

RECENZIJOS

Vytautas Kardelis, **Rytų aukštaičių šnektų slavizmų fonologijos bruožai** (Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakulteto mokslo darbai), Vilnius, Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2003, 195 p.

V. Kardelis' book will probably become a standard reference work for Lithuanian dialectologists and historical linguists. Eastern Lithuanian dialects have many Slavonic lexical borrowings, although a thorough study of the phonetic and phonological characteristics of these Slavisms did not previously exist. A clear and detailed formulation of the *phonological integration laws* of the Slavonic borrowings into Lithuanian, which represents perhaps Kardelis' major contribution, may well cast new light on some controversial linguistic problems, such as: the precise Slavonic etymology of the borrowings, in particular, whether they are Polish or East Slavonic (Belarusian, in its dialectal variety known as *мова проста* or "talk *po prostu*", that is "talk simply"), the chronology of the borrowing process, the relationship between Polish and Belarusian in respect to their influence on Lithuanian and the historical phonology of the Eastern Lithuanian dialects, to name just a few.

After a theoretical and methodological introduction, a description of the phonological system of the Lithuanian dialect of Liūkmenys, and a characterization of the vocalism of the Slavonic languages, the greatest part of Kardelis' book is devoted to the *integration laws* of the Slavonic borrowings into Lithuanian. These laws concern mostly the vocalic system of the borrowings.

Kardelis' work is based principally on dialectal data collected in the field, i.e. they come from Liūkmenys, the author's native place, where an Eastern Lithuanian dialect of the "Utena" type is

spoken (*rytų aukštaičiai uteniškiai*). "Utena"-type dialects have a complex phonological system, characterized by three distinctive degrees of vowel length. As Kardelis shows definitively in his book, it is the phonological system of the Lithuanian dialect (and not that of the source Slavonic languages and dialects) which shapes the regular correspondences between the phonological and phonetic shape of the Slavonic lexeme and its correspondent in the Lithuanian dialect which receives it.

In particular:

- it is possible to establish the precise correspondences between the Slavonic phonemes and their Lithuanian counterparts, which are adapted to the phonological system of the Lithuanian dialect. According to these *integration laws* each Slavonic phoneme will have its counterpart in the Lithuanian borrowing;
- a Slavonic phoneme can have different Lithuanian counterparts in different historical phases. This important fact shows the existence of various *chronological strata* of Slavonic borrowings in the Lithuanian dialects;
- the *integration laws* depend on the internal developments of the Lithuanian phonological system, while the Slavonic systems have hardly any influence on them. This finding, which is important on the typological level too, recalls Sapir's discussion of the huge number of Norman borrowings in Middle English: according to Sapir, their importance for the structural "drift" of the English language had been exaggerated, because they have at most favoured tendencies which were already latent in the structure of the English language. The same happened in Lithuanian: as Kardelis shows, the flood of Slavonic lexemes

into Lithuanian has only had a very minor influence on the phonological system, that is, the phonologization of two new vowels, the two semilong /ie./, /uo./, whose adoption was structurally necessary in the phonological system of the dialect, in order to fill two empty cells and obtain a symmetrical structure. Like the Norman borrowings in English, the great number of Slavisms in Eastern Lithuanian did not alter the structural path in which the

Lithuanian linguistic (in our case, phonological) system was going.

Let us now see more in detail some of the *integration laws*.

1) In the oldest chronological stratum, before the Eastern Slavonic loss of the *jers*, the following laws were operating:

Slavonic phoneme	ь	ъ	е	о
Reconstructed phoneme in the Lithuanian dialect	*i	*u	*e	*a
Contemporary phoneme in the Liñkmenys dialect (tonic syllable)	i.	u.	e.	a.
Contemporary phoneme in the Liñkmenys dialect (atonic syllable)	i	u	e	a

Slavonic phoneme	ě	i	u	y	a
Reconstructed phoneme in the Lithuanian dialect	e:	i:	u:	ui	a:
Contemporary phoneme in the Liñkmenys dialect (tonic syllable)	ie	i:	u:	ui	ɔ:
Contemporary phoneme in the Liñkmenys dialect (atonic syllable)	e.	i.	u.	ui	a.

