

SUFFIXAUFNAHME-LIKE PHENOMENA IN LITHUANIAN

ALESSANDRO PARENTI

Firenze

1. Introduction

We owe to Frans Plank (1990 and 1995) the merit of having re-proposed to a wider scholarly public the term 'Suffixaufnahme' (and the phenomenon which it indicates), first introduced by Fink (1910: 141). By Suffixaufnahme we mean a particular kind of agreement involving a nominal which stands in an attributive relation to a head nominal and obligatorily carries, in addition to its own case marker, the case marker of the head nominal itself. The phenomenon is rather uncommon: Suffixaufnahme seems characteristic of languages confined to a few major areas – the Caucasus region, the Ancient Near East, and Australia. Other instances are found in Africa and eastern Siberia, although phenomena more or less comparable occur in a wider range of languages (see Plank 1995 for an overview). Attributives admitted to Suffixaufnahme are typically in the genitive. An instance often cited is (1), from Old Georgian (Plank 1990: 1039):

- (1) perx-n-i ꝥac-isa-n-i
foot-Pl-Nom man-Gen-Pl-Nom
'(the) feet of the man'

A number of Australian languages allows case marking also after adnominal local cases. In (2), from Panyjima, a noun in the locative agrees with its head in the accusative (from Plank 1995: 35):

- (2) ngunha watharri-ku nyurna-yu warrapa-la-ku
that look=for-Pres snake-Acc grass-Loc-Acc
'He is looking for the snake in the grass'

Similar structures are also found in Baltic, and particularly in the language of the oldest Lithuanian texts from the northwestern area

(Specht 1931: 269). Among them is Daukša's *Postilla* (1599), where we find 'eine Reihe merkwürdiger Adjektivbildungen' (Specht 1926: 89), in which the anaphoric pronoun *jis* in its enclitic form is attached to nouns in the locative. See, for instance, DP 439₄₇ *dovanómis dąguięiomis*, which, reshaped in accordance with modern orthography, is to be analysed as in (3):

- (3) *dovan-omis* *dang-uję-j-omis*
 gift-InstrPIFem *heaven-LocSgMasc-Pro-InstrPIFem*
 'with heavenly gifts'

Although constructions which involve the genitive are by no means lacking in Lithuanian (see below), in Daukša's text we find only instances with the locative. Such attributives may occur both before or after their heads, apparently without significant difference.

From a syntactic point of view, the similarity of (2) and (3) is evident. In both an attributive element, while carrying its own case marking, exhibits an additional case marker controlled by the head. From a morphological point of view, they are rather unlike: in the Australian instance the 'external case' is attached directly to the 'internal case', whereas in the Lithuanian one the external case is carried by an enclitic pronoun. The latter, however, is reminiscent of the so-called 'ligative' or 'catalytic' affix, which in certain languages intervenes between the two case markers, and, according to the reasonable hypothesis of Aristar (1995), formerly had a pronominal function.

But what mostly diverges is the nature of the circumstances under which the attributives at issue occur. Unlike the 'true' instances of Suffixaufnahme, in Lithuanian these structures represent a marginal and scarcely productive phenomenon, at least in the stages of the language to which we have direct access. In the two most important cases of their occurrence, their use is, so to speak, provoked by contact with Slavonic adjectival patterns. There is evidence, however, that the syntactic strategy which gives rise to this kind of structure was extensively employed before the beginning of written records. (It is the same source to which we can trace the definite form of adjectives, a Baltic and Slavonic common feature, which however will not be dealt with here.) In consideration of this, although frag-

mentary and in most cases almost 'second-hand', the Suffixaufnahme-like instances of Lithuanian are worth examining in detail. In particular, they may tell us something about the possible evolution of this kind of attributive in a type of language which evidently does not favor Suffixaufnahme¹. As will be shown in the following paragraphs, these structures tend to be reinterpreted as denominal adjectives.

