The textual influences of Jacob Ledesma's catechism and the catechism of Mikalojus Daukša on the anonymous catechism of 1605

Anželika Smetonienė
Research Centre of Written Heritage
Institute of the Lithuanian Language
P. Vileišio g. 5
LT-10308 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: anzelika.smetoniene@gmail.com

Abstract

The article compares the relationship between the texts of the Polish Ledesma's catechism, the catechism of Mikalojus Daukša and the catechism of 1605. The problem of the source for the Polish translation of Ledesma's text and, consequently, for the two Lithuanian versions of the catechism is briefly introduced: scholarly opinions differ as to when the Italian original of Ledesma's catechism was published. Likewise unknown is the exact date of the translation of Ledesma's catechism into the Polish language. Both Lithuanian translations were accomplished from the Polish Ledesma's catechism; however, there are significant differences between them. Daukša was the first to accomplish a translation of such nature into Lithuanian, whereas the anonymous translator of the catechism of 1605 used not only the Polish source, but also Daukša's catechism, which had been rendered ten years earlier. Although the relationship between the latter text and the Polish translation as well as the Italian original has already been investigated, the comparison of the catechism of 1605 to the Polish version of Ledesma's catechism and to the catechism translated by Daukša still needs to be drawn. The aim of the present article is to compare the three catechisms and to investigate the textual influence of Daukša's catechism (which had been published earlier) on the anonymous translation of the catechism of 1605; in other words, to determine whether the catechism of 1605 was translated directly from the Polish catechism of Ledesma, or whether the translator relied more on the text of Daukša's catechism; also, to identify the authorial lines of the anonymous author.

Key words: Daukša, anonymous catechism, Ledesma, translation, Polish, Italian original

J. Ledesmos ir M. Daukšos katekizmų įtaka
1605 m. anoniminio katekizmo tekstui

Santrauka

Paskutinį XVI a. ketvirtį J. Ledesmos katekizmas buvo išverstas į lenkų kalbą, o iš šios – į lietuvių. Žinomi du J. Ledesmos vertimai į lietuvių kalbą: Mikalojaus Daukšos „Kathechismas arba moksłas kiekwienam krikszczionii priwalvs" (1595 m.) ir anoniminis katekizmas (1605 m.). Anksčiau teigta, kad nežinomas vertėjas J. Ledesmos katekizmą vertė smarkiai remdamasis M. Daukšos katekizmu. Pastarasis autorius J. Ledesmos katekizmą iš lenkų kalbos vietomis vertė laisvai, todėl anoniminio katekizmo vertimas šiame straipsnyje buvo lygintas ne tik su M. Daukšos katekizmu, bet ir J. Ledesmos lenkiškuoju vertimu. Taip buvo nustatyti abiejų lietuviškų katekizmų vertimų panašumai ir skirtumai su Ledesmos katekizmu ir tarpusavyje, autentiško teksto vietos. Sugretinus visus tris katekizmus paaiškėjo, kad 1605 m. katekizme papildomo teksto yra daugiau nei M. Daukšos vertime. Pastarasis lenkiško Ledesmos katekizmo vertimas yra tikslesnis, o anoniminis vertėjas nevengdavo perfrazuoti verčiamas mintis. Nors abiejuose lietuviškuose katekizmuose yra nemažai teksto, kurio trūksta lenkiškame katekizme, nėra pagrindo manyti, kad 1595 m. ir 1605 m. katekizmų vertimai atlikti iš skirtingų lenkiško katekizmo vertimų.

Raktažodžiai: Daukša, anoniminis katekizmas, Ledesma, vertimas, lenkų kalba, originalas italų kalba

1 Introduction

In the 16th century, catechisms were the major means of spreading the Catholic faith. In 1566, the first official Roman catechism was composed; at the same time, however, religious admonitions – limited in their scope and intended for a wider audience of believers – were likewise spreading. In the 16th century Poland, Jesuit catechisms by Peter Canisius, Robert Bellarmin and Jacob Ledesma were particularly recommended for deepening one's religious knowledge (Korzo 2004, 149). Ledesma's catechism was translated into Polish, and then from Polish into Lithuanian. Two translations of Ledesma's work into Lithuanian are known: Mikalojus Daukša's *Kathechismas arba moksłas kiekwienam krikszczionii priwalvs* (1595) and the anonymous catechism of 1605. The relationship between the latter translation and the Polish catechism as well as Daukša's catechism has not been thoroughly investigated.

The works of Daukša – the first books of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the Lithuanian language – have been vastly investigated not only by Lithuanian, but also by foreign

scholars. The catechism has been investigated slightly less than another notably large work of Daukša – *Postilla catholicka*; nevertheless, there is no dearth of studies that focus solely on *Kathechismas arba moksłas kiekwienam krikszczionii priwalvs*. One should mention the articles by Guido Michelini (Michelini 1999, Michelini 2001), in which the catechism of Daukša and the Polish translation of Ledesma's catechism are compared with the Italian text of Ledesma's publication of 1576. All works of Daukša have been thoroughly investigated by Jurgis Lebedys (Lebedys 1963), who was the first to correct the insights previously formulated by Vaclovas Biržiška (Biržiška 1953) and Ernst Sittig (Sittig 1929) about Daukša's translation of the catechism. Several studies were devoted to the language of the catechism (Palionis 1967; Zinkevičius 1988), its importance for the Lithuanian history (Ivinskis 1987), and its notation of sounds (Wolter 1886). Recently, the syntax of Daukša's catechism has also been investigated (Judžentis, Pajėdienė 2006).

The anonymous catechism, which is attributed to the eastern variety of the old Lithuanian writings, has been studied sparingly. Its first and the most thorough investigation was carried out by Jan Bystroń: in his preface to the transcription of the anonymous catechism, the scholar described its orthography, the notation of vowels and consonants, phonetics, the declension of nouns as well as the conjugation of verbs (Bystroń 1890). In order to determine the native dialect of the anonymous translator, Zigmas Zinkevičius analysed the phonetics and the grammatical forms of the catechism and concluded that the dialect must be traced to the surroundings of Vilnius, Maišiagala, Nemenčinė and Pabradė (Zinkevičius 1968). Jurgis Gerulis, introducing an extract from the catechism of 1605, briefly noted that its text does not always coincide with Daukša's catechism (Gerulis 1927). In his study on the problem of the hypothetical catechism of 1585, Sergejus Temčinas provided some possible circumstances of the origin of the anonymous catechism (Temčinas 2013). Together with other 16th and 17th century sources, the anonymous catechism was briefly discussed in other more general works (Biržiška 1953; Palionis 1967; Ivinskis 1987; Zinkevičius 1988); its clauses of cause and purpose were likewise investigated (Judžentis 2010).

The foreword of the anonymous catechism states that the book is the second translation of Ledesma's catechism into Lithuanian (*tú Ledéſmos Cathechiſmu iƷ nauio pérgulƷiau / kúris iau pirma to búo perguldidas* 'I retranslated Ledesma's catechism, which had already been translated before' AC 4_{11}–4_{14}). It has previously been suggested that the anonymous translator relied heavily on Daukša's rendering while working on Ledesma's catechism: "all the time [he] had in his hands Daukša's catechism, which he followed line for line, even word for word" (Lith. *visą laiką turėjo rankose Daukšos katekizmą, kuriuo jis sekė eilutė po eilutės, net žodis po žodžio*) (Biržiška 1953, 164). Afterwards,

this statement raised repeated doubts. The **aim** of the present article is to compare the three catechisms and to investigate the textual influence of Daukša's catechism (which had been published earlier) on the anonymous translation of the catechism of 1605; in other words, to determine whether the catechism of 1605 was translated directly from the Polish catechism of Ledesma, or whether the translator relied more on the text of Daukša's catechism; also, to identify the authorial lines of the anonymous author. Applying the method of textual analysis, a photocopy of the Polish translation of Ledesma's catechism (henceforth referred to as LC) from the Czartoryski Library in Kraków, a photocopy of Daukša's catechism (henceforth, DC) and the published concordances of the catechism of 1605 (henceforth, AC) were investigated. It should be emphasised that the analysis comprised not isolated extracts, but the entire texts of the catechisms. The main focus was on the hitherto little analysed anonymous catechism of 1605. In order to achieve the goal, the following research **tasks** were formulated: to discuss the problem of the source for the Lithuanian and Polish catechisms; to compare Daukša's catechism with the Polish rendering of Ledesma's catechism; to compare the anonymous translation of the catechism with the Polish rendering of Ledesma's catechism; to consider the relationship between the two Lithuanian translations of the catechism, the influence of the source on the translations into Lithuanian and the originality of translations; finally, to summarise some of the findings in the form of clearly illustrated tables.

2 The source for the Lithuanian catechisms

Lebedys, probably following Bystroń (Bystroń 1890, 1), maintained that the original of Ledesma's catechism was written in Spanish (Lebedys 1963, 204). This suggestion raised doubts for Michelini, who draw attention to the fact that even though Ledesma was Spanish, he moved to Rome as early as 1557 and stayed there for the rest of his life; therefore, the catechism might have been written in Italian (Michelini 1999, 259), especially because there is no information about the Spanish version of this text from the 16th century (Michelini 2001, 228). Others maintain that Ledesma's catechism first appeared in the Italian language (Korzo 2004, 150).

