

Lithuanian *penėti*, *pėslas*
and the Indo-European nasal infix presents

GEORGI T. RIKOV

Correlations such as Lith. *penėti* 'mästen, füttern, nähren' : Lat. *pāscō* 'I feed'; Gk. *φαίνω* 'I bring to light' : Skt. *bhāti* 'shines'; Skt. *bhānati* 'speaks, sounds' : Gk. *φημί* 'I say, affirm, assert' suggest that Lith. *penėti*, Gk. *φαίνω* (which is a *yod*-present, built on an earlier **φάυω*) and Skt. *bhānati* can continue nasal infix presents of the shapes *Cenh₂-* and *Cnh₂-e/ā*, formed from Indo-European *Ceh₂*-roots. In view of its acute intonation, Lith. *pėslas* points to IE **penh₂-* and confirms this explanation.

1.1. According to the main etymological dictionaries of the Indo-European languages, Lith. *penėti*, *penù* (East Lith. *peniù*) 'mästen, füttern, nähren', *pėnas* 'Nahrung, Futter, Kost'¹, Latv. *penēt* 'verwöhnen', Lat. *penus*, *-oris*, *penus*, *-ūs* 'food, provisions (esp. as the stock of household; a store-room in a temple of Vesta)² and Goth. *fenea* name of a barley dish, *finja* (**finja*) 'barley' point to an Indo-European root **pen*-³; it is also assumed that this root is related to IE. **pā*- (i.e. **peh₂-*), to which are traced

¹Cf. also Lith. *penimis* 'Masttier, Mastschwein', *penyba* 'Mästung, Fütterung, Unterhalt', *penyklà* 'Fütterungsplatz, Futterbrett', etc. (see Fraenkel 1962-1965:569) which, together with *pėnas*, can be explained as deverbative nouns, derived from *penėti*, *penù*.

²Cf. also Lat. *penitus* adv. 'from the inside, from within', *penetrō*, *penetrāre* (which is formed from *penitus* along the line of *intus* : *intrāre*), *Penātes*, etc. and see Walde and Hofmann 1938-1956 II:283).

³See Walde and Pokorny (1927-1932 II:25), Pokorny (1957:807); cf. also Walde and Hofmann, *loc. cit.*, Feist (1939:147-148), Fraenkel, *loc. cit.* The comparison of these forms with Skt. *panasá*- 'breadfruit, *Artocarpus integrifolia*' is uncertain, see Mayrhofer (1956-1980 II:209). Gk. *πανάς* 'bread', given as a direct cognate to these forms in many of the etymological dictionaries (cf. for instance Feist, *loc. cit.*, Fraenkel *loc. cit.*), is a loanword from Lat. *pānis* 'bread', see Chantraine (1968-1980:855).

back Hitt. *paḥš-* 'protect, guard', Lat. *pāscō* 'I feed', *pānis* 'bread', etc.⁴. The Lithuanian deverbative noun *pėslas* 'Masttier, Mastschwein'⁵, however, given by Fraenkel under *pēnas* and explained as **pen-slas*⁶, radically changes the situation: the acute intonation of Lith. *pėslas* suggests that we are dealing with an Indo-European disyllabic root **penh_x-*. In view of the related IE. **peh₂-*, the Indo-European *seḷ* root **penh_x-* can be interpreted as a nasal infix present and the laryngeal can be identified as the *a*-colouring one; thus we have a correlation **penh₂-* : **peh₂-*. Then, Lith. *penėti*, *pėnas*, *penimis*, etc., Latv. *penēt*, Lat. *penus*, etc. and Goth. *fenea*, *fingia* represent the regular loss of the laryngeal when it appears after a consonantal **n* and before a vowel or **y*.

1.2. Whereas Lith. *pėslas* clearly suggests that Lith. *penėti*, *penù*, etc. can be traced back to IE. **penh₂-*, Gk. Hom. *φαίνω* 'I bring to light' and its cognates are ambiguous; they can continue either a *seḷ* root or an *aniḷ* one.

Yet according to Hoffmann (1985:177 n.26), Gk. Hom. *φαίνω* is formed with the suffix *-ιε/-ιο-* from an earlier nasal infix present **φάνω*⁷ < IE. **b^hnh₂e/o-* which can be derived from an underlying IE. **b^heh₂-*⁸ (> Skt. 3rd. sg. pres. act. *bhāti* 'shines' RV., Gk. *φάος* 'light', etc.).

If so, forms such as Gk. *φάνσις* 'appearance' Porphyr., *φαντός* 'visible' Orph. etc. represent inner-Greek derivatives from **φανε/o-*⁹.

