

VYTAUTAS MAGNUS UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF THE LITHUANIAN LANGUAGE
KLAIPĖDA UNIVERSITY
ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY

Kęstutis Dambrauskas

**THE PROBLEM OF THE AUTHORSHIP
OF MORKŪNAS' *POSTILLA*: THE COMPARATIVE
RESEARCH OF MORPHOLOGY OF THE
LITHUANIAN WRITINGS BY THE REFORMERS
OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA
OF THE 16TH CENTURY**

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Šiauliai, 2018

This doctoral dissertation was written at Šiauliai University in 2013–2017. The right for the joint doctoral studies was granted to Vytautas Magnus University, Klaipėda University, Šiauliai University and the Institute of the Lithuanian Language on July 8, 2011, according to the decree of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania No. V-1019.

Scientific supervisor:

Prof. Dr. Bronius MASKULIŪNAS (Šiauliai University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H).

The doctoral dissertation is defended in the Philology Science Field Board of Vytautas Magnus University, Klaipėda University, Šiauliai University and the Institute of the Lithuanian Language:

Chairperson:

prof. dr. Genovaitė KAČIUŠKIENĖ (Šiauliai University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H);

Members:

Prof. Dr. Vytautas KARDELIS (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H);

Prof. Dr. Dalia PAKALNIŠKIENĖ (Klaipėda University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H);

Prof. Dr. Peteris VANAGS (Stokholm University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H);

Assoc. Prof. dr. Vilma ZUBAITIENĖ (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H).

The doctoral dissertation will be defended in an open session of Philology Science Field board on 29 June 2018 at 1 p.m. in Šiauliai University Library, Conference Room (No. 413 a.).

Address: Vytauto St. 84, LT-76352 Šiauliai, Lithuania.

The summary of the dissertation was sent on 29 of May 2018.

The dissertation is available in libraries of the Vytautas Magnus University, Klaipėda University, Šiauliai University and the Institute of the Lithuanian Language.

VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETAS
LIETUVIŲ KALBOS INSTITUTAS
KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETAS
ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETAS

Kęstutis Dambrauskas

**MORKŪNO *POSTILĖS* AUTORYSTĖS
PROBLEMA: XVI A. LDK REFORMATŲ
LIETUVIŠKŲ RAŠTŲ LYGINAMASIS
MORFOLOGIJOS TYRIMAS**

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H)

Šiauliai, 2018

Disertacija rengta 2013–2017 metais Šiaulių universitete pagal suteiktą Vytauto Didžiojo universitetui su Klaipėdos universitetu, Šiaulių universitetu ir Lietuvių kalbos institutu (2011 m. birželio 8 d. LR švietimo ir mokslo ministro įsakymas Nr. V-1019) doktorantūros teise.

Mokslinis vadovas –

prof. dr. Bronius MASKULIŪNAS (Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H).

Mokslo daktaro disertacija ginama Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto su Klaipėdos universitetu, Šiaulių universitetu ir Lietuvių kalbos institutu Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

pirmininkė –

prof. dr. Genovaitė KAČIUŠKIENĖ (Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H);

nariai:

prof. dr. Vytautas KARDELIS (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H),

prof. dr. Dalia PAKALNIŠKIENĖ (Klaipėdos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H),

prof. dr. Peteris VANAGS (Stokholmo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H),

doc. dr. Vilma ZUBAITIENĖ (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H).

Daktaro disertacija bus ginama viešajame Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2018 m. birželio 29 d. 13 val. Šiaulių universiteto bibliotekos 413 auditorijoje.

Adresas: Vytauto g. 84, LT-76285 Šiauliai, Lietuva

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka išsiųsta 2018 m. gegužės 29 d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto, Klaipėdos universiteto, Šiaulių universiteto, Lietuvių kalbos instituto bibliotekose.

INTRODUCTION

Relevance and novelty of the topic. The Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century are not a common object of research, and so called *Postilla* by Jokūbas Morkūnas has received especially little attention so far. Zigmās Zinkevičius (1988), while analysing the old Lithuanian publications, mentions that the language of reformers' books of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century, which is not as rich as the language of Catholics, e.g. by Mikalojus Daukša, has received the least attention from linguists. Bronius Maskuliūnas (2006b) emphasized that both due to a large volume and the small number of old Lithuanian writings it is necessary to research the Lithuanian publications by the Calvinists of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century.

Comparative studies conducted by several authors are performed quite rarely. Such studies would help to highlight the features of the early Lithuanian writings, the similarities and differences of the authors' language, they would help to answer the questions on the authorship of publications. Based on the comparative analysis of the most characteristic morphological features of Lithuanian texts by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century, the dissertation will contribute to the studies of old writings. Such analysis has not been conducted so far. Based on the studies of Jonas Palionis (1967), Zigmās Zinkevičius (1970), Antanas Jakulis (1982), Dalia Jakulytė (2016) and the material of Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century collected for the research, the postpositive locatives, the dative singular and plural forms with the endings *-mui* and *-mus*, athematic forms of verbs, forms of imperative and subjunctive mood, possessive pronouns are considered to be the most inherent morphological features of old Lithuanian writings in the present work. The analysis possesses theoretical and practical value: the research of the most inherent morphological features of the texts by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century supplements the studies of other old writings as well as the studies of the development of Lithuanian morphology, it reveals the development, change, regularities and differences of individual authors' language, helps to answer a relevant question on the authorship of *Postilla* translation. The conclusions of the research are relevant to Lithuanian morphology, history, further studies of the language of old writings.

Research aim and objectives. The aim of this dissertation is on the basis of morphological features to identify the authorship of Morkūnas' *Postilla* and its relationship with Merkelis Petkevičius' *Catechism*, as well as to determine whether all three parts of *Postilla* were translated by the same person.

To achieve this aim, the following **objectives** have been set:

1. To conduct the comparative research of the most inherent morphological features of Lithuanian publications by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century.
2. To determine what individual features are inherent to these concrete writings.
3. To determine the similarities and differences of the frequency of use of the most inherent morphological features of the sources under research, to evaluate the possible influences.

To evaluate whether Merkelis Petkevičius contributed to the translation of Jokūbas Morkūnas' *Postilla*.

4. To determine whether the translation of Morkūnas' *Postilla* is performed by one person.

The object of the research is the morphological features of Merkelis Petkevičius' *Catechism* (PK) and Jokūbas Morkūnas' *Postilla* (MP).

Investigated material comprises the bilingual (Polish-Lithuanian) *Catechism* published in 1598 by Merkelis Petkevičiaus and the translation of Mikołaj Rej's *Polish Postilla* (*Postilla polska*) (1594) to *Lithuanian Postilla* (1600) attributed to Jokūbas Morkūnas. In *Postilla* not each page is numbered, but every second page. Unnumbered page on the left side is marked with letter *v* (*verso*) above the page number. Morkūnas' *Postilla* 1st part consists of 230^v sheets of paper, the 2nd part – 148^v sheets of paper, whilst the 3rd part is almost three times shorter than the 1st part and almost two times shorter than the 2nd part – it is comprised of 86^v. Aiming to obtain the most reliable results, it was sought to retain the similar scope of research – the material has been collected from Petkevičius' *Catechism*, 116 sheets of paper from the 1st part of *Postilla* (112 866 words), 115 sheets of paper from the 2nd part (112 470 words) and the 3rd part (112 662 words).

The scholarly issue. Who is the real translator of the so called Morkūnas' *Postilla* into the Lithuanian language has not been clear until now. Some researchers, e.g. Jurgis Lebedys (1977), Zinkevičius (1988), indicate that the issue of a translator is open and debatable. The most common version is that *Postilla* from the Polish language was translated by a publisher Jokūbas Morkūnas himself (cf. Biržiška 1990, 196–199; Gineitis 1982, 37; Jovaišas 2003, 213). According to another, less popular and reasoned version, a translator of *Postilla* of 1600 year could be another reformer of the Grand Duchy of

Lithuania – Merkelis Petkevičius (cf. Biržiška 1998, 177; Zinkevičius 1988, 202).

Postilla consists of three parts. The third part is different from the first two – it is printed in a smaller print and has a separate pagination (in the book not pages but sheets of paper are numbered). Some linguists think that it could have been published later than other two parts (Zinkevičius 1988, 202), and a translator of *MP* 3rd part might have been another person.

While conducting the research of authorship attribution, it is often encountered with various difficulties. Moshe Koppel, Jonathan Schler and Shlomo Argamon (2008, 2) as one of the problems of authorship attribution underline *the problem of verification*, when the author is a *closed candidate*, but there is another potential candidate. A researcher's task is to determine whether a potential candidate is/is not the author. In the latter case the comparative research of language of two (sometimes several) sources is conducted: the language particularities of one author are compared with another author, as well as the similarities and differences are determined.

Aiming to attribute the authorship of *MP*, the comparative analysis of the most inherent morphological features of *PK* and *MP* is conducted in the thesis. This was conditioned by several reasons: Lithuanian and foreign linguists emphasize that the analysis of particularities of such texts, as the length of words (sentences), can contribute to the attribution of authorship; the stylometric language studies conducted by foreign scientists (Koppel et al. 2005; Argamon and Levitan 2005) confirm the hypothesis that different authors have different patterns of usage of words and their forms; the original language in the translation has a significantly lower influence on the usage of morphological features (word forms) than on lexical features or syntactic constructions; which word forms to choose, e.g. with a longer or shorter ending, reduced / non-reduced postposition, and how to use them was often decided by a translator of old writings himself and original (Polish) language had little influence on this.

Having compared the morphological features of *MP* parts and having identified the similarities and differences, it is possible to confirm or deny the hypothesis that a translator of *MP* 3rd part is another person than a translator of the 1st and 2nd parts of *MP*. Also, having compared the morphological features of *MP* 1st and 3rd parts with the language of *Catechism*, it would be possible to identify, whether Petkevičius contributed to the translation of *Postilla* or to the translation of one of its parts.

Having conducted the research, i.e. having compared the morphological features of both sources, an attempt will be made to answer the question on the authorship of translation of so called Morkūnas' *Postilla*. **The scholarly issues** have been raised: Whether Petkevičius contributed to the translation of so called

Morkūnas' *Postilla*? Whether the parts of Morkūnas' *Postilla* were translated by separate persons?

Theoretical overview. The old Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century have not received attention of linguists as much as the publications by the reformers of East Prussia or by the Catholics of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. According to Zinkevičius (1988, 43), more than 30 Lithuanian and foreign scientists had researched Mažvydas' *Catechism* until 1988. The prolific number of works about the language particularities of old writings, formation and development of common language have been written. The basic and probably the most comprehensive studies of the development of the Lithuanian language grammar and the language of old writings, which help to highlight the theoretical principles of the thesis, are the studies by Zinkevičius (1988, 1980, 1981), Jonas Palionis (1967, 1995, 2004), and Jonas Kazlauskas (1968). Palionis' monographic book (1967) about the particularities of orthography and language of Lithuanian writings of the 16–17th century deserves special attention. Not only the works by other authors are summarized, but also the particularities of phonetics, morphology, syntax, and lexis of the language of old writings are described in it. While discussing the formation of Reformation in Europe and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, it was referred to the studies by Ingė Lukšaitė (1999), Irena Backus (2008) and Dainora Pociūtė (2008), which provide the knowledge of origin, development, the main centres and persons of reformation. The studies of these scientists are more of historical-culturological nature, where much attention is paid to reformation as social, political, and ideological movement.

In the present thesis the morphological analysis is conducted, therefore, in the theoretical and practical parts the analysis was based on the works by Aldona Paulauskienė (1994; 2006). A number of linguists have discussed the development of separate language levels. The development of pronouns of the Baltic languages was researched by Albertas Rosinas (1995), whilst Zinkevičius (1957) wrote the study about the pronominal adjectives. The book by Vytautas Ambrazas (2006) about the historical syntax of the Lithuanian language was used in the practical part of the thesis. The book investigates some of the most important sources of the historical syntax of the Lithuanian language – the data of old Lithuanian writings. The author highlights the syntactic means inherent to the old Lithuanian language, reveals the changes of syntactic constructions, discusses the word order in a sentence and its development.

Analysing systematically other old Lithuanian writings of the 16th century of smaller or larger volume by Daukša, Bretkūnas, Mažvydas, etc. the features of morphology, syntax or other language levels of the old writings are discussed. From the previous overviews of the studies of language of old writings the works having both practical and theoretical value for further research by Pietro Dini

(1994), Viktor Falkenhahn (1941), Jurgis Lebedys (1963), Pranas Skardžius (1937), Wilhelm Witte (1931), etc. are worth to be mentioned. The study of monographic type by Gordon Ford (1969) about the language in Baltramiejus Vilentas' *Enchiridion*, as probably the only comprehensive research of one author's language (phonetics, morphology and syntax) of writings should be taken into consideration as well. Over the past twenty years the research of old writings has been conducted from the following perspectives: the influence of original text of old writings on translation (Bukantytė 2007), the constructions of cases and prepositions (Gelumbeckaitė 2002), the use of comparative clauses (Judžentis, Pajėdienė 2005), causal clauses (Kibildaitė 2001), the expression of possessiveness (Maskuliūnas 2000), the semantic and morphological structure of pronouns (Rosinas 2001), postpositive locatives (Žilinskaitė 2004, 2007, 2010), *sta* stem verbs (Šarkytė 2012; Pakalniškienė, Šarkytė 2012), pronominal clitics (Razanovaitė 2014), etc. The majority of these works are more related to the research of syntax of old Lithuanian writings, therefore, while preparing the theoretical basis for the dissertation or analysing the collected empirical data only some of them were used. The conclusion could be drawn that researchers have paid little attention to the studies of morphology of old writings. On the basis of material of some already conducted research, it is possible to compare the morphological features of individual authors' writings and to highlight the tendencies or changes of the frequency of use.

The language of analysed sources – *Catechism* and *Postilla* – was mostly analysed by the following linguists: Ernst Frenkel, Jonas Kruopas, Zigmās Zinkevičius, and Bronius Maskuliūnas. The work by Frenkel (1947) is worth to be emphasized, which is dedicated to discuss *PK* syntax. Kruopas (1957, 1970) and Zinkevičius (1970) were among the first who started researching the dialect and language features of *Catechism*. Maskuliūnas (2009), on the basis of the data of *PK* language, researched the ratio of the forms of possessive pronouns and the ratio of the use of two models of expression of reflexivity in *Catechism*. Bronius Maskuliūnas is, probably, the only linguist who provides the knowledge of the language of Morkūnas' *Postilla*. In his articles (2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2011) the history of *Postilla* birth is overviewed, the issue of its authorship is discussed, some more specific features of orthography, phonetics, morphology and syntax are briefly discussed as well.

Research methodology and methods. The identification of author, time and place of publication is, probably, the most difficult task for a textologist. The authorship of publication is usually identified on the basis of biographic or autobiographic material, evidence provided by relatives, editors or documents; sometimes the complex analysis of all documents accessible for research is conducted (cf. Subačius 2001, 206–223). One more way of authorship attribution is the linguistic analysis of a work. Linguistic analysis is a research

method, when the features of language are objectively analysed and described. It covers four main language levels: phonetics, morphology, lexis, and syntax (in foreign linguistics semantics and pragmatics are often distinguished as well). In order to answer the question on the authorship of publication, considerable attention should be paid to the lexis marked in dialectologic, social and literary perspectives, phonetic and morphological features underlying a writer's dialect, and syntactic constructions (Subačius 2001, 218–219).

