Citation:

Smetonienė, A. (2019). Patterns of morphological integration of Slavic loan nouns in Petkevičius' Catechism (1598) as an indication of their origin and chronology. *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*, 54. <https://doi.org/10.11649/sfps.1766>

Anželika Smetonienė
(Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Vilnius)

Patterns of Morphological Integration of Slavic Loan Nouns in Petkevičius' Catechism (1598) as an Indication of Their Origin and Chronology

Introduction

Merkelis Petkevičius' Catechism (hereafter PC) was the first Reformation book in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the second volume in Lithuanian published in the country (1598). It is thought to have come as a response to the Catholic Catechism of Mikalojus Daukša, issued in Lithuanian in Vilnius three years earlier (Zinkevičius, 1988, p. 196). In a pattern typical for Reformation catechisms of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Petkevičius' volume includes catechism, psalms, prayers and procedures of church rites (Kuźmina, 2002, pp. 17–18).

Although Petkevičius' Catechism is the second book published in Lithuanian in the Grand Duchy, it has received little attention from scholars so far. It has only been discussed in the general context of Lithuanian writings of the seventeenth century (Palionis, 1967; Zinkevičius, 1988) and has mainly

been viewed as a source of Calvinist worldview (Pociūtė, 2000). Scholars are also interested in its translations of psalms into Lithuanian, particularly those written by Jan Kochanowski (Meller, 1984; Niedźwiedź, 2008; Pociūtė, 2005). The grammatical, lexical and phonetic features of the language of the Catechism have been hardly investigated at all – studies in this area only concern possessive pronouns (Maskuliūnas, 2009), dialectal features (Zinkevičius, 1970) and lexical units (Kruopas, 1970).

The research on Slavic loanwords in the Lithuanian language goes back to Alexander Brückner's *Die slavischen Fremdwörter im Litauschen* (Brückner, 1877). The more recent works mainly focus on such issues as their origin and equivalence of Slavic sounds (Būga, 1958–1961; Skardžius, 1931), and include observations on the vowel shift (Zinkevičius, 2002). Slavic loanwords in Lithuanian are also mentioned in the context of lexis of old writings and contemporary Lithuanian (Dini, 1990, 1993; Fraenkel, 1962; ALEW, 2015; Lebedys, 1977; Palionis, 1967; Pokorny, 1959; Sabaliauskas, 1990; Siaurukienė, 1987; SEJL, 2019; Zinkevičius, 1968, 1974, 1988) or its dialects (Kardelis, 2003; Otrębski, 1965). Discussions about the numbers of Polish and Belarusian loanwords are found in the articles by Jonas Palionis and Vincas Urbutis (Palionis, 1967; Urbutis, 1992, 1993). The later works mainly address Slavic nominals; only the studies authored by Jurgis Pakerys (Pakerys, 2013) and Kirill Kozhanov (Kozhanov, 2014) consider Slavic loan verbs. A comprehensive analysis of issues related to the origin of Slavic loanwords, including verbs, is presented in the works by Rolandas Kregždys (Kregždys, 2012, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2016).

Although Slavic loanwords are not a new research topic, works devoted to their morphological integration are few and far between. Božena Voitkevič (Voitkevič, 2010) aptly observes that in those few studies (Laučiūtė, 2007; Valeckienė, 1967) “it is difficult to envisage any theoretical foundation which could contribute to the identification of principles of morphological integration of Slavic loanwords” (Voitkevič, 2010, p. 244). She claims that the donor language can be determined on the basis of the assignment of a loanword to a particular type of declension (Voitkevič, 2010, p. 248). The aim of this article is, then, to identify whether the stem of a Slavic loanword can suggest its origin more precisely. With a view to achieving this objective, I extracted all Slavic loan nouns from Petkevičius' Catechism, categorised them according to their stems, and identified patterns of their integration into the Lithuanian morphological system. The total number of extracted lexemes of Slavic origin

was 446; 199 of them are Slavic loan nouns analysed in this study. Their stems as well as their meanings were identified on the basis of the Catechism (other sixteenth-century sources were used when the PC data were not sufficient; only the meanings attested in the PC are presented; Lithuanian Language E-Dictionary [LKŽe, n.d.] was also used). In the next stage, the equivalents of Slavic loanwords were looked up in dictionaries of Slavic languages of the relevant periods – Old Russian: SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011; SDIA, 1989; Ruthenian: SSM, 1977–1978; HSBM, 1982–2015; MDSUM, 2002–2003; Old and Middle Polish: SS, 1953–2002; SPol, 1966–2012. The equivalents are the words that can be potentially regarded as sources of loans in terms of their root and meaning.

The Concept of Slavic Loanwords

With regard to their origin, the words in the Lithuanian language fall into two major categories: native words and loanwords, adopted from other languages through various contacts (economic, cultural, political, etc.) (Jakaitienė, 2009, p. 227). Those borrowed from the neighbouring countries are German, Slavic and Latvian loanwords. In analysing the Slavic loanwords, the essential thing is the direct source of the borrowing, not the language from which the word originally spread in other languages: if a German word came to the Lithuanian language through Polish, it is considered to be a Polish loanword, not a German one.

The oldest Slavic borrowings entered the Lithuanian language from the western dialects of East Slavs between the ninth and eleventh centuries, e.g. *muilas* < *mylo* (soap), *stiklas* < *stoklo* (glass) (Būga, 1958–1861, vol. 1, p. 351). Slavic loanwords came to Lithuanian through contacts with East Slavs (Zinkevičius, 2002, pp. 100–101); in the fifteenth–seventeenth centuries they appeared together with Polish speakers (Jakaitienė, 2009, p. 229; Zinkevičius, 2002, p. 106). The Polish language started spreading in the Grand Duchy only after the Christianisation of Lithuania, and by the mid-sixteenth century it had already gained a firm position in the country.

The history of the Polish language is divided into three stages: Old Polish (fourteenth–fifteenth centuries), Middle Polish (sixteenth–eighteenth centuries) and Modern Polish (since the end of the eighteenth century). Periodisation of the linguistic history of East Slavs is more complicated. The language of East Slavs

served as the basis for the Old Russian written language, which started splitting into its eastern and western variants in the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries. The Russian language (*великорусский язык*) formed on the basis of the eastern dialects. The south-western part of the area where it developed belonged to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the written Ruthenian language started to emerge there in the thirteenth century; the process completed in the fifteenth century. Since the language was influenced by Polish, Lithuanian, Czech, Latin and German, it deviated from the eastern variant of Old Russian more and more. The Ruthenian language (*книжная проста мова*) is referred to differently by various scholars: Western Russian (*западнорусский язык*), Old Belarusian (*старобелорусский язык*), Old Literary Belarusian (*старобелорусский литературный язык*), Old Ukrainian (*староукраинский язык*), Old Literary Ukrainian (*староукраинский книжный язык*) or even Polish-Belarusian (*język polsko-białoruski*). Considering that Petkevičius' Catechism was published in 1598, the Slavic loanwords used there could have derived from Old Russian, Ruthenian, Polish (Old and Middle) or the dialects of Polish and East Slavic languages.

Vytautas Kardelis stresses that the term *assimilation* used in Lithuanian linguistics is not accurate enough to determine conformation of a loanword to the phonological, accentual and morphological system of the Lithuanian language as it firstly refers to phonetic phenomena (Kardelis, 2003, p. 21). Indeed, The Encyclopaedia of Lithuanian Language defines *assimilation* as “a full or partial adjustment of a sound to the sounds of the same or adjacent word” (LKE, 2008, p. 33). Likewise, the terms *adaptive affixation* and *integrational affixation* only consider one aspect of adaptation of a loanword – its conformation to the morphological system of the recipient language. The most precise term to be used in this context, then, is *integration*, as it embraces not only a broader usage of a borrowing but also its adaptation to particular language systems (Kardelis, 2003, pp. 21–27).

Slavic Loan Nouns in Petkevičius' Catechism

Following their phonetic adjustment, which is a necessary condition for integration of words of foreign origin, borrowed nouns have to be assigned to the category of gender and the Lithuanian declension system. In the case of loan nouns from Slavic languages, they usually retain the gender from the donor language (Voitkevič, 2010, p. 248). However, as there is no neuter

gender in the Lithuanian language anymore, Slavic neuter words borrowed into Lithuanian and adapted to the Lithuanian morphological system after Leskien's law took effect (i.e. later than in the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries) acquired the feminine ending of the *ā*-stem, probably due to the phonetic adjacency of the vowels *o* and *a* (Girdenis, 2001, p. 385). Prior to that, Slavic neuter nouns with the ending *o* were assigned to the neuter gender in the Lithuanian language. After the change described by Leskien, such neuter loans, together with Lithuanian neuter inheritances, moved to the category of masculine gender and acquired the masculine ending of the *ō*-stem (Girdenis, 2001, p. 385). Hence, the stem of a loanword can imply the chronology and origin of a particular borrowing.

