

Indogermanische Forschungen

Zeitschrift für Indogermanistik
und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

Begründet von
Karl Brugmann und Wilhelm Streitberg

Herausgegeben von
Wolfgang P. Schmid und Eckhard Eggers

111. Band 2006

Sonderdruck



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

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

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

pres.	pret.
1sg. <i>pehhi</i>	1sg. <i>pehhun</i>
2sg. <i>paitti</i>	2sg. <i>paitta</i>
3sg. <i>pāi</i>	3sg. <i>pais</i>
1pl. <i>piḡeni</i>	1pl. <i>piḡen</i>
2pl. <i>pisteni</i>	2pl. <i>*pisten</i>
3pl. <i>pianzi</i>	3pl. <i>piḡer</i>

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. αἴνωμαι 'to take'. For instance, Oettinger (1979: 470) reconstructs **pói + h_{1,3}oi-*, and Melchert (1989: 44) gives **pe + ai-*. The latter argues that the same root is found in Lyc. *ije-* and HLuw. *ijasa-* 'to buy' as well.

Nevertheless, this etymology is problematic in several respects. First, the exact reconstruction of the root is unclear. Gk. αἴ- 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 preceding 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-je/o-* would have yielded Lyc. ***xije-* and Luw. ***hiia-*, instead of attested *ije-* and *ijasa-*.²

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 *piḡeni*, *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+h₁(e)i-* or **po+h₁(e)i-*:

pres.	pret.
1sg. <i>paimi</i>	1sg. <i>pāun</i> (< <i>*paiun</i>)
2sg. <i>paisi</i>	2sg. <i>paitta</i> (sec. for <i>*pais</i>)
3sg. <i>paizzi</i>	3sg. <i>pait</i>
1pl. <i>paiḡani, paiḡeni</i>	1pl. <i>paiḡen</i>
2pl. <i>paitteni, paittani</i>	2pl. <i>*paitten</i>
3pl. <i>pānzi</i> (< <i>*paianzi</i>)	3pl. <i>pāir</i> (< <i>*paiḡer</i>)

In this verb the singular as well as the plural stem is *pai-*, which indicates that the full grade form **po-h₁ei-* as well as the zero grade form **po-h₁i-* 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' < **plth₂eno-*).

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. αἴνωμαι would only be possible if we interpret the Hittite material as reflecting **p-h₂oi-*, **p-h₂i-*. This implies that the connection with Lyc. *ije-* and HLuw. *ijasa-* must be given up, if indeed the laryngeal of a preform **h₂ije-* should have left a trace in Lyc. and Luw.

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

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)jV-*. One might therefore argue that **h₂-* is lost in such a cluster.

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

**po-* in *pai-* ‘to go’ (*paizzi* < **po-h₁eiti*, *pānzi* < **paianzi* < **po-h₁ienti*)³

pe-* in *pedā-* ‘to bring’ (pe-deh₃-*), *pehutē-* ‘to lead’ (**pe-h₂u-d^heh₁-?*), *penna/i-* ‘to lead, to drive’ (*pe-noiH-*), *pēssiija-* ‘to throw away’ (**pe-h₁s-īe/o-*), *pejē-* ‘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-*:

<i>pai-</i> ‘to go’	:	<i>uūa-</i> ‘to come’
<i>pedā-</i> ‘to take (away)’	:	<i>udā-</i> ‘to take (here)’
<i>pehutē-</i> ‘to lead away’	:	<i>uūatē-</i> ‘to lead here’
<i>penna/i-</i> ‘to lead away, to drive’	:	<i>ūnna/i-</i> ‘to lead here’
<i>pēssiija-</i> ‘to throw away’	:	<i>ūssiija-</i> ‘to throw’
<i>pejē-</i> ‘to send (away)’	:	<i>uīē-</i> ‘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 *uūatē-* ‘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-/uūa-* ‘go/come’, however, seems to be quite old. This is clear from the fact that *uūa-*, which must reflect **h₂ou-h₁(e)i-*, was at a certain point reinterpreted as an **u-īe/o-* verb, showing a 1sg.pres. *uūami* instead of the expected ***uūēmi* < **h₂ou-h₁imi*). This must have happened at a fairly early stage. Besides, *pai-/uūa-* 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 *pejē-* < **pe-h₁ieh₁-*.