2. Attributives with the locative plus *jis* in Daukša's *Postilla*

Among the Old Lithuanian texts, Daukša's *Postilla*, a translation from Polish, offers the largest number of attributives of the kind described above. Specht (1926: 89, and 1931: 269) lists fifteen different forms with *jis* attached to the loc. sg., but two of them must be eliminated², whereas a few others may be added (see below). With its 167 occurrences, the most frequent form is *dangujejis* (cf. *dangus* 'heaven'), which translates Pol. *niebieski* 'heavenly' and *wieczny* 'eternal'. The others are much rarer:

artyjejis (analogical, cf. the adverb *arti* 'near') 1 x 'near', Pol. *bliski*.

dienojejis (cf. *diena* 'day') 2 x 'diurnal', 'daily': Pol. *dzienny*.

duobejejis (cf. *duobe* 'pit') 1 x 'lower': Pol. *dolny*.

kalnejis (cf. *kalnas* 'mountain') 1 x 'upper': Pol. *górnny*.

naktyjejis (cf. *naktis* 'night') 1 x '(of the) night': Pol. *nocny*.

pekl(o)jejis (cf. *pekla* 'hell') 2 x 'infernal': Pol. *piekielny*.

pragarejis (cf. *pragaras* 'hell') 1 x 'infernal': Pol. *piekielny*.

širdyjejis (cf. *širdis* 'heart') 2 x 'of the heart': Pol. *serdeczny*.

*ugnyjis*³ (cf. *ugnis* 'fire') 1 x 'flaming': Pol. *ognisty*.

¹ Suffixaufnahme typically appears in languages which exhibit agglutinative morphology and ergativity (cf. Plank 1995: 36-37, 94-95).

² The form *gerkleių* (394₃₄) is to be read *gerkle ių* 'their throat'; *gintieje* (526a₃₆) is the definite nom. pl. of the past active participle of *gintyti* 'to dispute'.

³ Specht writes *ugnijis*, assuming that *jis* is attached to the old loc. sg. ending of the consonant stems *-i*. In accordance with Skardžius (1943: 66), I prefer the transcription *ugnyjis*, with the loc. sg. ending of the *i*-stems in its shortened form (viz. without the postposition **-én*). Other instances in Daukša's works of adjectivals containing the shortened loc. sg. are DP 312₁₄ *zėmeiuose*, DK 51₅₋₆ *ze^amėių*, DK 81₂₋₃ *dągūiump* (here the first element is a loc. sg. and not a gen. pl.,

viduryjejis (cf. *viduryš* 'middle') 9 x 'inner': Pol. *wewnętrzny*.
viršujejis (cf. *viršus* 'top') 3 x 'upper': Pol. *zwierzchni*.
žemejejis (cf. *žeme* 'earth') 8 x 'earthly': Pol. *ziemski*.

Another instance not recorded by Specht is *aukštyjejis* (cf. *aukštis* 'height') 1 x 'upper' (dat. sg. *auksztieiam* in the margin of p. 4, in correspondence with *wirszutiniam* in the text). A slightly different form, and probably an old one, is *nūnajis* 'present' (474₂₆ *nūnqius* acc. pl., referring to *dáiktus* 'things' in the preceding line), which translates Pol. *ninejszy*. Its formation recalls constructions usual in Greek, such as Isocr. 15.32 *ejvk th''' kathgoriiva" th''' nu'n* 'from the present accusation' (in Greek, however, the determiner precedes). In my opinion, the first element of *nūnajis* might be an adverb **nūnq*, perhaps identical with Skt. *nunám* 'now'.

As clearly appears from the list given above, in Daukša's *Postilla* these formations occur all but exclusively in correspondence with a relational adjective of the Polish original. In many instances, the nouns from which they derive describe a place or a spatial concept; they are, so to speak, 'natural locatives'. Since locative expressions generally belong to the clause level, it is quite obvious to conclude that the constructions with the pronoun *jis* are employed to make such expressions more readily available for adnominal use. But there is evidence that the complex formed by the loc. sg. ending and the pronoun has been (or is being) reinterpreted as a derivational suffix, and that we are dealing with formations which show a plain adjective-like character. In the following lines some instances will be examined.

The forms *duobejejis* (cf. *duobe* 'pit') and *kalnejis* (cf. *kalnás* 'mountain') are evidently calques of Pol. *dolny* 'lower' (denominal adjective from *dóll* 'pit') and *górný* 'upper' (from *góra* 'mountain') respectively. In the Lithuanian forms, the loc. sg. ending and the pronoun together correspond to the Polish derivational suffix *-ny*.