The Slavic loan nouns used in Petkevičius' Catechism belong to the stems *ō*, *ā*, *iā*, *iū*, *i*, *ē*; they do not include cases of the presently productive *iō*, *iō* and non-productive *u*+consonant stems. Most of them have the *ō*-stem and are assigned to the first declension (82 instances):

- abrozās* PC 4,7 1. 'a picture'; 2. 'appearance';
- akrutnykas* PC 143,4 'a cruel person';
- anielas* PC 20,11 'an angel';
- aniolas* PC 39,5 'an angel';
- angelas* PC 137,1 'an angel';
- angiolas* PC 36,12 'an angel';
- antikristas* PC 133,8 'the Antichrist';
- apaštalas* PC 150,16 'each of the twelve disciples of Christ';
- apie kūnas* PC 65,11 'a patron';
- archanielas* PC 150,8 'an archangel';
- asilas* PC 109,5 'a donkey, *Equus asinus*';
- balvonas* PC 107,9 'an idol';
- bliūdas* PC 219,13 'a bowl';
- blūdas* PC 133,21 1. 'fallacy, a false belief'; 2. 'raving, wandering; foolery';
- būbnas* PC 102,4 'a drum';
- cimbolai* PC 102,7 'an ancient string instrument';
- čertas* PC 19,20 'the devil';
- čėsas* PC 16,24 'a duration, a period of time measured in centuries, years, months, hours, etc.';
- čėtras* PC 53,16 'a tent, a shelter';
- dvaras* PC 46,13 'a palace';

dyvas PC 122,18 'a wonderful, curious thing; a miracle';
grabas PC 149,11 'a coffin; a grave';
griekas PC 7,18 'a sin';
griešnykas PC 45,5 'a sinner';
gruntas PC 98,26 'background, setting';
heretikas PC 41,3 'a heretic; a misbeliever';
hetmonas PC 86,5 'a hetman';
impedimentas PC 229,9 'an impediment';
instrumentas PC 102,8 'a musical instrument';
katechizmas PC 105,3 'a short presentation of Christian faith in the form of questions and answers';
ketvergas PC 160,3 'Thursday';
klapatas PC 135,18 'trouble, concern';
kodylas PC 158,23 1. 'an aromatic yellow resin, usu. used during religious ceremonies for frankincense'; 2. 'smoke of this resin, frankincense';
kūbkas PC 13,23 'a glass; a cup';
latras PC 121,1 1. 'a tramp, a drunkard, a whoremonger'; 2. 'a murderer';
levas PC 80,9 'a lion';
majestotas PC 26,10 'majesty';
malžankas PC 239,7 'a spouse';
miestas PC 31,21 'a town';
ministras PC 203,22 'a teacher';
mūčelnikas PC 150,18 'a martyr';
mūras PC 92,16 1. 'a wall'; 2. 'a brick building';
mylasnykas PC 174,9 'a beloved';
pagrebas PC 46,18 'a cellar';
parėdkas PC 43,4 'an established procedure, rites';
pasnykas PC 205,19 'a period of abstinence from some food or reduction of its consumption, fasting';
patamkas PC 197,8 1. 'a descendant, a grandchild'; 2. 'a successor';
pelgrimas PC 203,16 'a pilgrim';
ponas PC 9,10 'a master';
pradkas PC 81,21 'an ancestor';
prajėvas PC 149,14 'a strange, unnatural thing, an unusual phenomenon, a miracle';
prarakas PC 150,16 'a prophet';
pravadnykas PC 18,26 'a leader, an initiator';

psalmas PC 43,10 'a psalm';
pulkas PC 53,5 'a crowd';
ratmistras PC 162,10 'a person of a certain rank';
razbainykas PC 52,13 'a mugger, a murderer';
rėdas PC 220,2 'orderliness';
rėdytojas PC 18,25 'someone who leads and administers';
rūbas PC 193,16 'a robe';
sakramentas PC 105,8 (*sekrementas* PC 220,20) 'a sacrament';
serafinas PC 150,11 'a seraph';
skorbas PC 46,18 'wealth';
smūtkas PC 71,18 'sorrow, heartbreak, distress, trouble';
stodas PC 153,26 'a herd, a drove';
strochas PC 160,18 'fear';
sūdas PC 22,11 'a court';
sviedkas PC 230,12 'a witness';
svietas PC 15,141 'the world, earth';
testamentas PC 14,1 'the Old and the New Testament';
uparas PC 209,9 1. 'stubbornness, obstinacy, waywardness, faddiness';
 2. 'anger, discontent, pride';
urėdas PC 199,6 'a post, a duty, a position';
ūmas PC 175,9 'mind, wisdom';
vargonai PC 102,5 'a keyboard pipe instrument';
vnūkas PC 96,2 'a grandchild, an offspring';
vynas PC 46,18 'an alcoholic drink made of grapes and various kinds
 of juice';
zbaras PC 132,12 'a community of believers';
zerkolas PC 106,18 'a mirror';
zokanas PC 43,14 (*zakonas* PC 158,26) 1. 'the five books of Moses, the Torah';
 2. 'Ten Commandments'; 3. 'the main law of the Church, Testament';
žertas PC 60,12 'a trick, a joke, a prank';
žydas PC 153,7 'a Jewish person';
žyvatas PC 7,20 1. 'life'; 2. 'a womb'.

All the equivalents of those regular Slavic loanwords have a non-palatalised ending in the donor languages, for example:

abrozās < Old Russian (hereafter O. Rus.) *о́бразъ* 1. 'appearance'; 2. 'representation, a portrait' (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 12, p. 133); Ruthenian

- (hereafter Ruth.) *образъ* ‘a portrait, a picture’ (MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 2, p. 18); Polish (hereafter Pol.) *obraz* 1. ‘a picture, portrayal of sth. in stone, wood or on canvas’; 2. ‘a form, an appearance’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 5, p. 367);
- akrutnykas* < Ruth. *окрутникъ* ‘a coarse, cruel person; a violator, a tyrant’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 22, p. 171); Pol. *okrutnik* ‘an angry, cruel person’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 5, p. 565);
- anielas* < Ruth. *аньелъ, аниелъ* ‘an angel’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 1, p. 124); Pol. *anjeł* ‘an angel’ (SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 1, p. 170; SS, 1953–2002, vol. 1, p. 38).

Basically no shifts in gender occurred: this type of declension includes masculine nouns, and their equivalents in Slavic languages are of the same gender. The equivalents of such words as *bliūdas*, *dyvas*, *kodylas*, *miestas*, *stodas*, *vynas*, *zerkolas* in Slavic languages are of neuter gender:

- O. Rus. *блюдо* ‘a bowl’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 1, p. 247), Ruth. *блюдо* ‘a plate’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 2, p. 74);
- O. Rus. *диво, дивъ* ‘a curiosity, a miracle’ (SDIA XI–XIV, 1988–2012, vol. 2, p. 465; SDIA, 1989, vol. 1, p. 664), Ruth. *диво, дивъ* ‘a miracle’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 1, p. 299; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 8, p. 88; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 1, p. 208), Pol. *dziw, dziwo* ‘a miracle’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 2, p. 334);
- O. Rus. *кадило* ‘fragrant resin’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 7, p. 12), Ruth. *кадило* ‘fragrant resin used during Masses’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 14, p. 216);
- O. Rus. *мѣсто* ‘an inhabited area, a small urban centre’ (SDIA XI–XIV, 1988–2012, vol. 9, p. 112), Ruth. *мѣсто* ‘a town’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 17, p. 360), Pol. *miasto* ‘a town’ (SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 13, p. 373);
- O. Rus. *стадо* ‘a herd’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 27, p. 190; SDIA, 1989, vol. 3, p. 489); Ruth. *стадо* ‘a herd’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 32, p. 308; SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 2, p. 378); Pol. *stado* ‘a herd’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 8, p. 406);
- O. Rus. *вино* ‘wine’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 2, p. 182; SDIA, 1989, vol. 1, p. 259); Ruth. *вино* ‘wine’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 1, p. 175; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 3, p. 281); Pol. *wino* ‘wine’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 10, p. 232);
- Ruth. *зеркало* ‘a mirror’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 12, p. 227).

