40.

–, (1992): The Greek nouns in -ω In: Journal of Indo-European Studies 20: 317–38.

–, (2000): On the origin of the PIE neuter plural. In: Folia Linguistica Historica 21: 3–29.

–, (2004): The Greek nouns in -ως and -ευς. In: Folia Linguistica Historica 25: 1–19.

–, (2005): The Hittite *ai-* stems. In: Indogermanische Forschungen 110: 184–202.

Brugmann, Karl (1906): Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. 2nd ed. vol. 2. pt 1. Strassburg: Trübner.

Chantraine, Pierre (1968–80): Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Paris: Klincksieck.

Ernout, Alfred (1965): Philologica III. Paris: Klincksieck.

Friedrich, Johannes (1952–66): Hethitisches Wörterbuch. 4 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

–, (1960): Hethitisches Elementarbuch. 2nd ed. Heidelberg: Winter.

Frisk, Hjalmar (1960–70): Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch 2 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

Kronasser, Heinz (1966): Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache. vol. 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy (1966): Les thèmes en -*ē*- du baltique. In: Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris 61: 13–20.

Lewis, Henry and Holger Pedersen (1937). A concise comparative Celtic grammar. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Pokorny, Julius (1959): Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. vol. 1. Bern: Francke.

Puhvel, Jaan (1991): Hittite etymological dictionary. vol. 3. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schwyzer, Eduard (1939): Griechische Grammatik. vol. 1. Munich: Beck.

Sturtevant, Edgar (1937): Latin and Hittite substantive *i-* stems with lengthened grade in the nominative. In: Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. Holger Pedersen à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire, ed. by Louis Hjelmslev, 57–62. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget.

–, (1951): A comparative grammar of the Hittite language. 2nd ed. vol. 1. New Haven: Yale University.

Walde, Alois and J. B. Hofmann (1938–54): Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. 3rd ed. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

1550 2nd St.   Paul W. Brosman, Jr.

New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

USA

Hittite *pai-/pi-* 'to give'

The Hittite verb *pai-/pi-* 'to give' is inflected as follows:

	pres.		pret.
1sg.	*pehhi*	1sg.	*pehhun*
2sg.	*paitti*	2sg.	*paitta*
3sg.	*pāi*	3sg.	*pais*
1pl.	*piu̯eni*	1pl.	*piu̯en*
2pl.	*pisteni*	2pl.	**pisten*
3pl.	*pianzi*	3pl.	*pii̯er*

Regarding its etymology, consensus seems to have been reached. The verb is generally explained as a univerbation of a preverb **pe-* (or **poi-*) followed by a root **(h₁)ai-* or **(H)ei-*, which is connected with TochB *ai-*, TochA *e-* 'to give' and Gk. αἴνυμαι 'to take'. For instance, Oettinger (1979: 470) reconstructs **pói + h₁,₃oi-*, and Melchert (1989: 44) gives **pe + ai-*. The latter argues that the same root is found in Lyc. *ije-* and HLuw. *ii̯asa-* 'to buy' as well.

Nevertheless, this etymology is problematic in several respects. First, the exact reconstruction of the root is unclear. Gk. αἰ- quite unambiguously points to a pre-form **h₂ei-*,[1] which would nicely fit the Tocharian forms as well. For Hittite, however, a root **h₂ei-* is impossible if we assume that the preceeding preverb ends in a vowel *(*pe* or **poi-)*, because intervocalic **h₂* remains as *-hh-* (e.g. **peh₂ur > pahhur* 'fire'). A preform **pe-h₂oi-* should thus have given Hitt. ***pahhai-*. This seems to be the main reason why Melchert (1994: 7) assumes a root **ai-*, LIV² (229) reconstructs **h₁ai-* and Adams (1999: 100) gives **h₄ei-*.

Furthermore, if the Lyc. and HLuw. forms are indeed cognate, we would have expected that a formation **h₂i-i̯e/o-* would have yielded Lyc. ***xije-* and Luw. ***hii̯a-*, instead of attested *ije-* and *ii̯asa-*.[2]

---

[1] I do not accept the existence of a fourth PIE laryngeal (i.e. *a*-colouring but not giving *h* in Hittite), nor the existence of a PIE vowel **a* (cf. Lubotsky 1989).

