Anželika Smetonienė
The Institute of the Lithuanian Language
Research Centre of Written Heritage
anzelika.smetoniene@gmail.com

THE ORIGIN OF THE SLAVIC VERBS IN THE CATECHISM OF DAUKŠA (1595) AND THE ANONYMOUS CATECHISM (1605)

The focus of this article is on the Slavic verbs in some of the earliest writings in the Lithuanian language in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, that is, in the *Catechism of Mikalojus Daukša*, published in 1595, and the *Anonymous Catechism* of 1605. The loanwords were first analysed morphologically, i.e. hybrids were eliminated, and then the origin of the Slavisms was determined on the basis of various criteria, and a brief presentation was made of how, in the light of the historical processes of the Slavic languages, it is possible to determine the origin of the loanwords with certainty or at least to hypothesise it.

Keywords: Daukša's Catechism, Anonymous Catechism, verbs, hybrids, Slavisms, origin of loanwords.

Фокус овог рада је на словенским глаголима у неким од најстаријих рукописа на литванском језику у Великој литванској кнежевини, а то су *Катихизис Микалојуса Даукше*, објављен 1595, и *Анонинми катихизис* из 1605. године. Позајмљенице се прво анализирају морфолошки, тј. хибриди су изостављени из даље анализе, а затим се приступило одређењу порекла славизама на основу различитих критеријума. Кратко се указује како се на основу историјских процеса у словенским језицима може са сигурношћу одредити порекло позајмљеница или барем претпоставити.

Кључне речи: Даукшин катихизис, Анонимни катихизис, глаголи, хибриди, славизми, порекло позајмљеница.

The first official Roman catechism was compiled in 1566, and in the 16th century catechisms in general were the main means of disseminating Catholicism, with the Jesuit catechisms by Peter Canisius, Robert Bellarmine, and Jacob Ledesma being particularly recommended for the promotion of religious knowledge (Korzo 2004: 149). The latter published two catechisms in Italian: «Dottrina Christiana Breve» and the expanded catechism «Dottrina Christiana, a modo di dialogo del Maestro, et Discepolo, per insegnare alli Fanciulli» (Michelini 2001: 227–228). The expanded catechism by J. Ledesma was first translated into Polish, and then into Lithuanian. The first to do so was Mikalojus Daukša and his translation «Catechism, or the Teaching Obligatory for Every Christian» [Kathechismas arba moksłas kiekwienam krikszczionii priwalvs] was published in 1595 (hereinafter - DC). Being the first printed book in Lithuanian in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, it has been extensively studied: its relationship with the texts of J.

Ledesma (Michelini 1999, 2001); the translation has been studied in various aspects by E. Sittig (Sittig 1929), V. Biržiška (Biržiška 1953), J. Lebedys (Lebedys 1963), J. Palionis (Palionis 1967) and Z. Zinkevičius (Zinkevičius 1988), the syntax of this source has been studied (Judžentis et al. 2006). The second translation of Ledesma's Catechism into Lithuanian (hereafter - AC) was published in 1605 by an unknown translator. The author of the AC referred to an earlier translation by M. Daukša, but he did it in a creative way. The AC translation has fewer similarities with the Catechism by J. Ledesma compared to the DC, the text itself is rearranged and supplemented (Smetonienė 2016: 167), and the vocabulary of the text is quite rich, with relatively few barbarisms. However, the AC has received less attention from researchers. After J. Bystroń, who published a transcription of this catechism and described in detail its spelling, vowel and consonant marking, phonetics, noun declension and verb conjugation (Bystroń 1890), it was not until the 1960s that it became more widely known when the phonetics and grammatical forms of the source were studied by Z. Zinkevičius (Zinkevičius 1968). More recent studies include a detailed examination of the cause and purpose clauses of the Catechism of 1605 (Judžentis 2010). In his discussion of the hypothetical Catechism of 1585, S. Temčinas also examines the possible circumstances of the appearance of the Anonymous Catechism (Temčinas 2013).

The DC and the AC are only ten years apart and have a close relationship. For this reason, it is worthwhile to use both of them to study some aspects of the language. Moreover, in addition to the similarities, there are also some important differences: the DC belongs to the so-called middle variant of the Lithuanian written language, while the AC is assigned to the eastern variant, and the language of the two sources is vivid, attempts are made to search for synonyms, and so on, which makes it particularly suitable for the study of the vocabulary. The aim of this article is to determine the origin of the loan verbs found in the two sources. To achieve this goal, all the main forms of the loan root verbs and their derivatives have been extracted from both the AC and the DC. The non-repeating verbs have been identified and generalised, i.e. the prefixed derivatives have been dissociated from the prefixed derivatives, if the meaning of the prefixed verb is, compared to the non-prefixed verb, only modified by the suffix. Thus, 18 loan root verbs were found in the AC and the DC. The main verb forms, which are implied by the current Lithuanian language and verb derivation system but are not witnessed by the sources under consideration, are presented in square brackets. For verbs, only the meanings used in the analysed sources are given, but all meanings in both Lithuanian and Slavic languages, as possible donor languages, have been considered identifying the origin of the loanword. The term *donor language* refers to the language from which the word is borrowed, the *recipient language* is the *language* into which the *word* is *borrowed*, (Wohlgemuth 2009: 51). In this case, Lithuanian

is the recipient language. The word *source* is also used to refer to the borrowing language, but it should be stressed that when it comes to loanwords from Eastern Slavic or Polish, the *source* is not the same as when analysing international words, when the *source* means the language from which the word has spread to the various languages. The source of a Slavic loanword is the language from which the borrowing directly entered the Lithuanian language.