It should be emphasised that the source for both, Daukša's catechism and later the anonymous catechism, is the extended version of Ledesma's catechism. It is known that Ledesma published two catechisms under the same title in Italian. The earliest publications of the short catechism *Dottrina Christiana Breve* that survived to the present day are dated 1569, 1570, 1587, and 1593. The extended catechism *Dottrina Christiana, a modo di dialogo del Maestro, et Discepolo, per insegnare alli Fanciulli* was first published most probably in 1573 (the publication of 1576 is extant) (Michelini 2001, 227–228). Other authors indicate that the Italian catechism by Ledesma was first

published in 1571 (Bystroń 1890, 1) (the second publication is dated 1593), and translated into Polish in 1572 in Kraków (Korzo 2004, 150). The date of the Polish translation is only putative. Having compared Polish and Italian texts, Michelini indicates that the source for the Polish catechism as well as for the Lithuanian ones was the extended version of the short catechism. Besides, having analysed the text, he concludes that the Polish translator sometimes "used an Italian edition unknown to us or an 'improved' transcription of the 1576 edition" (Lith. *panaudojo mums nežinomą itališką leidimą arba „pagerintą" 1576 m. leidimo perrašymą*) (Michelini 2001, 229). Therefore, the hypothetical year of the Polish translation – 1572 – should be later. Or, conversely: the first edition of the extended Ledesma's catechism in Italian is earlier than 1572. The translation of the catechism from Italian into Polish is dated 1572 by Korzo, who refers to *Historia Societatis Iesu in Poloniam ad annum 1572*, in which the name of the translator into the Polish language, Jakub Wujek, is also indicated. Michelini, meanwhile, also identifies the date of publication approximately, grounding his argument on the list of publications of Ledesma's catechism provided by Gilberto Aranci and the fact that the catechism might have been published together with another work of Ledesma in 1573 (Michelini 2001, 228). However, the Polish translation of Ledesma's catechism of 1572 has not survived. The year of publication of the next edition, *Nauka chrześciańska abo katechizmik dla dziatek przez D(oktora) Jakuba Ledezma theologa Zebrania P(ana) Jezusowego napisany a teraz z włoskiego na polskie przełożony*, is also unknown; the title page merely indicates that the catechism was published in Kraków. In addition, there survives a very similar catechism from 1604, also published in Kraków and different only in the layout of its text and sometimes in its orthography. For a while its authorship has not been attributed to Ledesma (Korzo 2004, 151); yet other scholars believe that the exemplar of 1604 is also a translation of Ledesma's catechism; true though, the place of its publication being indicated erroneously (Korzo 2007, 62–63). Since the dating of the publication of Ledesma's catechism in Italian is based on other sources, it is not known which date, pre-1572 or 1573, is correct. According to Korzo, the fact that in the foreword of his catechism Daukša indicated that he translated Ledesma's catechism from Polish (*Iʒgulditas iʒ Lieʒuwio Lankiʒko ing Lietuwiʒka per Kuniga Mikałoiu Daugʒa Kánonika Ʒemaicʒiu* DC 1_{12}–1_{17}) would suggest that the Polish translation of 1572 did exist (Korzo 2004, 151). On the other hand, Daukša might have used some later edition, the date of publication of which had not been indicated, and that could have been before the year 1592, when Daukša started his literary work (Temčinas 2013, 69). There are hints that the Polish translation of Ledesma's catechism was read in Vilnius in 1583 (Korzo 2004, 151).

3 Daukša's translation of the catechism

Daukša's catechism consists of two parts: "Mokslas krikszczoniszkas" and "Trumpas Budas Paſiſſákimo". There are no doubts that the second part was translated from Polish also by Daukša (Lebedys 1963, 205). It is noteworthy that the second part of the Polish catechism, "Krotki obycżay spowiedźi" (consequently, the Lithuanian "Trumpas Budas Paſiſſákimo" as well), is based on other sources rather than on Ledesma's catechism (Michelini 2001, 228). It is precisely this second part of Daukša's work that differs very slightly from the Polish catechism: the translator rendered word for word almost everything (Lebedys 1963, 207); it is thus worthwhile to examine in greater detail only the first part of the catechism.

In his comparison of Daukša's catechism with the Polish original, Lebedys identified the following features of translation: first, in the translation, some places were omitted; second, the original text was amplified or changed (Lebedys 1963, 207).

In his translation of the catechism, Daukša often skipped admonishments (the so-called *pagraudenimai*): in the Polish original, there are 11 such cases (LC 11_1; 14_{21}; 26_{18}; 35_{10}; 38_6; 44_{11}; 51_{10}; 55_{15}; 60_1; 62_6; 68_1), and Daukša translated only part of them (e.g. DC 15_1; 20_5; 44_1). When translation is not literal, it is only natural for some words to be omitted here and there; however, there occurred some major deletions: 15 lines are missing between DC 89_{21} and DC 90_1 (LC 58_{17}–59_{10}); 4 lines – between DC 94_{17} and DC 94_{18} (LC 63_{11}–63_{15}). Once an entire question is omitted, and two answers are merged into one:

(1) *V. Okázuiąc zwierzchnymi v-*
     cżynkámi wiárę y miłość / kto-
     rą ná sercu mamy.
     M. A w cżymże ią okázować?
     V. Nie robiąc tego dniá / słu-
     cháiąc Mszey zupełney / y kazá-
     nia / ták iako roskazuie kośćioł
     Boży <....> (LC 50_{15}–50_{22})
     'V. ('the pupil') By means of superior actions, demonstrating faith and charity that we have in our hearts.
     M. ('the master') And how to demonstrate it?
     V. By not working on that day, by attending the entire Mass and the sermon, as the Church of God commands: ...' (LC 50_{15}–50_{22})

Mo. Ródidami wirßutíneis
darbáis tikêiima / ir mêiła
kuría anť ßirdés túrime:
Ne dirbdamí ta diéna ßwe-
tes' kłaußîdami Mißios /
kaip' Bażnîcȝia Díewo lîe-
pia: <...> (DC 79$_{19}$–80$_6$)
'Mo. ('the pupil') By means of superior actions demonstrating faith and charity that we have in our hearts: by not working on that festive day, by attending the Mass, as the Church of God commands: …' (DC 79$_{19}$–80$_6$)

The extract also illustrates the above-mentioned cases of word omission: in Polish, the phrase *słucháiąc Mszey y kazánia* 'hearing the Mass and the sermon' is used, whereas Daukša did not translate *y kazánia*. Similar slight omissions occur in other passages as well.

Significantly more numerous are the cases when entire lines and even pages are inserted into DC. Michelini has compared Ledesma's catechisms in Italian, Polish and Lithuanian (Michelini 2001, 229–230) and identified the extracts in the Lithuanian catechism, which occur neither in the Polish, nor in the Italian text: DC 10$_{17}$–11$_9$; 13$_{13}$–13$_{14}$; 14$_1$–14$_{10}$; 22$_8$–22$_{10}$; 27$_9$–29$_{14}$; 30$_6$–31$_{16}$; 32$_{10}$–33$_2$; 34$_{14}$–35$_{16}$; 37$_{12}$–37$_{19}$; 38$_{10}$–38$_{16}$; 39$_{15}$–40$_{14}$; 46$_{13}$–46$_{16}$; 52$_2$–52$_7$; 52$_{16}$–53$_7$; 56$_{10}$–57$_{15}$; 61$_{13}$–62$_7$; 65$_{21}$–67$_{16}$; 76$_{17}$–77$_8$; 79$_5$; 84$_{15}$–84$_{16}$; 86$_2$–86$_3$; 86$_{14}$–86$_{16}$. Alongside the substantial insertions which elaborate on some issue under consideration, there also exist less significant ones, which add more to the fluency than to the informativeness of the text. For example, in DC 7 parts of prayers are listed, and immediately after that Daukša inserted a question with an answer, which are absent in Polish and Italian texts:

(2)   *M. Inġi kiek dalú ſki-*
        rias taſſai Pótĕrius:
        Tewĕ múſſu?
        Mo. Inġ ſeptînĕs. (DC 46$_{13}$–46$_{16}$)
        'M. ('the master') Into how many parts is the paternoster divided?
        Mo. ('the pupil') Into seven.' (DC 46$_{13}$–46$_{16}$)

Likewise, amplifications in questions serve mostly the stylistic purpose, cf.:

(3)   *M. Jáko záchowamy szoste?* (LC 54$_6$)
        'M. How shall we keep the sixth?' (LC 54$_6$)

M. Kaiṕ túrimě ſáu-
goł ßěßta priſſâkima /
kurís drâudʒě ſwětim-
móterauł? (DC 84_{13}–84_{16})
'M. How should we keep the sixth commandment that prohibits adultery?' (DC 84_{13}–84_{16})

However, there are several passages which cannot be included in this category, because part of their text is missing from both Polish and Italian catechisms: DC 12_8–12_{19}; 18_{20}–19_2; 58_7–58_9. 11 lines of the text (DC 12_8–12_{19}) are missing from the Polish catechism, but they coincide with the Italian original. Michelini suggests that a possible explanation for this insertion could be "the omitted lines written by hand in the book (or a handwritten copy of it) that Daukša used" (Lith. *Daukšos panaudotoje knygoje (ar jos rankraštinėje kopijoje) buvo prirašytos praleistos eilutės*) (Michelini 2001, 229).

