Frederik KORTLANDT
Leiden University

LITHUANIAN *žinóti* 'TO KNOW'

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* < *-zini(n)ma-*, 3rd pl. *posinna* < *-zin(n)a*. I have identified this flexion type with Lith. *žino* and Vedic *jānā́ti* 'knows', Latvian *zinim* beside *zinām* 'we know', Tocharian A *knānat* 'you know', and Slavic **zъnā́mь* (1985). The Slavic verb had mobile stress (c), as is clear from Serbo-Croatian (Dubrovnik) *nè znām*, *ne známo*, *pòznām*, *poznámo*, (Sarajevo) *dà znāš*, *nè znāš*, (Posavian) *nè znām*, *pòznām*, Slovene *poznâm*, also OLith. (Daukša) *žîno*, *žinomê*, *žinotê*. The Slavic verb *znati* and its derived noun *znamę* 'sign', which are based on the root aorist **ĝneH₃-*, have fixed stress (a), as is clear from SCr. *znàti*, *znàmēn* (e.g. D e r k s e n 2008, 546). The initial palatovelar was evidently restored on the basis of **zъnā́mь* in these words because the phonetic reflex of the root aorist would be **gna-* (cf. K o r t l a n d t 2009, 47), which would have merged with *gna-* < **gъna-*, SCr. *gnàti* 'chase', OPr. *guntwei*. It follows from both the mobile accentuation and the preservation of the initial palatovelar that SCr. *znâm* represents **zъnā́mь* and cannot be derived from the root aorist or from the perfect **-ĝnōu*, Vedic *jajñáu*, which is found in SCr. *poznávati* with restored palatovelar and long *-ā-* reflecting the lengthened grade vowel.

Miguel Villanueva Svensson has raised two objections to the derivation of Lith. *žinóti* 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 **ĝn-neH₃-*. However, OLith. (Daukša) *žîno*, *žinomê*, *žinotê* 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. K o r t l a n d t 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 *$\hat{g}n$-neH_3– with analogical loss of the acute in the tense suffix. The acute in the infinitive was evidently taken from the preterit suffix *-eH_2 before the latter lost its acute on the analogy of the preterit in *-$\bar{e}$ (cf. K o r t l a n d t 2009, 187).

The other objection put forward by Villanueva regards the Latvian forms 1st pl. *zinim*, 2nd pl. *zinit* beside *zinãm*, *zinãt*, which are difficult to explain on the basis of the reconstructions *$\check{z}inm\bar{e}$, *$\check{z}int\bar{e}$, allegedly from *$\hat{g}n$-nH_3– 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. K o r t l a n d t 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. K o r t l a n d t 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' < *-$oyy\b{m}$ < *-oiH_1m versus κελεύοι 'he may order' < *-$o\ddot{i}$ < *-oiH_1t (cf. K o r t l a n d t 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. K o r t l a n d t 1987). Thus, the derivation of Lith. *žinóti* from a nasal present is straightforward if the Prussian evidence is taken seriously.

Villanueva's own proposal is to derive *žinóti* from the weak perfect stem form *$\check{z}ini$–, to which the preterit suffix *-eH_2 was added (2008, 194). He disregards both the mobile stress of *žîno*, *žinomê*, *žinotê* and the Slavic formations. The accentuation of SCr. *pòznati*, *poznávati*, *pòznām* 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. K o r t l a n d t 2009, 43). It is therefore highly unlikely that the stem form *$\check{z}in$- originated in the aorist or the perfect. Moreover, it is unclear how the addition of the preterit suffix *-eH_2 could yield a present tense. Anyway, the

addition of *-eH_2 instead of *-eH_1, as in *dėvéti* 'to wear' and *stovéti* '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. *pažį́sta*, Proto-Indo-European *$ĝnH_3ske/o$- (with depalatalized *k, cf. L u b o t s k y 2001; V i l l a n u e v a 2009).

LIE. *žinóti*

S a n t r a u k a

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) *žîno*, *žinomê*, *žinotê* mobilųjį kirčiavimą, nei į slavų kalbų darinius. Darau išvadą, kad Villanuevos pasiūlymas neišsprendžia jo paties iškeltų problemų.

REFERENCES

Babik, Zbigniew 2004, Morphonology of the Slavic present stem *$jьmatь$, *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 54, 65–85.

Derksen, Rick 2008, *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*, Leiden: Brill.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1985, Slavic *imatь*, *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 31–32, 235–239.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1987, The formation of the Old Prussian present tense, *Baltistica* 23(2), 104–111.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1989, Lithuanian *statýti* and related formations, *Baltistica* 25(2), 104–112.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1992, The Aeolic optative, in Robert Beekes, Alexander Lubotsky, Jos Weitenberg (Hrsg.), *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie: Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden, 1987*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 235–239.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2009, *Baltica & Balto-Slavica*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Lubotsky, Alexander 2001, Reflexes of Proto-Indo-European **sk* in Indo-Iranian, *Incontri Linguistici* 24, 25–57.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2008, Lithuanian *žinóti* 'to know', *Baltistica* 43(2), 175–199.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2009, Indo-European **sk̑* in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 44(1), 5–24.

Frederik KORTLANDT
Cobetstraat 24
NL-2313 KC Leiden
Holland
[*f.kortlandt@hum.leidenuniv.nl*]