The two nouns describing units of time (*diena*, *naktis*) which are involved in these constructions are also in the locative case, whereas in their clause-level, viz. adverbial, function the accusative case generally occurs: *dienojejis* 'diurnal', lit. 'the one in the day-time', *naktyjejis* 'of the night', lit. 'the one at night' (both in the gen. pl. in

as is shown by the absence of the nasalization in the first *u*; cf. instead DK 39₈ *tikrūju*).

268₃₂₋₃₃, referring to *adīnu* 'hours'), but *dienq* 'in the day-time', *naktj* 'at night'.

In certain cases, the locative meaning of the inflected base noun is not particularly evident. See e.g. *širdyjejis* in 493₂₋₃: *klausikime io ne tiekái ausimis kunįngomis, bet' toli dáugiasn' szirdiiqiomis* 'let us listen to him not only with the ears of the body, but much more with the ones of the heart'. The locative meaning is completely effaced in the form *ugnyjis*, where, by the way, the postposition **-én* does not appear: 522₂₈₋₂₉ *iszwido kâtnq piĥna žirgų ir wezimų ugniiu* 'he saw a hill full of horses and flaming wagons'⁴. Although neither Specht nor others mention this form, I think that the interpretation given to *ugniiu* may also apply to the gen. sg. *ákmeniio* (421₄₄ *péilo ákmeniio* 'the knife of stone'), which translates Pol. *kamienny*. The nom. sg. would be *akmenyjis*. Here too any locative meaning seems to be absent (one may compare expressions like Fr. *un mur en pierre*, however).

A form probably similar to these ones is *vienatyjis* (*sic*) 'only, sole' (*wienatīis* 263₈ etc.: it occurs 28 times altogether). This adjectival, very frequent in Old Lithuanian texts, is formed by the pronoun *jis* joined to the loc. sg. (without **-én*) of *vienatis* 'oneness'. This fact, first recognized by Fraenkel in 1947⁵, later seems to have passed unnoticed.

The forms discussed above provide both semantic and – at least in part – morphological evidence about their adjective-like character⁶. They probably emerged to fill in a gap in the Old Lithuanian lexis, the well-known lack of a full-fledged system of relational adjectives: this lack is clearly shown by the fact that, in texts translated from Polish,

⁴ In 594₃₅ the translator opts for a genitive: *ant' liepsnų wezimo* 'on a wagon of flames'.

⁵ See Fraenkel 1947: 17 for details.

⁶ Perhaps another form of this kind may be added to the list. It is the hapax legomenon *pėniguojus* (DP 602₄ *zmōnes pėniguojus* 'moneyed men' acc. pl.), which has not yet been satisfactorily explained. Zinkevičius (1957: 12) considers the form as containing a gen. pl. (*pėnigų-jus*), but, apart from the graphical difficulties, it would be the only instance in the *Postilla* of *jis* attached to the genitive. (Moreover, the instances in which *jis* is attached to the genitive of an inanimate noun are almost non-existent in Lithuanian.) Skardžius (1943: 67) suspects a misprint for *pėniguojus*. I think, instead, that, in order to render the Pol. relational adjective *pieniężny*, a form **pėniguojis* was created: a suffix *-uojis* might have been extracted from Low Lithuanian attributives such as *paskuo-jis* 'last', *viduo-jis* 'middle', *viršuo-jis* 'upper' (where *jis* is attached to the Low Lithuanian loc. sing. of the *u*-stems *-uo*), reanalysed as *pask-uojis* etc.

the denominal adjectives, which occur quite often, most frequently are rendered by nouns in the genitive or by other means (see Tangl 1937: 109-113, Fraenkel 1947: 70-74, and recently Dini 1996).