Amplifications in 18_{20}–19_2, 58_7–58_9 were inserted in order to make the text more precise and more uniform, respectively. In the Polish text, which corresponds to DC 58_7–58_9, the new chapter begins with a Hail Mary. Other chapters normally start with the master's questions; for a similar reason a question might be inserted here:

(4)   *M. Sʒwecʒěuſei mêr-*
       gai Maríei kaip měł-
       diés? (DC 58_7–58_9)
       'M. How shall you pray to the Holy Virgin Mary?' (DC 58_7–58_9)

In 18_{20}–19_2, not a question, but an amplified answer was inserted, cf.:

(5)   *V. Aby ná káżdym mieyscu / y ká-*
       żdego cżásu / bronił nas Pan
       Bog od nieprzyiáćioł nászych:
       á wszystkie spráwy násze / aby się
       ściągáły y obracáły ku cźći á ku
       chwale Bożey. (LC 13_{15}–13_{20})
       'V. So that in every place and all the time the Lord God would protect us from our enemies, and that all our matters continued and turned to God's honour and glory.' (LC 13_{15}–13_{20})

       Mo. Idant wiſſókioiě wie-
       toiě ir wiſſú mětu gintu
       mus W. Díewas nǔg príe-

> *ſaku mûſu: ir wiſſí weika-*
> *łei mûſu idant teſtúś ir ap-*
> *grißtú garbéſṕ ir laupſeṕ*
> *Díewo ix wel dáʒneus mi-*
> *nétumbime kancʒia ir kâr-*
> *tu miríma W. mûſu Ié-*
> *ſaus Chriſtaus.* (DC 18₁₄–19₂)

> 'Mo. So that in every place and all the time the Lord God would protect us from our enemies, and that all the matters continued and turned to God's honour and glory and that we would more frequently commemorate the passion and the bitter death of our Lord Jesus Christ.' (DC 18₁₄–19₂)

All changes in the first part of the Lithuanian catechism, especially the additions, reveal that Daukša translated from Polish freely and did not attempt to recreate the original text word for word; emphasised what was relevant for the Lithuanian reader, yet remained within "the religious framework of the catechism" (Lith. *[neišeidamas] iš tikybinių katekizmo rėmų*) (Lebedys 1963, 208). An eloquent example of his method of translation is the extract about the worship of Perkūnas, serpents, trees, and the mythological beings *kaukai* (DC 76₁₇–77₈). In no way could have such passage occurred in the Polish catechism, all the more in the Italian edition of Ledesma. It is unclear though, why such method of free translation was abandoned in the second part of the book.

4 The anonymous translation of the catechism

There have been speculations that in 1605 Ledesma's catechism was translated into Lithuanian by Konstantinas Sirvydas. However, a comprehensive analysis of the phonetics and grammar of the catechism dismissed such possibility (Zinkevičius 1968, 111), and the translator of the text remains unknown. It has already been mentioned that the part on confession "Krotki obycżay spowiedźi", which was translated by Daukša from Polish, is missing from the Italian catechism of Ledesma. In the foreword of the catechism of 1605, the translator himself indicates that the book is already the second translation of Ledesma's catechism from Polish (*tú Ledéſmos Cathechiſmu iʒ nauio pérguldʒiau / kúris iau pirma to búo pergulditas* 'I retranslated Ledesma's catechism, which had already been translated before' AC 4₁₁–4₁₄); therefore, it is possible that the same Polish source was used here as in the translation of Daukša's catechism. In Daukša's catechism, the part "Krotki obycżay spowiedźi" was translated entirely, whereas in the catechism of 1605, only a couple of short extracts were rendered: "Piętnaśćie cżlonkow żywotá Páná Jezusá Chrystusá" (LC 134₁₄) ("Pinkiolika svnerv giwenimo Wieszpatés..." AC 92₆) and

"Kiedy Propace ráno" LC 139_{12} ("Kadu pro páce vnkſty" AC 94_5). The source for 30 lines of the text "Iſſipaʒinimas ʒmogáus alieydienós" is unknown.

In his study of clauses in the catechism of 1605, Artūras Judžentis compared them with the catechism of Daukša and the Polish version of Ledesma's catechism and concluded that in the anonymous catechism, the correspondences are of the following three types: 1) part of the AC text is absent from both DC and LC; 2) part of the AC text is either in DC, or in LC; 3) part of the AC text is present in both DC and LC. Passages of the third type constitute the biggest part of the catechism of 1605 (Judžentis 2010, 92–93). However, when comparing AC to the Polish catechism, it is helpful to distinguish two groups: first, the part of the AC text that is missing in LC; second, the part of the LC text that is missing in AC.

On the basis of Michelini's findings (Michelini 2001, 229–230) and the catechism of Daukša, the following fragments can be considered missing from the Italian catechism as well: AC 7_{16}–8_5; 10_3–10_4; 10_{10}–10_{19}; 15_3–15_5; 19_7–21_{11}; 22_2–22_{20}; 24_{19}–25_9; 29_{19}–30_3; 32_4–32_{13}; 37_7–37_9; 41_{15}–41_{19}; 42_6–42_{14}; 45_{19}–46_{21}; 50_{13}–51_5; 54_5–55_{14}; 62_{11}–62_{19}; 64_{12}; 68_{17}–68_{19}; 69_{21}–69_{22}; 70_9–70_{11}. The lines 8_{18}–9_8 of the AC text, which correspond to DC 12_8–12_{19}, can be found in the Italian original, but are missing from the Polish translation.

Other fragments of AC, which are also missing from LC, usually have no counterparts in DC: AC 14_1–14_3; 17_1; 18_{17}–19_6; 23_8–24_8; 25_{10}–25_{18}; 29_6–29_7; 30_4–30_5; 30_{10}–31_2; 35_{15}–35_{18}; 47_3–47_{20}; 48_{16}–49_5; 51_9–51_{11}; 57_4–57_7; 73_4–73_5; 85_{13}; 85_{17}–85_{20}; 86_5–86_8; 86_{16}–86_{18}; 87_{16}–87_{19}; 88_{11}–88_{15}; 89_2–89_6; 89_{15}–89_{18}; 90_{10}–90_{14}; 90_{21}–91_2; 91_4–91_7; 91_{13}–91_{16}. Only a few lines, AC 14_1–14_3, can also be found in DC 18_{20}–19_2. Some additions in AC are not very long. Most frequently the inserted lines resemble sub-chapter headings and serve the reader either as a reminder of what was written before, or as an introduction to a new topic, for example:

(6)　　*Iʒguldimás trecios*
　　　Perſunos. (AC 30_4–30_5)
　　　'The explanation of the Third Person.' (AC 30_4–30_5)

(7)　　*Kałbeiome iaú ape pirmui day-*
　　　ktu réykiamu ʒmóguy / tey ir / ape
　　　Tykieimu / Kałbékimeg / ir ape vn-
　　　taru / tey ir / ape Wilti. (AC 35_{15}–35_{18})
　　　'We have already spoken about the first thing necessary for the human being, namely, about faith. Let us talk also about the second, namely, about hope.' (AC 35_{15}–35_{18})

(8) *Pamiſákay turimêgu mes*
     kitu Paſweykinimu Pán-
     nos Mariôś? (AC 51_9–51_{11})
     'Tell if we have another greeting of Mary?' (AC 51_9–51_{11})

(9) *M. Irá tu ne mâʒa / bet tie pin-*
     ki pirmiauſiey. (AC 73_4–73_5)
     'There are quite a few of them, but these five are the most important.' (AC 73_4–73_5)

It has been acknowledged that the language of the catechism of 1605 is fairly rich and contains rather few barbarisms (Zinkevičius 1968, 115). The additions found only in AC reveal the translator's concern for fluency and homogeneity of the text. This is especially clear starting from AC 85_{13} (cf. DC from 103_8; LC from 70_{15}) to the end: in both DC and LC, there is an abrupt transition to the enumeration of the three divine virtues, the four cardinal virtues, seven corporal works of mercy, seven spiritual works of mercy, etc. Meanwhile in AC, the dialogue between the master and the pupil is maintained: questions are inserted and answers that elaborate on relevant religious principles are provided.

Another group consists of extracts that are missing from AC, but present in LC (or in LC and DC). The first point to be noticed is that in AC, a quite long address to the reader is missing ("Do czytelnika" LC 3_1–7_{18}; "Skaititoiop krikßcʒiónißkoṕ" DC 3_1–8_{18}). In AC, admonishments as well as text insertions in the dialogue are missing, for example:

(10) *Tu może mowić o miłośći niebá / y*
     chwáły niebieskiey: á o wzgárdźie tych
     źiemskich rzeczy. (LC 32_4–32_6)
     'Here you can speak about the love of Heaven and heavenly glory, and also about the disdain for earthly things.' (LC 32_4–32_6)

     Cʒẻ́ gáli bilôtiś ape
     mẻiła dagáus: ir ape patre-
     mima tu ʒẻmé-
     iu dáiktu. (DC 51_3–51_6)
     'Here you can speak about the love of Heaven and the disdain for those earthly things.' (DC 51_3–51_6)

Part of the text present in LC is missing in AC: between 17_{10} and 17_{11} (DC 25_4–25_{10}; LC 18_4–18_9); between 18_8 and 18_9 (DC 26_{13}–26_{19}; LC 19_7–19_{11}); between 27_{21} and 28_1

(DC 35_{17}–36_3; LC 21_{18}–21_{23}); between 41_2 and 41_3 (DC 51_3–51_6; LC 32_4–32_6); between 44_8 and 44_9 (DC 55_1–55_4; LC 34_{10}–34_{12}); between 46_{21} and 47_1 (DC 57_{16}–58_3; LC 35_{10}–35_{17}); between 48_8 and 48_9 (LC 36_9–39_{11}); between 49_9 and 49_{10} (DC 59_{13}–59_{18}; LC 36_{21}–37_3); between 64_{20} and 65_1 (LC 50_8–50_{11}); between 65_7 and 65_8 (LC 50_{18}); between 73_{21} and 74_1 (LC 58_{17}–59_{10}); between 76_{21} and 77_1 (DC 93_8–93_{16}; LC 62_7–62_{13}); between 78_1 and 78_2 (LC 63_{11}–63_{14}); between 82_{20} and 83_1 (LC 68_1–68_{12}). There are cases in AC, where questions and the answers to them are omitted (LC 18_4–18_9; 19_7–19_{11}; 36_9–39_{11}; 36_{21}–37_3; 50_{18}; 58_{17}–59_{10}; 63_{11}–63_{14}); these omissions are usually due to the rearrangement of the text of AC.

