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 ganéti ‘to be sufficient’. According to the Academy Dictionary [Vol. 3, p. 100] the preferred 3rd person present of ganéti is ganéja, but the form gâna is also apparently possible.

The Academy Grammar [Vol. 2, p. 239] gives a list of thematic verbs with the suffix -é- in the infinitive and preterit, e. g., 3rd pres. têka ‘runs, flows’, inf. tekêti, 3rd pret. tekéjo. Such verbs, called the mixed type, seem less numerous than the completely productive verbs with the -é- suffix in the infinitive and all tenses, e. g., akmenêti ‘to turn to stone’ (3rd pres. akmenêja, 3rd pret. akmenêjo; 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 gâna is probably more archaic than a 3rd present ganéja.

Bûga, 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. giwântei. He suggests further that an Old Prussian paradigm *givô, *givasei, *giva, *givamâi, *givaté has been levelled according to the plural forms as in Slavonic. This gave rise to a 3rd person givâ, which in turn produced *givasei, *givamâi. 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 pérwedâ ‘lead’ and popaikâ ‘deceive’ are not conjunctives [Trautmann, 1910, 397, 405], but are simple 3rd person present forms which are to be phonemicized as [per-vedâ] and [pa-paikâ] respectively [Schmalstieg, 1974, 173, 170].

Old Prussian per-wedâ would be compared with Lith. pri-veda ‘leads’ (a mobile paradigm which could reflect an earlier end-stress, if Bûga 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. paikti ‘grow foolish’, cannot be used as evidence since the present has an -st- suffix, viz. 3rd person paiksta, 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: nēbjauris, nopkenčia, praleņkia beside nebjaúris, n’opkenčia (i.e., neąpkenčia) and prąlenkia. He writes further that such forms as neąpkenčia and prąlenkia might not be mistakes, but reflect the linguistic facts, as is shown by the contemporary hesitation between atgręžia beside atgręžia. Again following Skardžius the accentuation (ne) turimé is attested (10X) and tūrime (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, iszrissá, kelauía, etc. are clear errors and compares the attested gădina, wădina, 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.

Ganā 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 ganěti governs the genitive case, cf. the example from the Academy Dictionary (Vol. 3, p. 100):

Sveikám žmogui prastesnio valingo (gen. sg.) ganėja.
For a healthy man simpler food suffices.

Used in short predicative sentences ganā 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 ganā. Being an etymological 3rd person present verb rather than a nom. sg. *ą-stem noun it could, of course, have no oblique case.

The adverbal forms daugi, daugia ‘much, many’ could also have been 3rd person forms of the verb daugęti ‘to increase, to be abundant’. Although the Academy Dictionary [Vol. 2, p. 314] does not list these as possible 3rd person pres. forms for daugęti, the pattern of i-stem or *je/o-stem presents for verbs with the suffix -ęti is attested elsewhere. For example, the 3rd present of the verb skaudeęti ‘to hurt’ according to the Academy Dictionary [Vol. 12, p. 769] in addition to standard skauda may be also skaüsta, skaüsti, skaüdžia or skaüdi.

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