It is difficult, however, to ascertain whether and to what extent such forms were used in the spoken language. I think that there probably were few of them, mostly derived from nouns indicating spatial concepts, and that these forms were being reinterpreted as relational adjectives. As a matter of fact, in the Low Lithuanian dialect spoken in Priekulė some adjectivals of this kind are still used: *apatėjis* 'lower', *kraštėjis* '(of the) edge', *vidurėjis* 'middle', *viršutėjis* 'upper' (cf. Grinaveckienė 1960: 196, with the corrections of Zinkevičius 1966: 282). Their origin from nouns in the locative is probably not discernible by the speaker. Following the pattern provided by such forms, in Old Lithuanian other derivatives might have been created. In any case, this kind of formation soon had to withdraw because of the affirmation of the suffix *-inis*, the most common means for deriving relational adjectives in Modern Lithuanian. It is worth mentioning that in the *Postilla* a dozen adjectives in *-inis* occur, some of which are concurrent with the derivatives at issue: *dieninis*, *naktinis*, *pragarinis*, *žeminis*.

3. Possessive adjectives in the dialect of Lazūnai

Attributives in which the genitive case is involved are commonly found in the dialect spoken in Lazūnai and surroundings, a residual High Lithuanian area in Belorussia. In many cases their formation evidently aims at reproducing, with Lithuanian means, the Belorussian 'possessive adjectives', a peculiar feature of the Slavonic languages completely absent in Baltic⁷. In Slavonic, these forms represent a particular set of denominal adjectives, employed to express possession: e.g. Upper Sorbian *Janowa kniha* 'Jan's book'. Because of the fact that they exhibit features both of inflectional and derivational behavior, Corbett has defined them as the «Slavonic's closest approach to Suffixaufnahme» (see Corbett 1995 for details). From a morphological point of view, the Lithuanian forms are

⁷ For this and other contact phenomena in the dialect of Lazūnai, see Grinaveckienė 1974.

certainly more similar to prototypical instances of Suffixaufnahme. Cf. (4), from Petrauskas & Vidugiris 1985: 288:

- (4) *Vīlk-o-j-ai* arkli-ai
V.-GenSgMasc-Pro-NomPlMasc horse-NomPlMasc
'Vilkas' (= proper name) horses'

In some instances, instead, the pattern seems to have been provided simply by Belorussian relational adjectives (the case is therefore similar to that discussed in the preceding paragraph). Cf. (5), from Grinaveckienė 1974: 53:

- (5) *v a r̃ d -as* sūn-o
dziēv-o-j-o
name-NomSgMasc son-GenSgMasc God-GenSgMasc-
Pro-GenSgMasc
'the name of the son of God'

The expression corresponds to Belor. імя сына божага.

In certain cases the transparency of the formation seems to be somewhat blurred. In Petrauskas & Vidugiris (1985), I found *krōlikosiojis* 'of the rabbit' (cf. *krōlikas* 'rabbit') and *vārņusiojis* 'of the crows' (cf. *vārņa*)⁸: since the genitive of the base nouns are *krōliko* (sg.) and *vārņu* (pl.) respectively, the element *-sio-* which intervenes is secondary. Perhaps it is an element no longer transparent, containing the pronoun *jis* itself in the gen. sg. masc. The *-s-* may have been extracted from preceding nouns in the gen. sg. feminine. I think that the insertion of *-sio-* is caused by the fact that the end of these attributives is becoming opaque and to some extent tends to be reinterpreted as a derivational suffix.

4. Derivatives in *-ijis* (and *-ujis*)

Other instances of structures in which *jis* is joined to a noun in the genitive are occasionally found elsewhere in Lithuanian. Among the most conspicuous are the ones found in the Low Lithuanian dialect of

⁸ In Grinaveckienė (1974: 53) this form is recorded as *vārņusioj* (nom. sg. fem.), with plain *u*.

Priekulė, where women may be indicated by hypostasis formations⁹ in which the anaphoric pronoun is attached to the genitive of the husband's name (cf. Grinaveckienė 1960: 197): *Krištupoji* 'Kristupas' wife', *Mártynoji* 'Martynas' wife' etc.

More interesting for my purposes are other similar forms containing a noun in the genitive plural, once employed to indicate people through reference to their belonging to a particular family, village, or such. Although the recorded data are very scanty, probably such forms were quite usual, at least in some of the dialects: Schleicher (1856: 147) mentions *Szucújis*, which indicates the owner of a house called *Szucái* (pl. of *Szúcás*, the name of the former owner); Kurschat (1876: 104), besides *mūsujis* «der Unsrige», records *Prūsaičiujis* «der dem Hause oder der Familie der *Prūsaičiai* oder des *Prūsaitis* angehört»; Fenzlau (1936: 124) has *Gaideliūjis* 'member of the family Gaidelis', rightly etymologized as **Gaideliū jis*. Unfortunately, he gives no other instances of these forms, which, according to him, «noch heute im Mittellitauischen üblich sind»¹⁰.