5 The relationship between the Lithuanian catechisms

First of all, attention should be drawn to the "lost" catechism mentioned in the preface of the catechism of 1605: the anonymous translator writes that a translation from Polish has already been accomplished, but was somewhere "lost" (Lith. *nugaišintas*). The phrase has aroused many discussions: it was suggested that this might be a reference to a lost catechism of 1585 by Canisius (which would be logical, because Canisius' catechism was one of the three recommended by church synods to be translated) (Biržiška 1960, 127). Conversely, it might refer to yet another catechism, which was intended for the diocese of Vilnius and prepared at approximately the same time as Daukša's catechism; however, this work was never published. The latter hypothesis became especially prevalent (Temčinas 2013, 68). Sentence logic would suggest that in the preface of the catechism of 1605, the author does not speak about two distinct catechisms – the catechism of Daukša and some other one. The dubious idea about the "lost" catechism most probably originated from the fact that in this case the anonymous translator could not have used the catechism of Daukša, but the similarity of these two catechisms suggests that the anonymous translator at least saw the catechism of 1595. Most probably the anonymous translator called Daukša's catechism "lost" because the diocese of Vilnius was not inclined to accept it as a Lithuanian catechism and refused both to use and to disseminate it (Temčinas 2013, 77).

It has already been mentioned that the part on confession "Krotki obycżay spowiedźi" in the Polish catechism was not translated from the Italian Ledesma's catechism, and it is also missing in the anonymous catechism of 1605; therefore, it is possible to juxtapose only the first part of DC and AC. The similarities and differences of these two catechisms disclose whether it was justifiable to affirm that the author of AC translated Ledesma's catechism from Polish "word for word", "translating independently only those places, which were not translated by Daukša" (Lith. *žodis po žodžio*; *savarankiškai versdamas tik tas vietas, kurių Daukša nebuvo išvertęs*) (Biržiška 1953, 164).

The extracts which exist in AC or DC, but are missing in the source of translation – the Polish catechism of Ledesma – have already been presented. The juxtaposition of all three works reveals that the catechism of 1605 contains more of the additional text that is not in LC than Daukša's catechism does (see Table 1).

DC	AC	DC	AC	DC	AC
10_{17}–11_9	7_{16}–8_5	39_{15}–39_{20}	31_{16}–31_{19}	79_5	64_{12}
12_8–12_{19}	8_{18}–9_8		30_4–30_5	84_{15}–84_{16}	68_{17}–68_{19}
13_{13}–13_{14}	10_3–10_4		30_{10}–31_2	86_2–86_3	69_{21}–69_{22}
14_1–14_{10}	10_{10}–10_{19}	40_1–40_{14}	32_4–32_{13}	86_{14}–86_{16}	70_9–70_{11}
18_{20}–19_2	14_1–14_3		35_{15}–35_{18}		73_4–73_5
22_8–22_{10}	15_3–15_5	46_{13}–46_{16}	37_7–37_9		85_{13}
	17_1	52_2–52_7	41_{15}–41_{19}		85_{17}–85_{20}
	18_{17}–19_6	52_{16}–53_7	42_6–42_{14}		86_5–86_8
27_9–29_{14}	19_7–21_{11}	56_{10}–57_{15}	45_{19}–46_{21}		86_{16}–86_{18}
30_6–31_{16}	22_2–23_3	58_7–58_9			87_{16}–87_{19}
	23_8–24_8		47_3–47_{20}		88_{11}–88_{15}
	25_{10}–25_{18}		48_{16}–49_5		89_2–89_6
32_{10}–33_2	24_{19}–25_9	61_{13}–62_7	50_{13}–51_5		89_{15}–89_{18}
34_{14}–35_{16}	27_6–27_{21};		51_9–51_{11}		90_{10}–90_{14}
37_{12}–37_{19}		65_{21}–67_{16}	54_5–55_{14}		90_{21}–91_2
	29_6–29_7		57_4–57_7		91_4–91_7
38_{10}–38_{16}	29_{19}–30_3	76_{17}–77_8	62_{11}–62_{19}		91_{13}–91_{16}

Table 1. Text extracts in DC and AC that are absent in LC

The translator of the catechism of 1605 used the earlier catechism of Daukša; therefore, it is understandable that in AC the same lines appeared which were missing in both the Polish and the Italian Ledesma's catechism. Following DC, the catechism of 1605 also contains a line, which is not in the Polish version, but appears in the Italian original (DC 12_8–12_{19}; AC 8_{18}–9_8), and which was probably added to the Polish translation of Ledesma's catechism that was used by Daukša (Michelini 2001, 229). Nevertheless, text additions in AC are significantly more numerous. Beside the tiny additions that have already been mentioned (such as inserted questions or sub-chapter headings), there

occur passages no fewer than several lines in length (AC 18_{17}–19_6; 23_8–24_8; 30_{10}–31_2; 47_3–47_{20}), which are absent not only in LC, but also in DC. These are not merely more exhaustive answers or additional questions. For example, the Apostles' Creed inserted in AC is divided into two parts (the first one comprises lines 23_8–24_8; the second, lines 30_{10}–31_2), in the middle of which a dialogue between the master and his pupil is inserted to explain the corresponding fragments of the creed. Such explanation is included in both DC and LC, but it is necessary to mention that in DC and AC this passage is expanded.

Interesting passages are LC 35_{20}, DC 58_7–58_9 and AC 47_3–47_{20}. In LC, a Hail Mary follows immediately after the chapter heading "O Pozdrowieniu Pánny Máriey". In DC, as indicated previously, a question is inserted before the prayer. In AC, the translator took the step still further and inserted a whole passage of 18 lines in length.

(11)   *Ʒmógus kúris nedryſa*
      Diewop' púlties / ku tuo-
      meť tur dáryt?
      Tur' pulties ßwintúmpiump / ku-
      rie irà múſu ažutarytoiéy / e ła-
      biàuſiéy Pannnósp' Mariosp'.
      Kas táy do Pônna Mariá?
      Mótina Diêwo / merga cʒiſtá /
      míliſtos Diéwo ir wiſſú gierybiu
      pilnà / karaliêne Dungàus ir ʒę-
      mes / Wießpati ir aʒútaritoia
      múſu.
      Káyp túrime púlties Pan-
      nóſp Marióſp?
      Swêikinť iu túrime / iós paſwêy-
      kinimu.
      Kałbêķiğ iós paſwêykini-
      mu? (AC 47_3–47_{20})
      'A man who does not dare to address God, what should he do then?
      He shall address the saints, who are our intercessors, but especially—Mary.
      Who is Mary?
      God's mother, pure virgin, full of God's grace and all gifts, the queen of heaven and earth, our lady and intercessor.
      How should we address Mary?
      We should address her by her greeting.
      Utter her greeting.'(AC 47_3–47_{20})

Other noteworthy differences between AC and DC result from the changes in text organization, for instance, a question that is recorded in DC or even in LC might be omitted in AC, because the anonymous translator merged two answers into one (e.g. DC 36_8–36_{19}; AC 28_5–28_{14}; LC 22_4–22_{14}), or, conversely, what was one answer in LC, in the Lithuanian translation was divided into two, and a question was inserted between them (e.g. DC 13_9–13_{22}; AC 9_{19}–10_9; LC 10_7–10_{13}). Also, there are cases of line mix-ups. In both DC and AC, the questions and answers of Ledesma's catechism were swapped in places: DC 30_1–30_5 should be instead of 29_{15}–29_{21}, and AC 21_{18}–22_1 – instead of 21_{12}–21_{17}. In DC, lines were confused only once: 106_{19} should be 106_{18}. In AC, such inconsistency does not appear (AC 89_{12}–89_{13}; LC 74_3–74_4).