Various circumstances determine which levels of language to choose for research. The analysis of phonetic features, while solving the issues related to the authorship of publication, e.g. aiming to determine whether one person could contribute to the translation of text attributed to another person, as if loses its meaning, if the researched sources belong to the same variant of language of old writings and belong to the same dialect or subdialect. Linguistically comparing several works, much attention should be paid to chronology, because the authors of old Lithuanian writings tended to adapt to the variant of writings' language which predominated at one time or another. (Subačius 2001, 219). *PK* and *MP* are assigned to the middle variant of the language of old writings.

The lexical analysis of language, while identifying the author or translator of the publication, in Lithuanian linguistics is usually related not to the lexemes themselves, but to the research of their orthography, i.e. an analysis is conducted whether the authors or translators of the analysed texts use different or similar letters in writing the words (see Jakulis 1982, Jakulytė 2016). The choice of some or another lexemes is determined by the genre of publication or source of translation. *PK* and *MP* are religious works of different genres, translated from the Polish language.

While comparing the syntactic features of works written in different genres, it is complicated to find the sentences of analogous or similar structure in different places of the texts. More attention has to be paid not to the structure of sentences, but to the analysis of different syntactic constructions with prepositions, infinitive, participle as well as the word order in a sentence. It is known that translators tried not to distort the contents and dogmas of religious writings, therefore, they often slavishly followed the original text (Rosinas 1988, 179; Palionis 1995, 90). Zigmantas Zinkevičius (1988, 189–198) relates the non-Lithuanian syntax of old Lithuanian writings to literal translation.

Taking into consideration that *PK* and *MP* are the works of religious type, written in the middle variant of the language of writings, and comparing only some syntactic constructions, it would be complicated to make more specific generalizations. The comparative analysis of the most specific morphological features of *PK* and *MP* is performed in the dissertation.

In Lithuanian linguistics the studies of morphological features are conducted when it is tried to attribute the authorship of the publication: the forms of

subjunctive and imperative mood, athematic verbs, postpositive locatives, locative adjectives, etc. are compared. Linguists usually move away from the research of syntactic constructions of the compared texts of old writings, and the conclusions are drawn on the basis of morphological features, and not so frequently of lexis or orthography. Antanas Jakulis (1982), while researching the authorship of the parts *Suma evangelijų* and *Maldos krikščioniškos* of *Knyga nobažnytės (KN)*, compared the particularities of orthography and language of the sources. The author paid relatively little attention to *KN* lexis and orthography – the variants of the same words are discussed. The author focuses on morphological features. Dalia Jakulytė (2016), in continuing the research of *KN* authorship initiated by Jakulis, briefly discusses *KN* orthography, phonetics, lexis, though most of the attention she pays to the morphology of nominal (the category of case: postpositive locatives; the category of number: dual number; the systemic reduction of endings, etc.). The studies conducted by Antanas Jakulis (1982, 1984), Dalia Jakulytė (2016), Koppel et al. (2005), Shlomo Argamon and Shlom Levitan (2005), Rosa María Coyotl-Morales, Luis Villaseñor-Pineda, Manuel Montes-y-Gómez, Paol Rosso (2006) prove that the analysis of morphological language features is employed when an attempt is made to answer the questions related to the authorship of publication.

The *analytical*, *descriptive* and *comparative* methods are mostly employed in the thesis. Discussing the features of morphology, in each chapter of empirical part their usage in the analysed sources is described. Postpositive locatives are classified and described according to the parts of speech (the categories of gender and number). The adessives and allatives of proper words (names), the usage of the forms of these postpositive locatives in two-word or three-word combinations are discussed, the most frequently found lexemes of inessives of nouns, adjectives or pronouns as well as prepositional constructions correlating with postpositive locatives are described, etc.

Considerable attention is paid to dative: the forms with long (archaic) and short endings are described, the usage of dative singular forms with the endings *-ui* and *-u*, the dative singular and plural pronoun forms, the distribution of dative noun and adjective forms with the long and short endings according to declensions as well as the forms of imperative and subjunctive mood, athematic verbs, possessive pronouns, etc. are analysed.

The thesis does not aim to research the forms of dual number of nominals that were only sporadically used in the writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century, locative adjectives (a lexeme *danguieiš* predominates), the locative plural forms with the ending *-su*, the forms of permissible mood, etc. It is not purposeful to compare and analyse the enclitic (atonic) pronouns in *PK* and *MP*, because they were comprehensively described by Aukšė Razanovaitė (2014).

The analytic method was employed in the thesis in order to describe the ratio of use of forms of reduced and non-reduced postpositive locatives, long and short forms of dative, imperative and subjunctive mood, etc. The dissertation analyses how the translation from the Polish language influenced morphological features, what conditioned the authors to choose some or another forms.

Aiming to determine the language similarities and differences of Petkevičius' and Morkūnas' translations, the morphological features are not only described but also compared. The material of analysed sources is also compared to foreign language originals. The data (examples) analysed in the thesis have been collected from the sources under research: Merkeliš Petkevičius' *Catechism* and Jokūbas Morkūnas' *Postilla*. The collected and evaluated empirical material has been summarized, the statistical method has been used, the results have been provided in tables and figures. The textological method was applied for more detailed analysis of the sources.

Dissertation structure. The introductory section presents the topic, aim, objectives and methods. Chapter 1 discusses the linguistic, cultural and political context of origin of printed Lithuanian writings, the sources under research and their publishers, the studies and research methods of the language of Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century, the ratio between the translated texts and foreign originals as well as the attribution of the publication.

Chapter 2 discusses the ratio of use of the most inherent morphological features of the 1st and 2nd parts of Morkūnas' *Postilla*.

Chapter 3 analyses the empirical data: the most inherent morphological features (postpositive locatives, long and short forms of dative, athematic forms of verbs, expression of imperative, possessive pronouns, etc.) of Morkūnas' *Postilla* and Petkevičius' *Catechism* are analysed and compared. The conclusions generalize the research. The thesis ends with the list of primary sources, the list of references and appendices.

Statements to be defended

1. The analysis of ratio of the reduced/non-reduced word forms, i.e. the research of ending forms or the length of postpositions, contributes the most to the attribution of authorship.
2. The reduction of endings is the common morphological feature of the language of *PK* and *MP* 1st part, and *MP* 3rd part is distinguished by its archaic nature, as the endings of the forms are reduced not so frequently.
3. The language of original text has little influence on the structure of the translated word form: in most cases, the translator of the old writings himself made decisions which word form – reduced or non-reduced – to choose and how to use it in the text.

4. The authorship of translation of separate *MP* parts is different – this is not the work of the same person. The differences of the use of forms show that the translation of *MP* 1st part is performed by one author (or authors), and the translation of *MP* 2nd part is performed by another author. The author who performed the translation of *MP* 1st part is not the translator of *MP* 3rd part.
5. Merkelis Petkevičius did not contribute to the translation of *MP* 1st and 3rd parts.

The ratio of frequency of use of the most specific morphological features of Morkūnas' *Postilla* 1st and 2nd parts

The stylometric studies of authorship attribution conducted by Koppel et al. (2005), Argamon and Levitan (2005), Stamatatos (2009) confirm the hypothesis that individual authors differently use words and their forms. Argamon and Levitan (2005) analyse the so called *function words*. Using stylometric research methods and aiming to attribute the authorship of texts, they researched the frequency of use of functional words, word combinations (pairs), and collocations in short stories. The results proved that the research of frequency of use of functional words in a text would allow to attribute the authorship more precisely rather than the research of word combinations or collocations. This, according to Argamon and Levitan (2005), basically contradicts the latest studies and their results, as well as the opinion that the research of word combinations (pairs) or collocations has to be more informative than of function words.

The research of frequency of use of words (e.g. function, content or context) in a text may contribute to authorship attribution. It is calculated how many forms of postpositive locatives, imperative and subjunctive mood, etc. are used in total in *MP* parts under research and the ratio of use of these forms is determined. Aiming to attribute the authorship, the research of word length is conducted: the longer and shorter forms of different words are researched, e.g. adessive forms with the postposition *-pi* and its reduced variant *-p*, the forms of imperative mood with the formatives *-ki* and *-k*, the forms of dative with the endings *-mus* and *-ms*, etc.

The so called Morkūnas' *Postilla* consists of three parts. The ratio of frequency of morphological features of the 1st and 2nd parts of *Postilla* has not been known until now. The authorship of these parts has scarcely been discussed as well. Due to a large volume, to research the morphology of both parts would be inappropriate, it is enough to choose one part, therefore, it was decided to compare the most inherent morphological features and to determine the ratio of their frequency in the 1st and 2nd parts of *MP*. If the research showed the differences of the majority of the most inherent morphological features of the 1st and 2nd parts in *MP*, this would be a significant argument, which would prove, that *MP* translation is not the work by the same person. If it were opposite and the research showed the similarities of the majority of the most inherent morphological features, it would be possible to claim, that the 1st and 2nd parts of *MP* were translated by the same translator (translators) and to choose one part out of two for further research. Aiming to obtain the most reliable results, the similar scope of research was chosen – the material was collected from 116

sheets of paper of the 1st part of *Postilla* (112 866 words) and from 115 sheets of paper of the 2nd part of *Postilla* (112 470 words).

The ratio of use of frequency of reduced/non-reduced forms in *MP* 1st and 2nd parts is determined by dividing by percentage the number of reduced forms of the number of non-reduced forms, e.g. in *MP* 1st part, the reduced forms of adessive make 77 per cent, whilst non-reduced forms make 23 per cent. The ratio of frequency of use of these forms is 3,3. The ratio of frequency of use of separate forms of both sources is determined by aligning these ratios (by dividing a larger ratio from a smaller ratio), e.g., it is known that the ratio of frequency of use of reduced and non-reduced forms of adessive in *MP* 1st part is 3,3 and it is smaller than in *MP* 2nd part – 24. Dividing 24 from 3,3 equals to 7,3. Therefore, the ratio of frequency of use of reduced and non-reduced forms of adessive in *MP* 1st and 2nd parts is 7,3. According to this ratio, it is possible to evaluate the mutual similarity of translation of *MP* 1st and 2nd parts – the larger the ratio of frequency of use of forms, the smaller the similarity, e.g. the ratio of frequency of use of reduced and non-reduced forms of adessive of *MP* 1st and the 2nd parts is 7,3, which shows a very small similarity. If the ratio of frequency of use equals to 1, it is estimated as *coincidence of use*, if the ratio is from 1 to 1,6, it is estimated as *large similarity*, if the ratio is from 1,6 to 2,2, it is estimated as *average similarity*, if the ratio is larger than 2,2, it is estimated as *small similarity*.

According to this methodology, the use of the prefix *ne-* together with or separately from imperative/subjunctive mood is researched as well.

The research of morphological features is conducted in this thesis, therefore, some orthographic issues are taken into consideration as well. It was noted that the prefix *ne-* is written together with or separately from imperative and subjunctive mood discussed in this chapter. While describing these forms, it was decided to discuss the use of the prefix *ne-* together with the form of relevant mood or without it. The similarities or differences of the usage will contribute to authorship attribution.

MP 1st part almost does not differ from *MP* 2nd part in the usage of reduced/non-reduced forms of allative, dative singular forms, the athematic forms of 3rd person of the verb *būti* (*to be*) with the endings *-t* and *-ti*, the forms of 2nd person of imperative mood with the adjoined particle *-gi*. This is confirmed by some orthographic particularities – the prefix *ne-* in the analysed *MP* parts is commonly written together with the form of imperative mood.

The research of other morphological features revealed various differences: the reduced/non-reduced forms of adessive, inessive singular, illative singular and plural, dative singular with the endings *-ui* and *-u*, dative plural forms with a long and the short endings, the forms of imperative mood with the formatives *-k* and *-ki* in *MP* 1st and 2nd parts are used differently – the research of the ratio of frequency of these forms showed a small similarity.

Table 1. The similarities and differences of use of forms of *MP* 1st and 2nd parts

<i>Similarities of use of forms of MP</i> 1st and 2nd parts	<i>Differences of use of forms of MP</i> 1st and 2nd parts
Reduced/non-reduced forms of allative Dative singular forms	Reduced/non-reduced forms of adessive Reduced / non-reduced inessive singular forms
Athematic forms of 3rd person of verb <i>būti</i> (to be) with the endings <i>-t</i> and <i>-ti</i>	Reduced / non-reduced illative singular and plural forms
2nd person forms of imperative mood with the adjoined particle <i>-gi</i>	Dative singular forms with the endings <i>-ui</i> and <i>-u</i> Dative plural forms
	Forms of imperative mood with the formatives <i>-k</i> and <i>-ki</i>

The differences of frequency of use of some reduced/non-reduced forms (inessive singular, 2nd person forms of imperative mood with the adjoined particle *-gi*) are not big, and the differences of prevalence of these forms in the text is often conditioned not by the translation but the original text (*RP*). It is evident that the text in the Polish language had a major impact on the differences of prevalence of allative and inessive in *MP* 1st and 2nd parts, when the Polish language constructions *do* + genitive or *k(u)* + dative were translated as postpositive locatives. This shows some looseness of translation of *MP* 2nd part, when it is aimed not to translate the text literally but to use synonymous forms.

Almost twice as many of imperative mood forms with the adjoined particle *-gi* were found in *MP* 2nd part than in *MP* 1st part, however, the ratio of use is similar, because almost a third more of imperative mood forms were found in *MP* 2nd part than in *MP* 1st part. Much more forms of inessive are used in *MP* 1st part than in *MP* 2nd part, although the ratio of use of reduced/non-reduced inessive singular forms is approximately equal. There is a tendency to use long (archaic) dative plural forms rather than reduced forms in *MP* 2nd part than in *MP* 1st part.

After having researched the morphological and some orthographic particularities, that can mostly contribute to the attribution of authorship, and after having established the ratio of reduced/non-reduced forms of *MP* 1st and 2nd forms, it was noticed that there are more differences than similarities in the analysed sources. Although some noticed differences are not big or they, e.g. the number of allative or inessive forms in *MP*, are conditioned not by translation but the original text (*RP*), i.e. the number of prepositional constructions in

Polish text, it is possible to state that *MP* 1st and 2nd parts were translated by different persons. Taking into account a rather big volume of the first two *MP* parts, only *MP* 1st part was chosen for further research. Aiming to determine whether *MP* 3rd part was translated by the same translator as *MP* 1st part, whether Petkevičius contributed to the translation of *MP* 1st or 3rd part, the morphological particularities of *MP* 1st part further in the research will be compared with the particularities of *MP* 3rd part and *PK*.

The morphological particularities of Petkevičius' *Catechism* and Morkūnas' *Postilla* 1st and 3rd parts

Postpositive locatives

Adessive and correlating with it prepositional constructions

Adessive of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. Adessive in Merkelis Petkevičius' *Catechism* and so called Jokūbas Morkūnas' *Postilla* is used quite rarely: in *PK* 91 form of adessive, in *MP* 1st part – 319 forms, whilst in *MP* 3rd part – 218 forms were found.