It is important to point out that, as results from Kurschat (1876: 104), the feminine form is in *-uje* (and not *-uji* or *-uja*): this means that these derivatives were assimilated to the adjectives of the third class (masc. *-is*, fem. *-ė*), once again as a consequence of the fact that the final part was reinterpreted as a derivational suffix.

The same formation, in my opinion, is to be recognized in some derivatives in *-ujis* (fem. *-uje*) which Valeckienė (1957: 275) mentions among the adjectives which do not have the definite form: *Lánkininkujis* 'man of Lankininkai', *Lazynūjis* 'man of Lazynai' etc. They derive from place names morphologically characterized as plurals¹¹.

⁹ i.e., «nouns in the genitive undergoing further case marking and acting as independent NPs» (Plank 1995: 10).

¹⁰ The list may be extended by adding *Lukšiujai* 'people of Lukšiai', title of a book by A. Giedrius (Chicago, 1959).

¹¹ If these forms really have a short *u*, it may be due to the influence of adjectives such as *paškūjis* (which itself derives from a locative plus *jis*, cf. Skardžius 1943: 67). The transcription may be fallacious, however.

5. Conclusion

To conclude, I will return to the general issue of Suffixaufnahme, trying to make use of the relevant elements obtained from the Lithuanian data. First of all, it is evident that the Lithuanian structures are the outcome of that particular syntactic pattern which, for the sake of brevity, following Aristar (1995), I will call the 'anaphor-binding strategy'¹². It is an essentially appositive mode of syntax, involving an attributive linked to the head of the noun phrase by means of a head-referent pronominal. Thus, e.g. DP 223₁₀ *Téwas daguiéjis* 'the heavenly Father' originally is 'the father, the one in the heaven'. The first thing to note is that the Lithuanian data fit in very well with Aristar's statement (1991: 15) that this strategy is a possible source for adjectivals. But more important is the fact that Lithuanian also provides some confirmation of Aristar's hypothesis (1995), according to which Suffixaufnahme is to be considered a possible result of the anaphor-binding strategy. It is a particular case of this kind of construction, which may appear when the noun involved as an attributive already has and maintains its own case marking and when the pronominal which is attached to it exhibits head-referent case marking.

This diachronic explanation is not taken into due account by Corbett (1995: 278) when he inquires into the reasons why Slavonic can not achieve prototypical Suffixaufnahme. He claims that, besides the general hindrances caused by fusional morphology, more specifically, Slavonic would not attach a second set of endings to the ending of a noun because combinations of vowel plus vowel are generally avoided. In his opinion, since endings usually begin with and end with a vowel (and often consist of a single vowel), they do not provide a convenient stem for other endings. This explanation would be appropriate if Suffixaufnahme had its source directly in the copying of case marking onto a modifying noun. But if the case displacement is produced by a pronoun, as we have seen in Lithuanian, which is both genetically and typologically related, similar phenomena may occur, at least in theory, in languages such as Slavonic too, provided that the anaphor-binding strategy is employed.

¹² In Aristar 1991, one encounters the expression 'binding-anaphor strategy' instead.

As a matter of fact, adjectivals derived in this way from the locative and even from prepositional phrases are occasionally found in Old Church Slavonic: e.g. *utrěi* 'tomorrow's', with **-ji* attached to *utrě* 'tomorrow', loc. sg. of *utro* 'morning'¹³; Cod. Supr. 322₂₅ *besčínaje množstvo* 'disorderly multitude' (cf. *bes čína* 'without order'). Here, as well as in the instances from Daukša, only elements with clause-level function are involved, which otherwise would be less easily available for adnominal use. As regards nouns in the genitive, no pronoun is required, since the already existing case marker is sufficient to express the dependency relation with the head.

