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**SANTRAUKOS / SUMMARIES**

***Raimonda Šarkytė***

***Sta* Stem Verbs with Long Root Attested in the Texts of Mikalojus Daukša**

The aim of this article was to explore long rooted *sta* stem verbs attested in the old texts of Mikalojus Daukša. 49 verbs in question have been found, 25 of which have a long vowel, 4 verbs have a diphtong and 20 verbs have tautosvllabiccombinations with *n* in their root.

The analysis of attested verbs allowed highlighting the most prominent peculiarities of usage of verbs in the texts of Daukša and his contemporaries Mažvydas and Bretkūnas, also in Lithuanian dialects and contemporary Lithuanian language:

1. In the works of the aforementioned author stable *sta* stem structures, complying with the oaradigm structure requirements, prevail, thus the majority of them correspond to the forms used in the contemporary Lithuanian language. The only complementary forms found in the works of Daukša *mėgsta* ∥ *mėgia*, *noka* ∥ *noksta* testify the expansion of *sta* stem. Semantic and constructional coding in the majority of attested verbs is optimal, that is, semantic characteristics of verbs in question (namely, spontaneous, reflexive, intransitive, and frequently resultative action) are reinforced by a morphological marker *sta*.

2. The present and past forms found in the texts of Mažvydas and Bretkūnas in the majority of cases correspond to those attested in Daukša‘s texts, the verbs do not have any prominent structural differences in the works of all three authors, the only complementary forms *plūsta* ∥ *plūdžia* have been found in the texts of Bretkūnas. This author used *a* stem verb *prašoka* differently from Daukša, who preferred *sta* stem forms for the same meaning.

3. In Lithuanian dialects complementary forms vary in their morphological root structure, that is, several infix forms, *a* and *ia* stem forms have been registered in Aukštaitija region as substitutes for *sta* stem forms. In the current Lithuanian language only optimally transparent and iconic *sta* stem forms, complying with assymetry of semantic and morphological coding are being used.

***Ona Aleknavičienė***

**Gottfried Ostermeyre‘s inscriptions in the manuscripts of Jacob Brodowski: *Litauische Spichwörter und Rätsel* and *Lexicon Germanico-Lithvanicvm et Lithvanico-Germanicυm***

The article addresses the problem of authorship of the manuscript collection of sayings, proverbs and riddles *Litauische Spichwörter und Rätsel* (PR) kept at the Wroblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences (LMAVB RS: F 137–1). Amidst the units of small folklore recorded by the principal compiler of the manuscript – precentor of Trempen (Darkehmen County) Jacob Brodowski (1692–1744) – the inscriptions made by Gottfried Ostermeyer (1716–1800; from 1744 – precentor of Trempen, from 1752 – priest) can also be found: 16 German and 11 Lithuanian phrases. The article also discusses Ostermeyerʼs inscriptions in Brodowskiʼs dictionary *Lexicon Germanico-Lithvanicvm et Lithvanico-Germanicυm* (B; LMAVB RS: F 137–15) and analyses the linguistic peculiarities of Ostermeyerʼs inscriptions in PR and B.

1775 can be considered *terminus ad quem* of Ostermeyerʼs inscriptions in PR and B; therefore, the inscriptions may be considered earlier Ostermeyerʼs autographs compared to those previously known and dated 1781–1797.

Most of Ostermeyerʼs inscriptions are related to Brodowskiʼs entries in the collection *Litauische Spichwörter und Rätsel* by vertical relation and comprise the collectionʼs macrostructure. Eight Lithuanian units of small folklore are absent in B, thus making Ostermeyer rather than Brodowski their actual recorder (PR o1r II5–11, o1v II3–6, o7v II4–6, o10v I2–4, o18r II1–6, o20v II1–3, o24v I9–12, o24v II10–12). Of them, seven Lithuanian – six proverbs and one riddle – were recorded for the first time (PR o1v II3–6, o7v II4–6, o10v I2–4, o18r II1–6, o20v II1–3, o24v I9–12, o24v II10–12). They had not been recorded in earlier works of the Lithuanian written language; they were most likely recorded by Ostermeyer from the living language.

