

SANTRAUKOS / SUMMARIES

Václav Blažek

Bandyamas etimologiškai analizuoti Ptolemajo užfiksuotus rytinio Baltijos regiono hidronimus

Straipsnyje nagrinėjami keli Klaudijo Ptolemajo *Geografijoje* minimų rytinio Baltijos regiono, patenkančio į Europinės Sarmatijos erdvę, hidronimai. Kaip pažymi autorius, tai yra bandymas paaiškinti jų etimologiją. *Geografija* buvo paskelbta II a. viduryje. Straipsnyje cituojama Ptolemajo Europos Sarmatijos geografinė samprata, išvardijant upes: *Chronus*, *Rudonis*, *Turuntus*, *he(r)sinus*, *Albis*, *Vistula*. Žvilgsnis taip pat metamas į kitų autorių hidronimų interpretacijas ir komentarus, paminimi IV a. istorikai Marcianas iš Ponto Heraklėjos, kuris modifikuoja upių pavadinimus, ir Amianas Marcelinas. Šie vardai I a. tikriausiai buvo žinomi ir Plinijui. Plinijumi sekdamas, apie tai III a. rašė ir Gajus Julijus Solinas. Autorius išsamiai nagrinėja keturių hidronimų etimologiją, siekdamas paaiškinti, iš kurios kalbos jie kilę. Šie hidronimai – tai *Chronas*, *Rudonas*, *Turuntas*, *Chesinas* (vardai pateikiami pagal Eugenijaus Jovaišos monografiją *Aisčiai. Raida*. Vilnius: Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto leidykla, 2014, 121–162. Straipsnio autorius tik neseniai susipažino su E. Jovaišos Ptolemajo žemėlapiu perskaitymu. – *Red. kolegijos pastaba*).

Ptolemajas II a. po Kr. viduryje paminėjo keturis rytinio Baltijos regiono hidronimus, o Marcianas IV a. po Kr. juos pakartojo šiek tiek pakeistus. Šie hidronimai yra pirminiai baltų upių pavadinimų germaniški vertiniai, išimtis tik *Ποῦβων*, kuris leidžia nustatyti tiesioginę baltų hidronimo *Irbė* etimologiją. Tikėtina, kad hidronimas *Chronius* (gr. *Χρόνος*) yra kilęs iš *Mare Cronium*, galimai atitinkantis Vistulą ar Kuršių marias bei jų intakus *Prieglių*, *1273 Pregorą* ar *Akmeną*.

Acknowledgement:

The present study was prepared thanks to the grant of the The Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) GA15-12215S. I am grateful to John D. Bengtson for correcting the English.

Brian D. Joseph

Baltų ir slavų prokalbė: ką manė Meillet, arba ką Meillet spėjo?!

Antoine'as Meillet buvo vienas iš svarbiausių indoeuropeistų, o daugelis jo veikalų, parašytų per ilgą ir produktyvią akademinę karjerą, jau kelis dešimtmečius yra labai vertinami kitų indoeuropeistų ir laikomi fundamentaliais šios srities darbais. Tačiau tai nereiškia, kad visi jo darbai laikomi neginčytiniais ir pripažinti daugumos mokslininkų. Viena tema, dėl kurios jis buvo ypatingai kritikuojamas, yra jo nuomonė apie baltų ir slavų prokalbę, suformuluota 1908 m. išleistoje knygoje *Les dialectes indo-européens* ir jos 1922-ųjų antrajame leidime, bei jo tvirtas įsitikinimas, jog trūksta įtikinamų įrodymų, patvirtinančių baltų ir slavų prokalbės pogrupio egzistavimą indoeuropiečių kalbų šeimoje.

