

Michiel DE VAAN

Université de Lausanne

## INFLECTED AND UNINFLECTED POSSESSIVES AND LITHUANIAN *kienō*

**Abstract:** It is argued that the uninflected possessive adjective Lithuanian *kienō* ‘whose’ replaces an earlier form *\*kienē* which arose from the addition of stressed *-nē* to monosyllabic *\*kie*. As the source of the latter form, an innovation *\*k<sup>w</sup>o-i?* ‘whose’ is posited, which was made as an uninflected adjective in *\*-i?* to the interrogative pronoun. The model for this formation was the existence of Balto-Slavic *\*?moi?* ‘my’, *\*tvoi?* ‘your’, *\*swoi?* ‘his, her own’, to which, according to a recent theory, the Proto-Slavic possessive adjectives *\*mojb*, *\*tvojb*, *\*svojb* go back.

**Keywords:** Lithuanian; Old Prussian; Balto-Slavic; possessive; pronoun; adjective.

1. There is no agreement on the explanation of Lithuanian *kienō* ‘whose?’ (dial. *kenō*, *kanō*), which synchronically functions as an uninflected possessive adjective to *kàs* ‘who’.<sup>1</sup> In dialects, it can also be found as an inflected adjective *kienàs*, but this is a recent development (Rosinas 1995, 92). In Old Lithuanian, we find *kiena* in the Wolfenbütteler Postille (Žemaitian, with frequent shortening of final *-ō* to *-a*), *kienó* in Daukša’s *Postilla* and *kieno* in Vilentas’ *Katekizmas*.

2. Different explanations are given in the standard works of reference. Vaillant (1958, 466) thinks that the adjective *\*kienas* is original and was made by adding the possessive suffix seen in Lith. *-ýnas*, OCS *-inъ*, to the genitive *kō*. Similarly, Stang (1966, 239) holds that “Das Wort ist aus dem interrog. Stamm *\*k<sup>w</sup>(e/o)-* durch das Suffix *\*-e/oino-* abgeleitet.” Smoczyński (2007, 284), too, regards *kienàs* as original, the restriction to *kienō* being a feature of the standard language. He reconstructs a stem *\*k<sup>w</sup>ei-no-*, built from the interrogative stem *\*k<sup>w</sup>ei-* found in *kiek* ‘how many’, plus the suffix *\*-no-* from the pronoun *anàs*. The opposite solution is chosen

<sup>1</sup>For comments on an earlier version, I am indebted to Frederik Kortlandt and Tijmen Pronk, as well as to an anonymous reviewer of this journal. The usual disclaimer applies.

by Endzelīns (1971, 195): “The form *kieno* is a fossilized genitive like *māno*, *tāvo*, *sāvo*; here and there, the declined form *kienàs* ‘whose’ is used, cf. Goth. *meins*, *peins*, etc.”

For different reasons, neither of these explanations is convincing. The view that the word was originally an inflected adjective *kienàs* is contradicted by the Old Lithuanian evidence, which shows no trace of such behaviour, and by the restricted dialectal spread of *kienàs*. Stang’s etymology compares the material suffix *-ienas*, but that usually has a stressed acute. Smoczyński’s solution would be possible if barytone *\*k<sup>w</sup>éinos* developed into *\*kéinos* > *\*kénos* > *\*kiena-* and then moved the stress to the ending; or if *\*-na-* was suffixed after a monosyllabic *\*k<sup>w</sup>éi* had become *\*kie*. The reconstruction *\*k<sup>w</sup>ei* ‘who?’ could be compared to Old Irish *cía*, Welsh *pwŷ* ‘who?’, from the same preform *\*k<sup>w</sup>éi*, or to Latin *quī* from *\*k<sup>w</sup>oi*, or to the Old Prussian nom. sg.f. *quai* ‘who?’. But in that case, putative *\*kiē* would have no possessive meaning, and there would be no model for the addition of suffixal *-nō*.