Some examples (tonic vowels)¹:

Slavonic lexeme (Belarusian or Polish) ²	<i>Liñkmenys dialect lexeme</i>	English translation
'mocny	<i>má.cnas</i>	"strong"
mar'kotny	<i>marká.tnas</i>	"sad"
sklep	<i>sklé.pas</i>	"shop"
čes'c'	<i>čě.stis</i>	"honour"
'оsьлѣ	<i>á.silas</i>	"donkey"
крѣ'stitѣ	<i>kri.kšti.t</i>	"to baptize"
'cěly	<i>ciēlas</i>	"whole"
svět	<i>sviētas</i>	"world"
aku'ratna	<i>akurš'tnei</i>	"accurately"
'пам'ac'	<i>pš.me.tis</i>	"memory"
har'bata	<i>arbɔ.tà</i> (gen. sing. <i>arbš'ta.s</i>)	"tea"
prud	<i>prū.das</i>	"pond"
sud	<i>sū.das</i>	"court"
blin	<i>blī.nas</i>	"pancake"
vino	<i>vī.nas</i>	"wine"

¹ Semilong vowels are marked with a low dot (*a.*).

² These Slavonic lexemes have an heterogeneous phonological structure, as they refer to different periods.

Atonic vowels:

'odra	<i>adrà</i>	"measles"
'sxody	<i>skadaĩ</i>	"ladder"
ga'd'ina (ha'dz'ina)	<i>adi'nà</i>	"hour"
ka'rol'	<i>karà.ļus</i>	"king"
pa'l'ak	<i>palē.kas</i>	"Pole"
'pomoc (pol.) 'pomač (blr.)	<i>pà.mačis</i>	"help"
pi'rog (blr.)	<i>pi.rà.gas</i>	"cake"
chitra'vac'	<i>ki.travó.t</i>	"to cheat"

In this first stratum, the Slavonic short and reduced vowels have a short counterpart in Lithuanian (which has at present become a semilong vowel).

As we can see, the contemporary phonological system of the Liñkmenys dialect is different from the generally reconstructed Lithuanian vocalism. Lithuanian dialects have inherited from the Baltic protolanguage a two-degree vocalism; some dialects have only later developed a third phonological degree of vowel length. In these dialects, short tonic vowels have been lengthened, but not so as to coincide with long vowels. After their phonologization,

these *semilong* vowels came to occupy a central position in the dialectal phonological system, as long vowels also had a semilong allophone (when they were not tonic). Given their wider distribution, the *semilong* vowels became the unmarked member of the vowel-length opposition.

A second chronological stratum of integration laws came into being after the phonologization of semilong vowels. Given the central position that these have gained, it is now a semilong *a*, *i*, *u*, which corresponds to Slavonic *a*, *i*, *u* (in the first stratum, the Lithuanian counterparts were the long vowels *a:*, *i:*, *u:* instead).

Table 3. Integration laws (II).

Slavonic phoneme	<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>a</i>
Contemporary phoneme in the Liñkmenys dialect (tonic syllable)	<i>ie.</i>	<i>uo.</i>	<i>i.</i>	<i>u.</i>	<i>a.</i>
Contemporary phoneme in the Liñkmenys dialect (atonic syllable)	<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>a</i>

Some examples:

Table 4. Integration laws (II). Examples.

<i>Slavonic</i>	<i>Lithuanian</i>	English
be'ret	<i>bariė.tas</i>	"cap"
'nagly	<i>nà.glas</i>	"naked"
bicza'vac'	<i>bí.čeva.t</i>	"to wheap"
'n'igdy	<i>nĩ.gdi</i>	"never"
brud	<i>brú.das</i>	"dirt"

Atonic vowels:

<i>Slavonic</i>	<i>Lithuanian</i>	English
dal'i'katny	<i>dalikš'inas</i>	"delicate"
'komin	<i>kà.minas</i>	"chimney"
k'i's'el'	<i>kisiē.ļus</i>	"kissel"
su'bota	<i>subatà</i>	"Saturday"
bu'd'il'nik	<i>budĩ.lni.kas</i>	"alarm clock"

An interesting case is the Slavonic word-forming suffix *-ik*, which appears in Lithuanian borrowings both as *-i:kas* (*zvanĩ'kas* "bell"), in older borrowings, and as *-i.kas*, (*paldiĩni.kas* "Monday").

Another important result of Kardelis' work confirms for Lithuanian dialectology what Urbutis had already shown for the old Lithuanian literary writings (see: BIt XXVII, 1992, 4–14): many Slavonic borrowings, which were thought to be Polonisms, are in fact Belarusisms. This is evident from the glossary (pages 170 to 195) in Kardelis' book. The prestige of the Polish language has always been very high in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Such prestige made the Lithuanian linguistic community receptive to Slavonic borrowings. It is not surprising that these borrowings came more from Belarusian dialects than from Polish: Lithuanian and Belarusian dialects are in long-standing contacts (not far from Liñkmenys, in Adutiškis, both dialects are spoken). The prestige of the Polish language has opened the way to the Belarusian influence in Lithuanian, and the Belarusian dialects acted as a substitute for the far-away Polish.