[2] Admittedly, I do not know another word in Lyc. or Luw. that reflects **h₂(i)i̯V-*. One might therefore argue that **h₂-* is lost in such a cluster.

Another problem regarding the generally accepted reconstruction, is the form of the assumed preverb, which is given as *pe-* or *poi-*. Although such a preverb poses no problem for the strong stem, which shows *pai-*, the plural forms *piu̯eni, pisteni* and *pianzi* are quite difficult to explain from a sequence *poi-(H)i-* or *pe-(H)i-*. This can be nicely demonstrated by looking at the paradigm of the verb *pai-* 'to go', which is generally reconstructed as $*pe+h_1(e)i$- or $*po+h_1(e)i$-:

	pres.		pret.
1sg.	*paimi*	1sg.	*pāun* (< *pai̯un*)
2sg.	*paisi*	2sg.	*paitta* (sec. for *pais*)
3sg.	*paizzi*	3sg.	*pait*
1pl.	*paiu̯ani, paiu̯eni*	1pl.	*paiu̯en*
2pl.	*paitteni, paittani*	2pl.	*paitten*
3pl.	*pānzi* (< *pai̯anzi*)	3pl.	*pāir* (< *pai̯er*)

In this verb the singular as well as the plural stem is *pai-*, which indicates that the full grade form $*po-h_1ei$- as well as the zero grade form $*po-h_1i$- both yielded Hitt. *pai-*. In the case of *pai-/pi-* 'to give', it is therefore impossible to assume that the weak stem was *pe-(H)i-* or *poi-(H)i-*, as these would not have given *pi-*, but **pai-*.

Consequently, if *pai-/pi-* reflects some kind of univerbation, it cannot contain a preverb *pe-* or *poi-*. If, however, we still want to assume that *pai-/pi-* is a univerbated verb, we can only assume that it contained a preverb *p-* without any vowel. This would be the only way to formally explain the outcome *pai-* < *p-(H)oi-* besides *pi-* < *p-(H)i-*.

This analysis could have the benefit of the fact that in principle the colour of a laryngeal would be invisible, as laryngeals drop between a consonant and a vowel (e.g. *paltana-* 'shoulder' < $*plth_2eno$-).

All in all, we have to conclude that, from a formal point of view, a connection between Hitt. *pāi, pianzi* and TochB *ai-*, TochA *e-* and Gk. αἴνῠμαι would only be possible if we interpret the Hittite material as reflecting $*p-h_2oi$-, $*p-h_2i$-. This implies that the connection with Lyc. *ije-* and HLuw. *ii̯asa-* must be given up, if indeed the laryngeal of a preform $*h_2ii̯e$- should have left a trace in Lyc. and Luw.

This formal reconstruction yields another problem: what kind of preverb is this *p-* exactly?

In Hittite we find two preverbs beginning with *p*:

*po- in *pai-* 'to go' (*paizzi* < **po-h₁eiti*, *pānzi* < **pai̯anzi* < **po-h₁ienti*)[3]

*pe- in *pedā-* 'to bring' (**pe-deh₃-*), *pehutē-* 'to lead' (**pe-h₂u-dʰeh₁-*?), *penna/i-* 'to lead, to drive' (*pe-noiH-*), *pēssii̯a-* 'to throw away' (**pe-h₁s-i̯e/o-*), *pei̯ē-* 'to send' (**pe-h₁ieh₁-*), *pe(-)hark-* 'to hold (ready)' (**pe h₂erk-*).

It is striking that all these verbs have a counterpart starting with the preverb *u-*:

pai- 'to go'	:	*uu̯a-* 'to come'
pedā- 'to take (away)'	:	*udā-* 'to take (here)'
pehutē- 'to lead away'	:	*uu̯atē-* 'to lead here'
penna/i- 'to lead away, to drive'	:	*ūnna/i-* 'to lead here'
pēssii̯a- 'to throw away'	:	*ūssii̯a-* 'to throw'
pei̯ē- 'to send (away)'	:	*ui̯ē-* 'to send (here)'

The verb *pe hark-* is the only verb not showing an *u*-counterpart. This is well explained by the observation that the univerbation of *pe* and *hark-* is very recent. In fact, we see the univerbation happen before our eyes. The older texts show *pe hark-* with a word space, whereas in the younger texts we find *pehark-* without a word space. The etymological interpretation of *uu̯atē-* 'to lead here' is rather unclear (especially with regard to its connection with *pehutē-*).