Nors yra daugybė įdomių grynai lingvistinio pobūdžio klausimų, susijusių su nesutarimu dėl baltų ir slavų prokalbės, kuriuos vertėtų aptarti, šio straipsnio tikslas ne spręsti lingvistinio persvarstymo problemą, o išnagrinėti, kokios pažiūros į „indoeuropiečių kalbų *dialektą*“ ir pačią indoeuropiečių prokalbę paveikė Meillet požiūris. Paaiškėjo, jog esama tam tikrų nenuoseklumų, kurie gali priversti mąstyti taip, kaip mąstė Meillet, rašydamas apie šią prokalbę. Pavyzdžiui, ar aptardamas „*dialectes indo-européens*“ jis turėjo omenyje dešimties (tikslus skaičius priklauso nuo italų ir keltų ir baltų ir slavų prokalbių) šakų (šakas suvokiant kaip „*dialektus*“) atsiradimą indoeuropiečių kalbų šeimoje, ar dialekto variacijas pačioje indoeuropiečių prokalbėje, t. y. prokalbės variacijas? Be to, dar lieka neaišku, kaip suderinti pokyčius bei jų difuziją su tradicinėmis pažiūromis į bendrą kalbų raidą. Meillet negalėjo plačiau aptarti difuzijos, nes geriau tą sritį (pavyzdžiui, *à la Labov*) imta suvokti kiek vėliau, tačiau jis numanė, kaip difuzija vyksta. Nenuoseklumų pastebima tada, kai Meillet pripažįsta, jog nėra visiškai vienodų kalbos bendruomenių. Galima teigti, jog pokyčiai turi vykti, kad kalba taptų pogrupio dalimi, t. y. *dialektu*

kalbos bendruomenėje. Tuomet kyla klausimas, kas, Meillet nuomone, sudarė „bendrąją kalbų raidą“, priešingą ypatybei, kuri sklinda difuziškai.

1922 m. leidimo pratarmėje Meillet vadina indoeuropiečių kalbų vienovę „tautine“ („l'unité indo-européenne était une unité nationale“), pabrėždamas savo suvokimo apie kalbos ir tautos santykį svarbumą, nagrinėjant galimą bendros baltų ir slavų prokalbės egzistavimo klausimą.

Taigi atidus Meillet požiūris į baltų ir slavų prokalbę nagrinėjimas bei kitų jo veikalų požymiai leidžia geriau suvokti jo mąstymą, kuriuo vadovaudamasis jis interpretavo baltų ir slavų kalbų panašumą.

Anželika Smetonienė

Alternation of Slavic-Root Words in *Ewangelie Polskie y Litewskie* by Jonas Jaknavičius from 1647, 1674, 1679, 1690 and 1705

Ewangelie Polskie y Litewskie (hereinafter referred to as JE) by Jonas Jaknavičius was released numerous times since 1647. First JE edition, as mentioned, is dated 1647 (JEI), the second 1674 (JEII), the third 1679 (JEIII), the fourth 1690 (JEIV) and the fifth 1705 (JEV). This is very helpful, because same text, released in several decades, may reflect some changes in a language. The object of the article is Slavic-root words in the first five editions of *Ewangelie Polskie y Litewskie*. The aim of the article is to determine how usage of loanwords and hybrids was changing in JE during decades: which loanwords or hybrids in same position were changed to other loanwords and hybrids or indigenous Lithuanian words, and vice versa – what indigenous Lithuanian words were replaced with loanwords and hybrids, and determine is there a connection between origin of loanwords and changes in original Polish texts and the alternation of loanwords and hybrids in first five editions of *Ewangelie Polskie y Litewskie*. To achieve the aim the texts in Lithuanian language in mentioned editions of *Ewangelie Polskie y Litewskie* were compared with Polish original texts.

Although number of words of foreign origin as units in all JE editions is almost the same, there are differences in usage frequencies. Furthermore, in some cases the indigenous word in later editions is replaced by loanword, sometimes on the contrary a single loanword is replaced by indigenous word or even by another loanword. All cases of alternation of words in JE can be classified: 1. Word of foreign origin in later editions of JE is replaced by indigenous word; 2. Indigenous word in later editions is replaced by word of foreign origin; 3. Loanword is replaced by other loanword.

