

INSTITUTE OF THE LITHUANIAN LANGUAGE

Dr. Giedrius Subačius

IDEAS ABOUT STANDARD LOWLAND  
LITHUANIAN: BEGINNING OF THE  
NINETEENTH CENTURY

Summary of the monograph presented for habilitation  
Humanities: philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 1999

INSTITUTE OF THE LITHUANIAN LANGUAGE

Dr. Giedrius Subačius

IDEAS ABOUT STANDARD LOWLAND  
LITHUANIAN: BEGINNING OF THE  
NINETEENTH CENTURY

Summary of the monograph presented for habilitation  
Humanities: philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 1999

LIETUVIŲ KALBOS INSTITUTAS

Dr. Giedrius Subačius, *ŽEMAIČIŲ BENDRINĖS KALBOS IDĖJOS: XIX AMŽIAUS PRADŽIA*; Habilitacijai teikiamos monografijos santrauka, Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H), Vilnius, 1999.

The right of habilitation granted in conjunction with the Institute of the Lithuanian Literature and Folklore by Resolution No. 900 of 20 July 1998 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania.

Habilitation Committee:

chairman:

Prof. Dr. habil. Algirdas SABALIAUSKAS (Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Humanities, philology, 04 H);

members:

Dr. habil. Saulius AMBRAZAS (Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Humanities, philology, 04 H);

Prof. Dr. habil. Aleksas GIRDENIS (Vilnius University, Humanities, philology, 04 H);

Prof. Dr. habil. Jonas PALIONIS (Vilnius University, Humanities, philology, 04 H);

Prof. Dr. habil. Vincas URBUTIS (Vilnius University, Humanities, philology, 04 H);

Dr. habil. Vytautas VANAGAS (Institute of the Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Humanities, philology, 04 H);

Prof. Dr. habil. Zigmas ZINKEVIČIUS (Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Humanities, philology, 04 H).

The open sitting of the Habilitation Committee will be held in the assembly hall of the Institute of the Lithuanian Literature and Folklore on July 7, 1999, at 2:00 P.M.

Address: Antakalnio St. 6, 2055 Vilnius, Lithuania.

Tel./fax: (370 2) 22 65 73.

The summary of the monograph submitted for Dr. habil. degree was posted on April 20, 1999.

The monograph is available in the National Martynas Mažvydas Library and in the library of the Institute of the Lithuanian Literature and Folklore.

## 1. Introduction

The monograph *Ideas about Standard Lowland Lithuanian: Beginning of the Nineteenth Century* examines the history of a particular period of a branch of standard Lithuanian. To put it more precisely, the main **goal** of the monograph is to analyse the written language of Lowland texts that was gradually becoming dominant in Lithuania Major (further—LMaj) during the first three decades of the nineteenth century. The **subject** of the monograph is the formation of standard Lithuanian based on Lowland dialects of the time, namely, different models and projects of standard Lithuanian. In other words, the subject of the monograph is the history of Lowland prescriptivism in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Texts written in the Lowland dialect have been researched in the course of the twentieth century and perhaps even earlier. The language of these texts was analysed as a component part of the history of the Lithuanian language (cf. major works by Petras Jonikas, Jonas Palionis, Zigmas Zinkevičius on history of the Lithuanian language). Differently from previous works, this monograph examines only the texts prepared by Lowland authors or in Lowland. It has helped to reveal the course of development and trends of the written (standard) language evolving on the basis of Lowland dialects, aspirations and ideas of the authors of models and projects of the standard language.

For the purpose of this monograph a new **methodology** has been created which differs significantly from that applied in traditional works on the history of the Lithuanian standard. Traditional methodology was applied by Jonikas, Palionis, Zinkevičius.

For example, Zinkevičius divides the eighteenth century texts containing Lowland forms into two groups. The first group consists of texts by Lowland authors. The language of these texts “was based on essentially traditional written language supported by the Middle Highland variety of the text language,” nevertheless, the authors could not escape from the features of their native Lowland dialect. Texts in the second group are those that are “written entirely in Lowland. Only isolated elements of the Middle Highland variety of written language may be discerned.” Therefore, according to Zinkevičius, the quantity of Highland or Lowland forms in the text determines its affiliation to one or

another group (quantitative characteristics). This traditional differentiation is very important, albeit depersonalising. For example, it does not explain whether a Lowland author wrote in Lowland because he did not know Highland or because such was his choice. In other words, traditionally in the works on the history of the standard Lithuanian language less attention was given to the intentions of the author (Lowlander).

An author's intention, however, is a very significant parameter in the history of the standard language. These intentions reveal the degree of prestige enjoyed by a written language variety during a particular period. It is beyond doubt that the prestige of a language variety is one of the paramount and even decisive sociolinguistic factors that affect the development of the standard language. Therefore, this monograph concerns more the intentions of particular authors, individual and subjective history of language and not the development of the language system. These are sociolinguistic aspects of the history of language. The attempts to understand the author's intentions can be viewed as a new stepping stone in the analysis of the history of language which is only possible when the directions of the history of the written language have been determined and explicated in most general terms.