In any case, Corbett is right when he states that fusional languages, such as Baltic and Slavonic, offer an unwelcoming environment for prototypical Suffixaufnahme. The major inhibiting element is the fact that such languages, unlike the agglutinating ones, exhibit different endings for each case depending on the inflectional class. Moreover, number is always cumulative with case. Sequences containing two morphemes of this kind are hard to process (on the paradigmatic level) and too cumbersome (on the syntagmatic level), and are unlikely to become obligatory. Under these conditions, as is clearly shown by Lithuanian, in the case that anaphor-binding structures reach a certain degree of grammaticalization, the pronominal element together with the 'internal' case marker is unavoidably doomed to reinterpretation as a suffix deriving adjectives from nouns.

The Lithuanian Suffixaufnahme-like instances are nevertheless instructive: they offer a diachronic illustration of the synchronic observation (Plank 1995: 76; see also Luraghi 1993: 159) that the transition from nounhood to adjectivehood in attributive function is gradual rather than categorical.

SOURCES

DK = *Kathechismas arba mokslas kiekvienam krikščionii priwalvs. [...] Jzgulditas iz Lięzuwio Lanķiszko ing Lietuwiszka per Kuniga Mikaloiu Dausza [...] 1595.* (Reprinted in: *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1595 metų katekizmas*, Vilnius 1995).

¹³ The same form, with an additional suffix, still survives in Pol. *jutrzejszy*.

DP = *Postilla Catholica. [...] Per Kūnigą Mikaloiv Davksza Kanoniką Médnikų, iz lęķiszko pergūldita. [...] 1599.* (Reprinted as: *Daukšos Postilė. Fotografuotinis leidimas*, Kaunas 1926).

REFERENCES

- Aristar A. R. 1991, *On diachronic sources and synchronic pattern: an investigation into the origin of linguistic universals*, "Language" 67, pp. 1-33.
- Aristar A. R. 1995, *Binder-anaphor and the diachrony of case displacement*, in Plank (ed.) 1995, pp. 431-447.
- Corbett, G. G. 1995, *Slavonic's closest approach to Suffixaufnahme: the possessive adjective*, in Plank (ed.) 1995, pp. 265-282.
- Dini P. U. 1996, *Sul «velato» influsso polacco negli aggettivi derivati del lituano antico (Ledesma 1590, Daukša 1595, Anonimo 1605)*, "Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi della Basilicata", Anno accademico 1993-1994, pp. 147-159.
- Fenzlau W. 1936, *Die deutschen Formen der litauischen Orts- und Personennamen des Memelgebiets*, Halle/S.
- Fink F. N. 1910, *Die Haupttypen des Sprachbaus*, Leipzig.
- Fraenkel E. 1947, *Sprachliche, besonders syntaktische Untersuchung des kalvinistischen litauischen Katechismus des Malcher Pietkiewicz von 1598*, Göttingen.
- Grinaveckienė E. 1960, *Tarmių medžiagos rinkimas lietuvių kalbos atlasui*, "Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai", 3, pp. 191-205.
- Grinaveckienė E. 1974, *Vlijanie belorusskoj grammatičeskoj sistemy na Lazunskij govor litovskogo jazyka*, in *Dialektologičeskij sbornik. Materialy IV dialektologičeskoj konferencii po izučeniju govorov i jazykovych kontaktov v Pribaltike, oktjabr' 1972*, Vilnius, pp. 46-56.
- Kurschat F. 1876, *Grammatik der litauischen Sprache*, Halle.
- Luraghi S. 1993, *La modificazione nominale nelle lingue anatoliche*, *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 78, pp. 144-166.
- Petrauskas J. - Vidugiris A. 1985, *Lazinių tarmės žodynas*, Vilnius.
- Plank F. 1990, *Suffix copying as a mirror-image phenomenon*, "Linguistics" 28, pp. 1039-1045.
- Plank F. 1995, *(Re-)Introducing Suffixaufnahme*, in Plank (ed.) 1995, pp. 3-110.
- Plank F. (ed.) 1995, *Double Case. Agreement by Suffixaufnahme*, New York-Oxford.
- Schleicher A 1856, *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache. I. Grammatik*, Praha.