Some of these pairs must be quite recent creations. In the case of *pe(-)hark-* we have already seen that the univerbation happens in the texts themselves, but also *pehutē-* must be a recent formation, because of the non-colouring of *e* by *h*.

The pair *pai-/uu̯a-* 'go/come', however, seems to be quite old. This is clear from the fact that *uu̯a-*, which must reflect **h₂ou-h₁(e)i-*, was at a certain point reinterpreted as an **-u-i̯e/o-*verb, showing a 1sg.pres. *uu̯ami* instead of the expected ***uu̯ēmi* < **h₂ou-h₁eimi*). This must have happened at a fairly early stage. Besides, *pai-/uu̯a-* is the only pair that has cognates in the other Anatolian languages, viz. in HLuw. *pa-* 'to

---

[3] Melchert (1994: 177), however, claims that *pai-* shows a preverb **pe-* of which the **e* is coloured to *a* due to the following cluster **h₁i-*. This assumption is contradicted by *pei̯ē-* < **pe-h₁ieh₁-*.

go': *áwa/i-* 'to come'.[4] This proves that this pair was PAnat. already, whereas the other univerbations possibly took place in pre-Hittite only.

If we compare this information about the univerbated verbs with the situation of *pai-/pi-* 'to give', we find some remarkable differences. Firstly, *pai-/pi-* does not have a *u*-counterpart. Secondly, *pai-/pi-* would, if univerbated, show a preverb **p-* that contrasts with the **po-* or **pe-* of the other verbs. Thirdly, *pai-/pi-* has many cognates in the other Anatolian languages (CLuw. *piịa-* 'to give', HLuw. *piịa-* 'to give', Lyc. *pije-* 'to give'), whereas all the other univerbated verbs (except *pai-/uụa-* 'go/come') are found in Hittite only.

Additionally, there are some arguments that really speak against an interpretation of *pai-/pi-* as a univerbation. For instance, in the other Anatolian languages we often find reduplicated formations of this verb: CLuw. *pipisa-*, HLuw. *pipasa-*, Lyc. *pibi(je)-* 'to give'. It seems quite improbable to me that an original preverb would get reduplicated. Besides, we find the Hittite verb *uppai-* 'to send forth', that according to Oettinger (1979: 489) is to be analysed as *u-* + *pai-* 'to give'. A *pe*-variant may be present in the hapax *pipessar* 'gift' (parallel to *uppessar* 'gift'). It seems improbable to me that an original univerbated verb would have attracted another preverb.[5]

All in all, I conclude that it is unlikely that *pai-/pi-* reflects a univerbated verb. We should rather analyse *pai-/pi-* as a genuine stem, of which the *p-* is an inherent part. This means that the connection with TochB *ai-*, TochA *e-* and Gk. αἴνῡμαι is untenable. The connection with Lyc. *ije-* and HLuw. *iịasa-* 'to buy' then must be given up, too.

If not a univerbated verb, how should *pai-/pi-* then be interpreted etymologically?

When we look at the inflection of *pai-/pi-*, it is clear that it belongs to the *dāi/tiịanzi*-type, of which the best-known exponent is *dai-/ti-* 'to

---

[4] Note that in CLuw. we find *aụī-* 'to come', but beside this only *i-* 'to go', without a **po*-preverb.

[5] Nevertheless, something similar could have happened in *pehutē-* if it reflects **pe-h_2u-d^heh_1-*. This verb, however, is probably a very recent formation.

put'. Although small, this is a rather distinctive class within the *hi*-conjugation. It is characterized by showing a strong stem *Cai-* (regularly becoming *Ce-* in front of *-h-*: *Cehhi*, *Cehhun*) besides a weak stem *Ci-*.[6] The class contains the following verbs: *ar(a)i-* 'to (a)rise', *d(a)i-* 'to put', *halz(a)i-* 'to scream', *huu̯(a)i-* 'to run', *ish(a)i-* 'to bind', *isham(a)i-* 'to sing', *isp(a)i-* 'to be satiated', *m(a)i-* 'to grow', *p(a)i-* 'to give', *par(a)i-* 'to blow', *paripar(a)i-* 'to blow', *pitt(a)i-* 'to run, to flee', *s(a)i-* 'to press, to seal', *z(a)i-* 'to cross'.