As for Gk. Attic *φάσις* 'appearance' and other related nouns and adjectives beginning with *φα-*, they can be explained either as analogical innovations¹⁰ or as archaic deverbatives derived from IE. **b^heh₂-*, which is attested in Greek by the 3rd sg. fut. middle *πεφήσεται* (only in Il. 17,155), the

⁴See for instance Persson (1912:568), Walde and Pokorny, *loc. cit.*, Walde and Hofmann, *loc. cit.*, Pokorny, *loc. cit.*

⁵Lith. *pėslas* is a deverbative noun in *-sla-* like *mėšlas*, frequently pl. *mėšlai* 'Mist, Dung, Dünger' (: *mėžti*, *mėžiu* '(aus)misten'), *mókslas* 'Können, Kenntnis, Kunst' (: *mokėti*, *móku* 'können, sich auf etw. verstehen, etw. zu tun wissen'), *keřslas* 'Messerchen zum Aderlassen, Lanzette' (: *kiřsti*, *kertù* 'hauen'), etc.

⁶Fraenkel. *loc. cit.*

⁷See Schwyzer (1939:694).

⁸In fact, from the point of view of the historical phonology and morphology, this is the best solution; cf. also §1.3.

⁹Frisk (1960-1972 II:983), Chantraine (1968-1980:1172).

¹⁰According to Frisk, *loc. cit.*, Gk. *φάσις* and *-φατος* relate to *φαίνω* as Gk. *βάσις* 'a step, walk' and *βατός* 'passable' to *βαίνω* 'I go, walk'; then, *φάσις* and *-φατος* can be analogical formations.

zero-grade forms 3rd. aor. act. *φάε* (only in Od. 14,502 *φάε δέ χρυσόδρονος Ηώς*) < IE. **b^hh₂wet*, *φάος* 'light' < IE. **b^hh₂wo-*, etc.¹¹. In the latter case Gk. *φάσις* would go back to IE. **b^hh₂-ti-* which, as a noun in **-ti-*, is formed with regular zero grade of the root.

1.3. Another representative of this type of nasal infix presents is possibly Skt. *bhánati* 'speaks, sounds' RV., later *bhānati* 'says, speaks, calls' JBr., Class.¹², which is related to Gk. *φημί*, Doric *φᾶμί* 'I say, affirm, assert' (< IE. **b^heh₂-mi*), etc.¹³. The reconstruction **b^hənō*, assumed by Osthoff (1884:353 fn.1) and accepted by Walde and Pokorny (1929:25) for Skt. *bhánati* is improbable, since IE. **ə* (i.e. **h₂* in this case) would yield Skt. *i* in this environment. From the point of view of historical phonology, Persson's **b^hen-* (> Skt. *bhánati*)¹⁴ is undoubtedly right, but there is no convincing morphological solution to the correlation **b^heh₂-* : **b^hen-*. Then, it is attractive to derive Skt. *bhánati* from IE. **b^henh₂eti*, which can be interpreted as a nasal infix present, formed on the basis of an underlying Indo-European root present **b^heh₂-mi* (> Gk. *φημί*).

2. In view of the forms discussed above, we can assume the existence of a type of nasal infix presents, derived from Indo-European *Ceh_x-*roots; Lith. *pėslas*, with its acute intonation, presents the best support of this hypothesis.

The formation of this type of nasal infix presents is parallel to that of the nasal infix presents derived from Indo-European *CeC-*roots; since the Indo-European laryngeals were consonants, this parallelism is not surprising.

Thus, the nasal infix present **b^hnh₂-e/o-* (hence the Greek *yod*-present *φαίνω*) is formed on the basis of the 3rd pl. act. **b^hnh₂-ent(i)* and parallels the nasal infix presents of the shape *CṛC-e/o-*, cf. for instance Skt. *sájati* 'attaches, fixes, fastens on' RV. < IE. **sṇg-e-ti*¹⁵ (: Lith. *sėgti*, *segù* 'heften,

¹¹See Chantraine (1968-1980:1170, 1172), who compares Gk. *φάε* and *φάος* with Skt. *vi-bhāva-* and assumes that the future *πεφήσεται* Il. 17,155 is formed with full grade of the root; similarly, Gk. *φάντα λάμποντα* Hes. can be formed from an earlier **φάσι* 'shines' (see also Walde and Pokorny 1927-1932 II:122-123, Pokorny 1959:104, Mayrhofer 1956-1980 II:493).