In DC, unless an additional passage is inserted, the translation from Polish is precise, and the conflation of answers is usually avoided. Meanwhile in AC, as described above, such conflations do exist. In the following extract, for example, two questions and the corresponding answers are merged into one in AC, while DC follows LC and leaves the passages separated:

(12)   *M. Kaġ padâre iʒġa-*
       nîtoiĕ́s mûʃʃu Iʒus
       Cġríʃtus / kad núʒege
       pragárů́n?
       Mo. Iβwĕ́de Tewu βwetû-
       iu duβĕ̆s / kuríos búwo prie-
       pĕ̊kłů̊fĕ̊ / łaukecʒios βíto
       βwecʒ̊ĕuʃio / ir pagarbinto a-
       taimo io
       M. Kaipoġ yβ numiru–
       ʃiu kełéś trĕcʒiá diena?
       Mo. Kełeś iʒġy numiruʃiu
       pałáîmintoʃp̃ giwâtoʃp̃ ʃu
       kûnu ir duβià padĕ̆iwintas /
       idánť ̇iau daugĕ̊ʃn níekaď
       nĕ̊ mirtú. (DC 36_4–36_{19})
       'M. Having descended into hell, what did our Saviour Jesus Christ do?
       Mo. He led the souls of the saints, who were in hell and waited for this most holy and glorified coming of him.
       M. How did he rise from the dead on the third day?
       Mo. He rose from the dead for a blessed life with body and soul deified, so that he would never die again.' (DC 36_4–36_{19})

M. Iʒguldyk ketwiertu ar-
tykúłu. Nuʒinge paſkun-
doſnu / treciu dienu kełes iʒ
numiruſiu.
Mo. Dußà wießpaties Ieſu Chriſto /
budamá ſu Diewiſty / nuʒinge pa-
ʒémeſnú / ißwéſt Dúßu ßwintuiu
Téwu / kuriós buo priépaſkundoy
ir łaukie io ßwynto ataimo. Etre-
ciu dienu / tasgi wießpáts múſu
kíełés tykrúy ſawo galiby iʒ nu-
miruſiu / dúßoy / ir kuny pagar-
byntami / vnt ámʒino ir linkſmo
giwénimo. (AC 28_5–28_{14})

'M. Explain the fourth article: he descended into hell, on the third day, rose from the dead.

Mo. The soul of Lord Jesus Christ, being divine, descended into hell, led the souls of the saints who were in hell and waited for his holy coming. On the third day, our Lord rose in his true power from the dead, glorified in his soul and body for the eternal and joyous life.' (AC 28_5–28_{14})

The most notable difference between DC and AC is the passage entitled "O Kredźie" in LC (LC from 17_{12} to 27_1). First of all, sections absent in DC (and in LC) are included in AC (AC 18_{17}–19_6; 23_8–24_8). Also, part of the text that is in DC (and in LC) is missing in AC (DC 25_4–25_{10}; 26_{13}–26_{19}). At times this LC text is translated in the catechism of 1605 so freely that one might doubt if the anonymous translator used the same Polish rendering as Daukša, or if he had at hand Daukša's catechism. Even questions are translated freely, cf.:

(13) *A iákoż wstąpił ná niebio-*
sá / y śiedźi ná práwicy Bogá
Oycá? (LC 22_{15}–22_{17})
'And how did he ascend to heaven and occupies his seat at the right side of God the Father?' (LC 22_{15}–22_{17})

M. Kaipóġ yʒege da-
gůſn / ir ſédi ąnt dě̊ßi-
nés Díewo Tewo? (DC 36_{20}–37_2)
'How did he ascend to heaven and occupies his seat at the right side of God the Father?' (DC 36_{20}–37_2)

Mo. Kayp pinktu artykúłu
iʒguldi? Vʒʒingie Dun-
guóſnu / ſédi vnt tieſes Die-
wo Tewo wyſſagaluncio? (AC 28_{15}–28_{18})
'Mo. How shall you explain the fifth article? Ascended to heaven, occupies his
seat at the right hand of the omnipotent God the Father?' (AC 28_{15}–28_{18})

The changes of the passage LC 17_{12}–27_1 made in Daukša's catechism and in the
anonymous catechism of 1605 are listed in the following table (see Table 2). In the two
Lithuanian catechisms, the following passages were divided into different segments, i.e.
the questions and the answers. The lines that have their correspondences in LC, DC or
AC are presented side by side. For example, the LC passage 17_{19}–18_3 corresponds to
24_{16}–25_3 in Daukša's catechism, and to 17_4–17_{10} in AC. Some extracts of LC were not
translated into Lithuanian, e.g. LC 26_{18}–26_{24} is absent from AC and is correspondingly
marked in the table (see Table 2).

As stated previously, Daukša's translation of the Polish Ledesma's catechism is more
accurate. Meanwhile in AC, the ideas are more frequently paraphrased. To offer an
example of an extremely altered text, one may consider the passage DC 32_1–32_9 and AC
24_9–24_{18} (another similar section is DC 33_3–34_7 and AC 25_{19}–26_{22}), where only a careful
comparison of the two texts can confirm that this is indeed a translation of LC, and not
an authorial text of the anonymous translator:

(14)   *M. A ktoż iest Iezus?*
V. Iest Syn Bogá Oycá / ták
możny / y ták mądry / iáko y o-
ćiec: ktory się stał dla nas cżło-
wiekiem / w żywoćie błogosłá-
wioney P. Máryey. (LC 20_{10}–20_{15})
'M. And who is Jesus?
V. He is the Son of God the Father, as powerful and wise, as the Father is; who for
us became man in the womb of blessed Mary.' (LC 20_{10}–20_{15})

M. Kaſg yra Iéſus
Chríſtus?
Mo. Yra ſunús Díewo teip
gàlis / teip gęras teip ißmin-
tingas kaip ir Téwas ku-
rís del mûſu tápęs eſt ʒmó-

164

LC	DC	AC	LC	DC	AC
17_{13}–17_{15}	24_8–24_{10}	16_{17}–16_{18}		34_{14}–35_{16}	27_6–27_{21}
17_{16}–17_{18}	24_{11}–24_{15}	16_{19}–17_3	21_{18}–21_{23}	35_{17}–36_3	
17_{19}–18_3	24_{16}–25_3	17_4–17_{10}	22_1–22_3	36_4–36_7	28_1–28_4
18_4–18_8	25_4–25_{10}		22_4–22_8	36_8–36_{12}	28_5–28_9
18_9			22_9–22_{10}	36_{13}–36_{14}	
18_{10}–19_6	25_{11}–26_{12}	17_{11}–18_8	22_{11}–22_{14}	36_{15}–36_{19}	28_9–28_{14}
19_7–19_{11}	26_{13}–26_{19}		22_{15}–23_2	36_{20}–37_{11}	28_{15}–29_6
19_{12}–19_{18}	26_{20}–27_8	18_9–18_{17}			29_6–29_7
		18_{17}–19_6		37_{12}–37_{19}	
	27_9–29_{14}	19_7–21_{11}	23_3–23_{12}	37_{20}–38_9	29_8–29_{18}
19_{19}–19_{22}	30_1–30_5	21_{18}–22_1		38_{10}–38_{16}	29_{19}–30_5
20_1–20_6	29_{15}–29_{21}	21_{12}–21_{17}	23_{13}–23_{14} (up to *wierzę*)	38_{17}–38_{19} (up to *tikiu*)	30_6–30_9
	30_6–31_{16}	22_2–23_3			30_{10}–31_2
20_7–20_9	31_{17}–31_{19}	23_4–23_7	23_{14} (from *wierzę*)–23_{19}	38_{19} (from *tikiu*)–39_4	31_3–31_8
		23_8–24_8	23_{20}–24_3 (up to *ktorego*)	39_5–39_{10} (up to *kuros*)	31_9–31_{15}
20_{10}–20_{15}	32_1–32_9	24_9–24_{18}	24_3 (from *ktorego*)–24_6	39_{10} (from *kuros*)–39_{14}	31_{19}–32_3
	32_{10}–33_2	24_{19}–25_9		39_{15}–39_{20}	31_{16}–31_{19}
		25_{10}–25_{18}		40_1–40_{14}	32_4–32_{13}
20_{16}–21_{12}	33_3–34_7	25_{19}–26_{22}	24_7–26_{17}	40_{15}–43_{20}	32_{14}–35_{10}
21_{13}–21_1	34_8–34_{13}	27_1–27_5	26_{18}–26_{24}	44_1–44_{11}	

Table 2. The comparison of the structure of an extract in LC, DC and AC

gumi / íśćioie pagirtós mer-
gós Mariiós / ir ſawe wíſ-
ſa múmus dàwe. (DC 32_1–32_9)
'M. Who is Jesus?
Mo. He is the Son of God as powerful, good, and wise as the Father is; who for us became man in the womb of blessed Mary and gave all of himself to us.' (DC 32_1–32_9)

Mo. Iʒguldikig túiey pir-
mu tu artikułu. Tikiu ingi
Ieſu Chriſtu.
M. Iſigúldʒia teyṗ / ir iſimano /
Kad IeſuChriſtas / irà ſunus Dié-
wo / tôſia gálibes / tôſia gieribes /
tôſia ißminties / kurios ir Diéwas
Téwas / kuris paſtois ʒmogum
ir iemis kunú íʒ gi ßwinciauſios
Marios / dàwés múmus wiſas. (AC 24_9–24_{18})
'Mo. Explain the first article. I believe in Jesus Christ.
M. The explanation is understood in the following way that Jesus Christ is the Son of God of such power, such goodness, such wisdom, as God the Father also is; who became man and with his body from the most holy Mary he gave all of himself to us.' (AC 24_9–24_{18})

The AC text that corresponds to LC 23_{22}–24_6, DC 39_7–39_{20} was also altered significantly. Daukša translated the LC passage 23_{22}–24_6 almost word for word; then in DC there follows a passage of 20 lines (39_{15}–40_{14}), which cannot be found either in the Polish translation of Ledesma's catechism, or in the Italian original. On the basis of LC and DC, it is evident that the passage 31_{12}–32_3 in the catechism of 1605 was restructured: lines LC 23_{22}–24_3 (corresponding to DC 39_7–39_{10}) are paraphrased, then a question that is absent in Ledesma's catechism is inserted (it corresponds to DC 39_{15}–39_{16}). Two and a half lines (AC 31_{17}–31_{19}) of the proposed answer correspond to the authorial text of DC (DC 39_{17}–39_{20}), but then 4 previously omitted lines are added from LC (LC 24_3–24_6).

