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В сборник включены статьи ученых России, Литвы, Латвии, Украины и Италии,
посвященные проблемам истории, языка и культуры народов балтской этнической группы,
написанные по материалам конференции «Балты в древности и Средневековье: языки, история,
культура» (11—12 декабря 2006 г.). В том вошли также воспоминания об Э. Бавениссе, памяти
которого была посвящена конференция. Издание предназначено как для специалистов
в области балтстики, так и для всех интересующихся историческими судьбами литовцев,
латышей и древних пруссов.
An Illusionary Independence of Major Trends in the Standardization of Lithuanian: The Example of Kalikstas Kasakauskis (1792–1866)

Kalikstas Kasakauskis, a priest, is the author of the Lithuanian grammar «A Grammar of the Lithuanian Tongue (Kalbrieda Ležuvio Žiamaytiszko», 1832, further — [KaKLŻ]) and of at least five Lithuanian books either on religion or against the abuse of alcohol (published in 1859, 1861, 1862, 1864 and 1868).

In my paper I want to speak about the concept of standard Lithuanian through the eyes of this author — Kalikstas Kasakauskis (Kossakowski; ~1792–1866). At that time Lithuanian was not yet a standard language, but attempts to standardize it were evident in Lithuania Major. I intend to demonstrate that Kasakauskis may appear to be thinking independently and introducing his own linguistic standards; nevertheless, on closer analysis he largely depends on the major ideas about standardization that were popular at the time. This means that Kasakauskis’ concepts were mere reflections of these ideas. Thus, first I intend to explicate Kasakauskis’ illusionary independence of general trends, and, second, I will try to show how Kasakauskis was unconsciously dependent on the major different ideas about standardization during two different periods of the nineteenth century.

1. Independence

1.1. Giedraitis’ New Testament

Around 1863 while writing his book An Explanation of Christian Catholics’ obligations (Iszguldims Pawinaszczju Kryksczjonu-Ktalyku (1864, further — [KaIPK]), Kasakauskis extensively cited the New Testament (Naujas Istatimas) that was prepared and published by the Bishop of Lithuanian Lowlands, Juozapas Arnulfas Giedratis,
G. Subočius

(and his helpers) in 1816 (further — {GieNI}). A comparison of certain textual passages (which will not be discussed here) negate the possibility of other interpretations regarding the citation source.

Kasakauskis changed and edited certain levels of GieNI language. In particular, the orthography, the phonetics, and the morphology were adjusted the most: Kasakauskis remodeled the vocabulary to some extent as well.

1. 1. 1. Orthography and phonetics. While quoting and rewriting some passages of GieNI, Kasakauskis changed their orthography quite radically and also substituted Lowland Lithuanian dialectal features for the Highland Lithuanian ones used by Giedraitis.


Other substitutions:


It is obvious that Giedraitis’ text, printed 47 years earlier, was no more prestigious for Kasakauskis, since he felt free to edit the text of Bible quotations and to adapt it to his own ideas about Lowland Lithuanian phonetic norms.


Other substitutions:


1. 1. 3. Vocabulary. Kasakauskis replaced some words used by Giedraitis:


Such replacements of lexical items, however, are not very frequent.

1. 2. Valančių Bishopric of Lithuanian Lowlands

Kasakauskis compiled a manuscript of critical notes¹ about Motiejaus Valančių’ (the future bishop of the Lithuanian Lowlands, 1801—1875) book The Bishopric of Lithuanian Lowlands [Zemaitijos Viskuotėje]. This manuscript was known to Vasilės Biržiška, who guessed that Kasakauskis’ manuscript must have been written around 1866 [Biržiška 1965: 35] (this would mean that Kasakauskis had to finish it just prior to his death, 18 years after its publication). However, according to some textual features of Kasakauskis’ manuscript it had to be compiled before 1863 (for instance, the letter <e>, which was accepted by Kasakauskis before 1863, was not used in this manuscript yet). It is more convincing to believe that Kasakauskis wrote his notes soon after Valančių’s book was published in 1848. At least a reason cannot be established as to why Kasakauskis would have to wait longer.

After the analysis of the text it becomes evident that Kasakauskis attempted to criticize at least four levels of Valančių’s book: morphology, vocabulary, style, and facts (a non-linguistic aspect).

1. 2. 1. Morphology. Kasakauskis suggested correcting many endings of nouns, which sometimes were simply a feature of Valančių’s native dialect, and sometimes a form unfamiliar to Kasakauskis. For instance: «Seredoms — must be seredimos» (p. 7); «priėmė — is this a participle or a future tense?» (p. 7); «Musi — why not musu as we say in The Lord’s Prayer; in any case, this is the second plural case» (p. 8); «If there is Petrus, we could use Jonas as well, but in this case what ending will there be in the fourth plural case; if there is Petrus, the second plural case must be Petras like dongaus» (p. 8)². We can feel the

¹ [Kalstas Kasakauskas,] «Z dziecka pod tytułem = Zemaitijos Viskuotėje» (the manuscript is kept at the Library of Vilnius University, sign.: f. 1 — C26).