Reduced and non-reduced forms of adessive. Adessives with the postposition *-pi* are quite rarely found in old Lithuanian writings – usually final vowel *i* is eliminated, therefore, shorter forms are used.

Adessive forms with the postposition *-pi* and reduced forms with a variant *-p* of the postposition *-pi*, e.g. *iamp* and *iampi* were used in the Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century. The research of the ratio of use of reduced and non-reduced forms of adessive in the Lithuanian writings of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century can contribute to the attribution of *MP* authorship.

Having established the ratio of use of reduced and non-reduced adessive forms, it is possible to evaluate the mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts.

Table 2. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced adessive forms

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	9:3,3 (2,7)	small similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 3rd part	9:6 (1,5)	big similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd and 1st parts	6:3,3 (1,7)	average similarity

The ratio of frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced adessive forms in the analysed sources is different. There are by 9 per cent more of non-reduced adessive forms in *MP* 1st part than in *MP* 3rd part, and by 13 per cent more than in *PK*. This shows a preference of a translator (or the translators) of *MP* 1st part to use archaic forms of adessive. The differences of frequency of use of non-reduced adessive forms in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part are minimal, therefore, the similarity is big – they are used by 4 per cent more often in *MP* 3rd part than in *PK*. It is known that the reformers used the writings of each other, therefore, they might have adopted some particularities of language, however, the choice and use of a longer or shorter form mostly depended on a translator himself.

Table 3. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced adessive pronoun forms

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	4:0,5 (8)	small similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 3rd part	4:0,7 (5,7)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd and 1st parts	0,7:0,5 (1,4)	big similarity

Considering the frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced adessive pronoun forms, it should be noted, that *MP* 1st part is very similar to *MP* 3rd part, because in both sources non-reduced adessive pronoun forms make almost two-thirds of all forms. The analysed *MP* parts differ from *PK*, because Petkevičius uses reduced adessive pronoun forms more frequently, and this conditioned the small mutual similarity.

In summary. The research showed that the forms of adessive in *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts are used differently. Non-reduced forms of adessive were mostly found in *MP* 1st part (these forms were found more often in the first part of *MP* than in the second part of *MP*), whilst they were not so frequent in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part. The frequency of use of non-reduced adessive pronoun forms in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is similar – they make about two thirds of all adessive pronoun forms. In this respect, the analysed *MP* parts differ from *PK*, where reduced adessive pronoun forms are used more frequently. The original language does not have influence on the use of reduced/non-reduced adessive forms, as a

translator himself made decision which form to choose – with postposition *-pi* or *-p*. The forms of adessive with postposition *-pe* have been found in *PK*, however, they are not used in the analysed *MP* parts.

Although the constructions of preposition *u* with the genitive are usually translated with adessive in the Polish language, in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part, differently than in *MP* 1st part, the constructions of prepositions *do*, *na* or *k* with the genitive and the construction of preposition *przed* with the instrumental in the Polish language become the source of adessive translation.

The research of adessive forms supports the hypothesis that *MP* 1st and 3rd parts were translated by different persons. The obtained data show that Petkevičius might have contributed to the translation of *MP* 3rd part.

Allative and correlating with it prepositional constructions

Allative of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. In *PK* 269 forms of allative, in *MP* 1st part – 668 forms, whilst in *MP* 3rd part – 960 forms of allative were found. Allative is characterized by a big lexical variety: the forms of nominals, pronouns and participles are used. Allative is more frequent than adessive in Petkevičius' *Catechism* and Morkūnas' *Postilla*.

Reduced and non-reduced forms of allative. The postposition **pie*, which is of the same origin as the preposition *prie*, eventually reduced to *-pi*, was used to form adessive and allative. Even before the beginning of writing, shorter variants appeared (without the postpositive vowel *i*): *miškiep*, *šakaip*, *upeip* (adessive), *miškop*, *šakosp*, *upėsp* (allative) (Zinkevičius 1996, 118). The forms of allative, the same as adessive with the postpositive vowel *-i*, in the Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the 16–17th century are treated as archaic.

Table 4. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced allative forms

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st part and <i>PK</i>	32,3:4 (8,1)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd part and <i>PK</i>	32,3:4 (8,1)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd and 1st parts	32,3:32,3 (1)	coincidence of usage

Having analysed the ratio of frequency of use of allative forms, it was noticed that the reduced allative forms predominate in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts (the frequency of use in percentage is the same), whilst in *PK* non-reduced forms make a fifth of allative forms. It should be noted that non-reduced adessive forms predominate in *MP* 1st part, and it is vice versa in Petkevičius' writing –

he usually reduces adessive forms, but he uses a lot of non-reduced forms of allative.

In summary. The research of allative shows that on the basis of the usage of allative forms with the postpositive vowel *-i* and the translation of allative forms from the Polish language some conclusions can be drawn in relation to the authorship of publications. The archaic non-reduced forms of allative were the most frequent in *PK*, whilst in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts they were less frequent – the ratio of use of reduced/non-reduced allative forms in the analysed *MP* parts is similar. Almost half of allative forms of 2nd person singular pronouns in *PK* and almost a third of 3rd person singular pronouns in *MP* were not reduced. The adjective and/or participle forms of allative with the postposition *-pi* were found in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part; however, they are not used in *MP* 1st part.

Although the constructions *k(u)* + dative and *do* + genitive in the Polish language are common sources of translation into allative, differently from a translator (the translators) of *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, Petkevičius does not often follow the principle of literal translation – the prepositional construction with noun is used in the original language, whilst allative pronoun is found in translation. Not only the construction of a sentence but also the meaning is changed if allative is used in translation.

The research of allative forms shows that the same person (or persons) could translate *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. It is unlikely that Petkevičius might have contributed to *MP* translation.

Inessive and correlating with it prepositional constructions

Inessive of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. Inessive in *PK* and *MP* parts is used most frequently of all four postpositive locatives: 586 inessive forms were found in *PK*, in *MP* 1st part – 2,688, whilst in *MP* 3rd part 1,875 inessive forms were found. The inessive forms of both nominals and pronouns or participles were found.

Reduced and non-reduced inessive forms. In the analysed texts both reduced and non-reduced (with the ending *-e*) forms of inessive are used. Analysing the systemic reduction of endings, Jakulytė (2016) claims that in *KN* there is a prolific number of the instances of systemic reduction of endings, when “long” cases are reduced alongside using both longer and shorter forms. The endings of feminine gender nominals are reduced slightly more frequently, the ratio of other non-reduced and reduced forms of nominals is 18:82 in

percentage. The inessive singular forms of nominals (not nouns) of masculine gender in *KN* are reduced very rarely.

Table 5. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced inessive forms

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	0,9:0,8 (1,1)	big similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 3rd part	0,9:0,6 (1,5)	big similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st and 3rd parts	0,8:0,6 (1,4)	big similarity

The ratio of frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced inessive forms in *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is similar. The endings of inessive singular forms have the tendency to be reduced slightly more often in *PK* and *MP* 1st part than in *MP* 3rd part. It should be noted that Petkevičius normally reduces the inessive like the adessive, however, he uses a lot of non-reduced forms of allative. The reduced forms of allative predominate in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, however, the forms of adessive in *MP* 1st part are reduced less frequently than in *MP* 3rd part.

It is likely that a translator of *MP* 1st part might have used more reduced forms of inessive if he had translated the constructions *na* + locative (Lith. *ant* + genitive) from the Polish language more freely. In *MP* 1st part 362 constructions *ant* + genitive, correlating with inessive, were found, i.e. much more than in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part.

In summary. The research of inessive has highlighted the similarities of language of the analysed sources, however, some differences that could contribute to the identification of authorship might be underlined as well. The feminine gender inessive singular forms with different endings are used in *MP* 1st part, differently than in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part. The feminine gender inessive singular forms of nominals and pronouns are commonly reduced in *PK* and in the analysed *MP* parts, moreover, reduced inessive plural forms were found in *PK*, which are not used in the analysed *MP* parts.

Although the ratio of frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced inessive forms in *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is similar, the endings of inessive singular forms are reduced slightly more frequently in *PK* and *MP* 1st part than in *MP* 3rd part. It is likely that a translator (or the translators) of *MP* 1st part might have used more reduced inessive forms if he (they) had translated from the Polish language the constructions *na* + locative (Lith. *ant* + genitive) correlating with inessive more freely. These constructions are significantly more frequent in *MP* 1st part than in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part.

The research of inessive forms shows that *MP* 1st and 3rd parts were translated by different persons. It is unlikely that Petkevičius might have contributed to *MP* translation.

Illative and correlating with it prepositional constructions

Illative of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. Illative is one of the least frequent postpositive locatives used by the reformers in the Lithuanian texts of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century. In *PK* 129 illative forms were found, in *MP* 1st part – 144, whilst in *MP* 3rd part 145 illative forms were found.

Reduced and non-reduced illative forms. The reduced illative singular postposition *-n* is quite frequent in the Lithuanian writings of the 16–17th century. However, illative plural form with *-na* predominates as well (Palionis 1967, 121–122). The illative singular forms were reduced more often, whilst illative plural forms were reduced much slower, because, probably, the *-sn* combination, which is inconvenient to pronounce, hindered the prevalence of reduced forms (Zinkevičius 1982, 36).

Table 6. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced illative singular forms

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	11,5:4,2 (2,7)	small similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 3rd part	11,5:4 (2,9)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st and 3rd parts	4,2:4 (1,1)	big similarity

Petkevičius more often reduced the endings of illative singular forms than a translator (or the translators) of *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. The ratio of frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced illative singular forms in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is similar – non-reduced forms make a fifth of illative singular forms. The original language does not have any influence on the usage of illative singular forms with the postposition *-na* or with its variant *-n* – the prepositional constructions are common in the Polish language.

Table 7. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced illative plural forms

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st part and <i>PK</i>	1:0,4 (2,5)	small similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 3rd part	0,4:0,02 (20)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st and 3rd parts	1:0,02 (50)	small similarity

The ratio of frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced illative plural forms in *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is different. Only several cases of reduced illative plural forms were found in *MP* 3rd part. Therefore, *MP* 3rd part essentially differs from *MP* 1st part and *PK*, where a lot more of these forms are used – this conditioned

a small similarity of frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced illative plural forms. Although the reduced illative forms are used more frequently in *PK* and *MP* 1st part than in *MP* 3rd part, the difference is obvious – by 19 per cent more of them were used in *MP* 1st part than in *PK*. The original language does not have any influence on the use of illative plural forms with the postposition *sna-* or with its reduced variant *-sn* – the prepositional constructions are common in the Polish language.

In summary. The illative forms of nouns predominate in the Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century. The masculine gender illative forms are mostly used in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part, whilst the feminine gender illative forms are mostly used in *MP* 1st part; moreover, the illative singular forms predominate in the analysed sources.

The ratio of frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced illative singular and plural forms in *PK* and the analysed *MP* parts is quite different. The endings of illative singular forms are reduced more often in *PK* than in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. The ratio of frequency of use of illative singular forms in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is similar – the non-reduced forms make a fifth of these forms. The illative plural forms with non-reduced endings are commonly used in *MP* 3rd part – only several reduced illative plural forms are used. Therefore, *MP* 3rd part essentially differs from *PK* and *MP* 1st part, where the reduced illative plural forms are used much more frequently.

The research of illative forms shows that *MP* 1st and 3rd parts were translated by different persons. It is unlikely that Petkevičius might have contributed to *MP* translation.

Dative forms with long and short endings

Dative of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. The dative forms are mostly used in *MP* 1st part (2,740x), and slightly less in *MP* 3rd part (2,524x). Almost four times less of these forms (683x) were found in *PK*.

Dative forms with long endings. The dative forms with the endings *-mui* and *-mus* are used in the Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century. There is an abundant number of these forms in *MP* 3rd part (1,674x) and in *MP* 1st part (1,473x), whilst in *PK* they are found not so often (223x).

Dative forms with short endings¹. Petkevičius and the translators of

¹ While analysing the dative singular forms with the short endings of nominals and pronouns used in the analysed sources, not only the forms with the endings *-am* (*tam*, *anam*, *geram*), *-ui* (*Ponui*, *Dievui*, *tėvui*), *-ai* (*-ei*) (*motinai*, *gerai*, *draugei*) etc., but also the forms with the reduced endings *-u* (*Dievu*, *tevu*), *-mu* (*tamu*, *savamu*) ir *-i* (*Poni*) are discussed.

Postilla interchangeably use dative forms with the endings *-mui* or *-mus* as well as reduced forms with the endings *-am*, *-ui* (*-u*), *-ai* (*-ei*), *-ms*², etc. In total, 460 dative forms with the short endings were found in *PK*, in *MP* 1st part – 1267, whilst in *MP* 3rd part 850 dative forms with short endings were found.

The usage of dative singular forms with the endings *-ui* and *-u*. The dative singular nominal forms with the endings *-ui* and *-u* are used in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. According to Zinkevičius (2002, 156–158), the combination *-ui*, which is found in the ending of dative singular and developed from other sounds, is not very old. There are nouns with ending *-u*, which predominates in the southern *Aukštaičiai* dialect, most likely originated from *-ui*, after the reduction of non-syllabic ending *-i*. The dative singular forms with the ending *-u* of nominals and pronouns are used as well.

Table 8. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the frequency of use of dative singular forms with the endings *-ui* and *-u*

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st part and <i>PK</i>	0,09:0,01 (9)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd part and <i>PK</i>	0,2:0,01 (20)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd and 1st parts	0,2:0,09 (2,2)	small similarity

Petkevičius scarcely uses the dative singular forms with the ending *-u*, therefore, the similarity of ratio of use of dative singular forms with the endings *-ui* and *-u* in *PK* and *MP* 1st part or *PK* and *MP* 3rd part is very small. There are by 9 per cent more of dative singular forms with the ending *-u* in *MP* 3rd part than in *MP* 1st part, and this conditioned the small similarity of ratio of use of dative forms with the endings *-ui* and *-u*. Hence, Petkevičius does not tend to use the endings of dative singular forms (in the translation of *PK* only several of these forms were found), whilst in the translation of *MP* 3rd part the dative singular forms with the ending *-u* are used more often than in the translation of *PK* or *MP* 1st part.

Analysing the ratio of use of dative nominal forms with the long and short endings, it should be noted, that there are much more of dative forms with the long endings than with the short endings in *MP* 3rd part. In *MP* 1st part there are more of dative singular forms with the endings *-am*, *-ui*, *-u*, *-ai* (*-ei*) etc. than with the ending *-mui*, and there are much more of dative plural forms with the endings *-mus* than with the ending *-ms*.

The dative singular forms with the endings *-am*, *-ui*, *-u*, *-ai* (*-ei*) etc. and the dative plural forms with the archaic ending *-mus* are the most frequently used in *Catechism*. Thus, *Catechism* and *Postilla* 3rd part written in the middle variant

² A reduced variant of the ending *-mus*.

of the language of writings are close to the eastern variant of the language of writings. According to Milda Lučinskienė (1998, 147), the ending *-mus* of dative plural predominated in this variant, and the ending *-ms* was not so frequent. Vaida Šilaikienė (2004, 15) notes that in Konstantinas Sirvydas' *Punktai sakymų* the dative ending *-mus* is more frequent than the reduced ending *-ms*.