These nouns are early borrowings from East Slavs; they were initially integrated into the Lithuanian language as neuter but later shifted to masculine (Leskien's law); the oldest loanwords in Lithuanian are considered to have derived mainly from Old Russian.

The second most numerous stem in Petkevičius' Catechism is the *ā*-stem (48 instances):

afiera PC 64,3 'a sacrifice';
alyva PC 95,16 1. 'the olive tree, *Olea europaea*'; 2. 'fat, oil extracted from olives';
apieka PC 223,25 'patronage';
arfa PC 98,4 'the harp';
cnata PC 17,14 'a virtue';
čystata PC 110,17 'innocence, virginity';
dėka PC 13,17 1. 'thanksgiving, commendation';
disciplina PC 206,14 'discipline';
dūma PC 37,14 'a thought, thinking, reasoning';
evangelista PC 242,22 'the author of one of the four Gospels';
figūra PC 180,18 'a form';
gromata PC 13,14 'a letter, a document';
hadina PC 160,20 'an hour';
jalmužna PC 225,23 'pittance';
knyga PC 33,11 'a book';
krivda PC 84,1 'grievance';
loska PC 38,22 'mercy';
malženstva PC 229,15 'a marriage';
miera PC 52,14 'measure';
mieščanka PC 161,6 'a female town dweller';
mira PC 158,23 'fragrant resin used as a perfume, incense, and medicine';
mūka PC 36,8 'suffering';
nata PC 95,1 'a sign for writing down music, a note';
pahonka PC 228,25 'a female pagan';
pakara PC 115,2 'obedience, abjection';
pakusa PC 20,24 'temptation';
pakūta PC 85,8 'penitence';
pamsta PC 27,13 'revenge';
pana PC 8,10 'a girl';
paroda PC 49,19 'advice, percept';

paslūga PC 131,2 'servicing';
patiecha PC 28,15 'comfort, joy';
pekla PC 7,10 'hell';
plēga PC 80,4 'a punishment, a misfortune';
ponstva PC 150,9 1. 'a ruler, authorities'; 2. 'col. gentry';
priprova PC 102,2 'a tool, an instrument, a gadget';
prova PC 87,11 'a law';
roda PC 31,19 1. 'advice'; 2. 'a meeting, a convention';
rona PC 55,21 1. 'advice'; 2. 'a meeting, a convention';
sirata PC 32,1 'an orphan';
sprova PC 20,6 'a job, an occupation, an affair';
strūna PC 102,41 'a string';
syla PC 6,9 'power';
triūba PC 102,1 'a wooden or metal wind instrument in the form of a pipe;
 a horn, a trumpet';
viera PC 2,3 'faith, religion';
vieža PC 57,16 'a tower';
zdroda PC 55,13 'a cheat, a ruse, a treachery';
žydavka PC 228,25 'a female Jew'.

Generally, feminine nouns are assigned to this productive stem, which is not a new tendency, as it is confirmed by old monuments of Indo-European languages (Zinkevičius, 1980, p. 189). Nevertheless, nouns of common or even masculine gender can also belong to the *ā*-stem. The largest number of *ā*-stem nouns in Petkevičius' Catechism are of feminine gender, and the equivalents of Slavic loanwords in Slavic languages are also feminine with the ending *-a*, for example:

afiera < Ruth. *офѣра* 'a thing or a living creature that is sacrificed to a god' (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 23, p. 323); Pol. *ofiara*, *ofiera* 'a thing for sacrificing' (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 5, p. 521; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 21, p. 2);

alyva < O. Rus. *олива* 1. 'the olive tree, *Olea europaea*'; 2. 'an olive' (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 12, p. 357); Ruth. *олива* 1. 'the olive tree'; 2. 'an olive' (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 22, p. 192; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 2, p. 41); Pol. *oliwa* 'fat, oil extracted from olives'; 2. 'bot. *Olea europaea*; *Oleaceae*'; 3. 'an olive' (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 5, p. 569; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 21, p. 319);

apieka < O. Rus. *опека* 'patronage' (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 13, p. 12); Ruth. *опека* 'patronage' (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 22, p. 239); Pol.

opieka ‘caring for somebody; custody, care, protection’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 5, p. 594; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 21, p. 499).

Such nouns as *evangelista*, *malženstva*, *pekla*, *ponstva*, *prova*, *sirata*, which belong to the *ā*-stem, are not of feminine gender. The equivalent of the Slavic loanword *sirata* in Slavic language is of common gender:

O. Rus. *cupoma* ‘a child or adolescent who has lost one or both parents; also: a lonely person’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 24, p. 156); Ruth. *cupoma* ‘an orphan’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 2, p. 346; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 31, p. 271); Pol. *sirota* ‘a child who has lost one or both parents’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 8, p. 191);

and the noun *evangelista* is assigned to the masculine gender:

Ruth. *евангелиста, еванггелиста, еванькгелиста, еуангелиста* ‘the author of one of the four Gospels’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 1, p. 343; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 9, p. 140); Pol. *ewangelista* ‘the author of one of the four Gospels’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 2, p. 348).

The Slavic loan nouns *malženstva*, *pekla*, *ponstva*, *prova* found in the Catechism belong to the *ā*-stem, although their equivalents in Slavic languages are of neuter gender:

malženstva < O. Rus. *малъженьство* (SDIA, 1989, vol. 2, p. 106); Ruth. *малженство, малженьство, мальжэнство* ‘a marriage’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 17, p. 238; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 1, p. 418); Pol. *małżeństwo* ‘a union between a man and a woman’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 4, p. 157; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 13, p. 129);

pekla < O. Rus. *некло* (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 14, p. 186); Ruth. *некло* ‘hell’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 17, p. 66; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 2, p. 89); Pol. *piekło* ‘in various religions: a place for the dead or their souls’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 6, p. 89; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 24, p. 57);

ponstva < O. Rus. *панство* ‘nobles, gentry’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 14, p. 145); Ruth. *панство, паньство* ‘aristocrats, nobility, gentry’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 23, p. 434); Pol. *państwo* ‘people belonging to the highest class’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 6, p. 35);

prova < O. Rus. *право* ‘a law’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 18, p. 115); Ruth. *право* ‘a law’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 2, p. 220); Pol. *prawo* ‘a law’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 7, p. 33).

Hence, these loanwords reached the Lithuanian language later than the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries and acquired the feminine endings of the *ā*-stem. The group of the *jā*-stem, in turn, includes 21 nouns:

absoliucija PC 206,8 ‘an acquittal’;
bažnyčia PC 7,16 ‘a church’;
biblija PC 222,7 ‘the Bible’;
dūšia PC 6,7 ‘an immortal incorporeal component in a human being; a spirit, a soul’;
evangelija PC 24,8 1. ‘one of the four Gospels of the New Testament’;
 2. ‘an extract from this book read during the service, before the sermon’;
komunija PC 205,20 ‘Communion, one of the seven sacraments’;
kožalnyčia PC 222,7 ‘a pulpit’;
mačia PC 53,17 ‘force, strength’;
nedėlia PC 4,22 ‘Sunday’;
nodieja PC 19,2 ‘hope’;
pamačia PC 236,12 ‘help’;
pūščia PC 81,19 ‘a desert, wastes, wilderness’;
religija PC 203,18 ‘faith, religion’;
sūdžia PC 27,20 ‘a judge’;
tajemnyčia PC 181,10 ‘a secret’;
temnyčia PC 101,6 ‘a prison, a jail’;
toblyčia PC 6,2 ‘a board’;
večerija PC 3,20 ‘supper’;
vynyčia PC 71,22 ‘a wine cellar, a wine-vault’;
zaria PC 49,21 ‘a glow of the sky in the morning or in the evening’;
zbraja PC 79,12 ‘arms, munition’.

Only one of those nouns is of masculine gender: *sūdžia*. The phonetic features of this loanword point at one of East Slavic languages as the donor language: O. Rus. *судья, судия* (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 28, p. 264); Ruth. *судия, судиѧ, судїѧ, соудїѧ, судья* (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 2, p. 398). The East Slavic ending *-я* resulted in assigning this noun to the phonetically close *jā*-stem in the Lithuanian language. Other Slavic nouns with the palatalised ending of

the stem also retained their gender and integrated into the *jā*-stem as Slavic loan nouns of feminine gender, for example:

zbraja < Ruth. *зброя* ‘a thing for defence of attack’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 1, p. 389; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 12, p. 42; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 1, p. 302); Pol. *zbroja* ‘metal coverings for protection of knights and horses, armour’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 11, p. 277).