Of this class, only one verb can be regarded as showing an original root ending in *-i-*, viz. *māi*, *mii̯anzi* 'to grow', which has to be reconstructed as *$*moHi-ei$*, *$*mHi-enti$* on inner-Hittite grounds.[7] The other verbs (which all have good IE etymologies, except *p(a)i-* 'to give' and *z(a)i-* 'to cross') reflect IE roots that did not end in an *-i-*. We therefore have to assume some kind of *-i-*suffix or *-extension: *d(a)i-* 'to put' must reflect *$*d^heh_1$- + *-i-*, *isp(a)i-* 'to be satiated' reflects *$*speh_1$- + *-i-*, *huu̯(a)i-* 'to run' < *$*h_2ueh_1$- + *-i-*, etc.

There are some slight differences in the etymological interpretation of this category. Oettinger (1979: 461), for instance, reconstructs *ispāi* as *$*spoh_1i̯-ei$*[8], whereas Melchert (1984: 73; 1994a: 65) reconstructs *dāi* as *$*d^heh_1i-ei$*. Consensus, however, has it that the Hittite ablaut originally took place in the root, whereas the formant *-i-* is unchanged, as is explicitly stated by Jasanoff (2003: 99): "The apophonic alternation that underlies Hitt. *dāi* : *tiyanzi* must have taken place entirely within the root syllable; the *$*-i-$* was a mere pendant to the root proper", which implies an analysis *$*CoH-i-ei$*, *$*CH-i-enti$*. Such a reconstruction indeed would formally work for roots that end in laryngeals since *$*Coh_{1/3}-i-ei$* would regularly yield *Cāi*, and *$*Ch_{1/3}-i-enti$* > *Cii̯anzi*.

---

[6] Often, this class is regarded as showing *Cai-/Cii̯a-*. This is incorrect. The weak stem is *Ci-* as can be seen in e.g. 1pl.pres.act. *halziu̯ani* 'we scream', 2pl.imp.act. *ispisten* 'you must be satiated', etc. The forms with a stem *Cii̯a-* belong to the secondary *mi*-inflected thematizations on the basis of the false interpretation of 3pl.pres. *Ci-anzi* as *Cii̯a-nzi* (e.g. *halzii̯asi*, *halzii̯au̯eni*).

[7] The laryngeal in the root is necessary to explain ^LÚ*mai̯ant-* 'adult' < *$*moHi̯-ent$*- (*$*moi̯-ent$*- would have given Hitt. **$*mānt$*-).

[8] Oettinger (1979: 460) takes *dāi* : *tii̯anzi* to have arisen secondarily. In his view, 3sg.pres. *$*(d^he-)d^hóh_1-ei$* > Hitt. *dāi*, whereas he regards 3pl.pres. *tii̯anzi* to be a reshaping of regular **$*danzi$*, but cf. note 9.

Although formally this interpretation would work for the larger part of the verbs in this class, two of them show that we have to interpret the ablaut differently. These two verbs are *ar(a)i-* 'to (a)rise' and *halz(a)i-* 'to scream'.