In the analysed sources, there are more of dative plural forms with the ending *-mus* than with the reduced ending *-ms*. There are ten times more of dative plural forms with the ending *-mus* than with the ending *-ms* in *MP* 3rd part.

The conclusion could be drawn that a translator of *MP* 3rd part almost always used the archaic dative plural forms with the ending *-mus*, whilst a translator and Petkevičius of *MP* 1st part tended to use the reduced forms with the ending *-ms*. The ratio of use of dative singular forms with the long and short endings found in *MP* 3rd part is similar, and the dative forms with the endings *-am*, *-ui*, *-u ir -ai (-ei)* etc. predominate in *PK* and *MP* 1st part.

The usage of dative singular forms with a long and the short endings.

The dative singular forms with a long and the short endings are used in the Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century.

Table 9. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according the use of dative singular forms with a long and the short endings

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st part and <i>PK</i>	0,7:0,1 (7)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd part and <i>PK</i>	1:0,1 (10)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd and 1st parts	1:0,7 (1,4)	big similarity

Petkevičius quite rarely uses the dative singular forms with a long ending, therefore, the similarity of the ratio of use of dative singular forms with a long and the short endings is very small in *PK* and *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. The similarity of ratio of frequency of use of dative singular forms with a long and the short endings is quite big in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, because, differently from *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, there is an abundant number of dative singular forms with a long ending *-mui*.

The usage of dative plural forms with long and short endings. The dative plural forms with long and short endings are used in the Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century. According to Jakulytė (2016, 73), the non-reduced forms of dative plural with the ending *-mus* are frequent in *KN*. Such forms predominate in other writings of the 16–17th century as well, e.g. the forms with the ending *-ms* make only two per cent of all examples in Daukša's writings, and in later writings this change was gradually

increasing (Zinkevičius 1988, 187, 203; Zinkevičius 1980, 195–196). In *KN* the ratio of masculine gender nominal forms with the endings *-mus* and *-ms* is 35:65 in percentage, whilst only short forms are used of feminine gender.

Table 10. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the use of dative plural forms with long and short endings

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st part and <i>PK</i>	2,7:1,2 (2,3)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd part and <i>PK</i>	11,5:1,2 (9,5)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd and 1st parts	11,5:2,7 (4,3)	small similarity

The dative plural forms with a long ending are mostly found in *MP* 3rd part – by 19 per cent more than in *MP* 1st part and by 37 per cent more than in *PK*. This difference conditioned the small similarity of ratio of frequency of use of dative plural forms with long and short endings in *MP* 3rd part and *PK* as well as in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. Petkevičius uses the dative plural forms with the long ending by 18 per cent more frequently than a translator of *MP* 1st part.

In summary. The dative singular and plural forms with the short endings predominate in *PK* and make 77 per cent of all dative forms used in the source. Meanwhile, the dative forms with the long (archaic) endings predominate in *MP* 3rd part, i.e. by 17 per cent more than with the short endings. The ratio of frequency of use of dative forms with the short and long endings in *MP* 1st part is similar.

The dative plural forms with the ending *-mus* are the most frequent in *PK* and *MP* 1st part. The ratio of frequency of use of dative singular and plural forms with the endings *-mui* and *-mus* in *MP* 3rd part is similar. The dative singular forms with the short endings are the most frequently used in *PK* and *MP* 1st part, and slightly more of the forms with a long ending *-mui* were found in *MP* 3rd part.

Petkevičius quite rarely uses the dative singular forms with a long ending, therefore, the similarity of ratio of frequency of use of dative singular forms with a long and the short endings in *PK* and *MP* 1st part as well as in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part is very small. The similarity of ratio of frequency of use of dative singular forms with a long and the short endings in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is quite big.

In *MP* 3rd part there are much more of the dative singular forms with the short endings than the dative plural forms. In the analysed sources there are more of the dative plural forms with the ending *-mus* than with a short ending. In *MP* 3rd part there are ten time more of the dative plural forms with the ending *-mus* than with the ending *-ms* – a translator of *MP* 3rd part almost always uses the dative plural forms with a long (archaic) ending.

The dative plural forms with a long ending are mostly found in *MP* 3rd part. This conditioned a very small similarity of ratio of frequency of use of dative plural forms with long and short endings in *MP* 3rd part and *PK* as well as in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. Petkevičius more often than a translator of *MP* 1st part uses the dative plural forms with a long ending.

The dative singular forms with the ending *-u* in *MP* 3rd part make a fifth of all dative short forms. In *MP* 1st part these forms are used much less frequently, and in *PK* only three dative forms with the ending *-u* were found. In *MP* 1st part the dative noun forms with the ending *-u* are commonly used in the dative constructions with the prepositions *prie(g)* and *prieš*. In *MP* 3rd part the ending *-ui* of dative singular forms of nouns is retained in such constructions, whilst in *PK* the dative noun forms with the ending *-ui* predominate.

MP 3rd part differs from *MP* 1st part and *PK* in the usage of dative long (archaic) singular and plural forms – in *MP* 3rd part they predominate over short forms. The ratio of use of dative forms with the endings *-mui* and *-mus* in *MP* 3rd part is similar, whilst in *PK* and *MP* 1st part there are more of dative long (archaic) forms with the ending *-mus* than with the ending *-mui*. In *MP* 3rd part the long (archaic) forms of dative singular and plural pronouns predominate. There are more of short than long forms of dative singular pronouns in *PK*, and the ratio of use of long/short forms of dative plural pronouns is similar. In *MP* 1st part the long forms of dative plural pronouns are used more frequently than short forms, and the ratio of use of long/short forms of dative singular pronouns is similar. In *MP* 3rd part the short forms of dative singular with the ending *-u* make a fifth of all dative short forms, whilst there are significantly less of them in *MP* 1st part and *PK*. The differences show that *MP* 1st and 3rd parts were translated by different persons. It is unlikely that Petkevičius contributed to the translation of *MP* 1st and 3rd parts.

Athematic conjugation of verbs

Maskuliūnas and Lauciūtė (2006, 100) note that the paradigm of athematic conjugation of the verb *būti* (to be) is the best retained of all verbs found in *MP* 3rd part, where the cases of usage of all (except the dual number) singular and plural persons were found.

The verb *būti* (to be). It is possible to compose the following conjugation paradigm from the athematic forms of the verb *būti* (to be) found in *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts (cf. Maskuliūnas, Lauciūtė 2006, 100; Zinkevičius 1981, 99):

Table 11. The paradigm of athematic conjugation of the verb *būti* (to be) in *PK* and *MP*

Person	Form of the verb <i>būti</i> (to be)
1st person singular	<i>efmi</i>
2nd person singular	<i>efi</i>
3rd person singular	<i>efii / efi</i>
1st person plural	<i>efme</i>
2nd person plural	<i>efte</i>
3rd person plural	<i>efii / efi</i>

The form *est(i)*. The athematic forms of the 3rd person singular of the verb *būti* (to be) are the most frequently used in the analysed sources. The biggest number of them (349x) was found in *MP* 1st part, and slightly less of them (211x) were found in *MP* 3rd part. Almost half less of them are used in *PK* than in *MP* 1st part (129x).

Table 12. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the use of athematic forms of the verb *būti* (to be) with the endings *-t* and *-ti*

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st part and <i>PK</i>	15,7:2,6 (6,03)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd part and <i>PK</i>	19:2,6 (7,3)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd and 1st parts	19:15,7 (1,2)	big similarity

The ratio of use of athematic forms with the endings *-t* and *-ti* of the verb *būti* (to be) in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is very similar – the forms with the ending *-t* predominate. There are much more of athematic forms with the ending *-ti* of the verb *būti* (to be) in *PK* than in the analysed *MP* parts, therefore, the similarity of ratio of use of forms with the endings *-t* and *-ti* in *PK* and in the analysed *MP* parts is very small.

In summary. The whole paradigm of conjugation of singular and plural of the verb *būti* (to be) is retained in the analysed sources. This shows that the athematic flexion of the verb *būti* (to be) was retained in the writings, published both earlier and some time later, by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century. The athematic forms of the verb *būti* (to be) are used as independent or as auxiliary in forming compound active and passive constructions. The orthography of athematic forms of the verb *būti* (to be) is consecutive – the characters *f* and *s* are interchangeably used in the root.

There are much more of athematic forms of the verb *būti* (to be) in the analysed *MP* parts than in *PK*. Although the 3rd person forms of the verb *būti* (to be) predominate in *PK* and *MP*, the differences in the usage of forms can be

underlined as well. There are much more of athematic forms of the 1st and 2nd person singular in *MP* 3rd part than in *PK* and *MP* 1st part. In *PK* there are the cases of free translation from the Polish language, when personal pronoun does not precede athematic form. There are almost twice as many of the 1st person plural of the form *esme* in *PK* than in the analysed *MP* parts. The indicated personal pronoun is usually used implicitly next to the mentioned form in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part, and in *MP* 1st part – explicitly.

Considering the athematic conjugation of other verbs (*duoti* (to give), *dėti* (to put), *gelbėti* (to save), and *kentėti* (to suffer)), it should be noted that the athematic forms of these verbs are more frequently used in *MP* 3rd part than in *MP* 1st part and *PK*. The athematic forms of the verb *eiti* (to go) were found in *MP* 3rd part (almost the whole paradigm of conjugation is retained), however, the athematic forms of this verb are not used in *MP* 1st part and *PK*.

The expression of imperative

The usage of imperative and its synonymous forms and constructions in the analysed sources. Having investigated the usage of imperative mood in the analysed sources, it should be noted, that the 2nd person singular forms predominate in them.

Table 13. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the usage of 2nd person singular forms of imperative mood with the formative *-k(i)* and the forms with the adjoined particle *-gi*

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	32,3:5,3 (6,09)	small similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 3rd part	32,3:3,3 (9,8)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st and 3rd parts	5,3:3,3 (1,6)	big similarity

According to the usage of imperative mood 2nd person forms with the formative *-k(i)* and the forms with the adjoined particle *-gi*, *PK* significantly differs from *MP* 1st and 3rd parts – the imperative mood forms with the formative *-k(i)* are commonly used in *PK*. By 7 per cent more of imperative mood forms with the formative *-kig(-ik)* were found in *MP* 3rd part than in *MP* 1st part, therefore, the similarity of ratio of frequency of use of forms with the formative *-k(i)* and the forms with the adjoined particle *-gi* in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is big.

Table 14. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the usage of imperative mood forms with the formatives *-k* and *-ki*

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	32,3:13,3 (2,4)	average similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 3rd part	–	–
<i>MP</i> 1st and 3rd parts	–	–

MP 3rd part essentially differs from *PK* and *MP* 1st part in the usage of imperative mood forms with the formative *-ki*, because these forms are not used in *MP* 3rd part. A translator of *MP* 3rd part always uses only reduced forms of imperative mood with the formative *-k*, therefore, to analyse the similarity of ratio of use of imperative mood forms with the formatives *-k* and *-ki* in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part as well as in *MP* 1st and 3rd part is inexpedient. By 4 per cent less of the forms with the formative *-ki* are used in *PK* than in *MP* 1st part.

Table 15. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the usage of imperative mood 2nd person reflexive and non-reflexive forms

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	99:6,1 (16,2)	small similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 3rd part	99:6,1 (16,2)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st and 3rd parts	6,1:6,1 (1)	coincidence of usage

The frequency of use in percentage of imperative mood 2nd person singular of reflexive forms in *MP* 1st and *MP* 3rd parts is similar – the coincidence of the use of these forms has been fixed. The analysed *MP* parts differ from *PK*, where much less of reflexive forms of imperative mood are used (a very small similarity).

Table 16. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd forms, according to the prefix *ne-* written together with or separately from the imperative mood form

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	4,9:0,37 (13,2)	small similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 3rd part	4,9:0,14 (35)	small similarity
<i>MP</i> 1st and 3rd parts	0,37:0,14 (2,6)	small similarity

The prefix *ne-* is commonly written with the imperative mood form in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. *PK* essentially differs from the analysed *MP* parts – the prefix *ne-* is usually written separately from the imperative mood form – this conditioned

a very small similarity of ratio of frequency of use of the prefix *ne-* written together or separately from this form in *PK* and in the analysed *MP* parts. The prefix *ne-* with the imperative mood form is used by 15 per cent more frequently in *MP* 1st part than in *MP* 3rd part.

The forms and constructions which are close in meaning to imperative mood. Having analysed *PK*, the first hundred pages of *MP* 1st part and *MP* 3rd part, it was noticed that besides imperative mood forms the other means of expression are used. One of the most frequently used constructions is *conjugated verb form + infinitive*, the forms of present tense are less commonly used. The forms of future tense possess quite clear meaning of imperative mood.

Table 17. The forms and constructions which used close in meaning to imperative mood in the analysed sources

Form or construction	<i>PK</i>	<i>MP</i> 1st part	<i>MP</i> 3rd part
Future tense form	13	50	45
Present tense form	–	15	10
Conjugated verb form + infinitive	33	134	68
In total	46	199	123

In summary. The Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century only slightly differ from the other publications of that period – the 2nd person singular forms predominate in the analysed sources. The imperative mood forms with the formatives *-k(i)* and the adjoined particle *-gi* are used alongside in *PK* and *MP*.

The archaic 2nd person imperative mood forms with the adjoined particle *-gi* are used more often in *MP* 3rd part than in *MP* 1st part or *PK*. The Polish language might have had the influence on the usage of the forms with the adjoined particle *-gi* – in the original texts (*PK* and *RP*) the forms with the formative *-že* are used. The 2nd person singular imperative mood forms, which are formed with the formative *-ki*, were found only in *PK* and *MP* 1st part, whilst they were not found in *MP* 3rd part. The ratio of use of reflexive forms of imperative mood in *MP* 1st and 3rd forms is similar, and they are used less frequently in *PK*. The 2nd person singular imperative mood forms, which are formed with *-kigik*, were found in *PK*; however, they are not used in the analysed *MP* parts. The choice and usage of 2nd person singular imperative mood forms, which are formed with *-kigik* and *-ki*, as well as reflexive forms, probably, depended on a translator himself – the Polish language had a slight influence on this. Petkevičius more often writes the negative prefix *ne-* separately from the imperative mood form, whilst in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts the negative prefix *ne-* is commonly used together with the imperative mood form.

In the writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century, the imperative is mostly expressed with the imperative mood forms, however, other synonymous expressive means usually translated from the original language can be employed for the same purpose as well. Besides the imperative mood forms, another frequently used construction to express imperative is *conjugated verb form + infinitive*, present tense forms are not so frequently found, and they were not found in *PK* at all. The future tense forms have a clear meaning of imperative mood – the similar number of these forms is used in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, and much less of them were found in *PK*. In *PK* and *MP* 1st part the conjugated form with infinitive close in the meaning to imperative mood of the verb *turėti* (to have) is used, whilst in *MP* 3rd part – the verb *galėti* (to be able to). The forms and constructions close in the meaning to imperative mood mostly are literally translated from the original language. Both Petkevičius and the translators of *MP* parts made the changes quite rarely. To mitigate the tone of appeal, the construction of imperative mood verb *teikis*(could you) with infinitive is used. In the text it is found alongside with common forms of imperative mood.