Francesco Zamblera

Zigmas Zinkevičius, **Krikščionybės ištakos Lietuvoje**: Rytų krikščionybė vardyno duomenimis, Vilnius, Katalikų akademijos leidykla, 2005, 112 p.

„Kalba prityrusiam kalbininkui yra tikras istorijos šaltinis, nes šių dienų kalboje atspindi praeitasis žmogaus gyvenimas, visa jo senovė“ – tokiais Kazimiero Būgos (1961, 728) žodžiais galima apibūdinti Zigmo Zinkevičiaus ikikatalikiškų laikų baltų ir slavų kultūrų sankirtų tyrimą remiantis lietuvių vardynu. Pats Būga aiškių ir slavų praeities pėdsakų ieškojo daugiau nagrinėdamas tikrinius vietų vardus, tuo tarpu Būgos raštų sudarytojas Zinkevičius baltų ir slavų santykiams aptarti pasirinko kartu su Rytų krikščionybėje gautus vardus bei jų kilmės pavardes, taip pat su šios kilmės asmenvardžiais siejamus vandenvardžius ir gyvenamųjų vietų vardus.

Nuo Būgos laikų žinoma (p. 7–11)¹, kad Lietuvoje pirmieji krikščionybės platintojai buvę rytiniai kaimynai, dabartiniai gudų protėviai, iš kurių lietuviai yra perėmę nemažai religinių terminų iki oficialaus (1387 m.) krikšto. Kadangi vardyne užkonservuojama daug archajiškų kalbos faktų, todėl teoriškai tokio paties senumo skolinių kaip religiniai terminai lietuvių tikrinėje leksikoje turėtų būti dar daugiau nei apeliatyvinėje, nes tautos nuo seno gyveno kaimynystėje. Minčių, kad lietuviai turėjo iš rytų slavų skolinių vardų, yra pareikšta ir anksčiau (žr. S a l y s 1983, 33), tik tokių vardų nebūta daug (D u m č i u s 1958, 128)² ir jie nesudarė pamato vėlesnei krikščioniško vardyno raidai (LVKŽ 27). Buvo labiau remiama nuomonė, kad krikščioniški vardai į Lietuvą atėjo kartu su krikštu iš lenkų kalbos³, iš kurios juos gavo ir rytų slavai. Teigta, kad iš rytų slavų vardai į lietuvių kalbą pateko tik pačioje krikščionybės pradžioje (D u m č i u s 1958, 119). Turėdamas prieš akis šiuos faktus Zinkevičius pabandė inventorizuoti visus iki krikšto gautus asmenvardžius ir iširti jų paveldą lietuvių tikrinėje leksikoje. Jis pastebėjo, kad prigijusių ir išlikusių šiuo laiku gautų vardų yra gerokai daugiau nei to paties senumo minėtų apeliatyvų. Bet prie šios išvados buvo prieita pamažu.

Pirmiausia paanalizavęs XVII a. pradžios Vilniaus miesto antroponimus Zinkevičius nustatė, kad tarp jų yra ne tik Vakarų, bet ir Rytų

¹ Čia ir toliau skliaustuose nurodomi aptariamų Zinkevičiaus knygos puslapiai.

² Pagal D u m č i u (1958, 128–130) iš rytų slavų yra patekę šie onimai: *Kipras*, *Grigālius*, *Antānas*, *Klīmas*, *Danýla*, *Mikāilas*, *Samūilis*, *Sidarāvičius*, *Tiškus*, *Apanāvičius*, *Ivōnas*, *Jūrka*, *Trīponas*, *Vosýlius*, *Rapailiōnis*, *Kvēdaras*, *Umbrāsas*, *Ambrāsas*.

³ Beje, asmenvardžių, iš Rytų lietuvių gautų iki krikšto, nurodo ir Jonu Dumčiumi dažniausiai besiremiantis Aleksandras V a n a g a s, teigęs, kad vardai *Motiėjus* (1974, 101; 1982, 80), *Póvilas* (1980, 67; 1982, 94), *Vosýlius* (1982, 27) Lietuvą yra pasiekę dar iki XIV a., o pvz., vardai *Pētras* (1977, 58; 1982, 88), *Ambraziėjus* (1977, 75; 1982, 90–91) į Lietuvą galėjo patekti ir per lenkus, ir per rytų slavus – baltarusius, rusus.