go’: *awa/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. *pija-* ‘to give’, HLuw. *pija-* ‘to give’, Lyc. *pije-* ‘to give’), whereas all the other univerbated verbs (except *pai-/uūa-* ‘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 *uppressar* ‘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. *αἴνυμαι* is untenable. The connection with Lyc. *ije-* and HLuw. *ūasa-* ‘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/tijanzi*-type, of which the best-known exponent is *dai-/ti-* ‘to

⁴ Note that in CLuw. we find *auī-* ‘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-h₂u-d^heh₁-*. 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', *huy(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*, *mījanzi* '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 *-i*-extension: *d(a)i-* 'to put' must reflect **d^heh₁- + -i-*, *isp(a)i-* 'to be satiated' reflects **speh₁- + -i-*, *huy(a)i-* 'to run' < **h₂ueh₁- + -i-*, etc.

There are some slight differences in the etymological interpretation of this category. Oettinger (1979: 461), for instance, reconstructs *ispāi* as **spoh₁i-ei*⁸, whereas Melchert (1984: 73; 1994a: 65) reconstructs *dāi* as **d^heh₁i-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* > *Cījanzi*.

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*, *arijanzi* is generally connected with PIE **h₃er-* '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 **h₃or-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 **h₃rói-ei*. Oettinger repeats this reconstruction in 2004: 402, but states there that the underlying root was **h₃rei-* (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 Puhvel (1991: 63), from a root **h₂let-*. In order to explain the Hitt. forms *halzāi*, *halzijanzi*, Oettinger (2002: XXVIII; 2004: 400) reconstructs **h₂ltói-ei*, **h₂lti-énti*. He seems to assume that we are dealing here with a root **h₂ltei-* (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 **h₂ltei-*, I would rather argue that we are dealing with the zero grade of the root **h₂let-*, followed by an ablauting suffix **-oi-/i-*: **h₂lt-ói-ei*, **h₂lt-i-énti*.

In my view, all verbs of the *dāi/tījanzi*-class (except *māi*, *mījanzi*) are formed in the same manner as **h₂lt-ói-ei*, **h₂lt-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*, *tījanzi* as **d^hh₁-ói-ei*, **d^hh₁-i-énti*,⁹ and *ispāi*, *ispijanzi* as **sph₁-ói-ei*, **sph₁-i-énti*,¹⁰ etc.

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

⁷ The laryngeal in the root is necessary to explain **moH₁ent-* 'adult' < **moH₁ent-* (**mo₁ent-* would have given Hitt. ***mānt-*).

⁸ Oettinger (1979: 460) takes *dāi* : *tījanzi* to have arisen secondarily. In his view, 3sg.pres. **(d^he-)^{d^hóh₁-ei}* > Hitt. *dāi*, whereas he regards 3pl.pres. *tījanzi* to be a reshaping of regular ***danzi*, but cf. note 9.

⁹ Also Oettinger (2004: 401) states: 'Ebenso dürfte heth. 3.Sg. *dāi* : Pl. *t(i)y-anzi* "ponit" im Prinzip auf vorurاناتolisches **d^hh₁óy-e+i* zurückgehen'.

¹⁰ Prof. Lubotsky draws my attention to the fact that a reconstruction **sph₁-ói-e* would perfectly explain Skt. *sphāya-te* 'to become fat', whereas the common reconstruction **speh₁-je-* 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’ < **t̥k-éi-ti/t̥k-i-énti* (from the root **ték-* ‘to create’)¹¹ and of which we find traces in the Baltic and Slavic *i*-flexion¹², the Latin *capere*-class and the Celtic BII-present¹³.