Some equivalents of the above-mentioned Slavic borrowings have a non-palatalised end of stem in Polish:

pamačia < O. Rus. *помочь* ‘help, support’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 17, p. 33); Ruthenian *помочь, помочь* ‘help’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 26, p. 292); Pol. *pomoc, pomóc* ‘to give a hand, to be useful, to provide relief’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 6, p. 376; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 27, p. 143);

večeria < O. Rus. *вечера, вечеря* ‘supper; a meal’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 2, p. 130; SDIA, 1989, vol. 1, p. 251); Ruthenian *вечера, вечеря* ‘supper’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 3, p. 161); Pol. *wieczera* ‘an evening meal’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 10, p. 127);

zaria < O. Rus. *заря, зара, зарѣа* ‘a glow in the sky before sunrise or sunset’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 5, p. 291; SDIA, 1989, vol. 1, p. 945); *заря, зара, зора, зоря* ‘an intensive glow in the sky before sunrise or sunset’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 11, p. 136); Pol. *zorza* ‘a glow in the sky before sunrise’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 11, p. 463).

The consonants *ž, š, č, c, r* were palatalised in Old Russian (IAM, 2005, p. 44), and the Polish *ż <rz>* and *c*, inherited from the Slavic proto-language, once were the palatalised *r* and *c*. As the forms *вечера, зара, зара, зора* from Old Russian show, newer forms (with the non-palatalised *r*) were attested in East Slavic languages as well. Considering that the hardening of the consonants *ž, š, č, c, r* began in the fourteenth century, *pamačia, večeria, zaria* must have been borrowed earlier and are more likely to be borrowings from East Slavic languages.

An even larger number of possible Slavic loanwords does not have an attested palatalised stem ending in East Slavic languages either:

bažnyčia < O. Rus. *божница* ‘a place of worship’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 1, p. 274), Pol. *bożnica* ‘a temple, a place for prayers and teaching faith’ (SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 2, p. 350);

dūšia < O. Rus. *душа* ‘a spirit, a soul’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 4, p. 384; SDIA, 1989, vol. 1, p. 749); Ruth. *душа, доуша* ‘a spirit, a soul’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 1, p. 333; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 9, p. 114; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 1, p. 237); Pol. *duża* ‘a psychical element of a human being, a soul’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 2, p. 220; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 6, p. 179);

kozalnyčia < Ruth. *казалниця* ‘a podium’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 14, p. 221); Pol. *kazalnica* ‘a pulpit’ (SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 10, p. 193);

pūsčia < O. Rus. *пуща* ‘an empty place’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 21, p. 73; SDIA, 1989, vol. 2, p. 1742); Ruth. *пуща, нусча, нусица, нушча, поуща* 1. ‘a desert’; 2. ‘wilderness’; 3. ‘an uninhabited area’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 2, p. 278; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 29, p. 385; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 2, p. 259); Pol. *puszcza* ‘an uninhabited or sparsely inhabited area, wastes’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 7, p. 400; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 34, p. 482);

tajemnyčia < Ruth. *таємниця, таємниця* ‘a secret’ (MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 2, p. 384); Pol. *tajemnica* ‘a secret’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 9, p. 82);

temnyčia < Pol. *ciemnica* ‘a prison’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 1, p. 294);

toblyčia < Ruth. *таблиця* ‘a board’ (MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 2, p. 383); Pol. *tablica* ‘a board’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 9, p. 80);

vunyčia < O. Rus. *винница* 1. ‘a vineyard’; 2. ‘a wine cellar’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 2, p. 181; SDIA, 1989, vol. 1, p. 261); Ruth. *винница* 1. ‘a vineyard’; 2. ‘a wine-vault’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 3, p. 275; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 1, p. 101); Pol. *winnica* ‘a vineyard’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 10, p. 229).

It appears that all these Slavic nouns end in *c* or *č*, the consonants which were palatalised by the fourteenth century. Consequently, the loanwords were borrowed before, which makes it possible to assume that they probably derived from East Slavic languages. If their borrowing had occurred after the hardening of consonants, they would have been integrated into the *ā*-stem.

The case of such nouns as

mačia < O. Rus. *мочь* ‘force, power, authority’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 9, p. 284; SDIA, 1989, vol. 2, p. 180); Ruth. *моць, моц* ‘force,

power' (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 1, p. 615; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 18, p. 187; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 1, p. 437); Pol. *moc* 'physical and spiritual power, force' (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 4, p. 303; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 14, p. 403)

is different than that of other *iā*-stem nouns. Other written works attest the *i*-stem (*macis*, *mačis*) as well as the *ē*-stem (*mačė*, *macė*) (LKŽe, n.d.). Apparently, integration of this Slavic loanword into Lithuanian was rather inconsistent because its equivalents in Slavic languages are rather atypical: neither in East Slavic languages nor in Polish do they have endings that are characteristic of most feminine nouns.

Integration of the nouns with *iū*-stem is very similar to those with *iā*-stem; however, all the loan nouns with *iū*-stem are of masculine gender. Petkevičius' Catechism includes 20 Slavic nouns with the *iū*-stem:

aliejus PC 51,7 'plant oil';
altorius PC 64,10 1. 'an altar (in antiquity)'; 2. 'a table in church for services';
bliuznierius PC 229,1 'a blasphemer';
cherubijus PC 150,9 'a cherub';
jednočius PC 145,7 'a unifier, a mediator, a peace-maker';
karalius PC 20,18 'a king';
kryžius PC 110,21 'a cross';
liekorius PC 251,17 'a doctor';
mečius PC 160,11 'a sword';
mesijošius PC 245,26 'the Messiah';
pakajus PC 17,14 'peace, quietness';
pakajus PC 39,11 'a room';
pečius PC 137,1 'a stove for warming premises, cooking food, baking bread';
popiežius PC 206,8 'the Pope';
prietelius PC 92,18 'a friend';
raskašius PC 149,8 'a bodily enjoyment, a pleasure';
ricierius PC 86,4 'a knight';
rojus PC 252,16 'the Paradise';
šeforius PC 201,3 'a supervisor, a caregiver';
žalnierius PC 162,14 'a soldier'.

The equivalents of the above-mentioned words in Ruthenian, Old Russian and Polish have the following endings: -*ŭ*, -*j*, for example:

aliejus < O. Rus. *олей, ольй* ‘olive oil or any plant oil in general’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 12, p. 355; SDIA, 1989, vol. 2, p. 658); Ruth. *оле́й, але́й* ‘olive oil or any plant oil in general’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 22, p. 190); Pol. *olej* ‘oil of plant origin’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 5, p. 563; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 21, p. 311);

a palatalised consonant, for example:

prietelius < O. Rus. *приятель* ‘a friend, a buddy’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 20, p. 87); Pol. *przyjaciół* ‘a good-willing person; a person in a sincere relation with somebody’ (SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 33, p. 222);

or the attested palatalised consonants *ž, š, č, c, r* in East Slavic languages, but already non-palatalised in Polish, for example:

altorius < O. Rus. *алтарь, олтарь* ‘an altar’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 1, p. 31; SDIA, 1989, vol. 1, p. 18); Ruth. *алта́рь, олта́рь, олта́ръ* ‘an altar’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 2, p. 82; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 1, p. 103); Pol. *ołtarz* ‘an altar’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 5, p. 572; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 21, p. 327).

The stem of Slavic loanwords in the latter group can suggest their origin: integration into the *ju*-stem indicates that they were borrowed into Lithuanian before the hardening of Slavic *ž, š, č, c, r*; therefore, it is more likely that East Slavic languages or, to be more precise, Old Russian served as the donor language in this case.

Slightly fewer words in the Catechism (19 instances) are assigned to the *i*-stem:

čias̃tis PC 19,19 ‘honour, respect’;

hadnastis PC 132,14 ‘value’;

kornastis PC 209,10 ‘discipline’;

koz̃nis PC 71,14 1. ‘punishment’; 2. ‘infliction’;

koz̃onis PC 23,12 ‘preachment’;

krikš̃cionis PC 3,4 ‘a Christian’;

kytrastis PC 175,14 ‘artfulness, tortuosity’;

mis̃lis PC 120,3 1. ‘a process of thinking’; 2. ‘a result of thinking’;

mostis PC 162,25 ‘a soft preparation of medicine and fat for treatment, ointment’;

pah̃onis PC 71,25 ‘a pagan’;

peč̃ėtis PC 12,24 ‘a device used to apply inked markings to objects; a sign made with this device; a stamp’;

pilnastis PC 245,16 ‘diligence, zeal, carefulness’;
pometis PC 241,1 ‘memory’;
smertis PC 14,16 ‘death’;
spaviedis PC 205,27 ‘confession’;
svētastis PC 133,10 ‘a saint thing, a relic’;
učtīvastis PC 203,10 ‘honesty’;
vdečnastis PC 224,25 (*vdecnastis* PC 194,4) ‘gratitude’;
zlastis PC 120,7 ‘anger, malice’.

