

ISTITUTO DI STUDI RINASCIMENTALI
FERRARA

***ITALY AND EUROPE
IN RENAISSANCE LINGUISTICS:
COMPARISONS AND RELATIONS***

Proceedings of the International Conference
Ferrara, Palazzo Paradiso
20-24 March 1991

Edited by
Mirko Tavoni

and

Pietro U. Dini, John Flood, Aldo Gallotta, Kristian Jensen,
Pierre Lardet, Hans-Josef Niederehe, Giuliano Tamani

Assistant editors
Roberta Cella, Laura Cerretini, Elena Pistolesi, Mirko Tavosanis

***Vol. II: Italy and non-Romance Europe.
The Oriental Languages***

Franco Cosimo Panini

©1996 ISR-Ferrara / Franco Cosimo Panini Editore
Viale Corassori 24, Modena

Questi volumi sono stati realizzati con il contributo del CNR e del MURST (Ricerche 40% "La terminologia linguistica in Italia dal Medioevo a oggi" e "Storia della grammatica italiana dal Quattrocento ai giorni nostri", coordinatore nazionale prof. Maurizio Dardano).

ON THE CATEGORY OF MOOD IN LITHUANIAN AND LATIN GRAMMARS DURING RENAISSANCE

GIEDRIUS SUBAČIUS

Institut of Lithuanian Language, Vilnius

We Lithuanians know very well about the similarity of structure of Lithuanian grammar to that of Latin. Linguists from other countries in their turn point out these contiguities, e.g. the Czech, Jiří Marvan, stresses that these languages have much in common in their declension and conjugation. I would like to underline that the verb of Lithuanian has morphologically expressed synthetic forms of person which are exactly like those of Latin.

There are two autonomous grammars of Lithuanian of the Renaissance period (17th century), published in Karaliaučius [Königsberg]: D. Klein, *Grammatica Lithvanica*, Regiomonti: Typis et sumptibus Johannis Reusneri, 1653; and Ch. Sappuhn and Th. Schulz, *Compendium grammaticae Lithvanicae*, Regiomonti: Typis Friderici Reusneri, 1673 (I use the following abbreviations: Kl and SSch). The genetical link of Kl with grammars of other languages of that time was investigated by Buchienė—Palionis (1957, pp. 28-38). They say this grammar has much in common with the Latin grammar by C. Finckius and Ch. Helvicus (1621), O. Gualperius's grammar of Greek (1611), and with other Latin, Hebrew, German and Czech grammars. They also point out D. Klein's creative employment of Latin and Greek rules while applying them to Lithuanian (p. 33). There is little investigation of genetical links between SSch and Latin and other grammars.

However, my task is not to show the genetical ties but rather to reveal typological links between Lithuanian grammars of the Renaissance and that of Latin. It is obvious that the authors of Lithuanian grammars based themselves not upon one indefinite grammar, e. g. D. Klein says the grammars are «in Latinâ ferè innumeras» (Kl, p. XIX). Eigminas (1979) points out that on the whole the source of all grammars of that time was the same, namely the grammars of Latin.

In my paper I would like to show the nature of the influence of Latin grammar on Lithuanian ones from a particular narrow aspect, namely the category of the mood of verb. I would like to distinguish two main kinds of influence of Latin grammar: 1) the *natural* one, when the grammatical structure of Latin coincides with that of Lithuanian; in this case the Latin scheme can be applied to the Lithuanian language without any problem; 2) the *artificial* one, when grammatical systems of these languages are different; in this case the authors quite artificially insert vernacular data into the scheme of Latin grammar. It is especially important to ascertain influence of the second kind, because this shows the strength of the effect of Latin in the most obvious way. Furthermore, when grammatical systems are

different it is also very important to establish such relations, when Lithuanian grammar is not influenced by Latin tradition, and it is described quite autonomously and creatively. One more kind of influence should also be mentioned, which I would call a kind of intermediate relation, when the systems of languages being different, the authors of Lithuanian grammars describe the facts of their language exactly and creatively, inserting them, however, into Latin scheme.