The analysis of records in JE leads to the conclusion that there is no connection between origin of loanword and its usage in later (1674, 1679, 1690, 1705) editions of JE. Furthermore, alternation of some words in first five editions of JE wasn't determined by changes in original Polish texts.

Dalius Jarmalavičius

Regarding the Used Terminology and Classification of Formative Elements in the Theory of Word-Formation

The analysis of the German nominal compounds in the handwritten Baltic bilingual dictionaries from the 17th–18th shows many problematic aspects: the lack of precise terminology which needs to be corrected in the synchronic theory of word-formation on the one hand and difficulties in the differentiation of decided word-formation patterns on the other hand.

In the scientific literature terminology used for the analogous examples of word-formation could be defined as superfluous terminology. This applies in particular to the words with unique morphemes such as in germ. *Himbeere* 'raspberry', *Schornstein* 'chimney' or lit. šikšnosparnis 'bat', titnagas 'fire stone'. To define the constituents that are demotivated and only occur in individual words, different terms like *pseudomorphem*, *pseudoplerem*, *Himbeer-morpheme*, *cranberry-word*, *cranberry-compounds*, *cranberry-morphemes* etc. are found in the theory of word-formation. It would be more exact to describe such lexical units, using the concept of quasi-compounds with remaining stems (lit. *tarsi dūriniai su atliekamais kamienais*) suggested by V. Urbutis. However, words with demotivated constituents but with their complex word structure could not be categorized neither as compounds nor as simplex (simple) words, such a definition needs concretization. Taking into account the properties mentioned in this paper, lexical units like germ. *Himbeere* or lit. *titnagas* can

be defined as complex words with demotivated stems (lit. *kompleksinės struktūros žodžiai su nemotyvuotais kamienais*).

Furthermore, this article discusses the special status of words with the elements that take a position between compound-components and the derivative morphemes and are characterized in the synchronic word-formation as affixoids. It is also difficult to say, if for example, germ. *Werk=Tag* 'working day', *Werk=Zeug* 'tool', *Kichen Gutt* 'churches goods', *Hauptmann* 'main person', *Kriegswesen* 'soldier ship' are compounds or derivations, because we do not have enough clear criteria to differentiate these words. The problem mentioned above is actual in diachronic word-formation, too. In order to determine elements between composition and derivation in historical word-formation one should focus on the following criteria: productivity and their semantic degree of abstraction, their registration as a free lemma in the dictionaries, their ability to change position in words, and word-for word translation of constituents in dictionaries.

Vilija Sakalauskienė, Zofia Sawaniewska-Mochowa **Translational Dictionaries as Texts of Culture (On the Example of the Nineteenth-Century Dictionaries by Rev. Antanas Juška)**

The analysis in this article concentrates on the nineteenth century Polish-Lithuanian and Lithuanian-Polish translational dictionaries by Rev. Antanas Juška, which we interpret as a kind of texts of culture. These types of sources provide valuable ethnolinguistic information for both Lithuanists and researchers of the Polish language. For ethnolinguists bilingual dictionary is a place of coexistence of two visions of the world: individual – the perspective of lexicographer, and collective – the perspective of collective entities/ linguistic- cultural communities.

Taking into account the view that the translational dictionaries form the textual genre and narration about the world, we strive to find answers to two questions:

1. To what extent could the Lithuanian and Polish vocabulary, contained in the macro- and microstructures of these dictionaries, reconstruct a common mentality of the then inhabitants of Lithuania?

2. To what extent does the material disclosed in the dictionaries indicate image of the world of the lexicographer himself and, at the same time, present the distinct visions of the world embraced by Lithuanians and Poles, that are expressed by the other pragmatic and stylistic means, and cultural patterns?