² «Seredoms — trzeba seredimos» (p. 7); «priėmė — czy imieli: czy czas przeszły?» (p. 7); «Musi — czemu nie musu tak, jak mówimy w polszczyźnie; — zrejno jest to 2 przyp. 1. m.» (p. 8); «Jeżeli Petrus, to można też Jonas; a tak będzie 4. przyp. 1. m. — rzeszą jeżeli Petrus, to 2. przyp. będzie Petras tak dongaus» (p. 8).
decisive intentions of the author of the grammar to adjust the morphology to his own concepts.

1.2.2. Vocabulary. Kasakauskis' criticism concerning Valančius' vocabulary is ample as well. Sometimes Kasakauskis just did not understand some words, e.g. "Laubsina — what does it mean?" (p. 3); "irnaj — what does it mean?" (p. 7); "Gwesen — what does it mean?" (p. 14); "Mieklinamos — what does it mean?" (p. 14); "Maneles — what does it mean?" (p. 15); "Miauzg — what does it mean?" (p. 16); "Stukoima — what does it mean?" (p. 16).

In some cases Kasakauskis felt that the words used by Valančius are foreign (loan-words), and Kasakauskis suggested replacing them with original Lithuanian ones, e.g. "Ermideris — what that foreign word is needed for?" (p. 5); "Spakajnej — wouldn't it be better pakaingai? Because spakajnej smells Polish very much" (p. 5); "Malawone and abrozdas: both from Polish" (p. 14). On the other hand, Valančius was rather a purist himself at that time, but as far as we can see Kasakauskis was not aware of this or did not appreciate it.

1. 2. 3. Style. Kasakauskis used to suggest some different synonyms, e.g. "wertiq — wouldn't it be better tinkanti?" (p. 8); "Kiepurq — however, this is not kiepuri, but Karuna" (p. 8); "Diewieiti — it means to wear clothes but not to carry a cross, that is why it will be neszioty" (p. 10). Sometimes Kasakauskis proposed alternative phrases, which he was more accustomed to, e.g. "Sakimus tegie — but it is accepted Kozonis y pavakstus sakas" (p. 9); "Badu stipa — 'died from starvation', when it was permitted to say badu miris" (p. 13). 5

1. 2. 4. Facts. Kasakauskis also criticized facts, which were presented (described) by Valančius, and which could be known to Kasakauskis himself, e.g. "Priest Gailevičius paid his debts — this is a lie" (p. 13); "It is a lie about the clock in the present Cathedral because it was made by the priest Juozapas" (p. 16).

Thus, Kasakauskis was interested in the rules of language, and he corrected Valančius' deviations from proper rules (as he understood them). Also, Kasakauskis attempted to correct other levels of Valančius' language, and to criticize his ideas. Kasakauskis' manuscript notes remark one of a rough draft, which might be intended to be used as the basis for a review of Valančius' book. However, it seems that such a review was never written. We can feel that Kasakauskis was eager to have his own differing opinion, that he wanted to escape the shadow of the Bishop's authority.

2. Dependence

I propose to discern at least two different creative periods for Kasakauskis: an early period (up to his grammar of 1832) and the late period — from 1859 till his death in 1866. This division allows me to demonstrate Kasakauskis' dependence on the intellectual trends in language standardization in each of these periods.

2. 1. The Early Period

Immediately after the Insurrection of 1831 against Russia Kasakauskis published his grammar — the first nineteenth century original Lithuanian printed grammar [KaKLŽ] in Lithuania Major. The decision itself to write a grammar demonstrates that Kasakauskis was interested in codifying the Lithuanian language.

The Censor Leon Borowski issued permission to publish Kasakauskis' grammar on December 8, 1831. This means that the committee of censorship had to acquire the manuscript even earlier. This makes it reasonable to believe that Kasakauskis had finished his grammar before the end of the Insurrection (summer, 1831), while he was still studying at Vilnius University.

Thus, though the grammar was published after the Insurrection of 1831, it had to be shaped according to the ideas of language standardization from the preceding period. Here I have to mention briefly that it is reasonable to discern at least two major trends in the
standardization of the Lithuanian language before 1831 in Lithuania Major: one tendency was to promote the Southern Lowland (Žemaičių Daininkai) dialect/variety for the basis of the future standard (a new modern trend), a different trend was the attempt to introduce Middle Highland (Vidurio Aukštaitai) as a dialectal basis for the same standard (the traditional trend).

At that time Southern Lowland standardizing ideas were expressed in the texts of poets and cultural activists Antanas Klementas (1756–1823), Kajetanas Nezabitauskas (1779–1837), Dionizas Poška (1765–1830), Silvestras Valiūnas (1789–1831), Leonas Uvainis (1755–1828), also in part Simonas Stanevičius (1799–1848). The Middle Highland tradition was underpinned by a group of priests led by the bishop of the Lithuanian Lowlands, Arūnas Giedraitis. This group published the New Testament in 1816 (cf. above) and many other books while attempting to retain at the Middle Highland dialectal basis.