As it is today, this non-productive stem is mostly found in feminine nouns, although there are also several cases of masculine ones (e.g. *geluonis*, *žvėris*, *dantis*, etc.). Only a few loan nouns in this group are of masculine gender, i.e. *krikščionis*, *pahonis*. The noun *krikščionis* is a mixed type because its singular form is declined according to the more productive *iġō*-stem. The form *krikščionies* (Gen. sing.), in turn, is attested in Petkevičius’ Catechism and Daukša’s Postils (hereafter DP), another source from the sixteenth century (DP 369,44; PC 3,12); this indicates assigning *krikščionis* to the *i*-stem. The following equivalents of the noun *pahonis* can be identified in Slavic languages:

O. Rus. *поганѣ* ‘a pagan, an infidel’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 15, p. 180; SDIA, 1989, vol. 2, p. 1012); Ruth. *поганѣ* ‘an infidel’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 2, p. 162); Pol. *pogan* ‘a believer in pretended gods; a term used for followers of other religions’ (SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 26, p. 136).

Assignment of *pahonis* to the *i*-stem (cf. *pahonies* PC 228,27) seems inconsistent: the features of all Slavic languages would favour its integration into the *ō*-stem. Pranas Skardžius points out that this particular stem was primary (cf. *pagonas*), and later the form of the word underwent changes (Skardžius, 1998, p. 209). The reasons for such changes are not clear. The form of collective noun *поганѣ* ‘pagans, infidels’ (SDIA, 1989, vol. 2, p. 1012), which was attested in Old Russian, could have influenced this process.

The remaining *i*-stem nouns in the Catechism are Slavic loans of feminine gender, which they retained from the donor languages. The sole exception here is *kozonis*, whose Slavic equivalents are of neuter gender:

O. Rus. *казанье, казание* ‘preachment, guidance’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 7, p. 16); Ruth. *казанье, казане, казание, козанье* ‘preachment’ (SSM, vol. 1, 1977–1978, p. 460; HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 14, p. 222; MDSUM,

2002–2003, vol. 1, p. 354); Pol. *kazanie* ‘proclaiming the God’s word, preachment, sermon’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 3, p. 254; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 10, p. 194).

Logically, this Slavic loan should have been integrated into the *ē*-stem. It is particularly conspicuous that almost all such Slavic borrowings are abstract nouns (except *pečėtis*) whose equivalents in Slavic languages end in a palatalised consonant, for example:

čias̃tis < Ruth. *честь* ‘dignity, respect, honour’ (MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 2, p. 480); Pol. *cześć* ‘respect, acknowledgement, honour’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 1, p. 375; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 4, p. 150);

hadnastis < Ruth. *годность* ‘value’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 7, p. 25; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 1, p. 178); Pol. *godność* ‘about people, their behaviour, creation and real-life situations: a highly appreciated quality, an advantage’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 2, p. 444; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 7, p. 480).

Eight loan nouns in Petkevičius’ Catechism belong to the *ē*-stem:

histarė PC 229,4 ‘history’;

koronė PC 22,18 ‘a penalty; a torture, a trouble, a misfortune’;

mardavonė PC 114,2 ‘suffering, trouble, slaughter’;

pametavonė PC 28,8 ‘penitence’;

plėmė PC 197,9 ‘kin’;

ponavonė PC 113,23 ‘a realm’;

traicė PC 41,20 ‘trinity’;

žegnonė PC 129,2 ‘blessing’.

They integrated into Lithuanian as feminine nouns, although the equivalents of most of them (except *histarė*, *traicė*) are of neuter gender ending in *-e* in East Slavic languages and in *-ie* in Polish, for example:

koronė < O. Rus. *каранье* ‘punishment’ (SRIA XI–XVII, 1975–2011, vol. 7, p. 73); Ruth. *каранье, каране, карание, каранне* ‘punishment’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 14, p. 279; MDSUM, 2002–2003, vol. 1, p. 358); Pol. *karanie* ‘enforcement of punishment, announcement of punishment, penance’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 3, p. 243; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 10, p. 123).

The East Slavic loan noun *plémė* – ending in -я in the possible donor languages

O. Rus. *племѧ, плѣмѧ* ‘kin’ (SDIA, 1989, vol. 2, p. 959); Ruth. *племя* ‘kin’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 24, p. 363)

requires particular attention because its phonetic analysis indicates that Polish cannot have been the donor language (cf. *plemię*). Such an ending should have predetermined assignment of the loanword to the *jā*-stem, but since the Slavic word was of neuter gender, the noun *plémė* integrated into the *ē*-stem.

Following the established pattern, the borrowings *histarė* and *traicė* should have integrated into the *jā*-stem in Lithuanian, cf.

Pol. *historyja, historia* ‘history’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 2, p. 543; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 8, p. 347); Ruth. *гисторія, гисторыя* ‘history’ (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 6, p. 283);

O. Rus. *троица* ‘the Holy Trinity’ (SDIA, 1989, vol. 3, p. 1001); Ruth. *троица, тройца, троїця* ‘the Holy Trinity’ (SSM, 1977–1978, vol. 2, p. 446); Pol. *trójca* ‘the Holy Trinity’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 9, p. 190).

Such inconsistency could have been caused by the fact that the Slavic loanwords in focus are abstracts, which were more frequently integrated into the *i*-stem and the *ē*-stem.

It is necessary to mention that abstracts used in the Catechism are more frequently hybrids, i.e. Lithuanian suffixes are added to an obviously Slavic root:

akrutnystė PC 142,19 ‘cruelty’;
dužybė PC 83,3 ‘grandeur, solidity’;
hadnystė PC 217,22 ‘suitability, value’;
karalystė PC 9,20 ‘an area or place where someone/something rules or reigns’;
kocerystė PC 134,2 ‘deviation, heresy’;
krikščionystė PC 150,18 ‘Christianity’;
kytrybė PC 19,20 ‘artfulness, tortuosity’;
nebespečnystė PC 21,1 ‘danger’;
nehadnybė PC 120,23 ‘disgrace’;
nevdecnystė PC 186,7 ‘ingratitude’;
pabažnystė PC 138,3 ‘piety’;
ponystė PC 118,6 ‘being a master’;
ubagystė PC 234,22 ‘beggary, poverty, destitution’;

valnumas PC 63,18 ‘freedom, independence, absence of any limitations’;
valnystė PC 101,6 ‘freedom, independence, absence of any limitations’;

or the name of action is derived from a borrowed verb:

afieravojimas PC 245,14 ‘sacrificing’;
apčystymas PC 193,25 ‘purification’;
atprovymas PC 205,23 ‘performing’;
dėkavojimas PC 183,21 ‘gratitude, acknowledgement’;
gatavijimas PC 205,15 ‘preparation’;
korojimas PC 58,11 ‘punishment’;
krikštymas PC 162,19 ‘giving the name’;
liečijimas PC 204,15 ‘treatment’;
mūčymas PC 159,16 ‘torturing’;
nusipakajimas PC 223,2 ‘calming down’;
pateriojimas PC 209,7 ‘loss, bereavement’;
paživojimas PC 13,4 ‘consumption’;
peržegnojimas PC 129,4 ‘blessing’;
rėdymas PC 213,17 ‘supervision, management’;
subudavojimas PC 197,15 ‘an act of building’;
sviečijimas PC 201,2 ‘witnessing’;
sviečymas PC 5,15 ‘witnessing’;
užliecavojimas PC 225,22 ‘pleading’;
užslūžijimas PC 224,9 ‘deserving, earning’;
užslūžymas PC 19,5 ‘deserving, earning’;
užvyojimas PC 11,9 ‘usage’.

Sometimes both abstract hybrids and Slavic loanwords are used without any considerable difference in their meaning: *hadnystė* and *hadnastis*; *kytrybė* and *kytrastis*; *korojimas* and *koronė*.