Ostermeyerʼs language is attributed to the south-western Aukštaitian (Highlander) subdialect by the feature which is traditionally considered the traditionally considered the principal distinctive feature of such sub-dialects: a comparatively intact vocalism of unstressed endings. Thougt the reductin of long endings and the morphological shortening of a word ending are also a characteristic of long endings and the morphological shortening of a word ending are also a characteristic feature of Ostermeyerʼs language, however, it is not as evident as in Brodowskiʼs language.

***Kristina Rutkovska*, Lietuvių kalbos skoliniai Lietuvos lenkų tarmėse / Lithuanian borrowings in Polish dialects in Lithuania**

The subject of the description in this article is a large amount of lexical borrowings from the Lithuanian language which function in Polish dialects in Lithuania. The expressions recorded in the dense areas where the Polish language is primary, that is in the Vilnius and Trakai regions as well as in parts of the Širvintos and Molėtai regions, have been analysed. The comparative chronological analysis of lithuanian borrowings as well as the analysis on thetransfer of the Baltic lexis into the Slavic dialects have been made. The verification of the historical dictionaries and vocabulary collected in the lexical studies of dialects shows that these expressions form several chronological layers (from the sparsely used 16th centuary borrowings till the latest borrowings that continue penetrating). The thematic comparison may indicate the variety of inter-ethnic relations on the former lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The inderect borrowings dominate due to the fact that a lot of borrowingspenetrated into the Polish dialects through Belarusian. This fact may be used as a linguistic evidence confirming the thesis about the Belarusian origins of the new Polish dialects in Lithuania.

***Halina Kara*ś**

**Jan Karłowiczʼs contribution to dialectology, *Słownik gwar polskich* [Dictionary of Polish Dialects] as a breakthrough project**

The paper discusses the contribution of Jan Karłowicz (1836–1903) to the development of Polish dialectology, and presents the “Dictionary of Polish Dialects” as a major breakthrough in the Polish dialectal lexicography. Jan Karłowicz, who has been long fiercely, though unjustly, criticized as a linguist (lexicographer and dialectologist), is currently re-discovered and esteemed as an organizer of scientific life. Karłowiczʼs contribution to the research on dialects is much more serious than what it has hitherto been consisered, and it involves an aspect of his work that has been scarcely emphasized and appreciated; namely, ethnographical and dialectological field studies that he initiated and organized.

His organizational work is attested in the prolific correspondence preserved e. g. In theLithuanian State Historical Archives. It exemplifies Karłowiczʼs co-operation with both professional scientists and laymen (enthusiasts of folklore, dialects and of broadly understood folk culture) as far as collecting ‘folk objects’ is concerned. The majority of his co-operators worked for the ethnographical journal “Wisła” that was edited by Karłowicz, and wrote articles devoted to folk culture, as well as compiled dialectal dictionaries of particular villages or small regions. Thus, the Vilnius archives mirror vividly Karłowiczʼs work as an organizer and collector of information on both Polish and – what is important – Lithuanian dialects. His contribution to the Lithuanian studies and Lithuanian dialectology has hitherto been little acknowledged, nonetheless currently this aspect of his work is much more often pointed to.

Undoubtedly, Karłowiczʼs major dialectological work is *Słownik gwar polskich* (1900–1911) [Dictionary of Polish Dialects] which has begun a new era in the history of the Polish dialectal lexicography. Though it still draws on previously published dictionaries, it can be described as a breakthrough project that marks the ending of the second period of the Polish dialectal lexicography and opens a new one. This conclusion is based on two features of Karłowiczʼs dictionary. Firstly, as compared to previously complied dictionaries, its content and source data are immense. Secondly, itʼs the first complete Slavonic dictionary (and actually the only one) covering all the dialects (except for the emigrant ones), although with a variable degree of precision. While many shortcomings of the dictionary have been pointed to from the day of its publication, it remains a valuable source of information on dialectal vocabulary. The paper discusses mainly the content of the dictionary, its sources, concept, methodology applied, as well as various opinions on the dictionary.

