Hittite pai-/pi- ‘to give’

The Hittite verb pai-/pi- ‘to give’ is inflected as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{pres.} & \text{pret.} \\
1sg. & \text{pehhi} \\
2sg. & \text{paitti} \\
3sg. & \text{pāi} \\
1pl. & \text{pi\text{"}eni} \\
2pl. & \text{pi\text{"}en} \\
3pl. & \text{pianzi} \\
\end{array}
\]

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 ei- ‘to give’ and Gk. αὐξάμα ‘to take’. For instance, Oettinger (1979: 470) reconstructs *poi + h₁,oi-, and Melchert (1989: 44) gives *pe + ai-. The latter argues that the same root is found in Lyc. ije- and HLuw. i\text{"}asa- ‘to buy’ as well.

Nevertheless, this etymology is problematic in several respects. First, the exact reconstruction of the root is unclear. Gk. αi- quite unambiguously points to a pre-form *h₂i,ei- \(^1\) which would nicely fit the Tocharian forms as well. For Hittite, however, a root *h₂,ei- is impossible if we assume that the preceeding preverb ends in a vowel (*pe or *poi-), because intervocalic *h₂ remains as -hh- (e.g. *peh₂,ur > pahhar ‘fire’). A preform *pe-h₂,oi- should thus have given Hitt. **pahhāi-. This seems to be the main reason why Melchert (1994: 7) assumes a root *ai-, LIV\(^2\) (229) reconstructs *h₂,ai- and Adams (1999: 100) gives *h₂,ei-.

Furthermore, if the Lyc. and HLuw. forms are indeed cognate, we would have expected that a formation *h₂,i,je/o- would have yielded Lyc. **xije- and Luw. **hija-, instead of attested ije- and i\text{"}asa-? \(^2\)

\(^1\) I do not accept the existence of a fourth PIE laryngeal (i.e. α-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,jV-.

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 pi\text{"}en, p\text{"}esten and p\text{"}anzzi 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+h₁(e)i- or *po+h₁(e)i-:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{pres.} & \text{pret.} \\
1sg. & \text{paimi} \\
2sg. & \text{pai} \\
3sg. & \text{paizzi} \\
1pl. & \text{pai\text{"}en, pai\text{"}en} \\
2pl. & \text{pait\text{"}en, pait\text{"}en} \\
3pl. & \text{p\text{"}anzz (<*p\text{"}anzzi)} \\
\end{array}
\]

In this verb the singular as well as the plural stem is pai-, which indicates that the full grade form *po-h₁,i- as well as the zero grade form *po-h₁,i- 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)i- 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’ < *plh₂,eno-).

All in all, we have to conclude that, from a formal point of view, a connection between Hitt. pāi, pianzi and TochB ai-, TochA ei- and Gk. αὐξάμα would only be possible if we interpret the Hittite material as reflecting *p-h₁,oi- or *p-h₁,i-. This implies that the connection with Lyc. ije- and HLuw. i\text{"}asa- must be given up, if indeed the laryngeal of a preform *h₂,ije- 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’ (*pazzi < *po-h, eiti, pänzi < *pa'janzi < *po-h, ienti)3

*pe- in pedâ- ‘to bring’ (*pe-đeh₂), pehuê- ‘to lead’ (*pe-h₂,u-đeh₂-), pennaí- ‘to lead, to drive’ (pe-noi-h-), pēssiuā- ‘to throw away’ (*pe-h₂,s-[e/o]-), pejê- ‘to send’ (*pe-h₂, ieh₁-), pe(-)hark- ‘to hold (ready)’ (*pe h₂,erk-).

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

\[
\begin{align*}
pai- & \text{ ‘to go’} & : & \text{ uṣṣa- ‘to come’} \\
pedâ- & \text{ ‘to take (away)’} & : & \text{ uđâ- ‘to take (here)’} \\
pehuê- & \text{ ‘to lead away’} & : & \text{ uqatê- ‘to lead here’} \\
pennaí- & \text{ ‘to lead away, to drive’} & : & \text{ ụmmaí- ‘to lead here’} \\
pēssiuā- & \text{ ‘to throw away’} & : & \text{ āssiuā- ‘to throw’} \\
pejê- & \text{ ‘to send (away)’} & : & \text{ uje- ‘to send (here)’}
\end{align*}
\]

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 uqatê- ‘to lead here’ is rather unclear (especially with regard to its connection with pehuê-).

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 pehuê- must be a recent formation, because of the non-colouring of e by h.