The verb *arāi, ariи̯anzi* is generally connected with PIE *$h_3$er-* 'to move upwards'. If we apply to this root the principle that the ablaut took place in the root only (*$CoCi$-ei* besides *CCi-enti*), we would expect a form *$h_3$or-i-ei* for the singular. Such a form, however, would yield Hitt. **ari*, not attested *arāi*. This was seen by Oettinger (2002: XXVIII) too, and he therefore reconstructs *arāi* as *$h_3$rói-ei*. Oettinger repeats this reconstruction in 2004: 402, but states there that the underlying root was *$h_3$rei-* (as in Lat. *oritur*). For *halz(a)i-* 'to scream' he gives a similar analysis. This verb is connected with Goth. *laþōn* 'to call' by Puhvel (1991: 63), from a root *$h_2$let-*. In order to explain the Hitt. forms *halzāi, halziи̯anzi*, Oettinger (2002: XXVIII; 2004: 400) reconstructs *$h_2$ltói-ei*, *$h_2$lti-énti*. He seems to assume that we are dealing here with a root *$h_2$ltei-* (an extension of *$h_2$let-*), but this is an impossible root-structure according to the PIE rules. Nevertheless, I think that Oettinger's formal reconstruction is undoubtedly correct, but his morphological interpretation has to be slightly adapted. Instead of assuming a root *$h_2$ltei-*, I would rather argue that we are dealing with the zero grade of the root *$h_2$let-*, followed by an ablauting suffix *-oi-/-i-*: *$h_2$lt-ói-ei*, *$h_2$lt-i-énti*.

In my view, all verbs of the *dāi/tiи̯anzi*-class (except *māi, miи̯anzi*) are formed in the same manner as *$h_2$lt-ói-ei*, *$h_2$lt-i-énti*: the class shows a formation with zero grade in the root, followed by an ablauting *-oi-/-i*-suffix: *CC-ói-ei*, *CC-i-énti*. I therefore reconstruct *dāi, tiи̯anzi* as *d^hh_1-ói-ei*, *d^hh_1-i-énti*,[9] and *ispāi, ispiи̯anzi* as *sph_1-ói-ei*, *sph_1-i-énti*,[10] etc.

---

[9] Also Oettinger (2004: 401) states: 'Ebenso dürfte heth. 3.Sg. *dāi* : Pl. *t(i)y-anzi* "ponit" im Prinzip auf voruranatolisches *d^hh_1óy-e+i* zurückgehen'.

[10] Prof. Lubotsky draws my attention to the fact that a reconstruction *sph_1-ói-e* would perfectly explain Skt. *sphāya-ᵗᵉ* 'to become fat', whereas the common reconstruction *$speh_1$-i̯e-* cannot account for the aspiration of *-ph-*. The class of *-āya*-presents to which *sphāya-* belongs is notorious for its unclear origin (cf. Kulikov 2001: 13). I intend to investigate on another occasion whether other verbs of this class could reflect *CC-ói-e* as well.

In my view, this class is the *hi*-variant of the athematic *i*-presents as found in e. g. Skt. *kṣéti*, *kṣiyánti* 'to dwell' < *$t\hat{k}$-éi-ti/ $t\hat{k}$-i-énti* (from the root *$te\hat{k}$-* 'to create')[11] and of which we find traces in the Baltic and Slavic *i*-flexion[12], the Latin *capere*-class and the Celtic BII-present[13].

Applying this newly gained information about the *dāi/tii̯anzi*-class, we can interpret *pai-/pi-* 'to give' in two ways: either the verb reflects a root **Pei-* (like **meHi-*), or it shows a formation **P-oi-/-i-* (like the other verbs). In the latter case, the root could either be **PeH-* (like **dʰh₁-oi-* of a root **dʰeh₁-*) or **HeP-* (like **h₃r-oi-* of a root **h₃er-*).

In order to establish a possible etymology, I have collected the roots listed in LIV[2] that show one of these structures, and valued their potential for a semantical connection:

*Pei-:   **bʰeiH-* 'schlagen', **peh₁i-* 'tadeln, schmähen', **peiH-* 'anschwellen', **peiH-* 'singen'.

*PeH-:   **bʰeh₁-* 'wärmen', **bʰeh₂-* 'glänzen, leuchten', **bʰeh₂-* 'sagen, sprechen', **peH-* 'sich bewegen', **peh₂-* 'schützen, hüten', **peh₃-* 'trinken'.

*HeP-:   **h₁ep-* 'fassen, ergreifen', **h₃ep-* 'herstellen'.

