ERIC P. HAMP

LITHUANIAN *pa-* AND *põ* AGAIN

The late Václav Machek has attempted (Kalbotyra, XIV, 93−9, 1966) to show that *pa-* (and its Slavic cognate) has a triple origin: **upo*, **apo*, and **par* (the latter from both **per* and **par*). He brings to light several interesting facts and relations, but I cannot accept his conclusions as stated.

1. *pa-* certainly has one clear meaning 'under', which includes, as Machek states, certain subsidiary uses, e. g. 'a lesser quantity', and what I would see as the closely related use in *pajuodys*, etc. Contrary to Machek (p. 97), I would also include under this the notion of 'lesser quality'; *pa-tėvis* 'father-in-law' and Russ. *pa-synok* 'stepson' seem to me not necessarily different in origin, in this respect, from *pa-juodys*, Czech *po-černý* 'blackish'. In this regard, I find myself siding with Němec, cited in Machek's footnote 12.

Machek further notes (p. 94) that the use of *pa-* as an intensive, which he relates to the use for lesser or weak intensity, seems at first glance to be semantically opposite, and therefore paradoxical. However, he claims that the two uses are related by virtue of being different grades of the same thing, and that it is merely a matter of point of view of the speaker vs. the audience in grading the amount of observed intensity. But such an argument virtually nullifies whatever value one assumes to start with. It is worth noting that this double usage − both as an intensive and as a minimizer − is not isolated. In Celtic, Welsh shows a strong development in exactly these two directions for the prefix *go-* < *u̯o-* < **upo*. It seems to me plausible to assume that the basic meaning in both Celtic and Baltic is 'under-, slight, minimal, etc.'. The intensive would then develop by intentional and deliberate understatement: 'a little' 'very, completely'. There would then be no question of a gradation, vagueness, difference of evaluation, or the like.

There is no doubt, as Machek points out, following Endzelins, that these related uses remind one of Greek ὑπο-, Sanskrit *upa-*, and lead one to **upo-*. Endzelins was clearly right that this use of *pa-* is related to ὑπο- in respect of its meaning; we might also say, in respect of its syntax. Following Machek's suggestions we may, I think, also go further than Endzelins was prepared to go. But I cannot follow Machek to his conclusion, that *pa-* simply is **upo-* by a claimed loss of initial vowel in Latin,

Iranian, and Balto-Slavic (p. 96). We simply cannot assume a straight forward phonetic loss of initial vowel in these languages. We return to this question below.

2. pa- also means 'away' (*pabėgti* etc.). All will agree with Endzelins and Machek that this use is related to ἀπο-, Slavic, *po-* (*poběhnúti* etc.). A specialization of this is the more neutral „perfective" *pa-* of Baltic and *po-* of Slavic. Forms without initial vowel are also clearly seen in Latin *pōnō* < **po-sinō*, *po-situs*, Ossetic *fœ*, and Hittite *pē*. For the Ossetic and Hittite I follow and accept Benveniste's perceptive analyses; I do not share Machek's scepticism, at least on the same grounds, regarding Hittite *pē*. Machek is surely right in rejecting Meillet's mention of ἐπι without initial vowel in this connexion. But he is just as surely wrong in speaking of a „forme abrégée de **upo*". Benveniste is right in reconstructing for IE, in traditional symbols, **po* (~ **pē* for Hittite). We will return to the detail of shape for this form below.

3. Machek posits a third *pa-* of 'proximity' (*pa-upė*, Russ. *po-rečje*, etc.), which he equates with παρ- (p. 97). I have already said that I would differ with Machek in classing the uses of 'lesser quality' under[1] above; I see no necessity for direct formal comparison with Greek παρ(α)-, even if one may translate the other. Similarly, I see no need to assume a separate origin for 'proximity' (p. 97) and the distributive *po* (apparent **pō* < earlier **pa* (by lengthening) = Slavic *po*), treated p. 98; they could readily be explained as extensions in use of the sense 'after, behind', though admittedly any hypothetical development for these uses must remain speculative[1]. Throughout his argument Machek seems to tend to attach the meanings of contexts (or reasonable earlier contexts) to the forms under discussion, and then to seek a separate source bearing this meaning as its central value. This ignores the fact that in language not only do shapes merge thus pooling or conflating meanings (as Machek argues well in part), but also the same shape picks up different shades and overtones from different contexts until the variant meanings confer multiple status to the similar or homophonous shapes. In these last cases I think we have to do in fair measure with the latter development.

Formally, I cannot see that loss of -*r* in *par-* is likely in the cases in question, since then it would have to be a common Balto-Slavic happening.

Machek is inclined to doubt (footnote 14) Else Westh Neuhard's argument that productive *pa-*, especially in Czech and Slovene, is a Germanism. I do not share Machek's doubt; the interested reader is referred to my note, IJSLP 8. 124 – 5, 1964 In sum, I see no clear need nor phonetic plausibility for positing **par-* (whether from **par* or **per*) as a source for the ranges of *pa-* discussed.

---

[1] I see no reason why imperatives such as Czech po nes to must have a distant origin different from the „perfective" *po-*. In fact, it seems reasonable that we have simply a fossilized perfective precisely because these forms occur persistently as imperatives. In short, it is the imperative that has shaped the preverb here, not the preverb which colours the imperative.

What is said above for *pa-* applies equally throughout for *põ*.

4. We return now to the possible development of *pa-* from both **apo* and **upo*, which are the only two forms that I consider necessary to account for the ranges discussed by Machek. As I have said above, there is an acceptable way (via ablaut) of deriving *pa-* from **apo*; but there is no direct way by simple phonology of deriving *pa-* from **upo*. Moreover, neither will yield *pa-* by simple phonetic loss of a vowel.

I have argued elsewhere (Evidence for Laryngeals 125, 127−8) that Albanian gives us reason, through the verbs *hap* 'open' and *hyp* 'mount' together with *humb* 'lose', to reconstruct the etyma in question as **hap-* and **hup-*. We therefore have **hapo* and **hupo*; these are the fullest ablaut forms we find for the first syllables. In zero-grade we expect **(h)po* and **hupo*, respectively; **(h)po* would yield either **əpo* > > **apo* (indistinguishable from **hapo*), or simple **po*. Thus there once was **hapo* ~ *(h)po* and unvarying **hupo*, which later became **apo* ~ *po*, and **upo*.

Now we recall that in Baltic we have a special development of apparent reduced grade seen in *upė* 'river' beside Indo-Iranian *ăp-* etc. Regardless of precisely how this developed, **upo* could now be taken as a reduced form of **apo*. Henceforth, instances of phonetic **apo* could have been replaced by **upo*, but that might have led to a preservation of **upo* which we do not find. Therefore I assume that **apo* replaced **upo* as if it were the full form of the latter. This gave a new pair **apo* ~ *po*, and **apo* (~ *upo*). The second **apo* = now fell phonetically in with the first, and acquired a new zero-grade **po*. Later, when **po* triumphed over **apo*, as we see in the result, the two had merged inextricably in phonetic shape.

University of Chicago