There are three main groups of borrowings from neighbouring languages: Germanisms, Slavisms, and Latvisms. In general, it is not difficult to distinguish loanwords from indigenous words. Difficulties may arise if very old loanwords are analysed. In his study of Latvian Slavisms, I. Koškin points out several problems with loanwords: their chronology and the difficulty in determining whether a verb is an own word or a loanword (Кошкин 2014: 2). Lithuanian linguistics does not emphasise this problem, but when examining borrowed words of the Lithuanian language, especially in the texts of the GDL from the 16th to 17th centuries, it is noted that etymological sources often give different origins of borrowed Slavisms. When the equivalent of the loanword is found only in one Slavic language or when there are some solid criteria for the origin (e.g., the representation of the Polish nasal letters), there are no such variations, otherwise they occur due to the chosen research methodology of Slavisms. Matching words are words that could potentially be considered as sources of a loanword because of the overlap in root, suffixes, and meanings. They are searched for in Slavic dictionaries of the relevant period.

The reasons for borrowing usually include the need of the language for a new word, attempts to express more precisely the nuances of an utterance; bilingualism; the rarity of an indigenous word in a particular region; etc. (Grzega 2003: 23). The oldest Slavisms of the Lithuanian language are believed to be 9th-11th century loanwords from western dialects of Eastern Slavic, e.g. *muilas, stiklas* (LKE 2008: 503). Chronologically, closer contacts were established with the Eastern Slavs and the Polish speakers later, from the 15th-17th c. (Jakaitienė 2009: 229; Zinkevičius 2002: 106). There are three phases of the Polish language: Old Polish (14th-15th c.), Middle Polish (16th-18th c.) and Modern Polish (late 18th c. to present). The loanwords of AC and DC could have reached Lithuanian only from the first two. The periodisation of Eastern Slavic is more complex. Old Russian, sometimes called Old Eastern Slavic, began to split into eastern and western variants in the 13th and 14th centuries. The present Russian language was formed on the basis of eastern dialects (*великорусский язык*). The south-western part of the area was included in the territory of the GDL, and there, around the 13th century, the written Ruthenian language began to emerge. By the 15th century it had already been definitively formed, and it had undergone influence of a range of languages, including Polish, Lithuanian, Czech, Latin, and German. For this reason, it became in-

creasingly different from the eastern variant of the Old Russian language (Золтан 2014: 43). It should be noted that educated people of higher social status in the territory of the GDL used more than one language: Church Slavonic, Latin, Polish, Lithuanian, and Ruthenian. The latter was initially used only as an administrative language, but by the middle of the 15th century it had become widely used (Темчинас 2012: 47) even in religious texts. Therefore, the term *administrative language* is not accurate for this language. Various researchers refer to Ruthenian (*книжная проста мова*) as Western Russian (*западнарусский язык*), Old Belarusian (*старобелорусский язык*), Old Belarusian Literary (*старобелорусский литературный язык*), Old Ukrainian (*староукраинский язык*), Old Ukrainian Literary (*староукраинский книжный язык*) or even Polish-Belorussian (*język polsko-białoruski*). Thus, the AC and DC Slavisms may come from the western dialects of Eastern Slavic, Old Russian, Ruthenian, and Polish.

VERBS OF DC AND AC. A total of 18 Slavic root verbs were found in these sources among all verb forms found in the DC and the AC. Although verbs are more difficult to transfer from one language to another compared to nominals, loan verbs are also a comprehensive part of the verb system of the recipient language, as shown by their derivatives, especially the participles (Булыка 1980: 223). When examining verbs the root of which is obviously borrowed, it is necessary to establish the formal suffixal morphological structure - the suffixes are distinguished by analogy with the derivationally decomposable Lithuanian verbs. The suffixes of almost all borrowed root verbs found in the AC and the DC have analogues in the Slavic languages: usually Polish, Eastern Slavic suffixes *-ować*, *-овати* (*-овать*, *-авать*, *-евать*) correspond to suffix *-avoti* in Lithuanian; Lithuanian verbs with *-yti*, *-ija*, *-ijo* correspond to Slavic verbs with suffixes *-ić* (*-yć*), *-ити* (*-ыти*), and verbs with *-(i)oti*, *-(i)oja*, *-(i)ojo* correspond to Slavic verbs with the suffixes *-ać*, *-ати* (*-аць*, *-ать*, *-ять*). Thus, the following loan verbs are found in the AC and DC:

• *afieravoti* (*affierawôtas* AC 82,8), *-avoja* (*affierawóiẹ̆* DC 99,15), [*-avojo*] 'to sacrifice' in LKŽe; *dėkavoti* (*dekawoſime* AC 63,5; *dêkawodami* DC 77,12), [*-avoja*], [*-avojo*] 'to thank, say thank you' in LKŽe; [*karūnavoti*], [*-avoja*], *-avojo* (*Karunowóimas* AC 94,1) 'to coronate, to crown' in LKŽe; *kryžavoti* (*nukryʒawotas* AC 16,2), [*-avoja*], [*-avojo*] / *kryžiavoti* (*Nukriǯẹ̆wôtas* DC 23,12; *nukriǯẹ̆wôtas* DC 33,16), [*-iavoja*], [*-iavojo*] 'to crucify; punish by nailing to the cross' in LKŽe; [*rokavoti*], *-avoja* (*rokawôiůs* DC 68,1; *rokawôies* DC 68,7), *-avojo* 'to settle' in LKŽe;