We can interpret more accurately those Lithuanian and Polish components in the structure of the dictionaries by Rev. Juška, that reflect conceptualization of HUMAN BEING with reference to his/her physicality, psyche and mentality, expressing of emotions, relation to other/alien, practicing religion and rituals.

Loreta Vaičiulytė-Semėnienė **Functional Aspect of Reciprocal Markers in Monadic Constructions**

Reciprocal markers used in monadic constructions with the meaning of mutual action or reciprocal verbs are analysed in the article, based on the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language (CCLL). The object of the article is to discuss, focusing on the functional aspect, what is actualised and specified by one or another reciprocal marker. The study shows that a hierarchy of reciprocal markers can be distinguished according to possible segmentation of mutants that are expressed as subject and orientation to subject resp. predicate, i.e., the actualisation and specification of the subject and predicate: *one with the other* > *among themselves* > *between themselves* > *reciprocity* > *mutual* / *mutually* / *reciprocally* (Lith. *vienas su kitu* > *tarp savęs* > *tarpusavyje* > *savitarpyje* > *abipusiai* / *abipusiškai* / *savitarpiškai*).

Reciprocal markers *one with the other*, *among themselves*, *between themselves*, *reciprocity*, *mutual*, *mutually*, *reciprocally* that express interrelation and actualise and specify it are modifiers. Some reciprocal markers are (more) subject-oriented (*one with the other*), others are more oriented to the predicate of the meaning of the mutual action itself (*mutually* / *reciprocally*). CCLL data indicates that markers related to the reciprocal verb itself are used sporadically, i.e., the manner of expressing mutual action itself is rarely actualised. Reciprocal markers semantically linked with mutants

expressed as subject are used the most frequently: they actualise together or separately understood mutuanants expressed as subject.

As to the segmentation of mutuanants of mutual situation that are expressed as subject, significant is *separate* : *seamless*, or *individual* : *collective* (Lith. *individualus* : *kolektyvinis*) parameter that correlates with the usage of reciprocal markers *one with the other* > *among themselves* > *between themselves*. Reciprocal anaphora *one with the other* actualises every separate mutuant as a member of the whole expressed as subject; mutual relation of mutuanants in a group that is regarded as more closed off or closed as (more or less) indivisible, i.e., seamless, whole is actualised by reciprocal marker *among themselves* or *between themselves* respectively.

The actualisation of the participants of the mutual relation corresponds to the differences of perspective, point of view: in the sentences with a reciprocal anaphora *one with the other*, each participant of a mutual situation seems to be visible individually, in the sentences with *between themselves*, an individual mutuant participating in a mutual situation seems to be shifted to the background, i.e., becomes irrelevant and all mutuanants are considered together, i.e., as a whole.

In the context reciprocal marker *among themselves* can get closer to a specifier of mutual relation of separate mutuanants, i.e., reciprocal anaphora *one with the other*, or reciprocal marker *between themselves* can get closer to it.

According to orientation or subject resp. predicate actualisation and specification and segmentation the mutuanants that are expressed as subject, reciprocal markers range hierarchically: *one with the other* > *among themselves* > *between themselves* > *reciprocity* > *mutual* / *mutually* / *reciprocally*. Reciprocal *between themselves* is like a relative transition from being subject-oriented to being predicate-oriented. Additionally, possible usage of reciprocal markers is also influenced by the differences of the meaning of predicate aspect, participle configurations, sequence parameter and actualisation of atypical mutual situations. In these cases, the usage of reciprocal *between themselves* is (possibly) limited.