3. My solution starts from the observation that the diphthong in *kienō* must originally have been stressed in Balto-Slavic, otherwise we would expect Lith. *\*keinō* (from PIE *\*ei*) or *\*kainō* (from *\*oi*, *\*h<sub>2</sub>ei* or *\*eh<sub>2</sub>i*), cf. Stang 1966, 51–68; Kortlandt 2009, 6. It follows that we are looking for an original form *\*kie* without *n*-suffix. I will furthermore assume that the addition of the element *-nō* happened at a recent stage and that its accentuation imitates that of anaphoric *anō* (Vaillant 1958, 465). Since the only obvious origin for the *n*-suffix in *kienō* is the genitive of ‘me’, Lith. *māno*, this addition must be recent: *māno* has no lengthening in open syllable (as opposed to the inflected possessive *mānas*) and conceals earlier *\*manō*. The initial accent of the modern form stems from the dative *mán*. Reconstructed *\*manō* had itself replaced *\*manè*, the form presupposed by the attested genitive and accusative forms of ‘I’; the model for this replacement was the genitive singular of other pronouns, such as *kō*, *anō* and *tō*. As argued by Endzelīns (1971, 186), the PIE and Balto-Slavic genitive *\*méne* (see Kortlandt 2013 for the accentuation) introduced *\*ma-* from the dative. In its use as an accusative, the addition of *-n* yielded *\*manen*, which, in turn, could be used as genitive and then prompted the addition of final *-s* giving OLith. *manens* > MoLith. *manęš*. The original form became oxytone *\*menè* in a prestage of Baltic, like *\*tewè* > *\*tavè*.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> One might ask why it was 1sg. *\*menè* which provided the model for ‘whose’, rather than 2sg. *\*tewè* or refl. *\*sewè*. A language-specific answer is that, in an early stage of

I therefore posit an earlier form *\*kienè* which arose from the addition of stressed *-nè* to monosyllabic *\*kie*. A parallel development may be seen in the rise of *anàs* from an originally uninflected deictic particle *\*an*, which added the inflection of *tàs* as stressed endings. Monosyllabic *\*kie* is likely to have been circumflex, which itself may have resulted from an acute syllable *\*kie*, compare the *métatonie douce* in monosyllables in *tie* (Kortlandt 2014).

4. As the source for Pre-Lithuanian *\*kíe* or *\*kiē*, a number of PIE forms of the interrogative pronoun come into mind, such as an animate nom.sg. *\*k<sup>w</sup>éi* ‘who?’ (stressed) or *\*k<sup>w</sup>oi* ‘which?’ (adjectival), an animate nom.pl. *\*k<sup>w</sup>oi*, or a neuter nom.pl. *\*k<sup>w</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>i*. Yet none these forms has a genitival meaning.<sup>3</sup>

The enclitic oblique singular forms *\*ǵmoi* ‘me’, *\*toi* ‘you’, *\*sei*, *\*soi*, seem to provide a better candidate. They are routinely used in possessive function, e.g., in Vedic Sanskrit, in Old Persian and in Avestan. The creation of an analogous form *\*k<sup>w</sup>oi* would be quite conceivable. However, in Baltic, we have no trace of such forms, outside, possibly, the possessive adjectives, to which we will turn now.

The traditional reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic possessive adjectives *\*mojb*, *\*tvojb*, *\*svojb* is *\*ǵmojó-*, *\*twojó-*, *\*swojó-*. At first sight, they look like *jo*-derivatives to the stems *\*ǵmo-*, *\*two-*, *\*swo-* (Vaillant 1958, 465; Derksen 2008, 322) which adopted the inflection of the anaphoric pronoun *jb*, or they could be viewed as thematizations of PIE *\*ǵmoi*, *\*t(w)oi*, *\*s(w)oi*. But in their accentuation, the possessive adjectives pattern with Slavic abstracts and collectives in *-bja*, *-bje* (Dybo 1981, 152–170), not with the

---

Balto-Slavic, *\*-ne* was more clearly a genitival affix in the 1sg. (PIE acc. *\*me* vs. gen. *\*mene*, cf. Beekes, de Vaan 2011, 233) than *\*-we* was in the 2sg. (PIE *\*acc. \*twe* vs. gen. *\*tewe*), though this argument is not valid for the reflexive (acc. *\*se* vs. gen. *\*sewe*). A more general solution could be to invoke typology, which tells us that first-person pronouns are significantly more frequent in spontaneous speech than second or third persons (cf. Siewierska, Bakker 2013, 393–395 on the basis of data from 12 modern European languages), so that, all else being equal, 1sg. *\*menè* would have provided the strongest model. A parallel can be found in French, where the possessive adj. *tien* ‘your’ and *sien* ‘his, hers’ do not directly continue Old French *tuen*, *suen* (Latin acc. *tuum*, *suum*) but adopted the vowel of OFre. *mien* ‘mine’ < *\*mēm* < Lat. acc. *meum*, cf. Bourciez 1971, 70 and FEW 6(2): 65 s.v. *meus*.