¹²According to Hoffmann (1960:132), the *η* of *bhánati* is onomatopoeic; other possibilities are mentioned by Mayrhofer (1956-1980 II:464-465).

¹³Cf. for instance Walde and Pokorny, *loc. cit.*, Pokorny, *loc. cit.*, Mayrhofer (1956-1980:469-470).

¹⁴Persson (1912:569 with fn.1); accepted also by Pokorny, *loc. cit.*, Mayrhofer, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵Cf. also OBg. *prisěšti* 'to touch' Supr. 504,24, which can continue either IE. **sṇg-* or

schnallen', OIr. *sén* 'Fangnetz' < IE. **seg-no-*); OPruss. *sindats* 'sits'¹⁶ (: Skt. 3rd sg. aor. act. *ásadat* RV. < IE. **é-sed-e-t*), etc.

Similarly, IE. **penh₂-* (cf. Lith. *penėti*, *penù*, *pėslas*, etc.) and **b^henh₂-* (cf. Skt. *bhánati*) are structurally the same as Lith. *pasigendù* 'sehne mich' (: *pasigėsti* 'sich sehnen', *gedėti*, *gedù*, *gedžiù* 'sich sehnen; traurig sein, trauern').

The nasal infix of IE. **penh₂-*, **b^henh₂-* and **b^hnh₂-e/o-* was extended to the non-present forms and the deverbative nouns and adjectives, as it was, for instance, in the case of the Sanskrit 3rd sg. perfect *sasañja* Br. and the deverbatives Skt. *sañga-* masc. 'Hängenbleiben, Haften, Stockung' TS., Kāth., etc., *ásañjana-* nt. 'Anhängen, Haken' Br. Ś.S., OBg. *prisęga* 'oath' Cloz. (cf. Skt. 3rd sg. pres. act. *sájati* < IE **sngeti*, etc., see above); this suggests that IE. **penh₂-*, **b^henh₂-* and **b^hnh₂-e/o-* were reinterpreted at an early date as root presents. As for the formation of these presents, however, if we accept the theory that the nasal infix is originally a suffix¹⁷, the creation of nasal infix presents to Indo-European *Ceh_x-* (and *CeC-*) roots is due to a secondary and relatively recent productivity of the infixation in Indo-European.

References

- Chantraine, P. (1968–1980), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Histoire des mots, t. I–IV, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Feist, S. (1939), *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache*. Mit Einschluß des Krimgotischen und sonstiger zerstreuter Überreste des Gotischen, 3rd ed., Leiden: Brill.
- Fraenkel, E. (1962–1965), *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bd. I–II, Heidelberg: Winter & Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frisk, Hj. (1960–1972), *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bd. I–III, Heidelberg: Winter.

IE. **seng-*.

¹⁶In view of OPruss. *sindats*, OBg. *seq* 'I sit' Ps. Sin. 30b7 goes back rather to IE. **snđ-e/o-* than to IE. *send-e/o-*.

¹⁷See for instance Kurylowicz (1964:106).

- Hoffmann, K. (1960), Buchbesprechung: J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* (1. Introduction générale par L. Renou; 2. Nachträge zu Bd. I von A. Debrunner; Nachträge zu Bd. II,1 von A. Debrunner; 4. Bd. II,2. Die Nominalsuffixe von A. Debrunner), *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 110, 175–182.
- (1985), Vedisch *kṣaṇ*, in: Ölberg, H. M., Schmidt, G., eds. in collab. with H. Bothien, *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen*. Festschrift für J. Knobloch. Zum 65. Geburtstag am 5. Januar 1984 dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen, *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft* 23, 171–178.
- Kurylowicz, J. (1964), *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1956–1980), *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Bd. I–IV, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Osthoff, H. (1884), *Zur Geschichte des Perfects im Indogermanischen*. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Griechisch und Lateinisch, Straßburg: Trübner.
- Persson, P. (1912), *Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung*, Teil 1–2, Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln & Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Pokorny, J. (1959), *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern & München: Francke.
- Schwyzler, E. (1939), *Griechische Grammatik*, Bd. I, München: Beck.
- Walde, A. & Hofmann, J. B. (1938–1956), *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bd. I–II, 3rd ed., Heidelberg: Winter.
- Walde, A. & Pokorny, J. (1927–1932), *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Bd. I–III, Berlin: de Gruyter.

Sofia University "Sv. Kliment Ochridski"
Faculty of Slavonic Studies
Dept. of General & Indo-European Linguistics
Car Osvoboditel 15
BG-1000 Sofia

Georgi T. Rikov