Aurelija Gritėnienė

Colours and Shades of Petals in Modern Lithuanian Prose: Black and White

The article analyses more than 300 collocations found in 98 works of 61 modern Lithuanian prose authors, these collocations are used by the authors to convey the white or black colour of the petals of flowering plants and the shades of these colours. Analysed prose authors in their texts mention approximately 70 white flowering plants, these are: trees, bushes, fruit trees, berry scrubs, weeds, forest, meadow, field, garden, indoor and other plants. In the analysed collocations only 4 black flowering plants (lilies, roses, tulips and greater celandines) are found. Research material indicates that when conveying the colour of achromatic petals authors usually use the adjectives *white* (Lith. *baltas*, *-a*; *juodas*, *-a*; feminine and masculine form; 152 collocations) and *black* (Lith. *juodas*, *-a*; feminine and masculine form; 10 collocations). Less frequently the colour of petals is described by using pronominal form of adjectives (*the white* (Lith. *baltasis*, *-oji*; feminine, masculine form) used 41 times; *the black* (Lith. *juodasis*, *-oji*; feminine, masculine form) used 9 times). Usage of the pronominal form of adjectives is determined by the context of the story: *the white* usually marks the sorts of plants that really exist (e.g. *the white clover*, *the white lily*; Lith. *baltasis dobilas*, *baltoji lelija*, etc.) and *the black* is usually used when imaginary sorts or kinds of plants are described in the work.

The highest intensity of white colour is emphasized by using the superlative form of adjectives, i.e., *the whitest* (Lith. *balčiausias*, *baltų balčiausias*), tautological collocations *white white* (Lith. *baltas baltas*), derivatives formed with suffixes *snow-white* (Lith. *baltutėlis*), etc. Verbs *showing white*, *was showing white*, *shine white*, *shone white*, *will shine white* (Lith. *baltuoja*, *baltavo*, *boluoja*, *(su)bolavo*, *suboluos*) are used to indicate white colour in prose works as well. Some authors use adverb *whitely* (Lith. *baltai*) to indicate the colour of petals in their texts. To indicate this colour the prose writers also use nominal abstracts *whiteness* (Lith. *baltumas*, *baltuma*, *baltybė*). There are cases when achromatic colours are conveyed through a concrete object, a certain colour prototype.

The colour white and its shades quite frequently are described by using various comparisons. Usually, plants that have white petals are compared to the closest objects of the person's surroundings: snow, soap suds or milk foam, cotton, wedding dress, shroud, some food items, white birds. It can be said that comparisons as these have become stereotypes: white as

snow/paper/milk/foam/curd/swan); black as night. Analogous prototypically white reality denotates (pale face, feet, hands, fingers, teeth, breasts, white hair, swans, paper, snow, etc.) are compared to white petals of plants.

It was noticed that female authors more thoroughly and more creatively convey to the readers colours and shades of the blooms. Male authors usually indicate the precise colour of the bloom but rarely mention subtle shades of colour of the blooms. More poetically and in detail male authors describe only more well-known white flowering booms (apple tree, cherry three, lily, etc.). These differences are determined not only by the specificity of gender but also by individual qualities of the writer.

Analysed collocations show that the authors use more varied literary devices to describe naturally growing and blooming plants (cherry trees, apple trees, mock-oranges, etc.). The colour of picked flowers is usually indicated in a very specific way, i.e., by using adjectives *white* and *black*.

Janina Švambarytė-Valužienė

Influence of Dialect on the Language of Marius Katiliškis' Works

The article describes linguistic views of writer Marius Katiliškis (real name is Albinas Vaitkus, born on 15 September 1914 in Gruzdžiai, Šiauliai district; died on 17 December 1980 in Lemont, a suburb of Chicago), who comes from Northern Lithuania, Žagarė district, discusses the lexis of Šiauliai sub-dialect of the Western Aukštaitian used in Katiliškis' works and dialect speech patterns that the writer is known for.

The article is compiled with reference to the material of the manuscript of the *Glossary of Marius Katiliškis Works* (abbreviated as KtŽ), compiled by the author of the article. KtŽ lexis is compiled from the novels *Miškais ateina ruduo* (1969), *Užuovėja* (1990), *Išėjusiems negrįžti* (1990) and a collection of short stories *Seno kareivio sugrįžimas* (2003). Katiliškis had a good command of Žagarė speech: he had heard quite a few stories told in it, collected and noted individual words, their forms and language expressions.