Applying this newly gained information about the *dāi/tiānzi*-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 **d^hh₁-oi-* of a root **d^heh₁-*) or **HeP-* (like **h₃r-oi-* of a root **h₃er-*).

In order to establish a possible etymology, I have collected the roots listed in LIV² that show one of these structures, and valued their potential for a semantical connection:

- **Pei-*: **b^heiH-* ‘schlagen’, **peh₁i-* ‘tadeln, schmähen’, **peiH-* ‘anschwellen’, **peiH-* ‘singen’.
 **PeH-*: **b^heh₁-* ‘wärmen’, **b^heh₂-* ‘glänzen, leuchten’, **b^heh₂-* ‘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 of 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 *ep-/app-* ‘to take, to seize’, does not speak

against the etymology of *pai-/pi-* as **h₁p-(o)i-*. The same phenomenon can be seen in the fact that besides the verb *dai-/ti-* ‘to place’ from **d^hh₁-(o)i-* we find *tē-* ‘to state’ from **d^heh₁-*.

The new reconstruction of *pai-/pi-* as **h₁p-(o)i-* sheds new light on the reflexes in other Anatolian languages as well, where we find CLuw. *piā-*, HLuw. *piā-* and Lyc. *pije-* ‘to give’. These verbs all seem to go back to a stem **piē/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. *halziā-zi* from *halz(a)i-*, *huja-zi* from *huḡ(a)i-*, etc. In the same way we find e.g. 1pl.pres. *piāuēni*, 1pl.pret. *piāuēn*, inf. *piāuūanzi* of *p(a)i-*. In the other Anatolian languages, these thematized 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 *piā-* ‘to give’ to be **piāattu* ‘he must give’. Nevertheless, in the Iṣtanuwian 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 Iṣtanuwian 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 thematized *piā-*), which demonstrate that, at least originally, this verb showed ablaut in CLuw. as well. This ablaut, then, must be Proto-Anatolian.

The reconstruction **h₁p-(o)i-* for Luw. *piā-* and Lyc. *pije-* 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. **h₁m-* ‘me’ > HLuw. *á-mu*).

¹⁴ According to Kortlandt (1989: 109), thematizations of original athematic *i*-presents are the source for e.g. Skt. *būdhyate* ‘wakes’, *mānyate* ‘thinks’ and Gk. φαίνομαι ‘to appear’.

¹⁵ E.g. in KUB 35.135 iv 22: *dussaniāllas=mi ājatra pāiu* ‘let the *dussaniālla-* give *ājatra* 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.’ < **h₁h₁t-ro-* (Skt. *ātman-*). I would now rather interpret the latter forms as **h₁h₁t-ro-*.

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.

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. αἴνωμαι 'to take' must be given up, as well as its connection with Lyc. *ije-* and HLuw. *ijasa-* 'to buy'.¹⁷

Just like the other verbs of the *dāi/tijanzi*-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-oi-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' < **t̥k-éi-ti/ t̥k-i-énti* and of which traces are found in Balto-Slavic, Latin and Celtic, points to an archaic PIE formation.

References

- 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 *statyti* 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.

- Melchert, H. C. 1989: New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. In: Historische Sprachforschung 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 Verbuns, Nürnberg.
 Oettinger, N. 2002: Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns. Nachdruck mit einer Kurzen Revision der Hethitischen Verbalklassen (= Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 7), Dresden.
 Oettinger, N. 2004: Die Entwicklung von *h₃* 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,
 Comparative Indo-European Linguistics
 P.O. Box 9515
 NL-2300 RA Leiden
 The Netherlands
 a.kloekhorst@let.leidenuniv.nl

Alwin Kloekhorst

¹⁷ Toch.B *ai-*, TochA *e-* 'to give' and Gk. αἴνωμαι '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.