In one case, assignment to a particular stem raises questions. The following quotation from PC includes the form *kastiriu* (PC 209,1), which can be assigned to the *iġ*-stem, the *i*-stem or the *iū*-stem: “[...] *apsiriieriu* ir *girtuoklu* / *kastiriu* / ir *papiktinimą daranciu*” (“[...] gluttons and drunkards / gamblers / doers of infuriating things”). This is a rare word and only its Gen. pl. form is known from PC; its equivalent in Polish is *kostyra* ‘a gambler’ (SS, 1953–2002, vol. 3, p. 356; SPol, 1966–2012, vol. 11, p. 7). Considering that a borrowed word usually remains of the same gender as in the donor language, in this case it

should remain masculine. Due to the Polish ending *-a*, this noun could have also been declined according to the *īā*-stem, which is not typical of the masculine gender (cf. *kastyria* [Kregždys, 2016, p. 91; Skardžius, 1998, p. 157]). The Ruthenian word *костырѣ* ‘a dicer’, then, is a more likely source of this borrowing (HSBM, 1982–2015, vol. 16, p. 52). Considering the gender and the variety of stems that Slavic loanwords integrated into, it can be concluded that *kastyrius* is a borrowing from Ruthenian assigned to the *īu*-stem.

Conclusions

There is a direct relationship between stem endings and gender of the Slavic words which served as a source for Slavic loanwords in the Lithuanian language and the Lithuanian stems those Slavic loanwords were integrated into:

- masculine Slavic loanwords whose equivalents in Slavic languages are nouns of masculine gender with a hard (non-palatalised) ending or nouns of neuter gender integrated into the *ō*-stem;
- feminine Slavic loan nouns whose equivalents in Slavic languages are feminine nouns with the ending *-a*, or words of neuter gender and, less frequently, Slavic loanwords of common or masculine gender whose equivalents in the Slavic donor language also have the ending *-a*, integrated into the *ā*-stem;
- feminine Slavic loan nouns whose equivalents in Slavic languages are feminine nouns with the attested palatalised end of the stem (Ruth. *зброя*; Pol. *zbroja*); with the palatalised *ž, š, č, c, r* at the end of the stem attested in East Slavic, but with non-palatalised ones in the Polish language (O. Rus. *вечера*; Ruth. *вечеря*; Pol. *wieczera*); with the non-palatalised *ž, š, č, c, r* at the end of the stem in East Slavic and Polish languages (O. Rus. *дыша*; Ruth. *дыша, доыша*; Pol. *dusza*) entered the *īā*-stem class; in rare cases, masculine Slavic borrowings whose equivalents in Slavic languages are also of masculine gender with analogous stem endings also integrated into the group of *īā*-stem words;
- masculine Slavic words whose equivalents in Slavic languages end in *ŭ, -j*, a palatalised consonant or the attested palatalised *ž, š, č, c, r* at the end of the stem in East Slavic languages, but already non-palatalised in Polish, integrated into the *īu*-stem group;

- feminine Slavic loan nouns whose equivalents in Slavic languages are of feminine gender with the soft (palatalised) stem ending (apart from *ž, š, č, c, r*), and nouns of neuter gender, became part of the *i*-stem class; less frequently, masculine Slavic borrowings whose equivalents are masculine nouns with the palatalised ending of the stem in Slavic languages were also assigned to this stem group;
- feminine Slavic loan nouns whose equivalents in Slavic languages are abstracts of neuter gender ending with *-e* in East Slavic languages and with *-ie* in Polish, and less commonly feminine nouns with palatalised endings of the stem, integrated into the *ē*-stem.

In cases where Slavic loanwords belong to the *iā* stem or the *iu* stem and their equivalents in Slavic languages have the palatalised or non-palatalised *ž, š, č, c, r* at the end of the stem, there is a higher probability that the loanwords reached Lithuanian from East Slavic languages and, thus, such stems can suggest the origin of Slavic loanwords.

Slavic borrowings derived from masculine and feminine nouns retain their gender in Lithuanian. While Lithuanian lost the neuter gender rather early, Slavic languages retained this feature. The changes that occurred after Leskien's law took effect clearly indicate the chronology of borrowing and the origin of Slavic loanwords: when a noun in Slavic languages is of neuter gender and a Slavic loanword that derives from it is assigned to the *ō*-stem in the Lithuanian language, it means that such a borrowing came from East Slavic languages; when a loanword belongs to the *ā*-stem group, it means that it reached Lithuanian later than the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries, and thus its source could have been Polish or East Slavic languages.

Although the integration of Slavic borrowings is rather consistent, in some rare cases assigning a loanword to a certain stem seems to be complicated. For example, Old Russian *казанье, казание*, Ruthenian *казанье, казане, казание, козанье*, Polish *kazanie* in Lithuanian language should have been integrated into the *ē*-stem, not the *i*-stem, as was the case in the Catechism (*kozonis*).

Translated by Jovita Bagdonavičiūtė

Abbreviations

ALEW	– <i>Altltitaisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> (Hock et al., 2015)
DP	– <i>Daukšos Postilė</i> , 1926
HSBM	– <i>Histarychny sloŭnik belaruskaj movy</i> (Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы, 1982–2015)
IAM	– <i>IAzyki mira: Slavianskie iazyki</i> (Языки мира: Славянские языки, 2005)
LKE	– <i>Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija</i> , 2008
LKŽe	– <i>Lietuvių kalbos elektroninis žodynas</i> (n.d.)
MDSUM	– <i>Materialy do slovnika pysemnoi ta knyzhnoi ukraïns'koï movy</i> (Тымченко, 2002–2003) / <i>Матеріали до словника писемної та книжної української мови</i> (Тимченко, 2002–2003)
O. Rus.	– Old Russian
PC	– <i>Petkevičiaus katekizmas</i> (Petkevičius, 1939)
Pol.	– Polish
Ruth.	– Ruthenian
SDIA	– <i>Slovar' drevnerusskogo iazyka</i> (Словарь древнерусского языка, 1989)
SDIA XI–XIV	– <i>Slovar' drevnerusskogo iazyka (XI–XIV vv.)</i> (Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.), 1988–2012)
SEJL	– <i>Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego</i> (Smoczyński, 2019)
SPol	– <i>Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku</i> , 1966–2012
SRIA XI–XVII	– <i>Slovar' russkogo iazyka XI–XVII vv.</i> (Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв., 1975–2011)
SS	– <i>Słownik staropolski</i> , 1953–2002
SSM	– <i>Slovnýk staroukraïns'koï movy XIV–XV st.</i> (Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст., 1977–1978)

Bibliography

- Brückner, A. (1877). *Die slavischen Fremdwörter im Litauischen*. Retrieved December 20, 2014, from <https://archive.org/details/dieslavischenfr01brgoog>
- Būga, K. (1958–1961). *Rinktiniai raštai* (Vols. 1–3). Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- Daukšos Postilė* [DP]. (1926). Kaunas: Lietuvos universiteto leidinys.
- Dini, P. U. (1990). Slavismi e germanismi lessicali nel “Piccolo Catechismo” lituano Di Lysius del 1719. *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università della Basilicata* 3, 225–245.