<sup>3</sup> As to *kíek* ‘how much’ < *kíeka-*, however, an origin from a neuter plural *\*k<sup>w</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>i* plus interrogative *ka-* seems quite possible. For a similar formation (with suffix *\*-li-*), compare OCS *koliko* ‘how much’ (Vaillant 1958, 485); for the use of the neuter plural in words for ‘how much’, compare Latin *quantus* ‘how much’ < *\*k<sup>w</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-nt-*.

compound pronouns *\*kv-jb* and *\*tv-jb*. Therefore, a different solution must be sought. One was recently proposed by Kortlandt (2016), and it takes its departure from the syntactic analysis of the pronouns.

Once a language has inflected possessive adjectives, and as long as the adjectival inflection remains alive in the language, it is unlikely that the adjectival possessive will be given up for an uninflected form of a different pronoun, such as the personal pronoun. Hence, since Lithuanian normally uses uninflected *māno*, *tāvo*, *sāvo* in possessive constructions, Kortlandt thinks that the PIE possessive forms were originally uninflected. Since the basic stems of the PIE possessive adjectives were *\*ǵmo-*, *\*two-*, *\*swo-* (Beekes, de Vaan 2011, 235), they may have been uninflected, as indeed most deictic stems were at the PIE level (cf. de Vaan, in press). Kortlandt (2016) now suggests that Slavic remade these possessives into *\*ǵmo-iǵ*, *\*two-iǵ*, *\*swo-iǵ*, with the “dominant”, possessive suffix PSI. *\*-bj-* < *\*-iǵ*? (cf. Kortlandt 2011, 323), which is also found, e.g., in the Italo-Celtic genitive singular in *\*-ī* and in derivatives of the type Skt. *vṛkī-*, Lith. *vilki* < *\*wilkiǵaǵ* and Russ. *volčica* < *\*wilkiǵ-kaǵ* ‘she-wolf’ (Kortlandt 2009, 106). This idea must be seen against the background of the same author’s suggestion (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 106, 122), viz. that the Slavic possessive adjective in *-bj-* is used in the oldest Slavic texts where the Greek original uses a genitive, e.g., *syn̄s božii* ‘son of God’. In other words, in the earliest stages of Slavic, and, a priori, also of Balto-Slavic, the unenlarged suffix *\*-iǵ-* was still a productive device to build possessive adjectives. In the words for ‘my’, ‘your’, ‘one’s own’, the dominant accentuation of the suffix would explain the final accent shown by the neoacute (*\*mo-iH*, *\*two-iH*, *\*svo-iH*), the subsequent thematization and adoption of inflection of the pronoun *\*jb* being trivial developments (cf. Lith. *mānas*, Latin *meus*).

5. I propose that we add Baltic evidence to the comparison, which may confirm that the rise of *\*moiH* etc. dates from Proto-Balto-Slavic. The Old Prussian possessive adjectives *mais* ‘my’, *twais* ‘your, thy’, *swais* ‘one’s own’ (nom.sg.f. *maia*, *twaiā*, *swaia*) are usually compared to Slavic *mojb* etc. (Vaillant 1958, 465). Their inflection follows that of the Old Prussian adjectives and can therefore be said to be thematic, but they could equally well continue athematic *\*maiǵ*.