• [*bliužnyti*], *-ija* (*blúʒniia* DC 77,19), [*-ijo*] 'to speak badly, talk dirty' in LKŽe; *krikštyti* (*krykßtytas* AC 7,20), [*-ija*], *-ijo* (*apſikrikßtiis* AC 7,14; *apſikríkßtii*ẹ DC 10,14; *kríkßtiio* DC 11,1) 'to baptize, give a name' in LKŽe; [*liečyti*], [*-ija*], *-ijo* (*ižliecǯiiimo* DC 87,1m) 'to cure' in LKŽe; *pravyti* (*prawitumbime* AC 71,13),

[-*ija*], [-*ijo*] 'to govern'; [*rėdyti*], -*o* (*rêdo* DC 31,11), -[*ė*] 'to lead, manage' in LKŽe; *rodyti* (*parôdjt* AC 89,10), [-*ija*], [-*ijo*] 'to advise' in LKŽe; [*sviečyti*], -[*ija*], -*ijo* (*ſwiecʒiiimo* DC 86,7m) 'to witness' in LKŽe; *velyti* (*beweļit* DC 28,3), [-*ija*], [-*ijo*] 'to prefer, be more willing, give preference' in LKŽe; *žyčyti* (*ʒicʒidami* DC 71,1m), [-*ija*], [-*ijo*] ' to wish' in LKŽe;

• *daboti* (*dabodamiês* AC 74,7), [-*oja*], [-*ojo*] 'to look at, regard, consider' in LKŽe; [*prisiegoti*], -*oja* (*príſsiegóia* DC 77,21), [-*ojo*] 'to wow' in LKŽe; [*terioti*], -*ioja* (*patẻrîoia* DC 92,6; *Nẻ tẻrîoiẻ* DC 92,19; *tẻrôiẻm* DC 93,11), [-*iojo*] 'to lose, deprive of something, waste' in LKŽe.

The verb *prierauti* (*Ne priierauk* AC 60,15; *priérauʒ* AC 68,18; *pryieráuk* DC 74,1m; *pryierauʒ* DC 84,4m), [-*auja*], [-*avo*] 'to adulterate, fornicate' in LKŽe stands out of all the verbs found in the catechism because it contains the suffix -*auti*, which is not characteristic of the Lithuanian loanwords. In rare cases, verbs in old Lithuanian writings are integrated by modifying the suffix, even though both Slavic and Lithuanian allow the verb to be taken over without any irregular changes. The most common connections can be observed between the atypical suffix for loanwords, the meaning of a borrowed word, and the derivational processes in the Lithuanian language: when a common root nominal functions alongside such a verb in the Lithuanian language, the derivational relationship is most likely established in the Lithuanian language system and the verb is a hybrid, i.e. a Lithuanian derivative of a borrowed verb with indigenous suffixes. Hybrids are inseparable from word formation because it is through the latter that hybrids emerge – the most important condition for hybrids is a clearly defined base word (Keinys 1984: 114). This is especially the case where a verb with an obviously non-native root is given a suffix in the recipient language that does not formally correspond to the suffix of Slavic verbs, a post-positional base word of the derivative exists and the derivational category of the derivative can be determined. In this case, *prierauti* is a typical derivative of the noun *prieras* 'adulterer', which is also witnessed in the Dictionary by Sirvydas of 1620; the general meaning of this category is 'to behave in the same way as the person or other creature named by the reference word' (DLKG 1997: 392).

Thus, loan verbs in Lithuanian can theoretically be considered to be derivationally decomposable if they exist in the same language with a common root noun, but it is first necessary to search for the full Slavic equivalents of the potential loan verb. In addition to the above-mentioned *prierauti*, all the other verbs found in AC and DC have exact equivalents in possible donor languages, so there is no reason to assume that these verbs are derivatives of the Lithuanian language rather than direct loanwords. Although the largest number of verbs are those that cannot be traced back to their exact origin, the donor language of some of them can be guessed more accurately, considering various criteria.

Seven loanwords of AC and DC entered Lithuanian from Eastern Slavic. Although the origin of Slavisms is often problematic – the morphological and phonetic expression of their Slavic equivalents is sometimes so similar that it is almost impossible to determine the source of the borrowing - there are criteria that clearly indicate the donor language. Phonological laws represent some of such criteria. A very important stage in the development of Eastern Slavic was the denasalisation of nasal vowels, which must have occurred by the 9th century (ИГРЯ 1981: 53), i.e. *ǫ became *u*, *ę became *'a*. Polish still has nasal vowels today, although their quality and distribution are changed (Чекмон 1988: 144–146). Polish [*en*], [*em*], and [*on*], [*om*] are represented by *en/em* and *on/om* in Lithuanian, and it is the realisation of these vowels that makes it clear whether the loanwords come from Polish or from Eastern Slavic. There are some very old loanwords in Lithuanian, taken over from the Eastern Slavs when they had not yet lost their nasal vowels, e.g. *lenkas*, but they are rare. The words, which were adopted into Lithuanian after the 9th century, already have a clear vowel representation/non-representation of the nasal vowels of Slavic languages, which demonstrates the indisputable origin of the loanwords: *dėkavoti*, [-*avoja*], [-*avojo*] < Old.Rus. *дяковати* 'благодарить' (СРЯ T. 4: 402), Ruthenian *дяковати* 'дзякаваць' (ГСБМ T. 9, 136; ССМ T. 1: 342) (cf. Pol. *dziękować* (SPol T. 6: 459); [*prisiegoti*], -*oja*, [-*ojo*] < Old.Rus. *присягати* 'присягать, давать клятву' (СРЯ T. 20: 48), Ruthenian *присягати, присегати, прысегати, прысягати* 1. 'прысягаць'; 2. 'пакляўшыся, запэўніваць каго-н. у чым-н.' (ГСБМ T. 29: 20) (cf. Pol. *przysięgać* (SS T. 7: 349); [*rėdyti*], -*o*, -[*ė*] < Old.Rus. *рядити* 1. 'править, управлять'; 2. 'начальствовать'; 3. 'распоряжаться'; 4. 'завещать'; 5. 'распределять, раздавать'; 6. 'судить'; 7. 'устраивать'; 8. 'исчислять' (СДЯ T. 3: 230), Ruthenian *рядити* 'рыхтаваць, нала   джваць, упарадкоўваць' (ГСБМ T. 31: 24) (cf. Pol. *rządzić, rzędzić* (SS T. 8: 70)). The latter verb is interesting because usually loanwords with the suffix -*yti* in the genitive case retain the suffixal element in both the present and the past tense (e.g. *būbnyti*, -*ija*, -*ijo*, *gvoltyti*, -*ija*, -*ijo*), but *rėdyti* is used in almost all old writings as a verb of mixed type.

