Elsewhere I have argued that an apophonic difference between singular and plural forms of present tense suffixes such as *-ei/i-, *-ā/i-, *-nā/n(a)- was quite common in Balto-Slavic times (1987; 1989; also 2009, 151–179, 275–296), e.g. Prussian 1st sg. posinna (4×) ‘bekenne’ < *-zinā, 1st pl. posinnimai < *-zinī(n)ma-, 3rd pl. posinna < *-zin(n)a. I have identified this flexion type with Lith. žīno and Vedic jānā́ti ‘knows’, Latvian zinīm beside zinām ‘we know’, Tocharian A knānat ‘you know’, and Slavic *zwnāmь (1985). The Slavic verb had mobile stress (c), as is clear from Serbo-Croatian (Dubrovnik) nē znām, ne znāmo, pōznām, poznāmo, (Sarajevo) dā znāš, nē znāš, (Posavian) nē znām, pōznām, Slovene poznām, also OLith. (Daukša) žīno, žinomē, žinotē. The Slavic verb znātì and its derived noun znamę ‘sign’, which are based on the root aorist *g̑neH₃-, have fixed stress (a), as is clear from SCr. znāti, znāmēn (e.g. Derksen 2008, 546). The initial palatovelar was evidently restored on the basis of *zwnāmь in these words because the phonetic reflex of the root aorist would be *gna- (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 47), which would have merged with gna- < *g̑ṇa-, SCr. gnāti ‘chase’, OPr. guntwei. It follows from both the mobile accentuation and the preservation of the initial palatovelar that SCr. znām represents *zwnāmь and cannot be derived from the root aorist or from the perfect *-g̑nōu, Vedic jajñāu, which is found in SCr. poznāvati with restored palatovelar and long -ā- reflecting the lengthened grade vowel.

Miguel Villanueva Svensson has raised two objections to the derivation of Lith. žinōti from a nasal present (2008, 176–181). He points out correctly that the vowel -ó- points to *eH₂-, which is at variance with a reconstruction *g̑ṇ-neH₃-. However, OLith. (Daukša) žīno, žinomē, žinotē shows that the present tense had lateral stress and, consequently, that the -o- was unstressed and may therefore represent either *-ā- or *-ō- (e.g. Kortlandt 2009, 6, 46). Since the rise of lateral mobility in Balto-Slavic accent paradigms preceded the East Baltic merger of *-ā- and *-ō- in unstressed syllables, the
Lithuanian present tense directly continues the nasal present *g̑n-neH₃ with analogical loss of the acute in the tense suffix. The acute in the infinitive was evidently taken from the preterit suffix *-eH₂ before the latter lost its acute on the analogy of the preterit in *-ē (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 187).

The other objection put forward by Villanueva regards the Latvian forms 1st pl. zinim, 2nd pl. zinit beside zinām, zināt, which are difficult to explain on the basis of the reconstructions *žinmē, *žintē, allegedly from *g̑n-nH₃ before consonant. It follows that the reconstructed development is incorrect. The solution to this problem is provided by the Prussian forms -sinnimai, -sinnati, which Villanueva does not explain (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 287–296). While 2nd pl. -sinnati can easily have replaced *zinte < *zinnte on the analogy of 3rd pl. -sinna < *zina < *zinna, 1st pl. -sinnimai evidently reflects *zinima < *zininma (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 280). We must conclude that the phonetic development of *-nnHm-, with three nasal resonants in succession, differed from that of *-nnHt-, where the nasal geminate was simplified. An imperfect parallel is offered by Greek ἐξελαύνοια ‘I may drive out’ < *-oyym < *-oiH₁m versus κελεύοι ‘he may order’ < *-oī < *-oiH₁t (cf. Kortlandt 1992, 237). Villanueva’s suggestion that “-sinnat built a thematic present in Old Prussian” (2008, 175) is clearly mistaken in view of the regular 1st pl. thematic endings -ammai, -emmai, as opposed to -imai in je-presents and athematic formations (cf. Kortlandt 1987). Thus, the derivation of Lith. žinótī from a nasal present is straightforward if the Prussian evidence is taken seriously.

Villanueva’s own proposal is to derive žinótī from the weak perfect stem form *žini-, to which the preterit suffix *-eH₂ was added (2008, 194). He disregards both the mobile stress of žīno, žinomē, žinotē and the Slavic formations. The accentuation of SCr. poznavati, poznavati, pōznām points to fixed stress in the aorist (a) and the perfect (b) and mobile stress in the present tense (c). It follows that in this verb the apophonic alternation between singular and plural forms had already been eliminated in the aorist and the perfect, but not in the present tense, before the characteristic system of accent paradigms was established in early Balto-Slavic times (e.g. Kortlandt 2009, 43). It is therefore highly unlikely that the stem form *žin- originated in the aorist or the perfect. Moreover, it is unclear how the addition of the preterit suffix *-eH₂ could yield a present tense. Anyway, the
addition of \(^*eH_2\) instead of \(^*eH_1\), as in \(dēvēti\) ‘to wear’ and \(stovēti\) ‘to stand’, is quite unexpected and unmotivated. I conclude that Villanueva’s proposal does not solve the problems which he raised himself. I find no evidence for Babik’s reconstruction of a thematic present \(^*žineti\) ‘makes acquaintance of’ (2004, 79) beside Lith. \(pažįsta\), Proto-Indo-European \(^*gnH\_ske/o\)– (with depalatalized \(^*k\), cf. Lubotsky 2001; Villanueva 2009).

**LIE. žinóti**

*Santauka*

Miguelis Villanueva Svenssonas iškėlė du prieštaravimus dėl lie. žinóti kildinimo iš nazalinio prezento. Mano nuomone, lie. žinóti galima be vargo kildinti iš nazalinio prezento, jei tik rimtai atsižvelgiama į prūsų kalbos duomenis.

Paties Villanuevos siūlyme neatsižvelgiama nei į s. lie. (Daukšos) žino, žinomė, žinotė mobilųjį kirčiavimą, nei į slavų kalbų darinius. Darau išvadą, kad Villanuevos pasiūlymas neišsprendžia jo paties išskeltų problemų.
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