- Skardžius P. 1943, *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*, Vilnius.
- Specht F. 1926, *Zur Bedeutung des Nasalvokals bei Daukša*, "Tauta ir Zodis" 4, pp. 85-100.
- Specht F. 1931, *Die Flexion der n-Stämme im Baltisch-Slavisch und Verwandtes*, "Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung" 59, pp. 213-304.
- Tangl E. 1937, *Die Einflüsse des Polnischen auf das altlitauische Schrifttum*, in *Zbornik lingvističkih i filoloških rasprava A. Beliču o četrdesetogodišnjici njegova naučnog rada posvećuju njegovi prijatelji i učenici*, Beograd, pp. 105-114.
- Valeckienė A. 1957, *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos įvardžiutinių būdvardžių vartojimas*, "Literatura ir kalba" 2, pp. 159-328.
- Zinkevičius Z. 1957, *Lietuvių kalbos įvardžiutinių būdvardžių istorijos bruožiai*, Vilnius.
- Zinkevičius Z. 1966, *Lietuvių dialektologija*, Vilnius.

Suffixaufnahme-like phenomena in Lithuanian
Alessandro Parenti (Florence)

This paper deals with a particular kind of attributive, occasionally found in Lithuanian, formed by a noun plus the enclitic pronoun *jis* attached to it. To a certain extent, its formation may be compared to the phenomenon called Suffixaufnahme. The term defines a particular kind of agreement involving a nominal which stands in an attributive relation to a head nominal and obligatorily carries, in addition to its own case marker, the case marker of the head nominal itself. Since the morphological character of Lithuanian does not favor this phenomenon, the attributives at issue are only marginal elements, showing a tendency to be reinterpreted as denominal adjectives.

**NAUJAS PIRMOSIOS LIETUVIŠKOS
LDK KNYGOS LEIDIMAS**

GIEDRIUS SUBAČIUS
Vilnius - Chicago

Pirmoji lietuviškoji Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės (LDK) spausdintoji knyga – 1595 metų Mikalojaus Daukšos katekizmas – susilaukė ketvirtojo leidimo¹. Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla šios knygos pirmojo leidimo 400-ųjų metų proga išspausdino solidų Vidos Jakštienės ir Jono Palionio parengtą, Agotos Sriubienės redaguotą fotografuotinį leidinį. Tai *Bibliotheca Baltica (Lithuania)* serijos knyga, paremta Karališkosios Norvegijos užsienio reikalų ministerijos ir Lietuvos kultūros ministerijos lėšomis.

Šis ketvirtasis leidimas yra pats išsamiausias ir kruopščiausiai parengtas. Jį sudaro fotografuotinis, transliteruotas lietuviškas, transliteruotas lenkiškas Ledesmos katekizmo (iš kurio Daukša ir vertė) tekstai, taip pat įvadinis straipsnis apie ankstesnius šio katekizmo leidimus, kolontitulų sąrašai, lyginamoji ankstesnių trijų leidimų skirtųjų lentelė bei lietuviškų žodžių formų rodyklė. Kaip matyti iš Palionio įvadinio straipsnio, nei antrasis Eduardo Volterio 1886 m., nei trečiasis Ernsto Sittigo 1929 m. (pastarasis net nesirėmęs originalu, tik Volterio perspaudu) leidimai nebuvo tokie platus ir išsamūs.

Knygos rengėjus ir leidėjus reikia pagirti už gerą fotokopijų kokybę – teksto fotografijos spausdintos faksimiliškai, su fonu, tad abejotinesniais atvejais skaitytojas turi galimybę pats stengtis tiksliau interpretuoti tekstą, mėginti atskirti diakritinį ženklelį nuo atsitiktinės dėmelės. Kaip rašoma minėtame straipsnyje, toks leidimas buvo būtinas „ne tik todėl, kad ankstesniuose leidimuose yra gana daug trūkumų, netikslumų“, bet ir kad „Vilniaus universiteto Senųjų spaudinių skyriuje tėra išlikęs vienintelis šiuo metu težinomas originalo egzempliorius, kuris dėl kokios nors nelaimės (pvz., gaisro, karo ar kt.) gali žūti arba būti sugadintas“ (p. 31–32). Antra vertus, dabar pirmoji LDK lietuviška

¹ Mikalojaus Daukšos 1595 metų katekizmas / Katechismus von Mikalojus Daukša vom Jahre 1595, Parengė / Vorbereitung von Vida Jakštienė ir Jonas Palionis, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1995, 748 pp.