The phonetics of the verb *krikštyti* (*krykßtytas* AC 7, 20), [-*ija*], -*ijo* is also closer to its Eastern Slavic counterparts, and there is a long-standing consensus that it is a borrowing from the Old Russian *крестити*, *крьстити* 'крестить, обращать в христианство, совершая (совершив) обряд крещения' (СРЯ T. 8: 42).

Another significant process for the Lithuanian loanwords from Slavic languages has taken place in their system of consonantalization. Around the 14th c. only naturally soft consonants began to harden – *ž*, *š*, *č*, *c*, *r*. The softness of these consonants is often reflected in Old Slavic writings – they were not followed by *я* or *ю*, as there was no need to mark softness twice. These consonants can be used to determine the approximate chronology of the loanword, and through it,

the source of the borrowed word. The verb in DC *kryžiavoti*, [*-iavoja*], [*-iavojo*], i.e. the form with a soft consonant, may indicate borrowing when *ž* was still soft in the Slavic languages (*ž* began to harden in the 14th c. (ИГРЯ 1981: 63, 77)), which means an early borrowing from the Eastern Slavic language (cf. Ruthenian *крыжовати*, *крижавати*, *крижовати* 'крыжаваць, распінаць на крыжы' (ГСБМ Т. 16: 192); Pol. *krzyżować* 'przybijać do krzyża, zawieszać na krzyżu' (SPol T. 11: 361)). The variant *kryžavoti*, [*-avoja*], [*-avojo*] used in the AC probably reflects a later period, especially since such a verb is evidenced not only in the AC, but also in the Catechism of M. Mažvydas.

Sometimes the path of a borrowing into Lithuanian can be determined by the fact that no formal equivalent is found in another possible donor language, or that it is found in later sources and is extremely rare. This is the case with the verb [*terioti*], *-ioja*, [*-iojo*]: its equivalents exist in Old Russian and Ruthenian (Old. Rus. *терѧти* 'терять, губить' (СДЯ Т. 3: 259); *теряти* 1. 'приводить в неустройсто; позорять, портить'; 2. 'лишаться'; 3. 'напрасно тратить, растрачивать' (СДЯ XI–XIV Т. 29: 319); Ruthenian *теряти* 1. 'траціць, страчаць'; 2. 'выдаткоўваць' (ГСБМ Т. 33: 273), while in Polish the possible equivalent is found only in dialects (Pol. *terać* 1. 'niszczyć'; 2. 'poniewierać'; 3. 'marnotrawić, niszczyć' (SGP T. 5: 396)). Furthermore, the suffix *-ioti* is phonetically closer to the Slavic *-яти* than to the Polish *-ać* (which would be adopted as *-oti*).

Eastern Slavic loanwords include also *velyti*, [*-ija*], [*-ijo*], found in DC. However, when analysing the possible Slavic equivalents of this verb, there is a difference between the meaning witnessed in the DC and the Slavic meanings of the verbs: Old.Rus. *велѣти* 'велеть' (СРЯ Т. 2: 60); *велѣти* 1. 'велеть, приказывать:'; 2. 'разрешать' (СДЯ XI–XIV Т. 1: 391); Ruthenian *велети* 'загадаць' (ГСБМ Т. 3: 81); *велїти*, *велѣти*. '(що) веліти' (ССМ Т. 1: 163); Pol. *wielić* 1. 'rozkazywać, nakazywać', 2. 'głosić chwałę, sławę, wielbić' (SS T. 10: 161) (cf. Lith. 'prefer, be more willing, give preference'). In other Lithuanian language sources, e.g. Wolfenbüttel's Postilla, *velyti* is also used in the Slavic sense of 'to command, order' (in LKŽe). Formal equivalents exist in Polish, Ruthenian, and Old Russian, so it is difficult to determine the origin of the loanword on the basis of the criterion of equivalence alone. However, examining all the meanings in the Lithuanian language (1. 'to want, to wish, to desire'; 2. 'to wish smb smth, to wish for something to happen to someone'; 3. 'to allow, not to forbid'; 4. 'to prefer, to be more willing, to give preference to'; 5. 'to advise, to recommend'; 6. 'to command, to order'), in addition to the meaning 'to command, order' common to Lithuanian and Slavic languages, the meaning 'to allow, not to forbid' is found in Old Russian. It is believed that the meaning 'to prefer, to be more willing, to give preference to' is due to the influence of the verb *velti, velia,*

vėlė 1. 'to allow', 2. 'to prefer, to be more willing, to give preference to', which is now an archaism (Smoczyński 2020: 1958).