The pair pai-/ụṣṣa- ‘go/come’, however, seems to be quite old. This is clear from the fact that ụṣṣa-, which must reflect *h₂ olu-h₂, e(e)₁, was at a certain point reinterpreted as an *u-je/o-verb, showing a 1sg.pres. uṣṣami instead of the expected **uṣe̥mēi < *h₂ olu-h₂, eim(m). This must have happened at a fairly early stage. Besides, pai-/ụṣṣa- is the only pair that has cognates in the other Anatolian languages, viz. in HLuw, pa- ‘to go’: ʹaωa- ‘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, pi̇ja- ‘to give’, HLuw, pi̇ja- ‘to give’, Lyc, pi̇je- ‘to give’), whereas all the other univerbated verbs (except pai-/ụṣṣa- ‘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, pipi̇sa-, HLuw, pipi̇sa-, Lyc. pibi̇je- ‘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 Octinger (1979: 489) is to be analysed as u- + pai- ‘to give’. A pe-variant may be present in the hapax pipi̇ssar ‘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. ʹai̇n̄uá is untenable. The connection with Lyc. ije- and HLuw. ijaśa- ‘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/i̇janzi-type, of which the best-known exponent is dāi/-i̇ti- ‘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 *h₂,i-. This assumption is contradicted by pejê- < *pe-h₂, ieh₁-.

4 Note that in CLuw, we find aq̄i̇- ‘to come’, but beside this only i̇- ‘to go’, without a *po-preverb.

5 Nevertheless, something similar could have happened in pehuê- if it reflects *pe-h₂, u-đeh₂-. This verb, however, is probably a very recent formation.
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, arījanzi is generally connected with PIE *h₂er- ‘to move upwards’. If we apply to this root the principle that the ablaut took place in the root only (*Co Ci ei besides *CC ei-ent), we would expect a form *h₂or-i-ent 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 *h₂rōi-ent. Oettinger repeats this reconstruction in 2004: 402, but states there that the underlying root was *h₂rei- (as in Lat. oritur). For halz(a)i- ‘to scream’ he gives a similar analysis. This verb is connected with Goth. lapōn ‘to call’ by Pulvel (1991: 63), from a root *h₂let-. In order to explain the Hitt. forms halzāi, halzjanzi, Oettinger (2002: XXVIII; 2004: 400) reconstructs *h₂lōi-ent, *h₂lī-ent. He seems to assume that we are dealing here with a root *h₂lei- (an extension of *h₂let-), 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 *h₂lei-, I would rather argue that we are dealing with the zero grade of the root *h₂let-, followed by an ablauting suffix *-oi-/i-/ *h₂lōi-ent, *h₂lī-ent.

In my view, all verbs of the dāi/tijanzi-class (except māi, mijanzi) are formed in the same manner as *h₂lōi-ent, *h₂lī-ent: the class shows a formation with zero grade in the root, followed by an ablauting -oi-/i-/suffix: *CC-oi-ent, *CC-ent. I therefore reconstruct dāi, tijanzi as *dʰh₁-i-ent, *dʰh₁-i-ent, and ispāi, ispājanzi as *sph₁-i-ent, *sph₁-i-ent, etc.

Often this class is regarded as showing Cai/Ciā. This is incorrect. The weak stem is Ci as can be seen in e.g. 1pl.pres. halzjanzi ‘we scream’, 2pl.imp.act. ispisten ‘you must be satiated’, etc. The forms with a stem Ciā belong to the secondary mɨ-inflected thematications on the basis of the false interpretation of 3pl.pres. Cı-anzi as Cıa-nzi (e.g. halzıjanzi, halzıjanjeni).

The laryngeal in the root is necessary to explain *majanzi ‘adult’ < *moH₁-ent- (*moj-ent- would have given Hitt. *mānt-).

Oettinger (1979: 460) takes dāi : tijanzi to have arisen secondarily. In his view, 3sg.pres. *dh₁-i-ent, > Hitt. dāi, whereas he regards 3pl.pres. tijanzi to be a reshaping of regular *d₁anzı, but cf. note 9.


Prof. Lobotsky draws my attention to the fact that a reconstruction *sph₁-i-ent would perfectly explain Skt. svāhā- ‘to become fat’, whereas the common reconstruction *sph₁-i-ent cannot account for the aspiration of -ph. The class of -āya- presents to which svāhā- belongs is notorious for its unclear origin (cf. Kulikoff 2001: 13). I intend to investigate on another occasion whether other verbs of this class could reflect *CC-oi-ent as well.
In my view, this class is the hi-variant of the athematic i-presents as found in e.g. Skt. kséti, kṣiyánti ‘to dwell’ < *īk-é-iti /k-í-énti (from the root *tek- ‘to create’) and of which we find traces in the Baltic and Slavic i-flexion,22 the Latin capere-class and the Celtic BII-present.13

Applying this newly gained information about the dāntijanzí-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-oí-i- (like the other verbs). In the latter case, the root could either be *PeH- (like *dh₁-oí- of a root *deh₁-) or *HeP- (like *h₁-re- of a root *h₁-er-).