6 Conclusion

Both translations of Ledesma's catechism – the translation of 1595 by Daukša and the anonymous catechism of 1605 – were rendered into Lithuanian from Polish; that is also declared in their prefaces. The catechism of Daukša (more precisely, its first part) is

usually compared to the surviving Polish translation of Ledesma's catechism, which is preserved in the Czartoryski Library in Kraków. The year of its publication is unknown; however, bibliographical lists suggest that this work actually *is* the second translation. Since the preface of the anonymous catechism of 1605 claims that the text was translated into Lithuanian from a Polish catechism of Ledesma, the anonymous catechism is also usually compared to the same Polish translation that is preserved in the Czartoryski Library in Kraków. Although both Lithuanian catechisms contain substantial portions of text that are missing from the Polish catechism, there is no reason to believe that the translations of 1595 and 1605 were produced from different Polish translations of the book. First of all, no such publications are known so far. Second, the text structure of the catechism of 1604 that is preserved in the Jagiellonian Library is somewhat different; therefore, the anonymous catechism of 1605 could have hardly been based on it.

The comparison of the two Lithuanian Ledesma's catechisms to the Italian catechism of 1576 reveals that in principle Daukša relied solely on the Polish translation, for just a few DC lines have no equivalents in Polish, but can be traced back to the Italian original. Although Daukša translated from Polish very accurately, he was not unwilling to amplify the text with lines of his own creation. With regard to some authorial lines of Daukša, one may conclude that he supplemented Ledesma's catechism at his own discretion, which might seem quite natural, since at that time such practice was widely accepted (Michelini 2001, 230).

There are no doubts that the anonymous translator of the catechism of 1605 relied heavily on Daukša's work. This is indicated by the juxtaposition of all three texts: the Polish translation of Ledesma, the catechism of 1595 and the catechism of 1605. There is not a single passage in which AC would contain an LC line that could not be found in DC. On the contrary, the text structure of LC and the precision of translation in general bear more resemblance to DC than to AC. Further evidence that the anonymous translator had at hand Daukša's rendering are the passages in AC that are missing in LC, but present in DC. Also, there are no instances of lines in DC that would be missing in both LC and AC. In other words, the anonymous translator relied heavily on Daukša's work and incorporated passages that are most probably the authorial text of Daukša, for example, the passage on idolatry ($AC\ 62_{11}$–$AC\ 62_{19}$). Consequently, if words in AC preface about the "lost" catechism are to be interpreted directly, that could not be the catechism of Daukša. It is more likely that the anonymous translator characterised in this way Vilnius diocese's aversion to the spread of Daukša's translation.

However, it would be a mistake to maintain that the anonymous translator relied indiscriminately on Daukša's catechism. It is hard to say if the anonymous translated

freely from Polish or paraphrased the text translated by Daukša while comparing it to the Polish text; in any case, the AC translation diverged more from Ledesma's catechism than DC. The author of the catechism of 1605 was not unwilling to omit some lines that were present in LC or in both LC and DC, to rearrange the text, or to insert some passages that cannot be found in the two previous catechisms.

Data Sources

AC   *Anoniminis 1605 m. katekizmas.* [Anonymous catechism of 1605]. Available at: http://www.lki.lt/seniejirastai/db.php?source=44

DC   *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1595 metų katekizmas.* [Mikalojus Daukša's catechism of 1595]. 1995. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

LC   *Nauka chrzesciańska abo katechizmik dla dziatek / przez Jakuba Ledezma ... a teraz z włoskiego na polskie przełożony.* [Christian knowledge or catechism for children / by Jacob Ledesma ... and now translated from Italian to Polish]. Vilnius.

References

Biržiška, Vaclovas. 1953. *Senųjų lietuviškų knygų istorija*. [History of the old Lithuanian books]. Čikaga: Čikagos lietuvių literatūros draugija.

Biržiška, Vaclovas. 1960. *Aleksandrynas*, 1. [Aleksandrynas, 1 vol.]. Čikaga: JAV LB Kultūros fondas.

Bystroń, Jan. 1890. *Katechizm Ledesmy w przekładzie wschodniolitewskim.* [Ledesma's catechism translated to the eastern variety of the Lithuanian language]. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego pod zarządem A. M. Kosterkiewicza.

Gerulis, Jurgis. 1927. *Senieji lietuvių skaitymai*. [The old Lithuanian readings]. Kaunas: Lietuvos universitetas.

Ivinskis, Zenonas. 1987. *Rinktiniai raštai*, 4. [Selected writings, 4 vol.]. Roma: Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademija.

Judžentis, Artūras, Jūratė Pajėdienė. 2006. Mikalojaus Daukšos Katekizmo (1595) sudėtiniai prijungiamieji priežasties sakiniai. [Complex sentences of cause in Mikalojus Daukša's catechism of 1595]. *Baltu filoloģija* 15 (1/2), 27–40.

Judžentis, Artūras. 2010. Ledesmos 1605 m. katekizmo priežasties ir tikslo sakiniai. [Clauses of cause and purpose in the Lithuanian translation (1605) of Ledesma's catechism]. *Lituanistica* 56, 92–103.

Korzo, Margarita. 2004. Polski przekład katechizmu Jakuba Ledesmy TJ i jego wpływ na tradycję unicką w XVII w. [Polish translation of J. Ledesma SJ catechism and its influences on the Greek-Catholic tradition in the 17th century]. *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, XLVIII, 149–159.

Korzo, Margarita. 2007. *Ukrainskaja i belarusskaja katechetičeskaja tradicija konca XVI–XVIII v.: stanovlenije, evoliucija i problema zaimstvovanij*. [Ukrainian and Belarusian catechetical tradition, the 16–18th centuries: formation, evolution and the problem of borrowings]. Maskva: Kanon+.

Lebedys, Jurgis. 1963. *Mikalojus Daukša*. [Mikalojus Daukša]. Vilnius: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla.

Michelini, Guido. 1999. Daukšos Katekizmo šaltinių klausimai. [The issues of the sources of Daukša's catechism]. *Baltistica* 34 (2), 259–261.

Michelini, Guido. 2001. Itališkas Ledesmos Katekizmas *Dottrina Christiana*: Daukšos panaudoto lenkiško teksto šaltinis. [Italian Ledesma's catechism *Dottrina Christiana*: the source of the Polish text used by Daukša]. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 44, 227–250.

Palionis, Jonas. 1967. *Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a*. [Lithuanian literary language in the 16th and 17th centuries]. Vilnius: Mintis.

Sittig, Ernst. 1929. *Der polnische Katechismus des Ledezma und die litauischen Katechismen des Daugßa und des Anonymus vom Jahre 1605*. [The Polish Ledesma's catechism and the Lithuanian Daukša's and the anonymous (1605) catechisms]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Temčinas, Sergejus. 2013. Pirmoji Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštijoje lietuviškai spausdinta (katalikiška) knyga: hipotetinis 1585 metų ar Mikalojaus Daukšos 1595 metų katekizmas? [The first printed Lithuanian (Catholic) book in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: the hypothetical catechism of 1585 or Mikalojus Daukša's catechism of 1595?]. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos istorijos ir tradicijos fenomenai: tautų atminties vietos*.

Wolter, Eduard. 1886. *Litovskij katechizis N. Daukši*. [Lithuanian M. Daukša's catechism]. Sankt Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatarskoj Akademii nauk.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas. 1968. Apie 1605 m. katekizmo tarmę. [On the dialect of the catechism of 1605]. *Baltistica* 4 (1), 109–116.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas. 1988. *Lietuvių kalbos istorija*, 3. [The history of the Lithuanian language, vol. 3]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Date of submission: June 2016

Atmena autoriams

Žurnalas **Kalbotyra** skirtas įvairių kalbų aspektų (taip pat ir tarpkalbinių) tyrimams. Jame spausdinami mokslo straipsniai, knygų recenzijos, pranešimai apie konferencijas. Gali būti spausdinama ir konferencijų medžiaga.

Pateikiami straipsniai ir recenzijos neturi būti publikuoti anksčiau ar atiduoti publikuoti kituose leidiniuose. Kiekvieną iš jų recenzuoja bent du anoniminiai recenzentai.

Visi rankraščiai elektronine forma siunčiami vyriausiajam redaktoriui elektroniniu paštu (aurelia@usonis.lt) dviem formatais: MS Word (*.doc arba *.docx) ir PDF (*angl*. Portable Document Format, *.pdf). Įrašius dokumentą pdf formatu rekomenduojama patikrinti, ar teksto ir iliustracijų formatavimas išliko nepakitęs.

Publikacijos apimtis paprastai neviršija 8 000 žodžių; kai kuriais atvejais gali būti siūlomi ir ilgesni straipsniai.

Pateikiami rankraščiai turi būti parengti pagal toliau išdėstytus reikalavimus viena iš šių kalbų: anglų, lietuvių, prancūzų ar vokiečių. Jei straipsnio kalba autoriui nėra gimtoji, toks tekstas gali būti teikiamas tik suredaguotas gimtakalbio specialisto.