Only two loanwords may have originated in Lithuanian from Polish - [*bliužnyti*], -ija, [-*ijo*] (Ruthenian *блюзнити, блознити, блузнити* 'блюзніць' (ГСБМ Т. 2: 77); *блюзнити* 'поносить, клеветать; богохульствовать'; *блюзнитися* 'хулиться' (МДСУМ Т. 1: 59); Pol. *bluźnić, bluznić* 1. 'znieważać słowami albo postępowaniem Boga lub świętych; ubliżać czemuś, co jest związane z wiarą i religią; błądzić w rzeczach wiary, głosić fałszywą naukę religijną'; 2. 'występować przeciwko komuś lub czemuś, lżyć, obrażać, spotwarzać (poza sferą wiarz i religii)' (SPol T. 2: 191). The spelling of this loanword varies to some extent in the old writings, even in the same source – in another work by M. Daukša «Postilla» - it is sometimes spelled *blúźniia,* sometimes *blużnija.* Only the second variant is used in the DC. This spelling may indicate an intuitive attempt to convey the very soft Polish *z* in *bluźnić.* This would suggest that the borrowing variant *bliùžnyti, -ija, -ijo* originated from Polish, while the adjacent variant *bliùznyti, -ija, -ijo* came from Eastern Slavic or Polish.

Another verb, which probably also came to Lithuanian from Polish, is *žyčyti,* [-*ija*], [-*ijo*], witnessed only in DC. This source uses it only in the sense of 'to wish smb smth' but considering all the meanings in Lithuanian 1. 'to lend to'; 2. 'to borrow'; 3. 'to wish' (in LKŽe), there is a greater probability that it is a derivative from the Polish language (cf. Pol. *życzyć* 1. 'udzielić, dać, użyczyć'; 2. 'wyrażać uczucia przyjazne, życzliwe lub nieprzyjazne, nieżyczliwe' (SS T. 11: 604) and Old.Rus. *зычити* 'благоволить, желать добра' (СРЯ Т. 6: 72); Ruthenian *жичити, жичыти, жьчити, жьчыти* 'жадаць' (ГСБМ Т. 10: 41); *зычити* '(що кому) зичити, бажати' (ССМ Т. 1: 412), *жичити* 'желать, хотеть' (МДСУМ Т. 1: 253).

It has already been mentioned that when studying Slavisms in Lithuanian, it is usually difficult to identify the exact donor language. Most of the verbs borrowed from AC and DC are assigned to verbs of uncertain origin, because neither the meaning of the borrowed verb, nor its morphology, nor other criteria indicate a clear donor language: *afieravoti, -avoja,* [-*avojo*] < Ruthenian *оферовати, офяровати* 'прыносіць у ахвяру каго-, што-н.' (ГСБМ Т. 23: 326), Pol. *ofiarować, ofierować* 'składać ofiarę rytualną Bogu lub bóstwu' (SPol T. 21: 22); [*karūnavoti*], [-*avoja*], -*avojo* < Old.Rus. *короновати, коруновати* 'короновать, венчать на царство' (СРЯ Т. 7: 341), Ruthenian *короновати, коруновати* 'каранаваць, вянчаць каго-н. на царства ці вышэйшую духоўную ўладу' (ГСБМ Т. 16: 29), Pol. *koronować, korunować* 'kłaść na głowę koronę (wieniec) jako znak władzy, uznania, chwały, wieńczyć, zdobić' (SS T. 3: 378); [*liečyti*], [-*ija*], -*ijo* < Old.Rus. *лѣчити* 'лечить' (СРЯ Т. 8: 223); Ruthenian *лечити, лечыти* 'лячыць' (ГСБМ Т. 17: 21); Pol. *leczyć* 'stosować w chorobie leki lub zabiegi lecznicze w celu przy-

wrócenia zdrowia człowiekowi lub zwierzęciu' (SPol T. 12: 85); *pravyti*, [*-ija*], [*-ijo*] < Old.Rus. *правити* 'делать, исполнять, совершать, осуществлять что-л.' (СРЯ Т. 18: 110); Ruthenian *правити* 'выконваць што-н.' (ГСБМ Т. 27: 449); Pol. *prawić* 'wykonywać, czynić' (SPol T. 30: 126); *rodyti*, [*-ija*], [*-ijo*] < Old. Rus. *радити* 'советовать' (СРЯ Т. 21: 123); Ruthenian *радити*, *радить* 'даваць параду' (ГСБМ Т. 29: 436); Pol. *radzić* 'zalecać określone postępowanie' (SS T. 7: 429); [*rokavoti*], *-avoja*, *-avojo* < Ruthenian *раховати* 1. 'рабіць накладкі, лічыць'; 2. 'улічваць, прыкідваць, браць пад увагу' (ГСБМ Т. 30: 32); Pol. *rachować* 1. 'liczyć, obliczać, zliczać'; 2. 'wliczać, uwzględniać przy liczeniu'; 3. 'brać pod uwagę, uwzględniać, rizważać, rozpatrywać' (SPol T. 35: 4); [*sviečyti*], *-[ija]*, *-ijo* < Ruthenian *сведчити, сведчыти, светчити, светчить, светчыти, светчыть, свечити* 1. 'паведамляць, пацвярджаць што-н. у якасці сведкі або дасведчанай асобы'; 2. 'заключаць у сабе якія-н. звесткі' 3. 'быць сведчаннем чаго-н.' 4. 'пацвярджаць што-н. (у заяве ці дакуменце)' 5. 'даваць паказанні (на судзе)' (ГСБМ Т. 31: 83); *свядчить* (ГСБМ Т. 31: 144); Pol. *świadczyć, świaczczyć, świaszczyć, świaczyć, świadszyć, świedczyć, świedszyć* 1. 'składać zeznanie w sądzie, występować w charakterze świadka'; 2. 'wspierać sprawę w sądzie czyimś zeznaniem lub jakimś stwierdzonym faktem'; 3. 'wypowiadać się, składać oświadczenie, wydawać urzędowe orzeczenia, zaświadczenia'; 4. 'potwierdzać, głosić coś, czego się było świadkiem, o czym się dobrze wie'; 5. 'dowodzić, udowadniać'; 6. 'nakazywać, pouczać, napominać'; 7. 'upominać, ostrzegać' (SS T. 9: 40). Verbs with the elements *d, t* are more frequently witnessed in the Slavic languages: *сведчити, сведчыти, светчити, светчить, светчыти, светчыть*; *świadszyć, świedczyć, świedszyć, świadczyć*. For the old Lithuanian writings, the form without these elements is more common, but in general only the second component of the consonant clusters *kg, gk, td, dt, tč, dč* is pronounced consistently (Pakerys 2003: 78). It should be noted that verbs without *d, t* are also witnessed in Slavic languages: Ruthenian *свечити*, Polish *świaczyć*.

