W. R. SCHMALSTIEG

Ganà: A RELIQUARY END-STRESSED VERB?

Ulvydas, 1969, 8, writes that the root of the word *ganà* 'enough' has taken a firm foothold in the Lithuanian language, but that this particular word was not productive as a noun and became an adverb in Lithuanian without leaving any other case. It seems to me, however, that the adverb *ganà* may be derived rather from the verb *ganĕti* 'to be sufficient'. According to the Academy Dictionary [Vol. 3, p. 100] the preferred 3rd person present of *ganĕti* is *ganĕja*, but the form *gãna* is also apparently possible.

The Academy Grammar [Vol. 2, p. 239] gives a list of thematic verbs with the suffix -*ĕ*- in the infinitive and preterit, e. g., 3rd pres. *tĕka* 'runs, flows', inf. *tekĕti*, 3rd pret. *tekĕjo*. Such verbs, called the mixed type, seem less numerous than the completely productive verbs with the -*ĕ*- suffix in the infinitive and all tenses, e. g., *akmenĕti* 'to turn to stone' (3rd pres. *akmenĕja*, 3rd pret. *akmenĕjo*; Acad. Gram., Vol. 2, p. 258). Historical linguistics shows that the less regular verbs are more likely to be archaic than the more regular verbs, so a 3rd present *gãna* is probably more archaic than a 3rd present *ganĕja*.

Būga, 1961, 57, proposes that at one time Lithuanian did indeed have an oxytone verbal paradigm. Doubting the primacy of etymological end-stress Stang, 1957, 156 — 157, assumes an original etymological mobility for certain Lithuanian verbal paradigms. Nevertheless he thinks there are some cases where the Old Prussian thematic vowel was stressed, e. g., 2nd sg. *giwassi* 'you live', 3rd person *giwa*, 1st pl. *giwammai*, pres. part. *giwāntei*. He suggests further that an Old Prussian paradigm **gívō, *gívasei, *gíva, *gívamái, *gívaté* has been levelled according to the plural forms as in Slavonic. This gave rise to a 3rd person *gīvà*, which in turn produced **gīvàsei, *gīvàmai*. I would certainly dispute in principle heavy reliance on Old Prussian evidence, but in other cases there does seem to be a macron written where one would expect a short vowel. I interpret the macron to denote an etymological stressed short vowel. Thus *perweddā* 'lead' and *popaikā* 'deceive' are not conjunctives [Trautmann, 1910, 397, 405], but are simple 3rd person present forms which are to be phonemicized as [per-vedá] and [pa-paiká] respectively [Schmalstieg, 1974, 173, 170].

Old Prussian *per-weddā* would be compared with Lith. *prì-veda* 'leads' (a mobile paradigm which could reflect an earlier end-stress, if Būga is right; *pér-veda*

'leads across' cannot be used as evidence, since *pér-* is always stressed). The Lithuanian cognate of Old Prussian *po-paikā*, viz. *paĩkti* 'grow foolish', cannot be used as evidence since the present has an *-st-* suffix, viz. 3rd person *paĩksta*, although the circumflex root is compatible with accentual mobility (or end stress) if we are dealing with a root-type thematic verb.

Skardžius, 1935, 195 notes the following vacillations in Daukša's accentuation: *nèbjauris, nopkeñčia, praleñkia* beside *nebjaũris, n'opkenčia* (i.e., *neàpkenčia*) and *pràlenkia*. He writes further that such forms as *neàpkenčia* and *pràlenkia* might not be mistakes, but reflect the linguistic facts, as is shown by the contemporary hesitation between *àtgręžia* beside *atgrȩ̃žia*. Again following Skardžius the accentuation *(ne) turimé* is attested (10X) and *túrime* (4X). In fact a marginal end-stress is well attested in the 1st and 2nd pl. present forms in Daukša's Postilla. Skardžius, 1935, 199, writes however that the forms *daliié, gadiná, giwená, iszriszá, kelauiá*, etc. are clear errors and compares the attested *gádína, wádina*, etc. It would appear to me, however, that if *turimé, žinomé*, etc. can reflect an earlier end-stress, then the 3rd person forms *daliié, gadiná*, etc. could also reflect an earlier end-stress.

Ganà is then a reliquary form from the 3rd person present originally meaning 'it is sufficient'. The government of the genitive case is to be expected, because the verbal successor *ganéti* governs the genitive case, cf. the example from the Academy Dictionary (Vol. 3, p. 100):

Sveikám	žmõgui	prastèsnio	val̃gio (gen. sg.)	ganéja.
For a healthy man	simpler	food		suffices.

Used in short predicative sentences *ganà* lost its connection with the verbal paradigm and was reinterpreted as an adverb of quantity. No longer a member of the verbal paradigm it was able to retain its final stress when oxytone paradigms became mobile. This explains also why there is no oblique case for *ganà*. Being an etymological 3rd person present verb rather than a nom. sg. *$\bar{a}$*-stem noun it could, of course, have no oblique case.

The adverbial forms *daũgi, daũgia* 'much, many' could also have been 3rd person forms of the verb *daugéti* 'to increase, to be abundant'. Although the Academy Dictionary [Vol. 2, p. 314] does not list these as possible 3rd person pres. forms for *daugéti*, the pattern of *i*-stem or *je/o*-stem presents for verbs with the suffix *-éti* is attested elsewhere. For example, the 3rd present of the verb *skaudéti* 'to hurt' according to the Academy Dictionary [Vol. 12, p. 769] in addition to standard *skaũda* may be also *skaũsta, skaũsti, skaũdžia* or *skaũdi*.

Since verbs in *-éti* are frequently denominatives in many cases it may be impossible to know whether the adverb is derived from a verb or a noun.

REFERENCES

Academy Dictionary — Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, Vol. 2 / Ed. by J. Kruopas et al.; Vol. 3 / Ed. by K. Ulvydas et al.; Vol. 12 / Ed. by K. Ulvydas et al. — Vilnius: Mintis.

Academy Grammar — Lietuvių kalbos gramatika / Ed. by K. Ulvydas et al. — Vilnius: Mintis, 1971, Vol. 2.

Būga, 1961 — Būga K. Rinktiniai raštai. — Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1961, t. 3.

Schmalstieg, 1974 — Schmalstieg W.R. An Old Prussian Grammar: The Phonology and Morphology of the Three Catechisms. — University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974.

Skardžius, 1935 — Skardžius P. Daukšos akcentologija. — Kaunas: Humanitarinių mokslų fakulteto leidinys, 1935.

Stang, 1957 — Stang Chr.S. Slavonic Accentuation. — Oslo: I kommisjon hos H. Aschehoug and Co, 1957.

Trautmann, 1910 — Trautmann R. Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler. — Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1910.

Ulvydas, 1969 — Ulvydas K. Vienaskaitos vardininko kilmės prieveiksmiai. — Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai, 1969, t. 11, p. 7—16.