These particularities show that Petkevičius did not contribute to the translation of the analysed *MP* parts, and *MP* 1st and 3rd parts were translated by different persons.

Subjunctive mood

The archaic forms of subjunctive mood formed with the formative -b- used in the analysed sources. In *PK* 197 archaic forms of subjunctive mood with the formative -b-, in *MP* 1st part – 459, whilst in *MP* 3rd part – 388 forms were found. These forms are not used in the modern Lithuanian language.

Table 18. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according the prefix *ne-* written together with or separately from the subjunctive mood form with the formative -b-

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	2,4:0,47 (5,1)	very small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd part and <i>PK</i>	3,8:2,4 (1,6)	very big similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd and 1st parts	3,8:0,47 (8,1)	very small similarity

In *PK* and *MP* 3rd part the prefix *ne-* is commonly written separately from the subjunctive mood form with the formative -b-. *MP* 1st part differs from *MP* 3rd part and *PK*, because the prefix *ne-* is commonly written with the subjunctive

mood form – this conditioned very small similarity of ratio of frequency of the prefix *ne-* written together with or separately from the subjunctive mood form. In *MP* 3rd part the prefix *ne-* separately from the subjunctive mood form with the formative *-b-* is written by 8 per cent more frequently than in *PK*.

The subjunctive mood forms with the formatives *-čia*, *-tu* and *-tum* used in the analysed sources. The subjunctive mood forms with the formatives *-čia*, *-tu* and *-tum* which are characteristic in the Modern Lithuanian language are used in *PK*.

Table 19. The mutual similarity of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, according to the prefix *ne-* written together with or separately from the subjunctive mood forms with the formatives *-tu*, *-tum* or *-čia*

Text	Ratio	Similarity
<i>PK</i> and <i>MP</i> 1st part	3,5:0,67 (5,2)	very small similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd part and <i>PK</i>	9:3,5 (2,6)	average similarity
<i>MP</i> 3rd and 1st parts	9:0,67 (13,4)	very small similarity

In *PK* and *MP* 3rd part the prefix *ne-* is commonly used separately from the subjunctive mood forms with the formatives *-tu*, *-tum* or *-čia*. *MP* 1st part differs from *MP* 3rd part and *PK*, because the prefix *ne-* is commonly used with the subjunctive mood form.

In summary. The archaic forms of 1st person plural are the most frequently used in the analysed sources. Only the archaic subjunctive mood 2nd person plural forms with the formative *-bite* are found in the texts. The subjunctive mood 3rd person singular and plural forms with the formative *-tu* were the most frequent. There are much less of the 2nd person singular with the formative *-čia* than the archaic forms with the formative *-bei*.

Some differences of the use of subjunctive mood forms were noticed. The subjunctive mood forms with the formatives *-čia*, *-tu* or *-tum* predominate in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, whilst in *PK* – archaic forms with the formative *-b-*. In *MP* 3rd part the subjunctive mood 1st person plural forms with the long formative *-bime* are less frequent than in *PK* and *MP* 1st part. In *PK* and *MP* 1st part the prefix *ne-* was more frequently written separately from subjunctive mood form with the formative *-b-*, and in *MP* 3rd part – together with the subjunctive mood form. Considering the subjunctive mood forms with the formatives *-čia*, *-tu* or *-tum*, the prefix *ne-* in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part was commonly written separately from these forms, whilst in *MP* 1st part the prefix *ne-* was written together with the subjunctive mood form.

The forms of possessive pronouns

The distribution of agreeing and non-agreeing forms of possessive pronouns. Having analysed the agreeing and non-agreeing forms of possessive pronouns and having compared the ratio of their usage, it is seen, that the non-agreeing forms of possessive pronouns significantly predominate in the sources.

Table 20. The ratio of use of agreeing possessive pronoun forms in the analysed sources (%)

Pronoun root	Agreeing form		
	<i>PK</i>	<i>MP 1st part</i>	<i>MP 3rd part</i>
<i>man-</i>	13 %	1 %	1 %
<i>tav-</i>	9 %	3 %	2 %
<i>sav-</i>	15 %	6 %	4 %

The possessive genitive forms with the ending *-a* and the ending *-o*. The usage of non-inflective possessive pronoun forms in both sources also encompasses the forms of possessive genitives with the ending *-a* and the ending *-o* which are used alongside. However, the ratio of these forms in both sources is different.

Table 21. The possessive genitive forms used in the analysed sources

Pronoun root	The form of possessive genitive					
	<i>PK</i>		<i>MP 1st part</i>		<i>MP 3rd part</i>	
	With the ending <i>-a</i>	With the ending <i>-o</i>	With the ending <i>-a</i>	With the ending <i>-o</i>	With the ending <i>-a</i>	With the ending <i>-o</i>
<i>man-</i>	50 (35 %)	91 (65 %)	13 (9 %)	131 (91 %)	32 (10 %)	274 (90 %)
<i>tav-</i>	93 (49 %)	99 (51 %)	18 (4 %)	384 (96 %)	9 (2 %)	506 (98 %)
<i>sav-</i>	97 (45 %)	117 (55 %)	39 (2 %)	1836 (98 %)	43 (2 %)	2218 (98 %)

In summary. In conclusion it should be noted that the Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century in the usage of possessive pronouns, although being very similar, possess clear differences.

The non-agreeing forms of possessive pronouns significantly predominate in *PK*, *MP 1st* and *3rd* parts, therefore, the analysed sources essentially differ from Mikalojus Daukša's texts, which belong to the same (middle) variant of the language of writings, where the agreeing possessive pronouns predominate.

There are more agreeing forms of personal pronouns in *PK* than in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. Petkevičius often combines the possessive pronoun with gender, number and case of nominal in order to retain the chime of the endings (cadences) in the lines. Only several agreeing forms of the feminine gender of possessive pronouns were found in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. In *PK* these forms are used more frequently than in *MP* parts, however, they are used less frequently than the forms of masculine gender. The agreeing forms of plural possessive pronouns are used much less frequently than singular forms in the analysed sources. In *MP* 1st part only two cases were found, when the agreeing form of possessive pronoun plural (or dual number) is used. The paradigm of declension of possessive pronouns is better retained in *PK* than in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts – the forms of all cases are used.

The forms of possessive pronouns in the agreeing and non-agreeing combinations in *Postilla* 1st and 3rd parts as well as in *Catechism* are more frequently used postpositionally. In *PK* the agreeing forms prepositionally are used more often than in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. In the sources the agreeing forms of the root *man-* are used more prepositionally, whilst the agreeing forms of the root *tau-* are used more postpositionally.

The usage of non-inflective possessive pronoun forms in both sources are characterized by the possessive genitive forms with the ending *-a* and the ending *-o* are used alongside. However, in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts the forms with the ending *-o* are used much more frequently than in *PK*.

CONCLUSIONS

Having conducted the research, it is possible to state that the frequency of use of the most specific morphological forms, some particularities of their orthography and translation from the original language allows to draw the main conclusions related to the authorship of Morkūnas' *Postilla*.

The reduction of the endings of forms. In the Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century the reduced and non-reduced forms of the same word are used. In *PK* and *MP* 1st part the forms of adessive, inessive singular, illative plural are reduced more often than in *MP* 3rd part. The 2nd person singular forms of imperative mood formed with the formative *-ki* are found only in *PK* and *MP* 1st part, whilst they are not found in *MP* 3rd part – the forms with a reduced variant *-k* of the formative *-ki* are used. The dative singular forms of masculine gender with the ending *-ui* predominate in *PK* and *MP* 1st part, whilst in *MP* 3rd part there are more forms with the ending *-u* than in *PK* and *MP* 1st part. The obtained data support the hypothesis that in *PK* and *MP* 1st part various forms with the reduced endings are used more frequently than in *MP* 3rd part.

Some translators of the Lithuanian writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century tended to reduce the forms translated from the original text, others – not. The construction of postpositive locative form translated from the Polish language often varies in the Lithuanian text, e.g. the non-reduced forms of adessive are found more often in *MP* 1st part than in *MP* 3rd part and *PK*, whilst Petkevičius and a translator of *MP* 1st part use the reduced forms of illative plural more often than a translator of *MP* 3rd part. The similar differences can be found considering other forms as well: dative, imperative mood, etc. The original language did not have the influence on the construction of a translated form – the choice and usage of reduced/non-reduced form in the Lithuanian text is the language feature chosen by a translator.

The influence of the original language on translation. Having conducted the research, it was noted, that the original text in the Polish language had a different influence on the Lithuanian writings (the translations) by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century. In *PK* and *MP* 3rd part, differently from *MP* 1st part, the Polish language constructions *do* + genitive, *na* + genitive and *k* + genitive, *przed* + instrumental became the source of translation of adessive. Although the Polish language constructions *k(u)* + dative and *do* + genitive are common sources of translation of allative, differently from a translator (the translators) of *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, Petkevičius does not often follow the principle of literal translation. As an exception can be treated the translation of imperative mood forms with the adjoined particle *-gi*, because in

the original sources (*PK* and *RP*) the forms with the formative *-že* are used (e.g., alongside with the form *day* the form *dayže* is used).

The ratio of *MP* 1st and 2nd parts. Having researched the particularities of morphology and some orthography and having established the ratio of reduced/non-reduced forms in *MP* 1st and 2nd parts, more similarities than differences were noticed. The reduced/non-reduced forms of adessive, inessive singular, illative singular and plural, the dative singular forms with the endings *-ui* and *-u*, the forms of dative plural with a long and the short endings, the imperative mood forms with the formatives *-k* and *-ki* are used differently in *MP* 1st and 2nd parts. Although some of the noticed differences are not significant, or they are determined not by the translation but by the original text (*RP*), e.g. the number of allative or inessive forms in *MP*, it is possible to state, that *MP* 1st and 2nd parts were translated by different persons.

The ratio of morphological particularities of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts.

Considering the ratio of morphological particularities of *PK*, *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, the usage of postpositive locatives, the dative singular and plural forms with the endings *-mui* and *-mus*, the forms of athematic verbs, the imperative and subjunctive mood forms, the possessive pronoun forms was researched. Further some features will be briefly described.

Postpositive locatives: the adessive and the allative. The prevalence of adessive and allative forms in the analysed sources is different. The non-reduced forms of adessive are found more often in *MP* 1st part than in *MP* 3rd part and *PK*, and the differences of frequency of use of these forms in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part are minimal. In *MP* 1st and 3rd parts the forms of allative tended to be reduced, the frequency of their usage in percentage is the same – on this basis, these *MP* parts differ from *PK*, where much more of non-reduced allative forms were found.

The inessive and the illative. The ratio of frequency of use of reduced/non-reduced forms of inessive in *PK*, *MP* 1st 3rd parts is similar, whilst of illative forms – quite different. In *PK* and *MP* 1st part the endings of inessive singular are slightly more often reduced than in *MP* 3rd part. Considering illative, it should be noted, that Petkevičius more often reduces the endings of singular illative forms than the translators of *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. The ratio of frequency of use of illative singular forms in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is similar. Petkevičius and a translator of *MP* 1st part use the reduced illative plural forms more often than a translator of *MP* 3rd part – only several of them were found in the text. Therefore, *MP* 3rd part essentially differs from *PK* and *MP* 1st part.

Dative. In *MP* 3rd part the archaic forms of singular and plural dative with the endings *-mui* and *-mus* predominate over the forms with the endings *-am*; *-ui*; *-u*; *-ai* (*-ei*); *-ms*. The ratio of the use of dative forms with the endings *-mui* and *-mus* in *MP* 3rd part is similar, and in *PK* and *MP* 1st part the dative

plural forms with the ending *-mus* are more frequent. In *PK* and *MP* 1st part the dative singular forms with the endings *-am*; *-ui*; *-u*; *-ai* (*-ei*) are commonly used, although the dative plural forms with the long ending *-mus* are more frequent than with the ending *-ms*. The dative singular forms with the ending *-u* in *MP* 3rd part make a fifth of all dative singular forms, these forms are used much less frequently in *MP* 1st part, and only three forms were found in *PK*.

Athematic conjugation of verbs. The whole paradigm of conjugation of singular and plural of the verb *būti* (*to be*) is retained in the analysed sources. Although the 3rd person singular forms of the verb predominate in *PK* and *MP*, some differences in the usage of forms can be noticed as well: the athematic forms of the 1st and 2nd person singular are used much more often in *MP* 3rd part than in *PK* and *MP* 1st part. There are twice as many of 1st person plural forms of the verb *esme* in *PK* than in *MP* parts. The ratio of frequency of use of athematic forms of 3rd person of the verb *būti* (*to be*) with the endings *-t* and *-ti* in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is similar (the forms with the ending *-t* predominate), whilst much more of athematic forms of the verb *būti* (*to be*) with the ending in *-ti* were found in *PK*.

The expression of imperative. The imperative mood forms with the formatives *-k*, *-ki* or the adjoined particle *-gi* are used alongside in *PK* and *MP*. The archaic forms of 2nd person imperative mood with the adjoined particle *-gi* are used more often in *MP* 3rd part than in *MP* 1st part or *PK*. The 2nd person singular forms of imperative mood, formed with the formative *-ki*, are found only in *PK* and *MP* 1st part, whilst they were not found in *MP* 3rd part. The ratio of use of reflexive forms of imperative mood in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts is similar, and much less frequently of them are used in *PK*. Petkevičius usually writes the negative prefix *ne-* separately from the imperative mood form, and in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts the prefix *ne-* is commonly written together with the imperative mood form.

In the writings by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century the imperative is usually expressed by the imperative mood forms, however, other synonymous expressive means, often translated from the original, may be employed for this purpose as well. Besides the imperative mood forms, one of the most frequent constructions to express the imperative is conjugated verb form + *infinitive*, and the forms of present tense were found not so often – they were not found in *PK* at all. The future time forms have a clear meaning of imperative mood – the similar number of these forms is used in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, whilst in *PK* they are much less frequent.

Subjunctive mood. The archaic 1st person plural forms of subjunctive mood were mostly used in the analysed sources, also there are plenty of 3rd person singular and plural forms of subjunctive mood formed with the suffix *-t-*. The 2nd person singular forms of the subjunctive mood, formed with the

formative *-čia*, were found much less frequently than archaic forms formed with the formative *-bei*. The subjunctive mood forms, formed with the suffixes *-t* or *-č-*, predominate in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, whilst in *PK* – the archaic forms, formed with the formative *-b-*. The 1st person plural forms of subjunctive mood with the long formative *-bime* are found less frequently in *MP* 3rd part than in *PK* and *MP* 1st part.

The prefix *ne-* in *PK* and *MP* 1st part was more often written separately from the subjunctive mood form, formed with the formative *-b-*, and in *MP* 3rd part – together with the subjunctive mood form. Considering the subjunctive mood forms, formed with the suffixes *-t* or *-č-*, the prefix *ne-* in *PK* and *MP* 3rd part was commonly written separately from these forms, and in *MP* 1st part the prefix *ne-* tended to be written together with the subjunctive mood form.