- Dini, P. U. (1993). Slavizmai Lizijaus ir Engelio katekizmuose: gretinamoji analizė. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai*, 30, 33–36.
- Fraenkel, E. (1962). *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Girdenis, A. (2001). *Kalbotyros darbai* (Vol. 3). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Hock, W., Fecht, R., Feulner, A. H., Hill, E. & Wodtko, D. S. (Eds.). (2015). *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch [ALEW]* (Vols. 1–2). Hamburg: Baar.
- Jakaitienė, E. (2009). *Leksikologija*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
- Kardelis, V. (2003). *Rytų aukštaičių šnektų slavizmų fonologijos bruožai*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universiteto leidykla.
- Kozhanov, K. (2014). Priešdėlio da- semantika lietuvių kalboje. In T. Civjan, M. Zavjalova, & A. Judžentis (Eds.), *Baltai ir slavai: Dvasinių kultūrų sankirtos* (pp. 254–274). Vilnius: Versmė.
- Kregždys, R. (2012). Charakterystyka słownika polonizmów w języku litewskim. *LingVaria*, 2012(2/14), 125–146.
- Kregždys, R. (2013). Leksiniai skoliniai – tautų kultūrinės interferencijos refleksija: lietuvių kalbos polonizmai-semitizmai. *Baltu filologija*, 22(2), 55–93.
- Kregždys, R. (2014a). Lietuvių kalbos polonizmų-lotynizmų atribucijos ypatumai. In M. Dawlewicz, I. Fedorowicz, & A. Kalėda (Eds.), *Funkcjonowanie języków i literatur na Litwie: Litewsko-polskie związki naukowe i kulturowe* (pp. 407–421). Wilno: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego.
- Kregždys, R. (2014b). Методика и критерии идентификации полонизмов литовского языка. *LingVaria*, 2014(2/18), 95–217.
- Kregždys, R. (2016). *Lietuvių kalbos polonizmų žodynas: Mokslinis žodynas / Słownik polonizmów w języku litewskim* (Vols. 1–2). Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Krupas, J. (1970). 1598 m. Merklio Petkevičiaus katekizmo leksika. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai*, 12, 83–154.
- Kuźmina, D. (2002). *Katechizmy w Rzeczypospolitej XVI i początku XVII wieku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Laučiūtė, J. (2007). Baltiškos kilmės vardažodžių galūnių likimas šiaurės slavų kalbose. *Res Humanitariae*, 2, 85–101.
- Lebedys, J. (1977). *Senoji lietuvių literatūra*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Lietuvių kalbos elektroninis žodynas* [LKŽe]. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.lkz.lt/>
- Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija* [LKE]. (2008). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Maskuliūnas, B. (2009). Savybiniai įvardžiai Merklio Petkevičiaus “Katekizme”. *Baltu filologija*, 18, 113–120.
- Meller, K. (1984). O pieśniowej twórczości Jakuba Lubelczyka. *Pamiętnik Literacki*, 75(4), 151–175.
- Niedzwiedz, J. (2008). Jan Kochanowski, poeta litewski. *Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipėdensis*, 16, 179–187.

- Otrębski, J. (1965). *Gramatyka języka litewskiego: Vol. 2. Nauka o budowie wyrazów*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Pakerys, J. (2013). *Naujųjų skolinių duonemų bazės veiksmažodžių morfologija*. *Taikomoji kalbotyra*, 2013(3). Retrieved from <https://taikomojikalbotyra.lt/ojs/index.php/taikomoji-kalbotyra/article/view/28/22>
- Palionis, J. (1967). *Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a.* Vilnius: Mintis.
- Petkevičius, M. (1939). *1598 metų Merkelio Petkevičiaus katekizmas* [PC]. Kaunas: Knygų leidimo komisija.
- Pociūtė, D. (2000). Prigimties pančiai ar įstatymų laisvė: kai kurie Mikalojaus Daukšos *Postilės* “Prakalbos į malonųjų skaitytoją” aspektai protestantų minties kontekste. *Literatūra*, 38(1), 23–31.
- Pociūtė, D. (2005). Psalmės Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės giesmynuose. XVI a.: Nuo Nesvyžiaus “Katekizmo” iki lietuviškųjų Merkelio Petkevičiaus vertimų. *Literatūra*, 47(1), 29–43. <https://doi.org/10.15388/Litera.2005.1.8148>
- Pokorny, J. (1959). *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- Sabaliauskas, A. (1990). *Lietuvių kalbos leksika*. Vilnius: Moksas.
- Siaurukienė, H. (1987). “Knygos nobažnystės” giesmyno skoliniai. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai*, 26, 145–150.
- Skardžius, P. (1931). Die slavischen Lehnwörter im Altlitauischen. *Tauta ir žodis*, 7.
- Skardžius, P. (1998). *Rinkiniai raštai* (Vol. 4.). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* [SPol] (Vols. 1–36). (1966–2012). Wrocław, Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Instytut Badań Literackich PAN.
- Słownik staropolski* [SS] (Vols. 1–11). (1953–2002). Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Smoczyński, W. (2019). *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [SEJL]. Retrieved from <https://romanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczy%C5%84ski%20W.%20S%C5%82ownik%20etymologiczny%20j%C4%99zyka%20litewskiego.pdf>
- Urbutis, V. (1992). Senosios lietuvių kalbos slavizmai. *Baltistica*, 27(1), 4–41. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.27.1.191>
- Urbutis, V. (1993). Senųjų slavizmų kilmės įvairovė. *Baltistica*, 28(1), 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.28.1.231>
- Valeckienė, A. (1967). Kitų kalbų kilmės žodžiai lietuvių kalbos morfologinėje sistemoje. In V. Ambrasas (Ed.), *Lietuvių kalba tarybiniais metais* (pp. 108–12). Vilnius: Mintis.
- Voitkevič, B. (2010). Mikalojaus Daukšos *Postilės* slavizmų morfologinė integracija. *Baltistica*, 45(2), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.45.2.1510>
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1968). Apie 1605 m. katekizmo tarmę. *Baltistica*, 4(1), 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.4.1.1683>
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1970). M. Petkevičiaus katekizmo (1598 m.) tarmė. *Baltistica*, 6(2), 227–243. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.6.2.1760>
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1974). S. M. Slavočinskio giesmyno (1646 m.) kalba. In A. Valeckienė (Ed.), *Žodžių formos ir jų vartoseną* (pp. 135–170). Vilnius: Mintis.

- Zinkevičius, Z. (1980). *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo.
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1988). *Senųjų raštų kalba*. Vilnius: Mokslo.
- Zinkevičius, Z. (2002). *Rinkiniai raštai* (Vol. 1). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы* [HSBM] (Vols. 1–35). (1982–2015). Мінск.
- Словарь древнерусского языка* [SDIA] (Vols. 1–3). (1989). Москва: Книга.
- Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.)* [SDIA XI–XIV] (Vols. 1–9). (1988–2012). Москва.
- Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв.* [SRIA XI–XVII] (Vols. 1–29). (1975–2011). Москва: Наука.
- Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст.* [SSM] (Vols. 1–2). (1977–1978). Київ: Наукова думка.
- Тимченко, Є. К. (2002–2003). *Матеріали до словника писемної та книжної української мови* [MDSUM] (Vols. 1–2). Київ: Національна академія наук України.
- Языки мира: Славянские языки* [IAM]. (2005). Москва: Academia.

Bibliography (Transliteration)

- Brückner, A. (1877). *Die slavischen Fremdwörter im Litauischen*. Retrieved December 20, 2014, from <https://archive.org/details/dieslavischenfr01brgoog>
- Būga, K. (1958–1961). *Rinkiniai raštai* (Vols. 1–3). Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- Daukšos Postilė* [DP]. (1926). Kaunas: Lietuvos universiteto leidinys.
- Dini, P. U. (1990). Slavismi e germanismi lessicali nel “Piccolo Catechismo” lituano Di Lysius del 1719. *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università della Basilicata* 3, 225–245.
- Dini, P. U. (1993). Slavizmai Lizijaus ir Engelio katekizmuose: gretinamoji analizė. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai*, 30, 33–36.
- Fraenkel, E. (1962). *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Girdenis, A. (2001). *Kalbotyros darbai* (Vol. 3). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы* [HSBM] (Vols. 1–35). (1982–2015). Мінск.
- Hock, W., Fecht, R., Feulner, A. H., Hill, E. & Wodtke, D. S. (Eds.). (2015). *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [ALEW] (Vols. 1–2). Hamburg: Baar.
- IAzyki mira: Slavianskie iazyki* [IAM]. (2005). Moskva: Academia.
- Jakaitienė, E. (2009). *Leksikologija*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
- Kardelis, V. (2003). *Rytų aukštaičių šnektų slavizmų fonologijos bruožai*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universiteto leidykla.