A more interesting Slavism *daboti*, [*-oja*], [*-ojo*] is worth considering. In old writings of the Lithuanian language, for example, in the Chyliński Bible, the verb *dboti*, *-oja*, *-ojo* is witnessed. It is this verb that is the exact, original loanword from the Slavic languages (cf. Ruthenian *дбати, тбати* 1. 'праяўляць клопаты аб кім-н., чым-н., турбавацца (пра каго-н., што-н.), думаць аб кім-н., чым-н.'; 2. 'звяртаць увагу, заўважаць' (ГСБМ Т. 7: 272); *дбати* 1. '(робити що) занедбувати, занедбати'; 2. '(чого и без додатка) не зважати (на що)' (ССМ Т. 1: 286); *дбати* 1. 'заботиться, иметь попечение, радеть.'; 2. 'обращать внимание' (МДСУМ Т. 1: 201); Pol. *dbać* 'troszczyć, starać się, mieć wzgląd; przestrzegać, przywiązywać do czego wagę' (SPol 4, 561); *dbać* 1. 'troszczyć się, starać się o coś, zwracać na coś uwagę, mieć w cenie'; 2. 'domagać się'; 3. 'ufać, mieć nadzieję' (SS T. 2: 44)). There have been attempts to argue that *daboti* re-

flects the earlier Eastern Slavic verb *dъbati before the disappearance of the reduced vowels, but this is unlikely since in Lithuanian there is no *a* instead of the Slavic ъ that was once found in the Lithuanian language. The scientific literature agrees that *a* is secondary in the verb *daboti* (Skardžius 1998: 118; Zinkevičius 1980: 110), but the argument that *a* was inserted because of the *db*, an unusual consonant cluster for Lithuanian, is debatable. If the form *dboti* is witnessed in Lithuanian, this pronunciation was probably not uncomfortable for Lithuanians in the first place, as the discomfort would have been eliminated by the immediate integration of the loanword. Another argument, that a verb without embedded vowels could only exist in writing, is also unsound since the writings in which it is witnessed were read aloud in churches. In the old Lithuanian loan verbs, the Slavic reduced vowels ъ and ь are represented by *u* and *i* (*katilas* < *котьлъ; kurtas* < *хьртъ, pulkas* < *пълкь* (Būga 1958: 340)), but not by *a*. However, it is possible that the *a* in *daboti* is not accidental. The Lithuanian noun *talpa* 1. 'the capacity to hold a quantity, capacity, volume'; 2. 'a spacious, free space, cavity' in LKŽe is related to the Slavic *tъlpa* (Būga 1959: 634), and although it is not a loanword from Slavic languages, it shows a parallel between Lith. *a* and Slav. ъ. All this suggests that the *a* in the verb *daboti* was not accidental.

CONCLUSION. Eighteen borrowed root verbs were found in the AC and DC and seventeen of them correspond to the integration system of Slavisms, i.e. the suffixal correspondence is preserved when borrowing a Slavic verb and integrating it into Lithuanian: Polish verbs with the suffix *-ować*, Eastern Slavic verbs with the suffix *-овати* have the suffix *-avoti* when integrated into Lithuanian; Lithuanian verbs with *-yti* correspond to Slavic verbs with the suffixes *-ić (-уć), -umu (-ыти, -ети, -итъ, -ытъ)*, while verbs with *-(i)oti, -(i)oja, -(i)ojo* correspond to Slavic verbs with *-ać, -ати (-яти)*. Only one verb has a clearly borrowed root, but its suffix is not typical of loan verbs – *prierauti* (AC 60,15; 68,18; DC 74,1m; 84,4m). In such cases, verbs, especially when there is a co-occurring noun are considered to be hybrids – derivatives of the loanword, in this case, – *prieras*.

Five Lithuanian loanwords are undoubtedly derived from Eastern Slavic languages, as evidenced by the phonetics of the loanwords: *dėkavoti, prisiegoti, rėdyti, krikštyti* and *kryžiavoti*. The path of the syllables to the recipient language is illustrated by important historical processes in Slavic languages – the denasalisation of nasal vowels and the hardening of naturally only soft consonants – *ž, š, č, c, r*. The verb *kryžavoti*, the variant of the verb kryžiavoti, probably reflects a later borrowing. The two borrowings probably come from Eastern Slavic languages. Sometimes, the equivalents of the Lithuanian loanwords are found in only one possible language, similarly with the verb *terioti*, but the possible equivalent of this verb is also found in Polish dialects. Therefore, there is a possibility, albeit a slight one, that the relevant verb simply did not find its way into the writings of

the respective period. The loan verb *velyti* is classified as an Eastern Slavic loanword because of its meaning closer to its equivalent.