***Aldonas Pupkis***

**Pranas Skardžius and the grand *Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language***

The articale addresses the relationship of the well-knownLithuanian linguist Pranas Skardžius with the compilation of the grand *Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language* and the discussions with its editor Juozas Balčikonis. It corrects the idea expressed in the history of Lithuanian linguistics to this day that in 1930, when the work of compilation of the dictionary of Kazimieras Būga was resumed, Balčikonis was the only candidate for the editorʼs position. The data from the new archival documents show that a young linguist Pranas Skardžius, who had just made his return from the studies in Germany, was the first candidate. New sources lead to a conclusion that it was most likely him who initiated the revival of the dictionaryʼs compilation and took care of the staff and finances. His non-appointment as the editor could have been determined by the conflict of interests and ambitions of the government of that time and the dean of the faculty of Vytautas Magnus University Vincas Krėvė-Mickevičius.

Even if he was not elected the editor of the dictionary, Skardžius always showed his interest in the work of compilation of the dictionary and contributed to the determination of the type of the dictionary and the principles of its compilation along with Salys, even though the opinions of the editor and the young linguists did not always coincide. Whenever possible, he did not hesitate to criticise Balčikonis in the press and often brought up the editorʼs incompetence in directing the work of such significance. His continuous requests focused on the improvement of the compilation of the dictionary on scientific grounds and its publishing only after making the necessary spelling corrections. Such requests gradually evolved into a one-sided requirement to introduce the spelling promoted by him and turned into an ill-favoured war of personal whims and ambitions. This war witnessed Skardžiusʼ attempts to remove Balčikonis from the office of the editor of the grand dictionary by administrative means and to take up his position.

***Daiva Vaišnienė***

***The Dictionary of the Kretinga Dialect* by Juozas Aleksandravičius: Principles of transposition and problematic cases**

The compilation of a dialect dictionary is not only related with the problems of presentation of words and illustrations but also with rather delicate problems of equivalence of the sound system or prosodic elements of the dialect and the standard language, as well as ambiguous interpretation of dialectal phenomena. Nevertheless, in dialectaldictionaries the same phonetic phenomena can be variously transposed under the same conditions, even though thegeneral principle is applied – the transposition in strict compliance with consistent patterns, following a universal law of equivalence of sounds. The article presents several schemes of application of this principle determining varying transposition results; the problematic principles of transposition of headwords and their principal forms applied in the compilation of the dictionary of the dictionary of the Northern Samogitian dialect *The Dictionary of the Kretinga Dialect* by Juozas Aleksandravičius are also discussed; the cases of problematic transposition are addressed: a) a dialectal phonetic form is directly transposed to the standard language taking into account the dialectal consistent patterns exclusively, with no regard to the universal phonetic sound changes – assimilation, accommodation, degemination, etc.; b) the choice of equivalence of a dialectal form depends on the functioning of a regular equivalent or, according to the author, an equivqlent of identical origin, in the standard language.

***Aurimas Markevičius***

**Issues Related to Periphery of Parts of Speech**

The article is devoted to analysis of the undefined situation typical of some parts of speech and morphological forms, their ambivalent interpretation in different linguistsʼ works, dictionaries and practical grammars (especially in school grammars).

Words usually acquire the status of another part of speech due to disappearance of some grammatical forms. Following extinction of the old locative case and the postpositional locative called the allative, their remains (e.g., *namiẽ* ‘at home’, *pusiáu* ‘semi-’, *vakaróp* ‘towards evening’, etc.) became adverbs. Such cases do not raise any discussions.

Yet the illative case, which is not extinct by far and used quite often, is ignored without any reason in some works related to morphology – it is simply omitted. Therefore, both Lithuanians themselves and people from other countries learning Lithuanian oftentimes do not know what kind of form it is, how it is derived and whether it is proper to use it.

Nominalisation of adjectives is not expected to cause great problems. Nevertheless, words having similar structures and semantics are often attributed to different parts of speech. E.g., the words *bevedis*, *-ė* ‘faceless’, *juodaplaũkis*, *-ė* ‘black-haired’, are called adjectives, whereas *juodavedis*, *-ė* ‘black-faced’ is treated as noun (Dictionary of Modern Lithuanian).

Great uncertainty is characteristic of the limit separating true participles and adjectivised participles. Adjectivisation of the participle is almost not recognissed in Lithuanian language grammars, yet it is widely reflected in the main dictionaries of Lithuanian. Nevertheless, quite a number of cases of disagreement exists here, as well. E.g., the words *pavéldimas*, -*à* ‘inheritable’, *prakéiktas*, -*à* ‘damned’ are called adjectives in some publications yet participles in others.