Of these roots, the only one that could give a meaningful connection, is **h₁ep-* 'to seize, to reach', which is supported by some if its reflexes: Alb. *ap-* 'to give' is reconstructed as **h₁op-eie-* 'ergreifen lassen' by Klingenschmitt (1981: 127), and Kortlandt (1992: 104) argues that Germ. **geb-* 'to give' reflects **ga-* + **h₁ep-*. These etymologies show that a semantic shift from **h₁ep-* 'to seize, to reach' to 'to give' is quite understandable. From a Hittite point of view, such a semantic shift is not very remarkable either: Hitt. *dāi/danzi* 'to take' is generally seen as reflecting PIE **deh₃-* 'to give'.

Since semantically there is nothing wrong with deriving a verb 'to give' from a root **h₁ep-* 'to seize, to reach', we may reconstruct *pai-/pi-* 'to give' as **h₁p-(o)i-*. The fact that in Hittite we also find the root **h₁ep-* as such in *epp-/app-* 'to take, to seize', does not speak

---

[11] Kortlandt 1989: 109.

[12] Baltic *-i-* reflects generalized **-i-*, whereas Slavic *-i-* reflects generalized **-ei-*: Kortlandt 1987: 109 and 1989: 109.

[13] For Latin and Celtic: Schrijver 2003.

against the etymology of *pai-/pi-* as *h_1p-(o)i-. The same phenomenon can be seen in the fact that besides the verb *dai-/ti-* 'to place' from *d^hh_1-(o)i- we find *tē-* 'to state' from *d^heh_1-.

The new reconstruction of *pai-/pi-* as *h_1p-(o)i- sheds new light on the reflexes in other Anatolian languages as well, where we find CLuw. *pii̯a-*, HLuw. *pii̯a-* and Lyc. *pije-* 'to give'. These verbs all seem to go back to a stem *$pii̯e/o$-, a thematization of the weak stem *pi-. This is not extraordinary. In Hittite, we find many secondary thematizations of verbs in the *dai/ti*-class, e.g. *halzii̯a-^{zi}* from *halz(a)i-*, *hui̯a-^{zi}* from *huu̯(a)i-*, etc. In the same way we find e.g. 1pl.pres. *pii̯au̯eni*, 1pl.pret. *pii̯au̯en*, inf. *pii̯au̯u̯anzi* of *p(a)i-*. In the other Anatolian languages, these thematicized forms have been generalized.[14]

Nevertheless, traces of the original inflection can be found as well. In CLuw., we would expect the normal 3sg.imp.act. of *pii̯a-* 'to give' to be *$pii̯attu$ 'he must give'. Nevertheless, in the Ištanuwian hymns we find a few times 3sg.imp.act. *pāiu* and *paiu*, which are generally translated as 'he must give'[15] and which formally correspond perfectly to Hitt. *pāu*. It is not surprising that these aberrant forms are found in the Ištanuwian hymns, as these are known to be written in a distinct Luwian dialect with archaic features. Thus, in CLuw. we find the two stems *pai-* and *pi-* (in thematicized *pii̯a-*), which demonstrate that, at least originally, this verb showed ablaut in CLuw. as well. This ablaut, then, must be Proto-Anatolian.

The reconstruction *h_1p-(o)i- for Luw. *pii̯a-* and Lyc. *pije-* shows that in these languages *h_1 disappears without a trace in initial position before a stop.[16] This is in contrast with the retention of h_1 in initial position before resonant (e.g. *h_1m- 'me' > HLuw. *á-mu*).

---

[14] According to Kortlandt (1989: 109), thematizations of original athematic *i*-presents are the source for e.g. Skt. *búdhyate* 'wakes', *mányate* 'thinks' and Gk. φαίνομαι 'to appear'.

[15] E.g. in KUB 35.135 iv 22: *dussanii̯allas=mi āi̯atra pāiu* 'let the *dussanii̯alla-* give *āi̯atra* to me', about which Melchert (2003: 174) states: "Since the verb *pāiu* is transitive and takes an indirect object or beneficiary, it is hard to avoid a sense 'give'".

[16] In Kloekhorst 2004: 44, I have suggested that in HLuw. and Lyc. initial laryngeals before stops were preserved, because of HLuw. *á-tara/i-* 'self', Lyc. *atra-* 'id.' < *h_1h_1t-ro- (Skt. *ātman-*). I would now rather interpret the latter forms as *$h_1h̥_1t$-ro-.