The donor language of only two verbs, both witnessed only in DC, is most likely Polish. *Bliužnyti*, according to its spelling, is closer to the Polish verb, i.e. perhaps an intuitive attempt to reproduce the Polish very soft *z* in *bluźnić* is observed. *Žyčyti* is assigned to Polonisms because of its meanings closer to the Polish verb *życzyć* than to Eastern Slavic verbs.

The number of Slavic verbs (*afieravoti*, *karūnavoti*, *liečyti*, *pravyti*, *rodyti*, *rokavoti*, *sviečyti*, *daboti*) for which the donor language is unknown is slightly higher than the number of loanwords from the Eastern Slavic languages as there are no objective criteria to determine the specific origin of these loanwords.

References

Biržiška, Vaclovas. Senųjų lietuviškų knygų istorija. Čikaga: Čikagos lietuvių literatūros draugija, 1953.

Būga, Kazys. Rinktiniai raštai. T. 1. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1958.

Būga, Kazys. Rinktiniai raštai. T. 2. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1959.

Bystroń, Jan. Katechizm Ledesmy w przekładzie wschodniolitewskim. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego pod zarządem A. M. Kosterkiewicza, 1890.

DLKG: Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika. Vytautas Ambrazas (par.). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1997.

Grzega, Joachim. "Borrowings as a Word-Finding in Cognitive Historical Onomasiology". Onomasiology Online, 2003: 22–42. <http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/OnOn.htm> 01.09.2023.

Jakaitienė, Evalda. Leksikologija. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, 2009.

Judžentis, Artūras, Jūratė Pajėdienė. „Mikalojaus Daukšos Katekizmo (1595) sudėtiniai prijungiamieji priežasties sakiniai". Baltu filoloģija 15/1–2, 2006: 27–40.

Judžentis, Artūras. „Ledesmos 1605 m. katekizmo priežasties ir tikslo sakiniai". Lituanistica 56, 2010: 92–103.

Keinys, Stasys. „Lietuvių kalbos hibridai (sąvoka, rūšys ir normiškumas)". Lietuvos TSR Mokslų Akademijos darbai. A serija, 1984: 113–123.

Korzo, Margarita. „Polski przekład katechizmu Jakuba Ledesmy TJ i jego wpływ na tradycję unicką w XVII w.". Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce, XLVIII, 2004: 149–159.

Lebedys, Jurgis. Mikalojus Daukša. Vilnius: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla, 1963.

LKE: Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija. Vytautas Ambrazas (red.). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2008.

LKŽe: Lietuvių kalbos elektroninis žodynas. <http://www.lkz.lt/> 01.09.2023.

Michelini, Guido. „Daukšos Katekizmo šaltinių klausimai". Baltistica 34/2, 1999: 259–261.

Michelini, Guido. „Itališkas Ledesmos Katekizmas Dottrina Christiana: Daukšos panaudoto lenkiško teksto šaltinis". Acta Linguistica Lithuanica 44, 2001: 227–250.

Palionis, Jonas. Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a. Vilnius: Mintis, 1967.

SGP: Słownik gwar polskich (red. J. A. L. Karłowicz). T. 1–6. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1900–1911.

Sittig, Ernst. Der polnische Katechismus des Ledezma und die litauischen Katechismen des Daugßa und des Anonymus vom Jahre 1605. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929.

Skardžius, Pranas. Rinktiniai raštai. T 4. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1998.

Smetonienė, Anželika. „Slavizmai veiksmažodžiai ir slaviškos šaknies hibridai". Acta Linguistica Lithuanica 74, 2016: 68–88.

Smoczyński, Wojciech. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego. <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21280621/Smo%D1%81zy%C5%84ski%20W.%20S%C5%82ownik%20etymologiczny%20j%C4%99zyka%20litewskiego.pdf> 01.09.2023.

SPol: Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku. T. 1–. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź: 1966–.

SS: Słownik staropolski. T. 1–11. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź: 1953–2002.

Wohlgemuth, Jan. A Typology of Verbal Borrowings. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH&-Co, 2009.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas. „Apie 1605 m. katekizmo tarmę". Baltistica 4 (1), 1968: 109–116.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas. Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1980.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas. Lietuvių kalbos istorija, 3. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1988.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas. Rinktiniai raštai. T. 1. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2002.

Булыка, Аляксандр Мікалаевіч. Лексічныя запазычанні ў беларускай мове XIV–XVIII ст. Мінск: Навука і тэхніка, 1980.

[Bulyka, Aliaksandr Mikalajevič. Lieksičnyja zapazyčanni ŭ bielaruskaj movie XIV–XVIII st. Minsk: Navuka i technika, 1980]

ГСБМ: Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы. Т. 1–. Мінск: 1982–.

[HSBM: Histaryčny sloŭnik bielaruskaj movy. T. 1–. Minsk: 1982–]

Золтан, Андраш. Interslavica. Москва: Индрик, 2014.

[Zoltan, Andraš. Interslavica. Moskva: Indrik, 2014]

ИГРЯ: Горшкова, К. В., Хабургаев, Г. А. Историческая грамматика русского языка. Москва: Высшая школа, 1981.

[IGRÂ: Gorškova, K. V., Haburgaev, G. A. Istoričeskaâ grammatika russkogo âzyka. Moskva: Vysšaâ škola, 1981]

Кошкин, Игорь. «Древнейшие славизмы в латышском языке: некоторые проблемы исторической реконструкции». Studia Slavica Hung., 59/1, 2014: 1–13.