Kasakauskis declared his relation to the culture of the 1820’s in this manner: «People know the writings of those who worked in this field: [...] the Reverend Giedraitis (the bishop of the Lithuanian Lowlands), Father Gailevičius, Dionizas Poška, Emerikas and Simonas Stanevičius, Father Rupeika, Father Kiprijonas and Kajetonas Nezabitauskas...» [KaKLŻ: X–XI]. He lists the representatives of both trends here (Lowland: Poška, Simonas Stanevičius, Kajetonas Nezabitauskas; Highland: Giedraitis, Gailevičius, Rupeika, Kiprijonas Nezabitauskas).

But the language that Kasakauskis had consciously attempted to implement in his texts was the Highland one. Let’s examine only several examples of the linguistic peculiarities that are (and were at that time) the most noticeable to all Lowlanders. Kasakauskis mostly (with some minor exceptions) used Highland [ie], and Highland [uo]: 14 liežiūs ‘a tongue’, 16 snėgus ‘snow’, 15 vienas ‘one’; 14 akmuo ‘a stone’, 28 duodu ‘(I) give’, 4 iudosas ‘black’.

And other relevant and frequent forms make it evident that Kasakauskis consciously tried to make the Highland variety the basis for the standard language he modeled. Some Lowland dialectal features that occur in his grammar mostly should be understood as his failure to notice and to replace them by Highland ones.

Thus, at this point the conclusion can be drawn, that Kasakauskis intentionally followed Giedraitis’ Highland ideas on standardization in the early period, though (as I have demonstrated above) much later Kasakauskis changed his mind and edited Giedraitis’ New Testament to great extent. The language of Giedraitis’ New Testament could have served as an example for the young Kasakauskis. But the older Kasakauskis did not like it at all. Though it was Holy Scripture, later (ca. 1863) Kasakauskis did not follow it literally.

2.2. The Late Period. After waiting for almost 3 decades after the publication of his grammar, Kasakauskis started writing and translating books again in 1859–1864: «Drunkenness and Soberness (1859); A Tale about a Discussion between the Devil and the Owners of Taverns» (1861); «An Explanation of the Sacrament of Penance» (1862), «An Explanation of Christian Catholics’ obligations» (KalPK, 1864). One more book was printed in Cyrillic letters after Kasakauskis death: «Explanations of Sacred Gospels for Every Week» (Искулумуй Швенту Евангелию анть Вису Недьлю, 1969).

In this period Kasakauskis has generally changed his attitude to the dialectal basis of the future standard. He started writing almost without exception in his own native Lowland dialect. Thus, Kasakauskis used Lowl. [i] instead of the Highl. [ie]: kik ‘how many’, kikwina ‘every’, wina ‘one’ etc. Also Lowl. [ii] instead of Highl. [uo]: duty ‘to give’, juokes ‘(he→she) will laugh’.

Another radical change that Kasakauskis made in the late period was a refusal of most of the diacritical marks that were present in his grammar. For instance, the circumflex diacritical mark in the shape of a broken line <‘> was very frequent in his grammar: <à> (2 płatyńu ‘[I] train’), <&>, <>, <>, <&> (3 paskiūnai ‘told afterwards’). It seems that in the late creative period Kasakauskis did not like these marks any more and that he made his orthography much more simple.

Thus, in the later period (from 1859 on) Kasakauskis radically changed his attitude toward the basis of future standard Lithuanian and started writing his books in the Lowland dialect (with only some minimal Highland particularities retained). What were the reasons for such a change? Most probably, in the late period Kasakauskis was influenced by the opinions of another bishop of the Lithuanian Lowlands, Motiejus Valančius and his helpers. Being a Lowlander himself, Valančius fostered a written Lithuanian, which was close to spoken dialects. Kasakauskis could interpret this as an urge to turn to a native dialect, which in his case was Lowland Lithuanian. I dare to affirm that the change in Kasakauskis’s conception was once more influenced by the opinion dominant in the Bishopric of the Lithuanian Lowlands at the time.
3. Conclusions

Though Kasakauskis most probably felt very independent in his attitudes toward standard Lithuanian, his opinions inevitably were a reflection of the ideas dominant in the appropriate period. He was not among the leaders of language engineering (he did not directly influence the process of language standardization). Rather Kasakauskis reflected the popular ideas of at least two comparatively different periods of attempts to standardize Lithuanian. In his youth Kasakauskis followed the Highland standardization ideas of the Bishopric of the Lithuanian Lowlands, and in his old age — the corresponding Lowland ideas of the same Bishopric. Even though he might have been unaware of this.

On the other hand, this fundamental turnaround in Kasakauskis on firm that earlier on, before the Insurrection of 1831, Giedraitis' ideas on written Lithuanian were the most influential and prestigious, while later those of Valančius took over and lasted well into the 1850's and 1860's.
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