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

*Pei-: *bpeih- ‘schlagen’, *pehi₁- ‘tadeln, schmähen’, *peih₂- ‘anschwellen’, *peih³- ‘singen’.

*PeH-: *bpeih₁- ‘wärmen’, *bpeih₂- ‘glänzen, leuchten’, *bpeih₂- ‘sagen, sprechen’, *peih₁- ‘sich bewegen’, *peih₂- ‘schützen, hüten’, *peih³- ‘trinken’.

*HeP-: *h₁-ep- ‘fassen, ergreifen’, *h₁-ep- ‘herstellen’.

Of these roots, the only one that could give a meaningful connection, is *h₁-ep- ‘to seize, to reach’, which is supported by some if its reflexes: Alb. ap- ‘to give’ is reconstructed as *h₁-op-eíc- ‘ergreifen lassen’ by Klingenschmitt (1981: 127), and Kortlandt (1992: 104) argues that Germ. *geb- ‘to give’ reflects *ga- + *h₁-ep-. These etymologies show that a semantic shift from *h₁-ep- ‘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. dānti/anzí ‘to take’ is generally seen as reflecting PIE *deh₁- ‘to give’.

Since semantically there is nothing wrong with deriving a verb ‘to give’ from a root *h₁-ep- ‘to seize, to reach’, we may reconstruct pai-/pi- ‘to give’ as *h₁-p-‘(o)i’-.

The new reconstruction of pai-/pi- as *h₁-p-‘(o)i’ sheds new light on the reflexes in other Anatolian languages as well, where we find CLuw. pı̄a-, HLuw. pı̄a- and Lyc. pı̄e- ‘to give’. These verbs all seem to go back to a stem *pı̄e/o-’, a thematicization of the weak stem *pı̄i-. This is not extraordinary. In Hittite, we find many secondary thematicizations of verbs in the dānti-class, e.g. halzıja-21 from halzı(a)i-, huııa-21 from huıı(a)i-, etc. In the same way we find e.g. 1pl.pres. pı̄a/jen, 1pl,pret, pı̄a/jen, inf. pı̄a/janzı 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 pı̄a- ‘to give’ to be *pı̄a/ttu ‘he must give’. Nevertheless, in the Istanuvian hymns we find a few times 3sg.imp.act. p̄aıiu and p̄aıi, which are generally translated as ‘he must give’15 and which formally correspond perfectly to Hitt. p̄aııu. It is not surprising that these aberrant forms are found in the Istanuvian 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 pı̄a-), which demonstrate that, at least originally, this verb showed ablaut in CLuw. as well. This ablaut, then, must be Proto-Anatolian.

The reconstruction *h₁-p-‘(o)i’ for Luw. pı̄a- and Lyc. pı̄e- shows that in these languages *h₁ disappears without a trace in initial position before a stop.16 This is in contrast with the retention of h₁ in initial position before resonant (e.g. *h₁-m- ‘me’ > HLuw. á-mu).

---


14 According to Kortlandt (1989: 109), thematicizations of original athematic i-presents are the source for e.g. Skt. báhyate ‘wakes’, máhyate ‘thinks’ and Gk. φαίνεσθαι ‘to appear’.
15 E.g. in KUB 35.135 iv 22: dussanivalias=mi ajatra páiu ‘let the dussanivalia- give ajatra to me’, about which Melehart (2003: 174) states: “Since the verb páiu is transitive and takes an indirect object or benefactive, it is hard to avoid a sense ‘give’”.
16 In Kloeckhorst 2004: 44, I have suggested that in HLuw. and Lyc. initial laryngeals before stops were preserved, because of HLuw. á-tara ‘self’, Lyc. atra ‘id.’ < *h₁,h₃-t-ro- (Skt. átman-). I would now rather interpret the latter forms as *h₁,h₃-t-ro-.
We arrive at the following conclusions:

The Hitt. verb *pai-pi-* ‘to give’ cannot be a univerbed verb, and therefore its connection with Toch.B *ai-, TochA e- ‘to give’, Gk. ἀφέω ‘to take’ must be given up, as well as its connection with Lyc. ije- and HLuw. iṣasa- ‘to buy’.17

Just like the other verbs of the dašš/tišaži-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 *ḥ₁ep- ‘to take, to seize’: *h₁p-ão-ěi, *h₁p-ți-ěnti. A similar semantic shift (‘to take, to seize’ > ‘to give’) is found in Alb. ap- ‘to give’ and Germ. *geb- ‘to give’ (from *gabe- + *h₁ep-).

The inflection *CC-o/-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-ěi/-CC-i- is seen in e.g. Skt. kṣet, kṣiyánti ‘to dwell’ < *t̚k₁-ěi/i/ t̚k₁-ěnti and of which traces are found in Balto-Slavic, Latin and Celtic, points to an archaic PIE formation.
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