Possessive pronouns. The Lithuanian texts by the reformers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the 16th century in the usage of possessive pronouns are considerably different. More agreeing forms of possessive pronouns are used in *PK* than in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. There are not many of the feminine gender forms of agreeing possessive pronouns in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts, whilst in *PK* they are used more frequently than in the analysed *MP* parts. The paradigm of possessive pronoun declension is retained better in *PK* than in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts – the forms of all cases are used. In *PK* the agreeing forms of possessive pronouns prepositionally are used more frequently than in *MP* 1st and 3rd parts. The usage of non-inflective forms of possessive pronouns in both sources is characterized by this that the possessive genitive forms with the ending *-a* and the ending *-o* are used alongside. However, in *MP* the forms with the ending *-o* are used much more frequently than in *PK*.

The identification of authorship. The found differences show that Merkelis Petkevičius did not contribute to the translation of *Postilla* 1st and 3rd parts. The research of ratio of use of reduced/non-reduced forms of postpositive locatives (pronoun adessive, allative, illative singular) shows that *PK* differs from the analysed *MP* parts. The differences were noticed in the usage of forms of dative singular pronouns and dative singular with the ending *-u*, the dative constructions with the prepositions *prie(g)* and *prieš* as well as athematic forms of 3rd person of the verb *būti* (to be) with the endings *-t* and *-ti*, in the translation of postpositive locative forms from the Polish language. Petkevičius uses the reflexive forms of imperative mood less frequently than the translators of *MP* 1st or 3rd part. In *PK*, differently from the analysed *MP* parts, the subjunctive mood forms with the formative *-b-*, agreeing forms of feminine gender of possessive pronouns, the possessive genitive forms with the ending *-a* predominate, and the prefix *ne-* is commonly written separately from the subjunctive mood form.

The found differences show that *Postilla* 1st and 3rd parts were translated by different persons. *MP* 1st and 3rd parts differ in the usage of reduced/non-

reduced forms of illative plural, dative singular and plural forms with the long and short endings, and the dative constructions with the prepositions *prie(g)* and *prieš*. A lot of differences were noticed in the orthography of prefix *ne-* written together with or separately from the subjunctive mood forms with the formative *-b-* and suffixes *-t-* or *-č-* as well as in the translation of adessive forms from the Polish language. The dative singular forms with the ending *-u*, the athematic forms of 1st and 2nd person singular, the 2nd person imperative mood forms with the formative *-kig* were much more frequent in *MP* 3rd part than in *MP* 1st part. The 1st person plural forms of subjunctive mood with the long formative (*-bime*) are found less frequently in *MP* 3rd part than in *MP* 1st part.

List of publications on the subject of dissertation

1. Dambrauskas Kęstutis 2017, „Ilgųjų ir trumpųjų naudininko formų vartojimo XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviškuose raštuose santykis“, *Lietuvių kalba 11* [interaktyvus], Prieiga per internetą: <http://www.lietviukalba.lt/index.php/lietviu-kalba/article/view/236/>
2. Dambrauskas Kęstutis 2016, „Liepimo raiška LDK reformatų lietuviškuose raštuose“, *Acta humanitarica universitatis Saulensis*, t. 23, 59–76.
3. Dambrauskas Kęstutis 2015, „Konceptualiosios DIEVO metaforos 1598 m. Merkelio Petkevičiaus *Katekizme*“, *Acta humanitarica universitatis Saulensis*, t. 22, 162–176.
4. Maskuliūnas Bronius, Dambrauskas Kęstutis 2014, „Savybinių įvardžių formos XVI a. Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės reformatų lietuviškuose raštuose“, *Martynui Mažvydui atminti: raštijos raida ir XXI a. iššūkiai*, 43–55.

SANTRAUKA

Temos aktualumas ir naujumas. XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviški raštai yra nedažnas tyrimų objektas, ypač mažai tyrinėta vadinamoji Jokūbo Morkūno *Postilė*. Zigmąs Zinkevičius (1988), kalbėdamas apie senuosius lietuviškus leidinius, pamini, kad bene mažiausiai kalbininkų dėmesio yra sulaukusi XVI a. LDK reformatų knygų kalba, kuri nėra tokia turtinga kaip katalikų, pvz., Mikalojaus Daukšos. Bronius Maskuliūnas (2006b) pabrėžia, kad tiek dėl didelės apimties, tiek dėl apskritai ne tokio jau gausaus senųjų lietuvių rašto paminklų skaičiaus XVI a. Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kalvinų lietuviškų leidinių apeiti negalima ir būtina juos tyrinėti.

Gana retai atliekami gretinamieji kelių autorių kalbos tyrimai, jie padėtų išryškinti ankstyvosios lietuvių rašytinės kalbos bruožus, tiriamų autorių kalbos panašumus ir skirtumus, padėtų atsakyti į dėl leidinių autorystės kylančius klausimus. Disertacija papildys senųjų raštų tyrinėjimus lyginamąja XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviškų tekstų būdingiausių morfologijos ypatybių analize, kurios iki šiol nebuvo. Remiantis Jonu Palioniu (1967), Zigmąs Zinkevičiumi (1970), Antanu Jakuliu (1982), Dalia Jakulyte (2016) ir tyrimui surinkta XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviškų raštų medžiaga, būdingiausiomis senųjų lietuviškų raštų morfologijos ypatybėmis darbe laikomi postpoziciniai vietininkai, vienaskaitos ir daugiskaitos naudininko formos su galūnėmis *-mui* ir *-mus*, atematinės veiksmazodžių formos, liepiamosios ir tariamosios nuosakos formos, savybiniai įvardžiai. Analizė turi teorinės ir praktinės vertės: XVI a. LDK reformatų tekstų būdingiausių morfologijos ypatybių tyrimas papildo kitų senųjų raštų tyrimus ir lietuvių morfologijos raidos tyrinėjimus, atskleidžia atskirų autorių kalbos raidą, kitimą, dėsningumus ir skirtumus, padeda atsakyti į iki šiol aktualų klausimą dėl *Postilės* vertimo autorystės. Tyrimo išvados aktualios lietuvių kalbos morfologijai, istorijai, tolesniems senųjų raštų kalbos tyrimams.

Darbo tikslas ir uždaviniai. Darbo tikslas – remiantis morfologijos ypatybėmis nustatyti Morkūno *Postilės* autorystę ir santykį su Merkelio Petkevičiaus *Katekizmu*, išsiaiškinti, ar visos trys *Postilės* dalys verstos to paties asmens.

Keliami tokie darbo **uždaviniai**:

1. Atlikti lyginamąjį XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviškų leidinių būdingiausių morfologijos ypatybių tyrimą.
2. Nustatyti, kokios individualios ypatybės būdingos tik šiems konkrečioms raštams.
3. Nustatyti tiriamųjų šaltinių būdingiausių morfologijos ypatybių vartojimo dažnumo panašumus ir skirtumus, įvertinti galimas įtakas.

4. Įvertinti, ar Merkelis Petkevičius prisidėjo prie Jokūbo Morkūno *Postilės* vertimo.
5. Išsiaiškinti, ar Morkūno *Postilės* vertimas – vieno asmens darbas.

Tyrimo objektas – Merkelio Petkevičius *Katekizmo* (*PK*) ir Jokūbo Morkūno *Postilės* (*MP*) morfologijos ypatybės.

Tiriamieji šaltiniai yra Merkelio Petkevičiaus 1598 m. išleistas dvikalbis (lenkų-lietuvių) *Katekizmas* ir 1594 m. Mikalojaus Rėjaus *Lenkiškos postilės* (*Postilla polska*) 1600 m. vertimas *Postilla lietuviška*, priskiriamas Jokūbui Morkūnui. *Postilėje* numeruojami ne puslapiai, o lapai. Nenumeruotas kairysis puslapis žymimas *v* raide (*verso*) virš puslapio numerio. Morkūno *Postilės* I dalį sudaro 230^v lapų, II dalį – 148^v lapai, o III dalis yra beveik tris kartus trumpesnė už I ir beveik du kartus už II dalį – ją sudaro 86^v. Siekiant gauti kuo patikimesnių rezultatų, stengtasi išlaikyti panašią tyrimo imtį – medžiaga rinkta iš Petkevičiaus *Katekizmo*, 116 *Postilės* I dalies lapų (112 866 žodžiai), iš 115 II dalies lapų (112 470 žodžių) ir III dalies (112 662 žodžiai).

Darbo problema. Iki šiol nėra aišku, kas tikrasis vadinamosios Morkūno *Postilės* vertėjas į lietuvių kalbą. Kai kurie tyrėjai, pvz., Jurgis Lebedys (1977), Zinkevičius (1988), nurodo, kad vertėjo klausimas yra atviras ir diskutuotinas. Labiausiai paplitusi versija, kad *Postilę* iš lenkų kalbos išvertė pats leidėjas Jokūbas Morkūnas (plg. Biržiška 1990, 196–199; Gineitis 1982, 37; Lukšaitė 2000, 6; Jovaišas 2003, 213). Pagal kitą, mažiau populiarią ir argumentuotą versiją, 1600 m. *Postilės* vertėjas galėjo būti kitas Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės reformatas Merkelis Petkevičius (plg. Biržiška 1998, 177; Zinkevičius 1988, 202).

Postilę sudaro trys dalys. Trečioji dalis skiriasi nuo pirmųjų dviejų – ji išspausdinta smulkesniu šriftu ir turi atskirą paginaciją (knygoje žymimi ne puslapiai, o lapai). Yra pareikšta nuomonių, kad ji galėjo būti išspausdinta vėliau už kitas dvi dalis (Zinkevičius 1988, 202), o ir *MP* III dalies vertėjas galėjęs būti kitas asmuo.

Neretai atliekant autorystės priskyrimo tyrimus, susiduriama su įvairiais sunkumais. Moshe Koppelis, Jonathanas Schleras ir Shlomo Argamonas (2008, 2) kaip vieną iš autorystės nustatymo problemų išskiria *tikrinimo problemą*, kai autorius yra žinomas (angl. *closed candidate*), bet atsiranda dar vienas galimas kandidatas. Tyrėjo uždavinys – nustatyti, ar galimas kandidatas yra / nėra autorius. Pastaruoju atveju atliekamas lyginamasis dviejų (kartais keleto) šaltinių kalbos tyrimas – vieno autoriaus kalbos ypatybės lyginamos su kito, nustatomi panašumai ir skirtumai.

Siekiant nustatyti *MP* autorystę, darbe atliekama *PK* ir *MP* būdingiausių morfologijos ypatybių lyginamoji analizė. Tai lėmė kelios priežastys: Lietuvos ir užsienio kalbininkai pabrėžia, kad prie autorystės nustatymo gali prisidėti tokių teksto ypatybių kaip žodžių (ar sakinių) ilgis analizė; užsienio mokslininkų

(Koppel ir kt. 2005; Argamon ir Levitan 2005) atlikti stilometriniai kalbos tyrimai patvirtina hipotezę, kad įvairūs autoriai turi skirtingus žodžių ar jų formų vartojimo modelius; morfologijos ypatybių (žodžių formų) vartojimui vertime originalo kalba daro daug mažesnę poveikį negu leksikos ypatybėms ar sintaksinėms konstrukcijoms; kokias žodžių formas pasirinkti, pvz., su ilgesne ar trumpesne galūne, sutrumpėjusia / nesutrumpėjusia postpozicija, ir kaip jas vartoti neretai sprendė pats senųjų raštų vertėjas ir tam mažai įtakos turėjo originalo (lenkų) kalba.

Palyginus *MP* dalių morfologijos ypatybes, nustačius panašumus ir skirtumus, galima bandyti patvirtinti arba paneigti hipotezę, kad *MP* trečiosios dalies vertėjas yra kitas nei pirmosios ar antrosios. *MP* I ir III dalių morfologijos ypatybes dar palyginus su *Katekizmo* kalba, galima bandyti identifikuoti, ar Petkevičius prisidėjo prie *Postilės* ar prie kurios nors vienos jos dalies vertimo.

Atlikus tyrimą, t. y. palyginus abiejų šaltinių morfologijos ypatybes, bus bandoma atsakyti į klausimą dėl vadinamosios Morkūno *Postilės* vertimo autorystės. Keliami **probleminiai klausimai**: ar Petkevičius yra prisidėjęs prie vadinamosios Morkūno *Postilės* vertimo? Ar Morkūno *Postilės* dalis vertė skirtingi asmenys?

Literatūros apžvalga. Senieji XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviški raštai nėra sulaukę tiek daug kalbininkų dėmesio kaip Rytų Prūsijos reformatų ar LDK katalikų leidiniai. Remiantis Zinkevičiumi (1988, 43), vien Mažvydo *Katekizmą* iki 1988 m. yra tyrinėję daugiau nei 30 Lietuvos ir užsienio mokslininkų. Parašyta nemažai bendro pobūdžio veikalų apie senųjų raštų kalbos ypatybes, bendrinės kalbos formavimąsi ir raidą. Pagrindiniai ir bene išsamiausi lietuvių kalbos gramatikos raidos ir senųjų raštų kalbos tyrimai, padedantys nusistatyti teorinius darbo principus, yra Zinkevičiaus (1988, 1980, 1981), Jono Palionio (1967, 1995, 2004) ir Jono Kazlausko (1968) darbai. Iš šių darbų išskirtina Palionio (1967) monografinio pobūdžio knyga apie XVI–XVII a. lietuviškų raštų rašybos ir kalbos ypatybes. Joje ne tik apibendrinti kitų autorių darbai, bet ir išsamiai aprašytos būdingiausios senųjų raštų kalbos fonetikos, morfologijos, sintaksės ir leksikos ypatybės. Aptariant reformacijos formavimąsi Europoje ir LDK, remtasi Ingės Lukšaitės (1999), Irenos Backus (2008) ir Dainoros Pociūtės (2008) studijomis, suteikiančiomis žinių apie reformacijos atsiradimą, raidą, pagrindinius centrus ir asmenis. Šių mokslininkų studijos labiau istorinio-kultūrologinio pobūdžio, kur daugiausia dėmesio skiriama reformacijai kaip visuomeniniam, politiniam ir ideologiniam judėjimui.

Šiame darbe atliekama morfologinė analizė, todėl teorinėje ir praktinėje dalyse remtasi Aldonos Paulauskienės (1994; 2006) darbais. Atskirų kalbos lygmenų raidą yra aptarę nemažai kalbininkų. Baltų kalbų įvardžių raidą tyrinėjo Albertas Rosinas (1995), apie įvardžiuotinius būdvardžius studiją parašė Zinkevičius (1957). Rengiant teorinį disertacijos pagrindą, lietuvių kalbos sintaksės

tyrimais remtasi mažiau. Galima išskirti Vytauto Ambrazo knygą (2006) apie istorinę lietuvių kalbos sintaksę. Joje tiriami vieni iš svarbiausių lietuvių kalbos istorinės sintaksės šaltinių – senųjų lietuviškų raštų duomenys. Autorius išryškina senajai lietuvių kalbai būdingas sintaksinės raiškos priemones, atskleidžia sintaksinių struktūrų kitimus, aptaria žodžių tvarką sakinyje ir jos raidą.