Ph. Camerarius in his grammar of 1621 (?; a copy was used without a title page) points out that nevertheless there are some authors who distinguish five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten moods «*qui autem Terminatione Modos discernendos putant, tantum quator hosce numerant*» (p. 229). Indeed many Latin grammars of the 16-17th century distinguish either four moods: 1) *indicativus* (= *finitivus*), 2) *imperativus*, 3) *conjunctivus* (= *subjunctivus*), 4) *infinitivus*¹, or five, inserting *optativus* between *imperativus* and *conjunctivus*². It is worthwhile pointing out that these five moods are distinguished more frequently in the 16th century grammars, but in the 17th century we find only four moods.

KI and SSch also distinguish the latter four moods, only the third one KI names *subjunctivus* (sometimes also *conjunctivus*), and SSch — *conjunctivus*. There exist the first three moods in Lithuanian and they also have morphological expressions. Thus I would like to consider the coincidence with Latin moods as that of the first kind, i. e. when the coincidence of language systems is observed. In Latin grammar the fourth mood — *infinitivus* — possesses non-conjugated forms and forms without numbers (Rhenius, Billicanus, Melanchtonus), i. e. it contains the forms without the most characteristic symptom of the verb, namely person, yet they are forms of verb. KI and SSch also keep at Latin tradition (see below) but at least partially I regard it as influence of the second kind.

Besides, KI and SSch point out that those four moods also include some specified moods, as in traditional Latin grammar, i. e. *subjunctivus* includes also *optativus* and *potentialis*, while *imperativus* includes *concessivus* and *permissivus* (KI, p. 85, SSch, p. 39). In this case the structure of Lithuanian is similar to that of Latin, therefore this is influence of the first kind. So the very general aspect of the category of mood coincides with Latin tradition.

Modern Lithuanian grammar affirms that the category of mood entirely coincides with the category of person, every form of person being also a form of mood (cfr.

¹ C. Finckius — Ch. Helvicus, *Grammatica Latina ... Perscriptorum Giessae Hassorum ...*, 1610 (a copy was used without a title page); J. Rhenius, *Compendium Latinae Grammaticae*, Lipsiae, 1620 (a copy was used without a title page); Ph. Melanchtonus, *Grammatica Latina*, Wittebergae: Impensis Danielis Reichelii, 1648; etc.

² I. Caesarius, *Diomedis grammatici opus*, Lipsiae: Iacobus Bervvaldus, 1542; Th. Billicanus, *De partium orationis...*, Cracoviae: apud Mattheum Sybeneicher impressum, 1563 (a copy was used without a title page).

Paulauskienė, 1971, p. 56). So when comparing separate moods one certainly needs to base oneself upon the systems of Latin and Lithuanian tenses. As a rule, Latin grammars of the 16-17th century distinguish five tenses: 1) praesens, 2) praeteritum imperfectum, 3) praeteritum perfectum, 4) praeteritum plusquamperfectum, 5) futurum (Billicanus, Melanchtonus, Camerarius). In Latin *indicativus modus activi* has all five tenses expressed morphologically (with the help of inflections). Lithuanian possesses only four inflected synthetic tenses. Nevertheless, KI distinguishes three tenses, 1) praesens, 2) praeteritum, 3) futurum (p. 84), and SSch the five ones: 1) praesens, 2) praeteritum primum, 3) praeteritum secundum, 4) plusquamperfectum, 5) futurum. Lithuanian has no such system of three past tenses like Latin. Therefore, the inclusion of plusquamperfectum into the paradigm by SSch, and its formation with the help of analytic forms is somewhat artificial. It shows the effect of the scheme of Latin, thus it is an important coincidence of the second kind. (KI also includes this tense into the paradigm, though he feels its artificiality and points out that «plusquamperfectum circumscribunt Litvani», p. 85. I would consider such a description as intermediate between creative and artificial). Meanwhile, creative descriptions that show an escape from the scheme of Latin grammars can be considered: 1) KI and SSch refrained from creating other past tenses paradigms, i. e. they did not follow the Latin example; 2) SSch were capable of perceiving peculiar Lithuanian past frequentative tense and singled it out to the autonomous praeteritum secundum tense (Klein followed the Latin example and ascribed, not quite exactly, the past frequentative tense to *verba derivata frequentativa*, p. 129, but characterized it quite precisely. Thus, I would say it is also an intermediate kind between creative and artificial description).