In the Old Prussian Enchiridion (p. 69), the genitive singular masculine *maisei* occurs once, and is used as the genitive singular of *as* ‘I’: *Asmai sen*

*maisei polligun ernertūns* = *Habe mit meines gleichen gezuernet* ‘I have become angered with my neighbour’. Since *maisei* does not agree grammatically with the acc.sg. *polligun*, it looks very much like the uninflected possessive *māno* of Modern Lithuanian (the line ‘Habe mit meines gleichen gezuernet’ is rendered by *ir rustawau ant saw ligaus* in Vilentas’ Catechism). The Enchiridion shows the coordination of *polīgu* both with the dative (in *stesmu polīgu* for “deßgleichen”, MoLith. *tam panašiai*), and with the genitive (in *steison polijgu* “des gleichen”, MoLith. *tų panašiai*), although the usage in the first two Catechisms and in Old Lithuanian suggests that the dative was original (compare the quotation from Vilentas). This renders it likely that *maisei* is a calque on German *meines*, that is, the genitive singular of the possessive *mais*. But if *maisei* was really the synchronic genitive of *as* ‘I’, it would show the earlier introduction of uninflected *\*mai?* ‘of mine’ into the personal pronoun.

6. Hence I reconstruct the following scenario for *kienō*. In Balto-Slavic, the uninflected possessive pronouns *\*lmo* ‘my’, *\*two* ‘your’, *\*swo* ‘his, her own’ were remade into *\*lmo-i?*, *\*two-i?*, *\*swo-i?*. They were eventually thematicized and adjectivized in Slavic, where the stress retraction from final jers caused their neoacute intonation (Stang 1957, 168; Olander 2009, 131). In Baltic, we find them with the productive pronominal inflection in Old Prussian *mais*, *twais*, *swais*. At some point, the form *\*k<sup>w</sup>o-i?* was made as an adjective to the interrogative pronoun (English ‘whose’, compare Lith. *kieno tai batai?*) rather than a grammatical genitive (Lith. *ko nori?*), which in Late PIE was *\*k<sup>w</sup>eso*. The originally disyllabic *\*k<sup>w</sup>o-i?* developed into *\*kai?* whence, with monophthongization, East Baltic *\*kē* and ultimately acute *\*kie*. At this point, suffixal *\*-nē* was added by analogy with the (then) genitive *\*menē* or *\*manē* ‘of me’ (see fn. 2), and later replaced by *-nō*.

7. The acute intonation of the diphthong reconstructed by Kortlandt seems at first sight to be confirmed by the reflex of *\*swoi* in Lith. *svainis* (also *svainys*), Latv. *svainš* ‘brother-in-law’, and Lith. *svainė*, Latv. *svaīne* ‘wife’s sister’. Derksen (2015, 437) reconstructs *\*suoin(i)o-*, but the preservation of *ai* requires that the initial syllable was unstressed at an earlier stage. The acute must then be due to metatony, caused by stress retraction from the *i*-suffix (Derksen 1996, 270–272) onto the originally circumflex initial syllable. Since the suffix *-ni-* is usually deverbal (Vaillant 1974, 599), the noun is likely to go back to an earlier original *n*-stem, of which OHG *geswiō*

‘brother-in-law, sister’s husband’, MoHG *Geschwei* m.f. (PGm. \**swei-an-*?), as well as Armenian *k<sup>c</sup>eni* ‘wife’s sister’ (Martirosyan 2010, 661) could be cognates. In East Baltic, the laryngeal could have disappeared in prevocalic position in the paradigm of \**swai?*-(*é*)*n-* ‘one of our own’, and the oxytonesis could stem from the oblique cases. Olsen (2012) reconstructs a compound \**sui-h<sub>3</sub>onh<sub>2-</sub>* (→ \**suei?*-*h<sub>3</sub>onh<sub>2-</sub>*?) ‘who has his own authority (now)’ for the Germanic word, with her interpretation of the “Hoffmann suffix” as the root of Latin *onus* ‘charge’, and PIE \**sui?*-*h<sub>3</sub>n(h<sub>2</sub>)-iah<sub>2-</sub>* for the Armenian word and Lith. *sváinė* (of which she regards *sváinis* as a back-formation). This etymology is adopted by ALEW. I find this derivation cumbersome, and it also leaves the prefix *ge-* of *ge-swio* unexplained. Possibly, then, Gmc. \**swei-an-* was a simple *n*-stem derivative of the pronoun and meant ‘our own family, our own’, with \**ga-swei-an-* ‘one of our own’. A thematic derivative may be PGm. \**swaina-*, reflected in Old Norse *sveinn* m. ‘boy, servant’, OHG *swein* ‘servant’, OE *swān* ‘swineherd’, MLG *sweene* ‘swineherd’. This can be connected with \**swajuta-* ‘host’ (as in ON *sveit*, *sjót* ‘host’, OE *swēot* ‘troop, band’), as per Kroonen 2013, 494, also pointing to PIE \**suoi*.