Sistemiškai tiriant kitus mažesnės ar didesnės apimties XVI a. senuosius lietuviškus raštus – Daukšos, Bretkūno, Mažvydo ir kitų – aptariami senųjų raštų morfologijos, sintaksės ar kitų kalbos lygmenų bruožai. Iš ankstesnių senųjų raštų kalbos tyrimų apibendrinimų minėtini Pietro Dini (1994), Viktoro Falkenhano (1941), Jurgio Lebedžio (1963), Prano Skardžiaus (1937), Wilhalmo Wittės (1931) ir kitų darbai, turėję tiek praktinės, tiek teorinės vertės tolesniems tyrimams. Vertėtų išskirti Gordono Fordo (1969) monografinio pobūdžio studiją apie Baltramiejaus Vilento *Enchiridiono* kalbą, kaip bene vienintelį išsamų vieno autoriaus raštų kalbos (fonetikos, morfologijos ir sintaksės) tyrimą. Per pastaruosius dvidešimt metų senųjų raštų tyrimai yra atliekami šiomis kryptimis: senųjų raštų originalaus teksto įtaka vertimui (Bukantytė 2007), linksnių ir prielinksnių konstrukcijos (Gelumbeckaitė 2002), lyginamųjų (Judžentis, Pajėdienė 2005) ir priežasties šalutinių (Kibildaitė 2001) sakinių vartoseną, posesyvumo raišką (Maskuliūnas 2000), įvardžių semantinę ir morfologinę struktūrą (Rosinas 2001), postpoziciniai vietininkai (Žilinskaitė 2004, 2007, 2010), *sta* kamieno veiksmožodžiai (Šarkytė 2012; Pakalniškienė, Šarkytė 2012), klitiniai (atoniniai) įvardžiai (Razanovaitė 2014) ir pan. Dauguma šių darbų labiau susiję su senųjų lietuvių raštų sintaksės tyrimais, todėl rengiant teorinį disertacijos pagrindą ar analizuojant surinktus empirinius duomenis naudotasi tik kai kuriais iš jų. Galima daryti išvadą, kad tyrėjai iki šiol palyginti mažai dėmesio skyrė senųjų raštų morfologijos tyrimams. Remiantis kai kurių jau atliktų tyrimų medžiaga, galima palyginti atskirų autorių raštų morfologijos ypatybes ir pastebėti jų vartojimo dažnumo tendencijas ar pokyčius.

Tiriamų šaltinių – *Katekizmo* ir *Postilės* – kalbą daugiausia yra tyrinėję kalbininkai Ernestas Frenkelis, Jonas Kruopas, Zigmas Zinkevičius, Bronius Maskuliūnas. Minėtinas Frenkelio (1947) darbas, skirtas *PK* sintaksei aptarti. *Katekizmo* tarmę ir kalbos ypatybes vieni iš pirmųjų lietuvių kalbininkų pradėjo tyrinėti Kruopas (1957, 1970) ir Zinkevičius (1970). Maskuliūnas (2009), remdamasis *PK* kalbos duomenimis, tyrė savybinių įvardžių formų santykį ir dviejų refleksyvumo raiškos modelių vartojimo santykį *Katekizme*. Bene vienintelis žinių apie Morkūno *Postilės* kalbą suteikia Bronius Maskuliūnas. Kalbininko straipsniuose (2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2011) apžvelgiama *Postilės* pasirodymo istorija, svarstomas jos autorystės klausimas, trumpai aptariamos kai kurios būdingesnės rašybos, fonetikos, morfologijos ir sintaksės ypatybės.

Tyrimo metodologija ir metodai. Veikalo autoriaus, publikavimo laiko ir vietos nustatymas, ko gero, sunkiausias tekstologo uždavinys. Leidinio autorystės

tė dažniausiai nustatoma, remiantis biografine ar autobiografinė medžiaga, artimųjų, redaktorių ar dokumentiniais liudijimais, kartais atliekama kompleksinė visų tyrimui prieinamų dokumentų analizė (plg. Subačius 2001, 206–223). Dar vienas autoritės identifikavimo būdas – kalbinė veikalo analizė. Kalbos analizė yra tyrimo metodas, kai objektyviai analizuojamos ir aprašomos kalbos ypatybės. Ji apima keturis pagrindinius kalbos lygmenis: fonetiką, morfologiją, leksiką ir sintaksę (užsienio kalbotyroje neretai dar skiriama semantika ir pragmatika). Norint atsakyti į klausimą dėl leidinio autorystės, daugiausia dėmesio reikėtų skirti dialektologiniu, socialiniu ir literatūriniu požiūriu žymėtai leksiškai, fonetinėms ir morfologinėms ypatybėms, liudijusioms rašiusiojo tarmė, ir sintaksinėms konstrukcijoms (Subačius 2001, 218–219).

Kuriuos kalbos lygmenis pasirinkti tyrimui, priklauso nuo įvairių aplinkybių. Fonetikos ypatybių analizė, sprendžiant su leidinio autoryste susijusius klausimus, pvz., siekiant nustatyti, ar vienas asmuo galėjo prisidėti prie kitam asmeniui priskiriamo teksto vertimo, lyg ir netenka prasmės, jei tiriama šaltiniai priklauso tam pačiam senųjų raštų kalbos variantui, yra tos pačios tarmės, patarmės ar šnektos atstovai. Lingvistiškai lyginant kelis veikalus, daug dėmesio reikia skirti chronologijai, nes senųjų lietuviškų raštų autoriams būdingas derinimasis prie vienu ar kitu metu įsivyravjančio raštų kalbos varianto (Subačius 2001, 219). *PK* ir *MP* priskiriami viduriniam senųjų raštų kalbos variantui.

Leksinė kalbos analizė, identifikuojant leidinio autorių ar vertėją, lietuvių kalbotyroje įprastai siejama ne su pačiomis leksemomis, o su jų rašybos tyrimu, t. y. analizuojama, skirtingas ar panašias raides, rašydami žodžius, vartojama tiriamų tekstų autoriai ar vertėjai (žr. Jakulis 1982, Jakulytė 2016). Vienokių ar kitokių leksemų pasirinkimą lemia leidinio žanras ar vertimo šaltinis. *PK* ir *MP* yra skirtingų žanrų religiniai veikalai, versti iš lenkų kalbos.

Lyginant skirtingo žanro veikalų sintaksės ypatybes, sudėtinga įvairiose tekstų vietose rasti analogiškos ar panašios struktūros sakinių. Daugiau dėmesio turi būti skiriama ne sakinių struktūrai, bet įvairių sintaksinių konstrukcijų su prielinksniais, bendratimi, dalyviais analizei, žodžių tvarkai sakinyje aptarti. Žinoma, kad senųjų raštų vertėjai stengėsi neiškreipti religinio raštų turinio bei dogmų, todėl neretai vergiškai sekė originalu (Rosinas 1988, 179; Palionis 1995, 90). Zigmas Zinkevičius (1988, 189–198) senųjų lietuviškų raštų nelietuvišką sintaksę sieja su pažodiniu vertimu.

Atsižvelgus į tai, kad *PK* ir *MP* yra religinio pobūdžio veikalai, parašyti viduriniu raštų kalbos variantu, o palyginus tik kai kurias sintaksines konstrukcijas būtų sunku daryti konkretesnius apibendrinimus, darbe atliekama *PK* ir *MP* būdingiausių morfologijos ypatybių lyginamoji analizė.

Morfologijos ypatybių tyrimai lietuvių kalbotyroje atliekami, kai bandoma nustatyti leidinio autorystę: lyginamos tariamosios ir liepiamosios nuosakos for-

mos, atematiniai veiksmažodžiai, postpoziciniai vietininkai, vietininkiniai būdvardžiai etc. Iprastai atsiribojama nuo sintaksinių lyginamų senųjų raštų tekstų konstrukcijų tyrimo, išvados daromos remiantis morfologijos, mažiau leksikos ar rašybos ypatybėmis. Tirdamas *Knygos nobažnystės (KN)* dalių – *Sumos evangelijų* ir *Maldų krikščioniškų* – autorystę, Antanas Jakulis (1982) lygina šaltinių rašybos ir kalbos ypatybes. Tyrime dėmesio *KN* leksikai ir rašybai skiriama palyginti nedaug – aptariami tų pačių žodžių variantai. Autorius koncentruojasi ties morfologijos ypatybėmis. Dalia Jakulytė (2016), tęsdama Jakulio pradėtą *KN* autorystės tyrimą, trumpai aptaria *KN* rašybą, fonetiką, leksiką, nors daugiausia dėmesio skiria vardažodžio morfologijai (linksnio kategorijai – postpoziciniams vietininkams, skaičiaus kategorijai – dviskaitai, sisteminiam galūnių trumpinimui etc.). Antano Jakulio (1982, 1984), Dalios Jakulytės (2016), Koppelio ir kt. (2005), Shlomo Argamono ir Shlomo Levitano (2005), Rosos Marijos Coyotl-Morales, Luiso Villaseñoro-Pinedos, Manuelio Monteso-y-Gómezo, Paolo Rosso (2006) atlikti tyrimai rodo, kad morfologinių kalbos ypatybių analizė pasitelkiama, kai bandoma atsakyti į klausimus, susijusius su leidinio autoryste.

Darbe daugiausia taikomi *analitinis*, *aprašomasis* ir *lyginamasis* metodai. Aptariant morfologijos ypatybes, kiekviename praktinės dalies skyriuje aprašomas jų vartojimas tiriamuose šaltiniuose. Postpoziciniai vietininkai klasifikuojami ir aprašomi pagal kalbos dalis (giminės, skaičiaus kategorijas). Aptariami tikrinių žodžių (vardų) adesyvai ir aliatyvai, šių postpozicinių vietininkų formų vartojimas dvižodžiuose ar trižodžiuose junginiuose, aprašomos dažniausiai aptinkamos daiktavardžių, būdvardžių ir įvardžių inesyvo leksemos, su postpoziciniaisiais vietininkais koreliuojančios prielinksninės konstrukcijos ir kt.

Nemaža dėmesio skiriama naudininkui – aprašomos formos su ilgosiomis (archajinėmis) ir trumposiomis galūnėmis, nagrinėjamas vienaskaitos naudininko formų su galūnėmis *-ui* ir *-u*, vienaskaitos ir daugiskaitos įvardžių naudininko formų vartojimas, daiktavardžių ir būdvardžių naudininko formų su ilgosiomis ir trumposiomis galūnėmis pasiskirstymas pagal linksniuotes, taip pat liepiamosios ir tariamosios nuosakos formos, atematiniai veiksmažodžiai, savybiniai įvardžiai etc.

Darbe netiriamos XVI a. LDK reformatų raštuose tik sporadiškai vartojamos vardažodžių dviskaitos formos, vietininkiniai būdvardžiai (dominuoja leksema *danguieis*), daugiskaitos lokatyvo formos su galūne *-su*, leidžiamosios nuosakos formos etc. *PK* ir *MP* enklitinių (atoninių) įvardžių analizės atsisakyta todėl, kad juos savo darbe išsamiai aprašė Auksė Razanovaitė (2014).

Analitinis metodas darbe taikomas, aptariant sutrumpėjusių ir nesutrumpėjusių postpozicinių vietininkų formų, ilgųjų ir trumpųjų naudininko, liepiamosios ir tariamosios nuosakos formų vartojimo santykį ir pan. Analizuojama, kaip morfologijos ypatybės paveikė vertimas iš lenkų kalbos, kas lėmė autorių pasirinkimą vartoti vienas ar kitas formas.

Siekiant nustatyti Petkevičiaus ir Morkūno vertimo kalbos panašumus ir skirtumus, morfologijos ypatybės ne tik aprašomos, bet ir palyginamos. Tiriamųjų šaltinių medžiaga taip pat lyginama ir su svetimkalbiais originalais. Darbe analizuojami duomenys (pavyzdžiai) surinkti iš tiriamų šaltinių: Merkelio Petkevičiaus *Katekizmo* ir Jokūbo Morkūno *Postilės*. Surinkta ir įvertinta empirinė medžiaga apibendrinama, naudojamas skaičiavimo metodas, rezultatai pateikiami lentelėse ir paveiksluose. Detalesnei pačių šaltinių analizei taikomas tekstologinis metodas.

Darbo struktūra. Įvade pristatoma tema, tikslas, uždaviniai ir metodika. Pirmame dėstymo skyriuje aptariamas lingvistinis, kultūrinis ir politinis spausdintų lietuviškų raštų pasirodymo kontekstas, tiriamieji šaltiniai ir jų leidėjai, kalbama apie XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviškų raštų kalbos tyrimus ir tyrimo metodus, aptariamas verstinių tekstų santykis su svetimkalbiais originalais ir leidinio atribucija.

Antrame skyriuje aptariamas Morkūno *Postilės* I ir II dalių būdingiausių morfologijos ypatybių vartojimo santykis.

Trečiame skyriuje pereinama prie empirinių duomenų analizės: analizuojamos ir lyginamos Morkūno *Postilės* ir Petkevičiaus *Katekizmo* būdingiausios morfologijos ypatybės (postpoziciniai vietininkai, ilgosios ir trumposios naudininko formos, atematinės veiksmažodžių formos, liepimo raiška, savybiniai įvardžiai ir etc.). Darbo pabaigoje yra išvados, šaltiniai ir literatūra, priedai.

Ginamieji teiginiai

1. Leidinio autorystę nustatymo labiausiai prisideda sutrumpėjusių / nesutrumpėjusių žodžio formų santykio analizė, kitaip tariant, formų galūnių ar postpozicijų ilgio tyrimas.
2. Galūnių trumpėjimas – bendra *PK* ir *MP* I dalies kalbos morfologijos ypatybė, o *MP* III dalis išsiskiria savo archajiškumu, nes formų galūnės trumpinamos rečiau.
3. Originalo kalba turi mažai įtakos verčiamos žodžio formos sandarai – daugeliu atvejų pats senųjų raštų vertėjas sprendė, kurią žodžio formą – sutrumpėjusią ar nesutrumpėjusią – pasirinkti ir kaip ją vartoti tekste.
4. Atskirų *MP* dalių vertimo autorystė skirtinga – tai ne vieno asmens darbas. Formų vartojimo skirtumai rodo, kad vieno autoriaus (ar autorių) parengtas *MP* I dalies, kito – *MP* II dalies vertimas. *MP* I dalies vertimą parengęs autorius nėra *MP* III dalies vertėjas.
5. Merkelis Petkevičius nėra prisidėjęs prie *MP* I ir III dalių vertimo.

IŠVADOS

Atlikus tyrimą galima teigti, kad pagrindines išvalgas, susijusias su Morkūno *Postilės* autoryste, leidžia daryti būdingiausių morfologijos formų vartojimo dažnumas, kai kurios jų rašybos ir vertimo iš originalo kalbos ypatybės.