As far as *imperativus* is concerned, it must be said that both KI and SSch diverged from the traditional scheme of Latin grammar with two tenses (present and futurum) and kept on to the structure of Lithuanian, as Lithuanian has only one paradigm of *imperativus* and it has no category of tense. It is possible to perceive a slight influence of Latin grammar in SSch, because the authors named the only paradigm as the praesens tense, though *imperativus* in Lithuanian has no tense category. So SSch tried to make a creative description conform to the pattern of Latin grammar, and I would call it an intermediate influence.

Conjunctivus = Subjunctivus usually has also five tenses expressed by the synthetic paradigm in 16-17 th c. Latin grammars. Lithuanian instead of these 5 has only one synthetic paradigm, and some modern grammarians speak also about two analytic paradigms. So in KI and SSch the system of Lithuanian is well reflected in two paradigms: 1) praesens et imperfectum (synthetic paradigm); 2) plusquamperfectum (one of the analytic paradigms). But KI and SSch still distinguish two tenses (all in all four by each!); 3) perfectum, 4) futurum. Lithuanian has no such forms, even analytic ones, and, e. g. Klein, required meaning expressed even by a syntactic combination of three words (*jey esmi wadinnęs perfectum, jey busu'*

wadinnēs futurum, p. 93). So in the conjunctivus mood it is possible to perceive the influence of the Latin scheme and the artificial supposition of two tenses for Lithuanian grammar. This mood along with the influence of the first kind at great length shows that of the second one.

The fourth and the last mood is infinitivus, and Lithuanian grammars present this according obviously to the scheme of Latin grammar. As was mentioned, infinitivus first of all possesses forms that have no category of person (modern Lithuanian grammar does not even ascribe such forms to those having moods). For instance, Billicanus speaks about infinitivus tenses: praesens, praeteritum, futurum, also about supinum and participium. KI and SSch speak about several tenses too (although not necessarily coinciding with the above mentioned ones) and about supinum and participium. I would like to emphasize that the system of Lithuanian, in this distribution coinciding with that of Latin grammar, is presented quite clearly and precisely. Only the distribution of infinitivus itself marks the great influence of Latin tradition, and I would consider this to be the second kind of coincidence.

In this paper all four moods have been looked at (except the passive). It is evident that the influence of the second kind (when the systems of Latin and Lithuanian grammars do not coincide and orientation to the Latin scheme remains) is not insignificant (1. Infinitivus, 2. Plusquamperfectum SSch, 3. Conjunctivus perfectum and futurum). However the efforts to describe autonomously the category of mood and to fight the attraction of Latin schemes are not insignificant too (1. KI, SSch did not create many past tenses of indicativus, 2. Past frequentative tense SSch, 3. Imperativus KI, SSch).

Finally, I would like to define the main reason for the influence of Latin grammar in the concrete aspect of mood. It is common knowledge that Latin grammar and grammar as such at that time were almost the same thing and it was commonly supposed that grammatical categories corresponded to logical ones (cfr. Eigminas 1979, p. 135). And I suppose this point of view was the main reason of Latin influence. The intermediate kind of relation between artificial and creative descriptions particularly confirms this: 1) the inclusion of plusquamperfectum into the system of indicativus tenses by Klein and at the same time the pointing out by the latter that Lithuanians «circumscribunt» this tense, 2) the exact description of the peculiar Lithuanian past frequentative tense by Klein, however according to the scheme of Latin grammar ascription of it, not to tenses, but to verba derivata frequentativa, 3) pointing out of praesens tense of imperativus by Sappuhn—Schulz, though imperativus has no tenses in Lithuanian. In these cases the authors showed perfectly their comprehension of the peculiarities of Lithuanian and its difference from Latin. But they supposed the categories of Latin grammar were characteristic to thinking and tried to adjust Lithuanian grammar to Latin, pointing out how it is possible to express the categories usual to Latin grammars through Lithuanian. This can be said about many cases of the second kind of influence. On the other hand both of the

Lithuanian grammars of the Rinascimento were adjusted to men of Latin intelligence who had to be good judges of Latin grammar. Therefore such interpretations of Lithuanian grammatical data through the scheme of Latin grammar was intended to help learners to understand the structure of Lithuanian.