Dialect lexis abundant in Katiliškis' writings indicates that the writer acted as a dialect user, i.e., created words, formed collocations not included into any dictionaries, used various nuances of word meaning. Words used or created by Katiliškis are affective, noticed by the reader as new, emotional, finally interesting in the way of phonic and semantic meaning.

In Katiliškis' writings the story is relayed by using simple and extended sentences or thoughts that are divided into short sentence components. It seems that the writer wishes to halt the reader for a moment and to emphasise every collocation or phrase. Usually, this kind of fragmented sentence also conceals an emotion expression.

Katiliškis' writings, as indicated in the article, are written in local dialect, i.e., dialect language used in 20th century. Up till this day, the development of standard language requires a more in-debt study by linguists focused on various areas of research, and Katiliškis' writings are texts on which such an investigation should be grounded.

Jürgen Udolph

Indoeuropiečių genčių tėvynė ir paplitimas vardyno tyrimo šviesoje

Jurgenas Udolphas, remdamasis onomastikos duomenimis, studijoje apibendrina per daugelį metų sukauptus indoeuropiečių genčių ir jų protėvynių tyrimų rezultatus. Jis daro svarbias išvadas, kurioms galima pritarti ar nepritarti, bet nepaisyti jų nederėtų. Autoriaus nuomone, Europoje telkiasi vandenvardžiai, datuoti indoeuropiečių kalbų radimosi ir vystymosi laikotarpiu. Lemtingi indoeuropiečių kalbų vystymosi ir plitimo procesai iš esmės vyko Senosios Europos hidronimijos ribose. Be kitų dalykų, tai rodo ir rytų indoeuropiečių kalbų apeliatyvai, glūdintys Europos vandenvardžiuose. Slavų ir germanų kalbose atitinkamų paralelių nesama. Vidurio Europos vardai nepaliudija pirmykščio indoeuropietiškojo sluoksnio. Tai tikrai stebina, nes, be abejo, ten jau gyveno žmonės, nekalbėję jokia indoeuropiečių kalba. Autorius nesiryžta spęsti, ar tai susiję su indoeuropiečių genčių sėslumu, palyginti su ankstesniųjų gyventojų klajokliškumu arba pusiau klajokliškumu. Pirmaisiais tūkstantmečiais prieš Kristų indoeuropiečių gyvenviečių radimasis glaudžiai susijęs su žemės kokybe. Tai akivaizdžiai patvirtina ir senųjų vardų paplitimas. Autentiškų indoeuropiečių lyčių atstatymas remiasi žinomų pavienių indoeuropiečių kalbų faktais.

Indoeuropietiški vandenvardžiai paliudyti pavienėse indoeuropiečių kalbose. Todėl tikėtina, kad tarp autentiškų vardų lyčių ir indoeuropietiškų autentiškų lyčių rekonstrukcijos esama skirtumų. Senosios Europos vandenvardžių centras vienareikšmiškai yra Pabaltijys ir baltų kalbos. Daug faktų byloja, kad ten būta ne tik kontinuumo (Wolfgangas P. Schmidas), bet ir vardų išplitimo centro. Tėvynės gali būti ieškoma tik Senosios Europos hidronimijos žemėse, kurios yra Europoje. Germanų genčių tėvynė yra ten, kur gyveno germanai, slavų tėvynė ten, kur gyveno slavai, keltų tėvynė ten, kur istorijos paliudyta gyvenus keltų. Darytina išvada, kad indoeuropiečių kalbų protėvynės susidarymas Pietų Rusijoje, Mažojoje Azijoje ar Kaukaze onomastikos požiūriu tikrai atmestinas. Apibendrinant galima teigti, kad indoeuropiečių ekspansijos tėvynė ir sklidimo sritis yra Pabaltijys.