

SLAVIC *imamĩ*

Frederik Kortlandt

0. The only athematic present with a vocalic stem in Old Church Slavic is *imamĩ* 'have'. Since it does not represent a Proto-Indo-European formation, it must be of analogical origin. The question to be answered in this paper is: which verb provided the model for the analogy?

1. Stang compares the flexion of Gothic *salbo* and Latin *amō* and suggests that the ending *-mĩ* can be attributed "dem Einfluss später verschollener athem. Verba auf langen Vokal" (1942:23). Cowgill has shown that the Germanic paradigms must be derived from the thematic flexion of Gr. *tīmāō* and OCS *děljaję* (1959), and the same holds for the Latin inflexion. Since this type is distinct in Slavic, the comparison is spurious and does not contribute to a clarification of *imamĩ*. The lost "athem. Verba auf langen Vokal" remain to be specified.

2. Another comparison which suggests itself is with the Hittite factitive *ahh*-stems, e.g. *newahmi* 'renew', Latin *novāre*. This is also a blind alley, not only because *imamĩ* does not fit semantically, but especially because the type belongs to the *hi*-flexion in Old Hittite (Oettinger 1979:455) and must therefore be derived from the PIE. thematic inflexion, like the causatives and iteratives in *-hi*.

3. Vaillant derives the present stem of *imamĩ* from the preterit of *imati* 'take', "mais on ne voit plus comment le slave aurait tiré du prétérit **imāt* un présent athématique v.sl. *imatũ* pour le joindre au thème du prétérit en *-ē-* ou du parfait **imē-*, ou quel présent athématique antérieur le présent athématique secondaire et isolé en *-amĩ* aurait remplacé" (1966:453). The problem can hardly be formulated more clearly. Neither the model nor the motivation for the creation of the analogical present *imamĩ* are specified.

4. Aitzetmüller also starts from the preterit stem *ima-* but does not seem to be aware of the difficulties involved. He translates the verb *imati* as "ergriffen halten," which is clearly wrong, and submits that "aus dem zeitlich begrenzten Aorist **imām*" arose "das zeitlich unbegrenzte Präsens **imāmi* 'habe' als echtes Perfekt und zugleich Bedeutungsvariante zu *jemlję*"

(1978 230) This is muddled thinking. The verb *jemljo* 'take', aor *ima-* is simply the imperfective correlate of *imq*, *je-*. Its formation is "d'un type d'itératif antérieur au type productif des imperfectifs dérivés à allongement de la voyelle radicale" (Vaillant 1966 310) and has nothing to do with the perfect stem *imě-*

5. There is a clear reason why the present stem *ima-* 'have' cannot be identified with the preterit stem *ima-* 'took', a reason which has evidently escaped both Vaillant and Aitzetmuller. The paradigm of *imamĩ* had mobile accentuation (cf. Stang 1957 128), as is clear from SCr (Dubrovnik) *imām*, *imāmo* (Rešetar 1900 189), the corresponding Čakavian forms (Jurišić 1973 70), Sln *imām*, Bulg *ímam*, ORu (Čud NT) *imaté*. On the other hand, the aorist of *imati* had undoubtedly fixed stress on the second syllable, first because this holds for all verbs which combine a *je*-present with an *a*-aorist, and second because the present tense *imq* does not belong to the accentuation class which has original mobile stress (cf. Stang 1957 115f, Dybo 1981 203). It follows that the two formations were distinct from the outset. It is clearly impossible to reconstruct Proto-Slavic without taking the accentual evidence into account.

6. The accentuation of *imamĩ* shows that the verb reflects an extremely archaic formation. Unlike *damĩ* 'give', *jamĩ* 'eat', and *jesmĩ* 'am', which generalized final stress, *imamĩ* agrees with the accentual mobility of Vedic *dádhdhāmĩ* '(I) put', *dadhmas* '(we) put'. Since the present stem ends in *-ā-*, the obvious comparison is with the ninth class of the Sanskrit grammarians. Von Fierlinger proposed to derive *imamĩ* from **imnāmĩ* (1885). This proposal meets with several formal and semantic difficulties, which can largely be removed by special assumptions (cf. Pedersen 1905 348-353). The main point is that there is no nasal present with a similar meaning in other Indo-European languages, so that there is no obvious analogical source for *imamĩ*.

7. Where do we find the model for the creation of *imamĩ*? I claim that there was a second Proto-Slavic verb of the same type, viz. **žīnamĩ* 'know', which is reflected in SCr (Dubrovnik) *ně znām*, *ne znāmo*, *poznām*, *poznāmo* (Rešetar 1900 189), also (Sarajevo) *da znāš*, *ne znāš* (Šurmin 1895 197), Posavian *ně znām*, *pōznām* (Ivšić 1913 83), Sln *poznām*. This accentuation must be old. The verb can be identified with Lith *žino* and Vedic *jānāti* 'knows', which is ancient in view of Toch A *knānat* 'you know', and must have provided the model for *imamĩ*. The accentual mobility is still pre-

served in OLith. (Daukša) *žinomė, žinotė*, from where it spread to *turimė* 'have' (cf. Stang 1966:451fn). The archaic character of the accentual mobility in *žinóti* is supported by the accentuation of the participle (cf. Skardžius 1935:199). Thus, I reconstruct a Balto-Slavic present tense **žinaHmi, *žinHmes*.