Author's address:

Giedrius Subačius
Užupio gatvė, 8-18
2007 Vilnius, Lithuania

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Buchienė, T. — Palionis, J. 1957. «Pirmosios spausdintos lietuvių kalbos gramatikos». In: *Pirmoji lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, pp. 9-53.
- Eigminas, Kazimieras. 1979. «Anoniminės 1737 m. lietuvių kalbos gramatikos "Universitas lingvarum Litvaniae" santykis su kitomis to meto gramatikomis». *Lietuvos Mokslų Akademijos Darbai*, A, 1, pp. 135-147.
- . 1989. «Kristupas Sapūnas — mūsų kalbotyros vienas pradininkų». *Kultūros Barai*, 11, pp. 52-54.
- Paulauskienė, Aldona. 1971. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodis*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Lietuvių kalbos katedra.

RIASSUNTO

Sono note due grammatiche lituane autonome del sec. XVII scritte da D. Klein (Kl, 1653) e da K. Sappuhn e T. Schulz (SSch, 1673). Studiando il microsistema della categoria del modo, nella presente comunicazione si intende mostrare attraverso quale meccanismo il tradizionale schema grammaticale del latino viene applicato al lituano. Oltre ai casi di pedissequa imitazione o di evidente creatività, sono particolarmente interessanti quei casi di influsso mediato, individuabili quando i due sistemi grammaticali, latino e lituano, non coincidono e gli autori delle grammatiche lituane, nonostante descrivano esattamente i fatti lituani, si sforzano però di inquadrali nello schema latino; p. es. 1. In Kl il tempo *plusquamperfectum* viene inserito nel sistema dei tempi dell'*indicativus*, nel contempo tuttavia si precisa che i lituani «circumscribunt» tale tempo; 2. In Kl si descrive esattamente il preterito

iterativo (*būtasis dažninis laikas*) peculiare del lituano, ma secondo lo schema del latino esso viene ascritto non ai tempi, bensí ai verbi frequentativi; 3. In SSch si indica un tempo *imperativus praesens* sebbene l'imperativo in lituano non abbia tempi. In questi casi gli autori delle grammatiche dimostrano la loro perfetta comprensione delle peculiarità del lituano, ma anche il loro sforzo per conciliarle con le categorie proprie della grammatica latina che, come si riteneva generalmente, coincidevano con quelle della logica. Anche le interpretazioni dei dati grammaticali del lituano attraverso lo schema della grammatica latina erano intese ad aiutare i discenti di cultura latina nella comprensione della struttura del lituano.

SUMMARY

There are two autonomous grammars of Lithuanian written in the 17th century by D. Klein (Kl, 1653) and by K. Sappuhn and Th. Schulz (SSch, 1673). This paper by the narrow aspect of category of mode intends to show the mechanism how the traditional scheme of Latin grammar was adjusted to Lithuanian. Besides either the literal imitation or obvious creativeness, intermediate cases of influence are especially interesting. Such cases are evident when authors of Lithuanian grammars, even while the systems of the Lithuanian and the Latin are not coinciding, though the data of the Lithuanian are described exactly and are inserted creatively into the Latin scheme (1. The inclusion of *plusquamperfectum* into the system of *indicativus* tenses by Kl and at the same time it is pointed out by the latter that Lithuanian «circumscribunt» this tense. 2. The exact description of the peculiar Lithuanian past frequentative tense by Kl, however according to the scheme of Latin grammar is ascribed not to tenses, but to *verba derivata frequentativa*. 3. The *praesens* tense of *imperativus* is pointed out by SSch, though *imperativus* has no tenses in Lithuanian). In these cases the authors showed both their perfect comprehension of the peculiarities of Lithuanian, and their effort to adjust it to peculiar categories of the Latin grammar. In fact at that time it was commonly supposed that grammatical categories corresponded to logical ones. Also interpretations of Lithuanian grammatical data through the scheme of Latin grammar were intended to help learners (which were of Latin intelligence) in understanding the structure of Lithuanian.