Formų galūnių trumpėjimas. XVI a. LDK reformatų raštuose vartojamos to paties žodžio sutrumpėjusios / nesutrumpėjusios formos. Adesyvo, vienaskaitos inesyvo, daugiskaitos iliatyvo *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje trumpinamos kur kas dažniau negu *MP* III dalyje. Liepiamosios nuosakos vienaskaitos 2-ojo asmens formos, sudarytos su formantu *-ki*, aptinkamos tik *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje, o *MP* III dalyje jų nerasta – vartojamos formos su sutrumpėjusiu formanto *-ki* variantu *-k*. *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje dominuoja vienaskaitos naudininko vyriškosios giminės formos su galūne *-ui*, o *MP* III dalyje daugiau negu *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje rasta formų su galūne *-u*. Gauti duomenys paremia hipotezę, kad *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje labiau linkstama vartoti įvairias formas su sutrumpėjusiomis galūnėmis negu *MP* III dalyje.

Iš originalo verčiamas formas vieni XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviškų tekstų vertėjai buvo linkę trumpinti, kiti – ne. Iš lenkų kalbos konstrukcijos išverstos postpozicinio vietininko formos sandara lietuviškame tekste neretai įvairavo, pvz., *MP* I dalyje nesutrumpėjusios adesyvo formos aptinkamos dažniau negu *MP* III dalyje ir *PK*, o štai Petkevičius ir *MP* I dalies vertėjas sutrumpėjusias daugiskaitos iliatyvo formas vartoja dažniau negu *MP* III dalies vertėjas. Panašių skirtumų galima rasti ir aptariant kitas formas: naudininko, liepiamosios nuosakos etc. Originalo kalba neturėjo įtakos verčiamos formos sandarai – sutrumpėjusios / nesutrumpėjusios formos pasirinkimas ir vartojimas lietuviškame tekste yra vertėjo kalbos ypatybė.

Originalo įtaka vertimui. Atlikus tyrimą, pastebėta, kad originalus tekstas lenkų kalba XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviškiems raštams (vertimams) darė skirtingą įtaką. *PK* ir *MP* III dalyje, skirtingai negu *MP* I dalyje, adesyvo vertimo šaltiniu tampa lenkų kalbos konstrukcijos *do + genyvas*, *na + genityvas* ir *k + genityvas*, *przed + instrumentalis*. Nors įprasti aliatyvo vertimo šaltiniai yra lenkų kalbos konstrukcijos *k(u) + datyvas* ir *do + genityvas*, skirtingai negu *MP* I ir III dalių vertėjas (*-ai*), Petkevičius neretai nesilaiko pažodinio vertimo principo. Išimtimi galima laikyti liepiamosios nuosakos formų su prisišliejusia dalelyte *-gi* vertimą, nes originaluose (*PK* ir *RP*) vartotos formos su formantu *-že* (pvz., greta formos *day* vartota forma *dayže*).

***MP* I ir II dalių santykis.** Ištyrus *MP* I ir II dalių morfologijos, kai kurias rašybos ypatybes ir nustačius sutrumpėjusių / nesutrumpėjusių formų santykį, pastebėta daugiau *MP* I ir II dalių skirtumų negu panašumų. Sutrumpėjusios / nesutrumpėjusios adesyvo, vienaskaitos inesyvo, vienaskaitos ir daugiskaitos

iliatyvo, vienaskaitos naudininko formos su galūnėmis *-ui* ir *-u*, daugiskaitos naudininko formos su ilgąja ir trumposiomis galūnėmis, liepiamosios nuosakos formos su formantais *-k* ir *-ki* *MP* I ir II dalyse vartojamos skirtingai. Nors dalis pastebėtų skirtumų nėra dideli arba juos, pvz., aliatyvo ar inesyvo formų skaičių *MP*, lemia ne vertimas, bet originalus tekstas (*RP*), galima tvirtinti, kad *MP* I ir II dalis vertė skirtingi asmenys.

***PK, MP* I ir III dalių morfologijos ypatybių santykis.**

Aptariant *PK, MP* I ir III dalių morfologijos ypatybių santykį, tirtas postpozicinių vietininkų, vienaskaitos ir daugiskaitos naudininko formų su galūnėmis *-mui* ir *-mus*, atematinų veiksmažodžių formų, liepiamosios ir tariamosios nuosakos formų, savybinių įvardžių vartojimas. Toliau trumpai apibūdinamos atskiros charakteristikos.

Postpoziciniai vietininkai. Pašalio esamasis vietininkas (**adesyvas**) ir pašalio einamasis vietininkas (**aliatyvas**). Adesyvo ir aliatyvo formų paplitimas tirtuose šaltiniuose yra skirtingas. *MP* I dalyje nesutrumpėjusios adesyvo formos aptinkamos dažniau negu *MP* III dalyje ir *PK*, o šių formų vartojimo dažnumo skirtumai *PK* ir *MP* III dalyje yra minimalūs. *MP* I ir III dalyse aliatyvo formas linkstama trumpinti, jų vartojimo dažnumas procentais yra vienodas – tuo šios *MP* dalys skiriasi nuo *PK*, kur aptikta gerokai daugiau nesutrumpėjusių aliatyvo formų.

Vidaus esamasis vietininkas (**inesyvas**) ir vidaus einamasis vietininkas (**iliatyvas**). Sutrumpėjusių / nesutrumpėjusių inesyvo formų vartojimo dažnumo santykis *PK, MP* I ir III dalyse yra panašus, o iliatyvo formų – gana skirtingas. *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje šiek tiek labiau linkstama trumpinti vienaskaitos inesyvo formų galūnes negu *MP* III dalyje. Kalbant apie iliatyvą, reikia pabrėžti, kad Petkevičius dažniau trumpina vienaskaitos iliatyvo formų galūnes negu *MP* I ir III dalių vertėjai. Vienaskaitos iliatyvo formų vartojimo dažnumo santykis *MP* I ir III dalyse panašus. Petkevičius ir *MP* I dalies vertėjas sutrumpėjęs daugiskaitos iliatyvo formas vartoja dažniau negu *MP* III dalies vertėjas – jų tekste rasta vos keletas. Tuo *MP* III dalis esmingai skiriasi nuo *PK* ir *MP* I dalies.

Naudininkas. *MP* III dalyje vienaskaitos ir daugiskaitos archajinės naudininko formos su galūnėmis *-mui* ir *-mus* dominuoja prieš formas su galūnėmis *-am*; *-ui*; *-u*; *-ai* (*-ei*); *-ms*. Naudininko formų su galūnėmis *-mui* ir *-mus* vartojimo santykis *MP* III dalyje yra panašus, o *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje daugiau aptikta daugiskaitos naudininko formų su galūne *-mus*. *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje įprastai vartojamos vienaskaitos naudininko formos su galūnėmis *-am*; *-ui*; *-u*; *-ai* (*-ei*), nors daugiskaitos naudininko formų su ilgąja galūne *-mus* rasta daugiau negu su *-ms*. Vienaskaitos naudininko formos su galūne *-u* *MP* III dalyje sudaro penktadalį visų vienaskaitos naudininko formų, *MP* I dalyje šių formų vartojama daug mažiau, o *PK* rastos tik 3 formos.

Atematinis veiksmažodžių asmenavimas. Tirtuose šaltiniuose išlaikyta visa atematinio veiksmažodžio *būti* vienaskaitos ir daugiskaitos asmenavimo

paradigma. Nors *PK* ir *MP* vyrauja veiksmažodžio 3-iojo asmens formos, galima pastebėti ir formų vartojimo skirtumą: vienaskaitos 1-ojo asmens ir 2-ojo asmens atematinių formų kur kas daugiau vartojama *MP* III dalyje negu *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje. Daugiskaitos 1-ojo asmens formų *esme* beveik dvigubai daugiau užfiksuota *PK* negu tirtose *MP* dalyse. Atematinių veiksmažodžio *būti* 3-iojo asmens formų su galūnėmis *-t* ir *-ti* vartojimo dažnumo santykis *MP* I ir III dalyse yra panašus (vyrauja formos su galūne *-t*), o *PK* kur kas daugiau rasta atematinių veiksmažodžio *būti* formų su galūne *-ti*.

Liepimo raiška. *PK* ir *MP* pagrečiui vartojamos liepiamosios nuosakos formos su formantais *-k*, *-ki* ar prisišliejusia dalelyte *-gi*. *MP* III dalyje archajinės liepiamosios nuosakos 2-ojo asmens formos su prisišliejusia dalelyte *-gi* vartojamos dažniau negu *MP* I dalyje ar *PK*. Liepiamosios nuosakos vienaskaitos 2-ojo asmens formos, sudarytos su formantu *-ki*, aptinkamos tik *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje, o *MP* III dalyje jų nerasta. Liepiamosios nuosakos sangražinių formų vartojimo santykis *MP* I ir III dalyse yra panašus, o *PK* jų vartojama gerokai mažiau. Petkevičius neigiamąjį priešdėlį *ne-* su liepiamosios nuosakos forma dažniausiai rašo atskirai, o *MP* I ir III dalyse priešdėlis *ne-* įprastai rašomas drauge su liepiamosios nuosakos forma.

XVI a. LDK reformatų raštuose liepimas dažniausiai reiškiamas liepiamosios nuosakos formomis, tačiau šiam tikslui gali būti pasitelkiamos ir kitos, neretai iš originalo išverstos, sinoniminės raiškos priemonės. Be liepiamosios nuosakos formų, viena iš dažniau liepimui reikšti vartojamų konstrukcijų – *asmenuojamoji veiksmažodžio forma + infinityvas*, rečiau aptinkamos esamojo laiko formos – pastarųjų *PK* nerasta. Aiškia liepiamosios nuosakos reikšmę turi būsimojo laiko lytys – *MP* I ir III dalyse šių lyčių vartojama panašus skaičius, o *PK* jų rasta kur kas mažiau.

Tariamoji nuosaka. Tiriamuose šaltiniuose dažniausiai vartojamos daugiskaitos 1-ojo asmens archajinės tariamosios nuosakos formos, gausu vienaskaitos ir daugiskaitos 3-iojo asmens tariamosios nuosakos formų, sudarytų su priesaga *-t-*. Tariamosios nuosakos vienaskaitos 2-ojo asmens formų, sudarytų su formantu *-čia*, rasta gerokai mažiau negu archajinių formų, sudarytų su formantu *-bei*. *MP* I ir III dalyse vyrauja tariamosios nuosakos formos, sudarytos su priesagomis *-t-* ar *-č-*, o *PK* – archajinės formos, sudarytos su formantu *-b-*. *MP* III dalyje daugiskaitos 1-ojo asmens tariamosios nuosakos formos su ilguoju formantu *-bime* aptinkamos daug rečiau negu *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje.

Priešdėlis *ne-* *PK* ir *MP* I dalyje dažniau buvo rašomas skyrium nuo tariamosios nuosakos formos, sudarytos su formantu *-b-*, o *MP* III dalyje – su tariamosios nuosakos forma. Kalbant apie tariamosios nuosakos formas, sudarytas su priesagomis *-t-* ar *-č-*, priešdėlis *ne-* *PK* ir *MP* III dalyje įprastai buvo rašomas skyrium nuo šių formų, o *MP* I dalyje priešdėlį *ne-* buvo linkstama rašyti kartu su tariamosios nuosakos forma.

Savybiniai įvardžiai. XVI a. LDK reformatų lietuviški tekstai savybinių įvardžių vartojimu nemažai skiriasi. *PK* vartojama daugiau derinamųjų savybinių įvardžių formų negu *MP* I ir III dalyse. Derinamųjų savybinių įvardžių moteriškosios giminės formų *MP* I ir III dalyse rasta nedaug, o *PK* jos vartojamos dažniau negu tirtose *MP* dalyse. *PK* geriau negu *MP* I ir III dalyse išlaikyta savybinių įvardžių linksniavimo paradigma – vartojamos visų linksnių formos. *PK* derinamųjų savybinių įvardžių formų prepoziciškai vartojama daugiau negu *MP* I ir III dalyse. Nekaitomų savybinių įvardžių formų vartojimas abiejuose tiriamuose šaltiniuose pasižymi tuo, kad čia pagreičiui vartojamos savybinių kilmininkų formos su galūniniu *-a* ir galūniniu *-o*. Tačiau *MP* formos su galūniniu *-o* vartojamos žymiai dažniau nei *PK*.

Autorstės identifikavimas. Rasti skirtumai rodo, kad Merkelis Petkevičius nėra prisidėjęs prie *Postilės* I ir III dalių vertimo. Sutrumpėjusių / nesutrumpėjusių postpozicinių vietininkų (įvardžių adesyvo, aliatyvo, vienaskaitos iliatyvo) formų vartojimo dažnumo santykio tyrimas rodo, kad *PK* skiriasi nuo tirtų *MP* dalių. Skirtumų pastebėta vartojant vienaskaitos naudininko įvardžių ir vienaskaitos naudininko formas su galūne *-u*, naudininko konstrukcijas su prielinksniais *prie(g)* ir *prieš*, taip pat atematinių veiksmažodžio *būti* 3-iojo asmens formas su galūnėmis *-t* ir *-ti*, postpozicinių vietininkų formų vertime iš lenkų kalbos. Petkevičius liepiamosios nuosakos sangražines formas vartoja rečiau negu *MP* I ar III dalies vertėjai. *PK*, skirtingai negu tirtose *MP* dalyse, vyrauja tariamosios nuosakos formos, sudarytos su formantu *-b-*, derinamosios savybinių įvardžių moteriškosios giminės formos, savybinių kilmininkų formos su galūniniu *-a*, priešdėlis *ne-* įprastai rašomas skyrium nuo liepiamosios nuosakos formos.

Rasti skirtumai rodo, kad *Postilės* I ir III dalis vertė skirtingi asmenys. *MP* I ir III dalys skiriasi sutrumpėjusių / nesutrumpėjusių daugiskaitos iliatyvo formų, vienaskaitos ir daugiskaitos naudininko formų su ilgosiomis ir trumposiomis galūnėmis, naudininko konstrukcijų su prielinksniais *prie(g)* ir *prieš* vartojimu. Nemažai skirtumų pastebėta priešdėlio *ne-* rašyboje kartu arba skyrium nuo tariamosios nuosakos formų, sudarytų su formantu *-b-* ir priesagomis *-t-* ar *-č-* ir adesyvo formų vertime iš lenkų kalbos. *MP* III dalyje kur kas daugiau negu *MP* I dalyje rasta vienaskaitos naudininko formų su galūne *-u*, atematinių vienaskaitos 1-ojo ir 2-ojo asmens formų, liepiamosios nuosakos 2-ojo asmens formų su prisišliejusia dalelyte *-gi*. Tariamosios nuosakos daugiskaitos 1-ojo asmens formos su ilguoju formantu (*-bime*) *MP* III dalyje aptinkamos rečiau negu *MP* I dalyje.

Kęstutis Dambrauskas

**THE PROBLEM OF THE AUTHORSHIP OF MORKŪNAS'
POSTILLA: THE COMPARATIVE RESEARCH OF
MORPHOLOGY OF THE LITHUANIAN WRITINGS BY THE
REFORMERS OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA
OF THE 16TH CENTURY**

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, Philology (04 H)

2018-05-10. 3,25 spaud. leid. 1. Tiražas 50.
Išleido Šiaulių universitetas, P. Višinskio g. 38, 76352 Šiauliai.
Spausdino UAB BMK leidykla. J. Jasinskio g. 16, 03163 Vilnius.