The article also embraces a brief overview on the ambivalent treatment of adverbs serving the function of subordinate conjunctions (e.g., *ku* ‘where’, *kadà* ‘when’, *kap* ‘how’, *kek* ‘how many/much’, etc.). The most rational way would be treating them as relative adverbs.

***Laura Geržotaitė***

**The Southern Subdialects of the Western Aukštaitian of Šiauliai: The Geolinguistic Aspect and its Interpretation**

The article is concerned with the area of *the Šiauliai subdialect of the Western Aukštaitian* in the classifications of Lithuanian dialects during various periods. The focus is on the little studied southern subdialects of Jonava its environs.

By applying a computer cartography method, the Western Aukštaitian of Šiauliai in the classification by Zigmas Zinkevičius and Aleksas Girdenis was compared to the Middle Aukštaitian in the classification by Kazimieras Jaunius and Antanas Salys and to the First Eastern in the classification by Antanas Baranauskas.

The comparison of the mentioned areas demonstrated their intermediate situation with regard to other subdialects. The *Western Aukštaitian of Šiauliai* finds itself between the Žemaitian and Eastern Aukštaitian. With regard to the *Western Aukštaitian of Šiauliai*, Jaunius and Salys’ Middle Aukštaitian that is similarly placed borders with the Western Aukštaitian in the West, while in the East they border on the Eastern Aukštaitian. In Baranauskas’ classification the First Eastern that differs from the *Western Aukštaitian of Šiauliai* by distribution also finds itself between the Western and Second and Third Eastern.

The subdialects of Jonava and its environs emerge as peripheral i.e. as occupying a fringe situation with regard to the compared subdialects. Their peripheral situation was determined not only by their exceptional geographical situation but also interaction with the Slav languages that were spoken in these areas.

***Ilona Mickienė*, *Rita Baranauskienė***

**Nicknames of the residents of the environs of Veliuona: onomasiological motivation**

While participating in the Institute of the Lithuanian Language project *Modern Research of Geolinguistics in Lithuania: Optimization of Network of Point and Interactive Spread of Dialectal Information* during the summer of 2011 the nicknames of one of the dialectal points, i.e. the region of Veliuona were analysed.

The paper aims at identifying the onomastic motivation of Veliuona region nicknames, i.e. the reasons for nickname choice determining its structure and appellative meaning, whereof revealing the prototypical characteristics of the locals that are implicated in nicknames. The nicknames are analysed onomastically – determining the assigning motives of the nicknames. The paper excludes semasiological analysis in which the motives for the given nickname are not known and appellatives are semiologically associated with a dictionary definition. For this reason only the nicknames for which the respondentsprovided the motives were analysed. For the objective purposes the real nicknamed people names are not mentioned except the cases when nickname was derived from the surname or the personal name. The object of study consists of 386 nicknames.

Summarising the research it is possible to denote the most frequent motives for Veliuona region nicknames. The largest group consists of nicknames that are given according to the physical properties. 140 nicknames were found (36,27 % from all the nicknames that were analysed). Nicknames that stemmed from phonetic or semantic associations are also frequent. 94 of them were recorded (24,35 % from all the nicknames that were analysed). The nicknames denoting temper or occupation divide almost evenly: 57 (14,77 %) and 49 (12,69 %). The nicknames that are created according to kindred are less frequent – 21 (5,44 %). Far more uncommon are the nicknames denoting language content (9; 2,33 %), living place (7; 1,81 %) and background (4; 1,04 %). The paper also distinguishes the nicknames with double motivation, i.e. when the nickname for individual is created according to two motives. 5 (1,3 %) of such nicknames were analysed.

In attempt to individualise a person the nicknames are created according to the features that are characteristic of him. It is interesting to notice that in the region that was analysed the nicknames are as if inherited. They are given not only according to parents’ but also grandparents’ occupation, nicknames and surnames. As it was expected, the nicknames with negative connotation are dominant. Negative physical properties (such as unattractive face features, head, eye, ear, nose, teeth, leg form, stoutness or small height), certain traits of temper (as stupidity, harshness, malice or untidiness) are exposed. Nevertheless, people living in Veliuona region are described as studious, strong personalities and no nicknames describing lazy people were found.