- Kozhanov, K. (2014). Priešdėlio da- semantika lietuvių kalboje. In T. Civjan, M. Zavjalova, & A. Judžentis (Eds.), *Baltai ir slavai: Dvasinių kultūrų sankirtos* (pp. 254–274). Vilnius: Versmė.
- Kregždys, R. (2012). Charakterystyka słownika polonizmów w języku litewskim. *LingVaria*, 2012(2/14), 125–146.
- Kregždys, R. (2013). Leksiniai skoliniai – tautų kultūrinės interferencijos refleksija: lietuvių kalbos polonizmai-semitizmai. *Baltu filologija*, 22(2), 55–93.
- Kregždys, R. (2014a). Lietuvių kalbos polonizmų-lotynizmų atribucijos ypatumai. In M. Dawlewicz, I. Fedorowicz, & A. Kalėda (Eds.), *Funkcjonowanie języków i literatur na Litwie: Litewsko-polskie związki naukowe i kulturowe* (pp. 407–421). Wilno: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego.
- Kregždys, R. (2014b). Metodika i kriterii identifikatsii polonizmov litovskogo iazyka. *LingVaria*, 2014(2/18), 195–217.
- Kregždys, R. (2016). *Lietuvių kalbos polonizmų žodynas: Mokslinis žodynas / Słownik polonizmów w języku litewskim* (Vols. 1–2). Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Krupas, J. (1970). 1598 m. Merklio Petkevičiaus katekizmo leksika. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai*, 12, 83–154.
- Kuźmina, D. (2002). *Katechizmy w Rzeczypospolitej XVI i początku XVII wieku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SBP.
- Laučiūtė, J. (2007). Baltiškos kilmės vardažodžių galūnių likimas šiaurės slavų kalbose. *Res Humanitariae*, 2, 85–101.
- Lebedys, J. (1977). *Senoji lietuvių literatūra*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Lietuvių kalbos elektroninis žodynas* [LKŽe]. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.lkz.lt/>
- Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija* [LKE]. (2008). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Maskuliūnas, B. (2009). Savybiniai įvardžiai Merklio Petkevičiaus “Katekizme”. *Baltu filologija*, 18, 113–120.
- Meller, K. (1984). O pieśniowej twórczości Jakuba Lubelczyka. *Pamiętnik Literacki*, 75(4), 151–175.
- Niedźwiedz, J. (2008). Jan Kochanowski, poeta litewski. *Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis*, 16, 179–187.
- Otrębski, J. (1965). *Gramatyka języka litewskiego: Vol. 2. Nauka o budowie wyrazów*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Pakerys, J. (2013). *Naujųjų skolinių duonemų bazės veiksmąžodžių morfologija. Taikomoji kalbotyra*, 2013(3). Retrieved from <https://taikomojikalbotyra.lt/ojs/index.php/taikomoji-kalbotyra/article/view/28/22>
- Palionis, J. (1967). *Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a.* Vilnius: Mintis.
- Petkevičius, M. (1939). *1598 metų Merklio Petkevičiaus katekizmas* [PC]. Kaunas: Knygų leidimo komisija.
- Pociūtė, D. (2000). Prigimties pančiai ar įstatymų laisvė: kai kurie Mikalojaus Daukšos *Postilės* “Prakalbos į malonųjį skaitytoją” aspektai protestantų minties kontekste. *Literatūra*, 38(1), 23–31.
- Pociūtė, D. (2005). Psalmės Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės giesmynuose. XVI a.: Nuo Nesvyžiaus “Katekizmo” iki lietuviškųjų Merklio Petkevičiaus vertimų. *Literatūra*, 47(1), 29–43. <https://doi.org/10.15388/Litera.2005.1.8148>

- Pokorny, J. (1959). *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- Sabaliauskas, A. (1990). *Lietuvių kalbos leksika*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Siaurukienė, H. (1987). "Knygos nobažnystės" giesmyno skoliniai. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai*, 26, 145–150.
- Skardžius, P. (1931). Die slavischen Lehnwörter im Altlitauischen. *Tauta ir žodis*, 7.
- Skardžius, P. (1998). *Rinkiniai raštai* (Vol. 4.) Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Slovar' drevnerusskogo iazyka* [SDIA] (Vols. 1–3). (1989). Moskva: Kniga.
- Slovar' drevnerusskogo iazyka* (XI–XIV vv.) [SDIA XI–XIV] (Vols. 1–9). (1988–2012). Moskva.
- Slovar' russkogo iazyka* XI–XVII vv. [SRIA XI–XVII] (Vols. 1–29). (1975–2011). Moskva: Nauka.
- Slovník staroukrajinského jazyka* XIV–XV st. [SSM] (Vols. 1–2). (1977–1978). Kyїв: Naukova dumka.
- Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* [SPol] (Vols. 1–36). (1966–2012). Wrocław, Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Instytut Badań Literackich PAN.
- Słownik staropolski* [SS] (Vols. 1–11). (1953–2002). Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Smoczyński, W. (2019). *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [SEJL]. Retrieved from <https://rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczy%C5%84ski%20W.%20S%C5%82ownik%20etymologiczny%20j%C4%99zyka%20litewskiego.pdf>
- Tymchenko, I. E. K. (2002–2003). *Materialy do slovnika pysemnoi ta knyzhnoi ukrains'koï movy* [MDSUM] (Vols. 1–2). Kyїв: Natsional'na akademiia nauk Ukraїny.
- Urbutis, V. (1992). Senosios lietuvių kalbos slavizmai. *Baltistica*, 27(1), 4–41. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.27.1.191>
- Urbutis, V. (1993). Senųjų slavizmų kilmės įvairovė. *Baltistica*, 28(1), 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.28.1.231>
- Valeckienė, A. (1967). Kitų kalbų kilmės žodžiai lietuvių kalbos morfologinėje sistemoje. In V. Ambrazas (Ed.), *Lietuvių kalba tarybiniais metais* (pp. 108–112). Vilnius: Mintis.
- Voitkevič, B. (2010). Mikalojaus Daukšos Postilės slavizmų morfologinė integracija. *Baltistica*, 45(2), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.45.2.1510>
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1968). Apie 1605 m. katekizmo tarmę. *Baltistica*, 4(1), 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.4.1.1683>
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1970). M. Petkevičiaus katekizmo (1598 m.) tarmė. *Baltistica*, 6(2), 227–243. <https://doi.org/10.15388/baltistica.6.2.1760>
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1974). S. M. Slavočinskio giesmyno (1646 m.) kalba. In A. Valeckienė (Ed.), *Žodžių formos ir jų vartoseną* (pp. 135–170). Vilnius: Mintis.
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1980). *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1988). *Senųjų raštų kalba*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Zinkevičius, Z. (2002). *Rinkiniai raštai* (Vol. 1). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Patterns of Morphological Integration of Slavic Loan Nouns in Petkevičius' Catechism (1598) as an Indication of Their Origin and Chronology

Summary

This article focuses on the morphological integration of Slavic loan nouns featuring in Merkelis Petkevičius' Catechism (1598) into the Lithuanian language. It attempts to establish whether the pattern of adaptation of a Slavic loanword to a particular Lithuanian stem can suggest its more precise origin. In order to achieve this objective, I extracted all Slavic loan nouns from Petkevičius' Catechism, identified their stems and meanings, and established their equivalents in Slavic languages of the relevant period (Old Russian, Ruthenian, Old and Middle Polish). Comparing this data made it possible to establish some common patterns of integration of Slavic loanwords into the morphological system of the Lithuanian language. A direct relationship was identified between the endings and gender of the Slavic words and the Lithuanian stems into which they were integrated. Therefore, in some cases the pattern of adaptation of a Slavic loanword can suggest its path into the Lithuanian language.

Adaptacja morfologiczna słowiańskich zapożyczeń rzeczownikowych w katechizmie Pietkiewicza (1598) jako wskazówka na temat ich źródła i chronologii

Streszczenie

Niniejszy artykuł omawia adaptację morfologiczną słowiańskich zapożyczeń rzeczownikowych w języku litewskim na podstawie materiału leksykalnego katechizmu Melchiora Pietkiewicza (1598). Podjęta analiza stanowi próbę ustalenia, czy ich dostosowanie do określonego rdzenia litewskiego może

dokładniej wskazywać na źródło pochodzenia. W toku przeprowadzonych badań z katechizmu wyekscerpowano wszystkie rzeczowniki zapożyczone z języków słowiańskich, zidentyfikowano ich rdzenie i znaczenia oraz ustalono ich ekwiwalenty w językach słowiańskich w odpowiednim okresie (staroruskim, ruskim, staro- i średniopolskim). Porównanie tych danych pozwoliło uchwycić pewne prawidłowości adaptacji zapożyczeń słowiańskich do systemu morfologicznego języka litewskiego. Ustalono bezpośredni związek pomiędzy końcówkami i rodzajem gramatycznym leksemów słowiańskich a ich adaptacją do określonych rdzeni litewskich. W pewnych przypadkach wzorzec adaptacji może zatem wskazywać na źródło zapożyczenia słowiańskiego w języku litewskim.

Keywords: Petkevičius' Catechism; Slavic loanwords; morphological integration; Slavic languages

Słowa kluczowe: katechizm Pietkiewicza; zapożyczenia słowiańskie; adaptacja morfologiczna; języki słowiańskie

Anželika Smetonienė, Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Vilnius

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0352-884X>

Correspondence: anzelika.smetoniene@gmail.com

The preparation of this article was financed by the author.

Competing interests: The author declares that she has no competing interests.