Autorius(-iai) prisiima atsakomybę už tai, kad galutinis pateikiamo publikuoti rankraščio tekstas visiškai atitiktų toliau išdėstytus žurnalo reikalavimus.

Autorius(-iai) privalo garantuoti, kad jų autoriniame darbe nėra pažeistos trečiųjų asmenų autorinės teisės ir kad tiesiogiai ar netiesiogiai panaudodami kitų autorių mintis jie pateikia nuorodas į šaltinius. Su autoriais pasirašoma Licencinė sutartis ir Sąžiningumo deklaracija, atliekama plagiato patikra. Žurnale **Kalbotyra** publikuoti straipsniai nekomerciniais tikslais, nurodant autorių ir pirminį šaltinį gali būti naudojami pagal Kūrybinių bendrijų (*Creative Commons*) licenciją CC BY-NC 4.0.

Kad būtų užtikrintas anoniminis recenzavimas, autorius(-iai) privalo pateikti du variantus: vieną straipsnio tekstą kaip reikalaujama atmenoje, antrą variantą – be nuorodų ar užuominų į autorystę. Straipsnio failas turi būti pateiktas taip, kad jame neliktų duomenų, galinčių padėti identifikuoti autorių (būtina pašalinti informaciją iš dokumento skilties *properties*).

1 Struktūra ir forma

Pateikiami straipsniai turi atitikti bendruosius straipsniams keliamus reikalavimus. Juose turi būti suformuluotas tyrimo klausimas/problema ir tikslas, apžvelgti ankstesni tiriamos srities darbai, apibūdinti duomenys ir metodai, pateikti rezultatai ir argumentuotos išvados bei nurodyti duomenų šaltiniai ir naudota literatūra. Darbai, neatitinkantys šių reikalavimų, grąžinami autoriams taisyti.

Rankraščiai teikiami A4 formato lape, kurio paraštės yra tokios: 1,5 cm dešinėje, 2,5 cm viršuje, kairėje ir apačioje. Puslapiai numeruojami nuo pirmo iki paskutinio viršutiniame dešiniajame puslapio kampe. Tekstas rašomas tarp eilučių paliekant 1,5 intervalą, 12 pt Times New Roman šriftu (jei nereikalaujama kitaip), lygiuojamas tik kairėje.

Straipsnio pradžioje pateikiami:

(1) straipsnio pavadinimas, 14 pt, paryškintas,

(2) pilnas autoriaus(-ių) vardas(-ai) ir pavardė(-s) paryškintu šriftu, institucija; visa informacija rašoma 12 pt šriftu publikacijos kalba, nurodomas visas institucijos pavadinimas, įskaitant katedrą; taip pat nurodomas elektroninio pašto adresas (be pabraukimo).

Pavyzdžiui:

Evidenciniai būdvardžiai lietuvių akademiniame diskurse

Anna Ruskan
Anglų filologijos katedra
Vilniaus universitetas
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01513 Vilnius, Lietuva
El. paštas: anna.ruskan@flf.vu.lt

(3) **Santrauka**

Ji turi būti anglų kalba (250 žodžių). Santraukoje turi būti pristatomas tyrimo objektas, problema, metodas ir pagrindiniai rezultatai bei apibendrinimai. Galima pateikti santrauką ir lietuvių ar kita žurnalo kalba. Prieš santrauką kita nei straipsnio kalba nurodomas straipsnio pavadinimas paryškintai 12 pt ir žodis Abstract / Santrauka ta kalba.

(4) **Raktažodžiai**: 5–7 žodžiai, atskirti kableliais, pateikiami po kiekviena santrauka atitinkama kalba.

2 Tekstas

Tekstas skirstomas į skyrius ir poskyrius, nurodant numerį (1, 1.1, 1.1.1) ir pavadinimą. Numeris ir pavadinimas rašomi **paryškintai**, bet ne didžiosiomis raidėmis. Visame tekste ištisai pastraipos rašomos be įtraukų pirmosiose eilutėse. Prieš pastraipas paliekamas 12 pt tarpas.

Paveikslai ir lentelės (tekstas rašomas 12 pt) numeruojami atskirai, jų numeriai ir pavadinimai pateikiami apačioje (po pavadinimo taškas nededamas). Iliustracijos turi būti pritaikytos juodai baltai spaudai, jų rezoliucija turi būti ne mažesnė nei 300 dpi. Kursyvu tekste rašomi svetimos kalbos žodžiai. Tai, kas norima pabrėžti, rašoma **paryškintai**. Laužtiniuose skliaustuose [taip] rašomi autoriaus(-ių) papildymai.

Citatos. Trumpos citatos tekste rašomos išskiriant jas dvigubomis kabutėmis „štai taip" (*citata originalo kalba pateikiama skliausteliuose*). Citatos citatose arba perfrazuoti svetimos kalbos žodžiai ir pateikti vertimai rašomi viengubose kabutėse. Ilgesnės nei trijų eilučių citatos (apie 40 žodžių) rašomos kursyvu atskiroje įtrauktoje pastraipoje (įtrauka – 5 pt).

Išvardijimo eilės tvarka žymima mažosiomis raidėmis su vienu skliausteliu, kiekviena sąvoka pateikiama atskiroje įtrauktoje (5 pt) eilutėje, pavyzdžiui:

    a) pirma frazė / sakinys ...

    b) antra frazė / sakinys ...

Pavyzdžiai (žodžiai, frazės, sakiniai ir t. t.) teikiami *kursyvu* ir numeruojami ištisai visame tekste; skaičiai rašomi skliaustuose be įtraukų: (1), (2) ir t. t. Būtina nurodyti pavyzdžių šaltinius, galima naudoti santrumpas.

(1) *Šeimininkas* **akivaizdžiai** *suglumo.* (LKT)

Vertimas ir **glosos** būtini visoms citatoms/pavyzdžiams, kurie pateikiami ne publikacijos kalba. Vertimas (rašomas ne kursyvu) paprastai žymimas viengubomis kabutėmis, pavyzdžiui: *evidently* 'matyt'. Žodžiai sulygiuojami vertikaliai, naudojant tabuliavimo (angl. *tab*), o ne tarpo (angl. *space bar*) klavišą. Gramatinė informacija (NOM.SG.F) pateikiama sumažintomis didžiosiomis raidėmis (angl. *small caps*), pavyzdžiui:

(2) *Jai   reikia   eiti   namo.*
    she.DAT.SG   need.3PRS   go.INF   home.ADV
    'She has to go home.'

Daugiau apie glosas galima rasti interneto svetainėje adresu: http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php

Išnašos (10 pt) galimos norint trumpai paaiškinti (iki 3 eilučių ilgio). Jos numeruojamos ištisai.

Padėka

Ji pateikiama straipsnio gale prieš literatūros sąrašą.

Santrumpų sąrašas pateikiamas prieš **Duomenų šaltinius** arba **Literatūros sąrašą**.

Po visu straipsniu nurodoma jo įteikimo redaktorių kolegijai data.

3 Literatūros nuorodos tekste

Visos nuorodos tekste pateikiamos reikiamoje vietoje skliaustuose (autoriaus pavardė ar publikacijos pavadinimas, metai, kablelis, puslapis(-iai), jei reikia), pavyzdžiui, (Howarth 1998, 27–28). Skirtingų autorių nuorodos skiriamos kabliataškiais, pavyzdžiui, (Aijmer 1996, 1997; van der Auwera, Schalley & Nuyts 2005). Nelotyniška abėcėle (kirilica ir kt.) parašytos autorių pavardės ir publikacijų pavadinimai turi būti transliteruojami.

4 Duomenų šaltiniai ir naudotos literatūros sąrašas

Straipsnio pabaigoje abėcėlės tvarka turi būti pateikiami darbe analizuojamų duomenų šaltiniai ir tik darbe cituojamų naudotos literatūros šaltinių sąrašas. Kiekvienas šaltinis pateikiamas atskira pastraipa; antroji pastraipos eilutė įtraukiama 10 pt. Straipsnių ir knygų pavadinimuose didžiąja raide rašomas tik pirmasis pavadinimo žodis ir tikriniai žodžiai. Jei straipsnis rašomas ne lietuvių kalba, literatūros sąraše teikiamus knygų ir straipsnių pavadinimus lietuvių, latvių, rusų, lenkų kalba būtina išversti į straipsnio kalbą ir pateikti juos laužtiniuose skliaustuose. Literatūros sąraše nelietuviškos pavardės, prasidedančios raidėmis Q, W, X, Y, teikiamos pagal lotynų abėcėlę. Prašome rašyti pagal pateiktus pavyzdžius:

Duomenų šaltiniai

BNC   *The British National Corpus.* Davies, M. 2004–. BYU–BNC. Available at: http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc

CorALit   *Lietuvių mokslo kalbos tekstynas* (Corpus Academicum Lithuanicum). Interneto prieiga: http://www.coralit.lt/

Literatūros sąrašas

Ambrazas, Vytautas. 1990. *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskich jazykov.* [Comparative syntax of participles in Baltic languages]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Barbieri, Federica. 2008. Patterns of age-based linguistic variation in American English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12 (1), 58–88.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1965. The atomization of meaning. *Language* 41, 555–573.