[Koškin, Igor′. «Drevnejšie slavizmy v latyšskom âzyke: nekotorye problemy istoričeskoj rekonstrukcii». Studia Slavica Hung., 59/1, 2014: 1–13]

МДСУМ: Тимченко Євген Костянтинович, Матеріали до словника писемної та книжної української мови. Т. 1–2. Київ – Нью-Йорк: Націонална академія наук України, 2002–2003.

[MDSUM: Timčenko Êvgen Kostântinovič, Materìali do slovnika pisemnoï ta knižnoï ukraïns′koï movi. T. 1–2. Kiïv – N′û-Jork: Nacìonalna akademìâ nauk Ukraïni, 2002–2003]

СДЯ: Словарь древнерусского языка (ред. И. И. Срезневский). Т. 1–3. Москва: Книга, 1989.

[CDÂ: Slovar′ drevnerusskogo âzyka (red. I. I. Sreznevskij). T. 1–3. Moskva: Kniga, 1989]

СДЯ XI–XIV: Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.). Т. 1–. Москва: 1988–.

[CDÂ XI–XIV: Slovar′ drevnerusskogo âzyka (XI–XIV vv.). T. 1–. Moskva: 1988–]

СРЯ: Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв. Т. 1–. Москва: Наука, 1975–.

[SRÂ: Slovar′ russkogo âzyka XI–XVII vv. T. 1–. Moskva: Nauka, 1975–]

ССМ: Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст. (ред. Л. Л. Гумецка). Т. 1–2. Київ: Наукова думка, 1977–1978.

[SSM: Slovnik staroukraïns′koï movi XIV–XV ct. (red. L. L. Gumecka). T. 1–2. Kiïv: Naukova dumka, 1977–1978]

Темчинас, Сергеюс. «О времени и условиях становления руськой мовы в качестве литературного языка». [В:] I. Э. Багдановіч, С. М. Запрудскі, Г. А. Цыхун, А. А. Сушка (ред.) Новае слова ў беларусістыцы. Матэрыялы V Міжнароднага кангрэса беларусістаў. Мінск, 20–21мая 2010 года. Мінск: Выдавецтва «Четыре четверты», 2012, 47–52.

[Temchinas, Sergeĩus. «O vremeni i usloviĩakh stanovleniĩa rus′koĩ movy v kachestve literaturnogo iazyka». [V:] I. Ė. Bagdanovich, S. M. Zaprudski, G. A. T͡Sykhun, A. A. Sushka (red.) Novae slova ŭ belarusistytsy. Matėryialy V Mizhnarodnaga kangrė-sa belarusistaŭ. Minsk, 20–21maia 2010 goda. Minsk: Vydavet͡stva «Chetyre chetverty», 2012, 47–52]

Чекман, Валерий Николаевич. Введение в славянскую филологию. Вильнюс: Мокслас, 1988.

[Čekman, Valerij Nikolaevič. Vvedenie v slavânskuû filologiû. Vil′nûs: Mokslas, 1988]

Resources

AC – Anoniminis 1605 m. katekizmas. < http://seniejirastai.lki.lt/db.php?source=44> 01.09.2023.

DC – Palionis, Jonas. Mikalojaus Daukšos 1595 m. katekizmas. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1995.

Анжелика Сметонијене

ПОРЕКЛО СЛОВЕНСКИХ ГЛАГОЛА У *ДАУКШИНОМ КАТИХИЗИСУ* (1595) И *АНОНИМНОМ КАТИХИЗИСУ* (1605)

Резиме

У 16. веку катихизиси су уопште имали главну улогу у ширењу католичанства, при чему су посебну препоруку за развијање религијских знања имали језуитски катихизиси Петера Канисијуса, Роберта Баларминa и Јакоба Ледесме. Ледесмин катихизис *Dottrina Christiana, a modo di dialogo del Maestro, et Discepolo, per insegnare alli Fanciulli* преведен је на пољски, а касније и на ливански. Први превод, који је урадио Микалојус Даукша (у тексту рада DC), објављен је 1595. године. Други превод објављен је десет година касније, када је анонимни преводилац превео Ледесмин катихизис на основу Даукшиног катихизиса (у тексту рада АС). У овом чланку испитију се глаголски славизми, а њихово порекло одређује се на основу различитих критеријума. Како би се тај циљ постигао, из оба катихизиса ексцерпирани су основни облици позајмљених инфинитава и њихови деривати, глаголи који се не понављају су дефинисани и уопштени, а префиксалне изведенице су искључене из даље анализе уколико се значење префиксалног глагола разликује у односу на мотивни глагол и уколико је модификован само суфиксом. Ови кратки катихизиси садрже 18 позајмљених основних облика глагола, од којих 17 прати систем интеграције славизама, што подразумева да се суфикс чува приликом преузимања словенског глагола и његовог интегрисања у литвански. Само се глагол *prierauti* класификује као литванска изведеница од већ позајмљене именице, тј. као хибрид. Седам славизама у анализираним текстовима класификовани су као источнословенски због њихове фонетике и значења, док се један класификује као источнословенски јер нису пронађени могући еквиваленти у пољском језику из тог периода. Два глагола класификују се као полонизми узимајући у обзир значење и фонетику глагола и њихове могуће еквиваленте. Осам славизама нема познат језик-давалац јер не постоје објективни критеријуми помоћу којих би се одредило порекло тих позајмљеница.

Кључне речи: *Даукшин катихизис*, *Анонимни катихизис*, глаголи, хибриди, славизми, порекло позајмљеница.