## LINKSNIUOJAMI IR NELINKSNIUOJAMI POSESYVAI IR LIE. *kienō*

### *Santrauka*

Straipsnyje teigiama, kad nelinksniuojamasis savybinis įvardis lie. *kienō* yra pakeitęs ankstesnę formą \**kienē*, atsiradusią pridėjus kirčiuotą *-nē* prie vienskiemenio \**kie*. Kaip pastarosios formos šaltinis postuluojuama inovacija \**k<sup>w</sup>o-i?* ‘kieno’, padaryta kaip nelinksniuojamas būdvardis su \**-i?* iš klausiamojo įvardžio. Modelis tokiam dariniui buvo bl.-sl. \**?moi?* ‘mano’, \**?woi?* ‘tavo’, \**?swoi?* ‘jo, jos, savo’, iš kurių, pasak neseniai paskelbtos teorijos, atsiradę slavų savybiniai įvardžiai \**mojb*, \**twojb*, \**swojb*.

## REFERENCES

ALEW – Wolfgang Hock, Elvira-Julia Bukevičiūtė, Rainer Fecht, *Alllitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Hamburg: Baar, 2015.

Beekes, Robert, Michiel de Vaan 2011, *Comparative Indo-European linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

- Bourciez, Édouard, Joseph Bourciez 1971, *Phonétique française. Étude historique*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Derksen, Rick 1996, *Metatony in Baltic*, Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Derksen, Rick 2008, *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Derksen, Rick 2015, *Etymological dictionary of the Baltic inherited lexicon*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Endzelīns, Jānis 1971, *Comparative phonology and morphology of the Baltic languages* (translated by William R. Schmalstieg and Benjaminš Jēgers), The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- FEW 6(2) – Walther von Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch: eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes* 6(2): *Mercatio – Mneme*, Basel: Zbinden, 1967.
- Fraenkel, Ernst 1962–1965, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2009, *Baltica & Balto-Slavica*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2011, *Selected writings on Slavic and general linguistics*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2013, Balto-Slavic personal pronouns and their accentuation, *Baltistica* 48, 5–11.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2014, Metatony in monosyllables, *Baltistica* 49, 217–224.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2016, On the rise of neo-acute \*e and \*o, *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 42(2), 471–482.
- Kroonen, Guus 2013, *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Martirosyan, Hrach K. 2010, *Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Olander, Thomas 2009, *Balto-Slavic accentual mobility*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette 2012, Oldhøjtysk (*ge*)swio “søsters mand” og germanske svingerskabsbetegnelser, in E. Hansen, A. Holsting, H. F. Nielsen (eds.), *Ældre germansk sproghistorie. Et uformelt minisymposium*, Odense: Syddansk Universitet, 43–49.
- Rosinas, Albertas 1995, *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai: morfologijos raida*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.
- Schmalstieg, William 1974, *An Old Prussian grammar: The phonology and morphology of the three catechisms*, Pennsylvania State UP.
- Siewierska, Anna, Dik Bakker 2013, Suppletion in person forms: the role of iconicity and frequency, in D. Bakker, M. Haspelmath (eds.), *Languages across boundaries: Studies in memory of Anna Siewierska*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 347–395.
- Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.
- Stang, Christian 1957, *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Stang, Christian 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

de Vaan, Michiel (in press), Proto-Indo-European \**sm* and \**si* 'one', in Alwin Kloekhorst (ed.), *Proceedings of The precursors of Proto-Indo-European: The Indo-Hittite and Indo-Uralic hypotheses*, Leiden, 9–11 July 2015.

Vaillant, André 1958, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves 2: Morphologie 2: Flexion pronominale*, Lyon: IAC.

*Michiel DE VAAN*

*Section des sciences du langage et de l'information*

*Université de Lausanne*

*CH-1015 Lausanne*

*Suisse*

*[Michiel.deVaan@unil.ch]*