Gansel, Christina, Frank Jürgens. 2007. *Textlinguistik und Textgrammatik. Eine Einführung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Haß, Ulrike, Hg. 2005. *Grundfragen der elektronischen Lexikographie. elexiko – das Online-Informationssystem zum deutschen Wortschatz*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Holvoet, Axel, Loreta Semėnienė, red. 2004. *Gramatinių kategorijų tyrimai*. [Studies in grammatical categories]. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum, eds. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jaszczolt, Katarzyna. 2009. Default semantics. *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis.* Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 193–221.

Kleiber, Georges. 1990. *La sémantique du prototype: catégories et sens lexical.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 2. Descriptive application.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rayson, Paul. 2004. *Log-likelihood calculator*. Available at: www.ucrel.lancs.ac.uk. Accessed: 5 October 2008.

Šinkūnienė, Jolanta. 2011. *Autoriaus pozicijos švelninimas rašytiniame moksliniame diskurse: gretinamasis tyrimas.* [Hedging in written academic discourse: A cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study], (ms.). Humanitarinių mokslų daktaro disertacija. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

Trbojević-Milosević, Ivana. 2010. On innocence and experience: Modal hedges in health care products instructions in English and Serbian. Presentation in *The 4th international conference 'Modality in English 4'*, Madrid.

***

Straipsniai į **Kalbotyros** 70 numerį priimami iki 2017 m. gegužės 31 d.

Style sheet

The journal of linguistics **Kalbotyra** focuses on research into various aspects of language studies as well as the ones addressing cross-linguistic issues. It publishes articles, reviews of books and reports of conferences. Proceedings of conferences are also invited.

Papers submitted for publication should not have been published or submitted for publication elsewhere. They are reviewed by at least two anonymous referees following the double blind refereeing procedure.

All manuscripts in an electronic version should be sent to the editor-in-chief Aurelija Usonienė by e-mail (aurelia@usonis.lt) in two formats: MS Word (*.doc or *.docx) and Portable Document Format (*.pdf). Please check the converted PDF for formatting errors (margins, paragraphing, charts, pictures, etc.)

Papers should not normally exceed 8,000 words in length; only in exceptional circumstances can significantly longer papers be considered.

Papers should be prepared according to the requirements set out below in one of the following languages: English, French, German or Lithuanian. If the language of the paper is not a native language of the author(s), the paper should be proof-read by a native-language specialist to check its correctness.

It is the authors' responsibility to ensure that the final version of their paper fully conforms to this style sheet.

The author(s) warrant that their paper is original and no property rights (including copyright or other intellectual property rights) of any third parties have been violated. **Kalbotyra** follows the policy of screening for plagiarism. The authors will be required to sign a licence agreement and an honesty declaration. Articles published in **Kalbotyra** are distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 Licence (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Since the journal follows a double blind review policy, the author(s) have to submit two versions of the paper. Version one should be prepared according to this stylesheet and version two should have all author identifying features removed both from the text of the article and from the document properties.

1 Structure and form

Papers submitted for publication should correspond to the general requirements of research papers and cover the following points: the research question/problem, review of previous research on the subject, data and methods, research findings/results (evaluated

and validated), evidence (documented), conclusions and references. Papers that do not conform to the requirements will be returned to the authors for revision before further processing.

Papers should be printed on A4 paper size with a 1.5 cm margin on the right and 2.5 cm margins on the top, left and bottom; the pages should be numbered beginning with the title page at the top right corner of the page. The authors should use 1.5 spacing between the lines throughout the paper. The font is 12 pt Times New Roman. The text should be justified left.

The paper should contain:

(1) the title of the paper, 14 pt, **bold**

(2) the full **name(s)** in **bold** and affiliation(s) of the author(s), 12 pt. The affiliation should be given in the language of the publication in full, including departments/centres, postal address, authors' e-mail address (hyperlink should be removed), in this order

Evidential adjectives in Lithuanian academic discourse

Anna Ruskan
Department of English Philology
Vilnius University
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: anna.ruskan@flf.vu.lt

(3) **Abstract**

All articles must have an abstract in English (250 words). An abstract should clearly describe the purpose of the research, data and methodology, the main results and the principal conclusions. The second abstract in Lithuanian or any other language of the journal is optional. Abstracts in languages other than the language of the publication should bear the title (in bold, 12 pt) and the words Abstract/Santrauka.

(4) **Keywords**: a list of 5–7 key words separated by commas is provided below every abstract in the language of the abstract. For example, articles written in English should have keywords in English.

2 The text

The text should be divided into sections and subsections, each of them decimally numbered beginning with 1 (e.g.: 1, 1.1, 1.1.1, etc.) and titled. The number and title should be in **bold** type. The block organisation of paragraphs (not indented) should be used throughout the whole text with spaces of 12 pt before each new paragraph.

Figures and tables (12 pt) should be numbered and titled separately under the figure/ table. The illustrations will be printed black and white, their resolution should not be less than 300 dpi.

Use *italic*s for foreign words (especially *et al.*); use **bold** face for emphasis. Use square brackets [like this] for personal additions.

Quotations. Short quoted sections in the running text should be enclosed in double quotation marks "like this" (*the original citation in italics is given in round brackets*). Use single quotes for special forms, for quotations within quotations, and for glosses and paraphrases of (foreign) words. Quotations longer than three lines (ca. 40 words) should be given in a separate indented paragraph (5 pt) in italics.

Listings for the purpose of classification should be written in a new indented (5 pt) line, e.g.:

    a) the first model ...

    b) the second model ...

Examples (words, phrases, sentences, etc.) are not indented, they are given in italics and numbered consecutively throughout the article; the numbers (regular) are enclosed in round brackets, e.g.: (1), (2), e.g.:

(1) *Šeimininkas **akivaizdžiai** suglumo.* (LKT)
   'The host **evidently** became confused.'

References for cited examples should be indicated, translation correspondences of all language data in a language other than the language of the paper should be given in single commas, e.g.: *eiti* 'to go'.

Translation and word-by-word glosses are provided for all quotations/examples from languages other than the language of the article. Translation is given in single quotation marks. Words are aligned vertically using tab key rather than space bar key. Use small caps to indicate grammatical information (NOM.SG.F). The glosses and the translation should be left-aligned with the example text as in the example below:

(2) *Jai*   *reikia*   *eiti*   *namo.*
   she.DAT.SG   need.3PRS   go.INF   home.ADV
   'She has to go home.'

For more details about glossing refer to: http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/ glossing-rules.php

Footnotes set in 10 pt can be used only for very brief explanatory remarks. They should be numbered consecutively throughout the text.

Acknowledgements

They follow the main text of the paper.

List of Abbreviations should precede **Data sources** or **References.**

Below the body of the article, the date of its submission for publication should be indicated.

3 References in the text

All references should be given at the appropriate point in the text in brackets (author's name or title of publication, year of publication, comma, page(s) referred to, if relevant), like this: (Howarth 1998, 27–28). Different sources of reference should be separated by semi-colons (Aijmer 1996, 1997; van der Auwera, Schalley & Nuyts 2005). If letters of Slavic or some other non-Latin alphabet have been used, the names and titles should be transliterated.

4 Reference list

All data sources and works cited in the text, and only those, should be listed alphabetically at the end of the paper in separate sections under the headings **Data Sources** and **References**. Each reference entry is given in a separate paragraph; the second line of the paragraph is indented by 10 pt. All lexical words are capitalized only in the *Names of Periodicals*; only the first word is capitalized in the *Titles of books* (proper names, etc. are exceptions). Papers written in languages other than Lithuanian should provide translations of Lithuanian, Latvian, Russian, Polish book and article titles in brackets. Please follow the pattern given below:

Data Sources

BNC   *The British National Corpus.* Davies, M. 2004–. BYU–BNC. Available at: http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc

CorALit   *Lietuvių mokslo kalbos tekstynas* [Corpus Academicum Lithuanicum]. Interneto prieiga: http://www.coralit.lt/

References

Ambrazas, Vytautas. 1990. *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskich jazykov.* [Comparative syntax of participles in Baltic languages]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Barbieri, Federica. 2008. Patterns of age-based linguistic variation in American English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12 (1), 58–88.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1965. The atomization of meaning. *Language* 41, 555–573.

Gansel, Christina, Frank Jürgens. 2007. *Textlinguistik und Textgrammatik. Eine Einführung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Haß, Ulrike, Hg. 2005. *Grundfragen der elektronischen Lexikographie. elexiko – das Online-Informationssystem zum deutschen Wortschatz*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Holvoet, Axel, Loreta Semėnienė, red. 2004. *Gramatinių kategorijų tyrimai.* [Studies in grammatical categories]. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum, eds. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jaszczolt, Katarzyna. 2009. Default semantics. *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis.* Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 193–221.

Kleiber, Georges. 1990. *La sémantique du prototype: catégories et sens lexical.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 2. Descriptive application.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rayson, Paul. 2004. *Log-likelihood calculator*. Available at: www.ucrel.lancs.ac.uk. Accessed: 5 October 2008.

Šinkūnienė, Jolanta. 2011. *Autoriaus pozicijos švelninimas rašytiniame moksliniame diskurse: gretinamasis tyrimas*. [Hedging in written academic discourse: A cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study], (ms.). Humanitarinių mokslų daktaro disertacija [PhD dissertation]. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

Trbojević-Milosević, Ivana. 2010. On innocence and experience: Modal hedges in health care products instructions in English and Serbian. Presentation in *The 4th international conference 'Modality in English 4'*, Madrid.

***

Deadline for submission to ***Kalbotyra*** 70 is May 31, 2017.