We arrive at the following conclusions:

The Hitt. verb *pai-/pi-* 'to give' cannot be a univerbated verb, and therefore its connection with Toch.B *ai-*, TochA *e-* 'to give', Gk. αἴνῡμαι 'to take' must be given up, as well as its connection with Lyc. *ije-* and HLuw. *iịasa-* 'to buy'.[17]

Just like the other verbs of the *dāi/tiịanzi*-class, *pai-/pi-* has to reflect **CC-(o)i-*. On formal as well as semantic grounds it can be determined that we have to derive *pai-/pi-* from the root **h₁ep-* 'to take, to seize': **h₁p-ói-ei*, **h₁p-i-énti*. A similar semantic shift ('to take, to seize' > 'to give') is found in Alb. *ap-* 'to give' and Germ. **geb-* 'to give' (from **ga-* + **h₁ep-*).

The inflection **CC-oi-/*CC-i-* is an archaic one. Besides the Hitt. class, we find traces of it in CLuw., which proves that the inflection must be Proto-Anatolian.[18] The similar *"mi-"*inflection **CC-ei-/ *CC-i-* as seen in e.g. Skt. *kṣéti*, *kṣiyánti* 'to dwell' < **tk̂-éi-ti/ tk̂-i-énti* and of which traces are found in Balto-Slavic, Latin and Celtic, points to an archaic PIE formation.

R e f e r e n c e s

Adams, D. Q. 1999: A Dictionary of Tocharian B, Amsterdam – Atlanta.

Klingenschmitt, G. 1981: Albanisch und Urindogermanisch. In: Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 40, 93–131.

Kloekhorst, A. 2004: The Preservation of **h₁* in Hieroglyphic Luwian: Two Separate *a*-Signs. In: Historische Sprachforschung 117, 26–49.

Kortlandt, F. 1987: The Formation of the Old Prussian Present Tense. In: Baltistica 23, 104–111.

Kortlandt, F. 1989: Lithuanian *statýti* and Related Forms. In: Baltistica 25, 104–112.

Kortlandt, F. 1992: The Germanic Fifth Class of Strong Verbs. In: NOWELE, North-Western European Language Evolution 19, 101–107.

Kulikov, L. 2001: The Vedic *-ya*-presents, Leiden University Dissertation.

LIV² = Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage (ed. H. Rix e. a.), Wiesbaden, 2001.

Lubotsky, A. M. 1989: Against a Proto-Indo-European phoneme **a*. In: The new sound of Indo-European, 53–66, Berlin – New York.

---

[17] Toch.B *ai-*, TochA *e-* 'to give' and Gk. αἴνῡμαι 'to take' can now safely be regarded as reflecting a root **h₂ei-*.

[18] If the analysis of Skt. *sphāya-* as **sph₁-oi-e* (cf. note 10) is correct, then the formation **CC-oi-* must have been PIE as well.

Melchert, H. C. 1989: New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. In: Historische Sprachfor-schung 102, 23–45.

Melchert, H. C. 1994: Anatolian Historical Phonology, Amsterdam – Atlanta.

Melchert, H. C. 2003: Language. In: The Luwians (ed. H. C. Melchert), Leiden – Boston, 170–210.

Oettinger, N. 1979: Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums, Nürnberg.

Oettinger, N. 2002: Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums. Nachdruck mit einer Kurzen Revision der Hethitischen Verbalklassen (= Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 7), Dresden.

Oettinger, N. 2004: Die Entwicklung von h_3 im Anatolischen und hethitisch *arāi* "erhebt sich". In: Per Aspera Ad Asteriscos, Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV (edd. A. Hyllested e. a.), 397–405.

Puhvel, J. 1991: Hittite Etymological Dictionary, Vol. 3 Words beginning with H, Berlin – New York.

Schrijver, P. 2003: Athematic *I*-Presents: The Italic and Celtic Evidence. In: Incontri Linguistici 26, 59–86.

Leiden University,   A l w i n   K l o e k h o r s t
Comparative Indo-European Linguistics
P. O. Box 9515
NL-2300 RA L e i d e n
The Netherlands
a.kloekhorst@let.leidenuniv.nl