8. The existence of a present tense **žīnamĩ* accounts for the initial fricative of *znati*. Apart from Lith. *žėnklas* 'sign', all Indo-European forms of this root must be derived from **ǵnH-* or **ǵnoH-* (cf. Vendryes 1936:66), and we expect depalatalization of the initial stop in the Balto-Slavic reflex of the latter variant (cf. Kortlandt 1978). The fricative of *znati* must therefore be due to an analogical development.

9. When the aspectual system evolved, the paradigms of *damĩ, *žīnamĩ*, and *stanǵ* were ousted in their primary function by the secondary *je*-presents *dajǵ, znajǵ*, and *stajǵ*, which were built upon the aorist stems *da-*, *zna-*, and *sta-*. I submit that the distinction between SCr. pf. *pòznā* 'recognizes' and ipf. *pòznājē* 'knows' is just as ancient as between pf. *dā, stānē* and ipf. *dājē, stājē*.

10. It is remarkable that OCS. *vědě* 'I know' was evidently preserved in East Bulgaria and replaced by *vēmĩ* in Macedonia, in spite of the fact that the texts from the western area are generally more archaic. I think that the replacement took place under the influence of **žīnamĩ*, which had apparently been replaced by *znajǵ* in the eastern dialects at an early stage. Modern Bulgarian has both *znam* and *znāja*: This is undoubtedly a relic because the athematic ending is not found with other monosyllabic stems except *dam* 'give', *jam* 'eat', and *sūm* 'am'.

11. One may wonder why **žīnamĩ*, unlike *damĩ* and *stanǵ*, did not become the perfective correlate of *znajǵ*. The reason is that the verb is not terminative, but belongs to Proeme's type IVa (1983:395): it can be compared with Ru. *ponimāju* and Bulg. *razbíram*, which do not denote the process of reaching a state of understanding, as their formal make-up suggests, but the state of understanding which is reached as a result of the process. Imperfective presents of this type can be viewed as perfects in relation to their perfective correlates.

12. The semantics of **žīnamĩ* actually provides the motivation for the creation of *imamĩ*. Since **žīnamĩ* supplied a perfect to the aorist stem *zna-*,

it could serve as a model for the creation of *imamĩ* on the basis of the aorist stem *jē-* by the addition of **-āmi* to the zero grade of the root. The analogical development can probably, though not necessarily, be dated before the rise of the preterit *ima-*, which was created as an imperfect to the present *imq* (cf. Vaillant 1966:499) and subsequently developed into the imperfective aorist when the aspectual system took shape. The present *jemljq* must be the youngest formation: it relates to the aorist stem *jē-* as *dajq*, *znajq*, *stajq* to *da-*, *zna-*, *sta-*. Thus, the derived present *jemljq* and the derived preterit *ima-* became the imperfective correlates of the simple present *imq* and the root aorist *jē-* through the grammaticalization of the aspectual opposition. The preterit *imě-* is much older: it can be compared with Lith. *turėti*, Latin *habēre*, and the Greek passive aorist. I think that it represents an original PIE. nominal formation which was incorporated into the verbal system at an early stage in order to supply a perfect. From a diachronic point of view, it differs from *imamĩ* in the same way as Ru. *pónjal* '(has) understood' differs from *ponimáju* 'understand': both of these forms can be viewed semantically as perfects in relation to the simple form *pojmu*, but grammatically the former is a preterit and the latter a present tense.

University of Leiden

REFERENCES

- Aitzetmuller, R.
 1978 *Altbulgarische Grammatik* (Freiburg Weiher).
 Cogwill, W.
 1959 "The inflection of the Germanic *ō*-presents," *Language* 35, 1-15
 Dybo, V. A.
 1981 *Slavjanskaja akcentologija* (Moscow: Nauka).
 Fierlinger, J. von
 1885 "Abulg. *imamĩ*," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 27, 559-560.
 Ivšić, S.
 1913 "Današnji posavski govor," *Rad JAZU* 197, 9-138.
 Jurišić, B.
 1973 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade II Rječnik* (Zagreb. JAZU).
 Kortlandt, F.
 1978 "I-E palatovelars before resonants in Balto-Slavic," *Recent developments in historical phonology* (The Hague Mouton), 237-243.
 Oettinger, N.
 1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (Nurnberg. Hans Carl).
 Pedersen, H.
 1905 "Die nasalprasentia und der slavische akzent," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 38, 297-421

Proeme, H

- 1983 "On terminativeness and aspect in Russian," *Dutch Contributions to the 9th International Congress of Slavists Linguistics* (Amsterdam Rodopi), 385-404

Rešetar, M

- 1900 *Die serbokroatische Betonung sudwestlicher Mundarten* (Wien Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften)

Skardžius, P

- 1935 *Daukšos akcentologija* (Kaunas VDU Humanitarinių Mokslų Fakulteto Leidybos)

Stang, C S

- 1942 *Das slavische und baltische Verbum* (Oslo Universitetsforlaget)

- 1957 *Slavonic accentuation* (Oslo Universitetsforlaget)

- 1966 *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen* (Oslo Universitetsforlaget)

Šurmin, Đ

- 1895 "Osobine današnjega sarajevskog govora," *Rad JAZU* 121, 186-209

Vaillant, A

- 1966 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, III Le verbe* (Paris Klincksieck)

Vendryes, J

- 1936 "À propos du lituanien *žinau* 'je sais'," *Studi Baltici* 5, 62-68