For the purpose of the *reconstruction of subjectively linguistic intentions* a sociolinguistic method had to be applied in the text analysis to reveal the attitude of a Lowland author towards the dialectal forms that he used. On the basis of the texts of selected Lowland authors whose knowledge of non-native Highland dialect was at different levels (Mykolas Olševskis, 1753; Juozapas Bukata, 1773; editor of *The Golden Altar* [*Auksa Atorius*], 1793; etc.) a **methodology** was developed by the author of this monograph to **group Lowland dialectal features according to the degree of noticeability by Lowlanders** and arrange them in a certain hierarchy. Not always do Lowlanders distinguish between their own dialectal features and the Highland equivalents, that is, sometimes they notice a difference between both dialects very easily and sometimes not.

There are three groups of Lowland dialectal features arranged according to the degree of noticeability by Lowlanders. This is a *social classification* of certain selected Lowland features:

1. The following Lowland dialect features can be regarded as the *least noticeable*: (a) the morphological feature of pronouns with acc. pl. in *-us* (*anus* 'anos'); with some exceptions (b) the morphological feature of 1 cond. sg. in *-čio* (*abejocio* 'abejočiau').

2. In the group of *occasionally noticeable* less noticeable are (a) the phonetic feature [ie] (West Highl. *ė*; *tiewas* 'tėvas'); (b) the morphological short endings in 3 pres. sg. & pl. (*tur* 'turi'); (c) the morphological feature of dat. pl. in *-yms* (*wyffims* 'visiems'). The following may also be regarded as occasionally noticed by Lowlanders: (d) the morphological feature of loc. pl. in *-ūse* (*anusy* 'anuose'); (e) the morphological feature of imper. pl. with *-kia-* (*mel/jkiemos* 'melskimės'); (f) the phonetic feature of *y* [ɛ] (*itykty* 'itikti').

3. The Lowland dialect features *usually noticeable* by Lowlanders are three phonetic peculiarities: (a) [ɛi], [i̯] (West Highl. *ie*, cf. *diena*); (b) [ou], [ū<sup>u</sup>] (West Highl. *uo*, cf. *duonos*); (c) [ā], [ē] at word final position (West Highl. *ai*, *ei*, cf. *iey* 'jei') and one morphological feature (d) the dat. sg. of nouns in *-uo* (West Highl. *-ui*, cf. *Ponuy* 'ponui').

In other words, if in a nineteenth century text we come across *consistent Lowland* features of the third group, it is highly probable that the author made a conscious effort to retain the Lowland character of the language. He would hardly have been able to overlook them regularly. If we detect Lowland dialect features of only the first group, it is evident that the author was trying to keep in line with *Highland*, but sometimes this escaped his attention and he did not write everything in Highland; and it is only from the least noticeable features that we can tell the author being a Lowlander.

Against such background it becomes particularly important to evaluate mistakes made by authors. Especially those that appear not due to inattention, but due to the wrong rules that the author set for himself in order to find equivalent sounds or forms—errors usually referred to as *hypercorrections*. Such errors are described in many traditional works on the history of standard Lithuanian. This monograph deals with *hypercorrections* because they are especially helpful in revealing author's intentions (subjective perception of language), his orientation towards a particular variety of the written language which is viewed by the au-

thor as being superior (more prestigious) to his native dialect. Superior to the extent that it makes the author to try to imitate this version not even knowing exactly its concrete forms (norms).

The method of reconstruction of intentions was applied to practically all authors described herein, to those whose at least some original Lithuanian texts survived. The method is especially promising in that it allows to speak also about the intentions of those authors, who have not left any theoretical texts about the formation of the standard language (for example, Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis, his brother Kajetonas Nezabitauskis). To put it in another way, the Lithuanian (Lowland) text written by a Lowlander enables us to reconstruct at least partially the attitude of the author of a non-linguistic text towards his language. This method of reconstruction of intentions of Lowland authors is also applied to those who laid out their own theory of the standard language. Sometimes theoretical concepts coincide only in part with those that can be reconstructed from non-linguistic texts of the same authors (for example, Dionizas Poška's).

The information obtained through reconstruction of intentions is mostly related to the author's attitude towards one parameter of the standard language—the selection of a dialect for the standard language being formed. In traditional works on the history of the written language, for example, those of Palionis, there are two ways of describing the possibility to choose a dialect for the written language at a theoretical level: a) one dialect is chosen, b) dialects are combined. When there are no surviving texts on theory, reconstruction of intentions from non-linguistic texts still helps to find out at least something about attitudes towards the dialect chosen for a standard.

Another **method** employed in this monograph is aimed at **identifying, determining and defining** some parameters or **categories** of models or projects of the evolving standard language. At least four categories of the standard language have to be considered with respect to the evolution period in question: 1. Dialectal foundation of standard language; 2. Territory of usage of the standard language; 3. Relationship between the written and the spoken standard variety; 4. Prioritisation between usage and rules. The first category, that is, selection of a dia-

lect for a standard language, has already been discussed. The reconstructed linguistic intentions are, first and foremost, the selection of a dialect as a basis. This category is very important because usually it is considered that the final choice of a dialect for the standard language concludes the first stage of evolution of any standard language. This subject has been discussed at a great length in traditional works on the history of the Lithuanian language.

The second category is the area of the standard language projected by the author where inhabitants would use the future standard language. Here the geography of dissemination of the standard language takes precedence over the choice of dialect. These two categories are completely different: quite often the author modeling a standard took Lowland dialect as a basis, nevertheless, he oriented the standard language to the entire Lithuanian speaking territory of LMaj. So far the scholars of the history of the Lithuanian language have been treating these two categories rather syncretically, did not separate them and usually spoke only about the geographical parameter. For example, these two categories were treated as one by Palionis: "Poška [...] regarded the dialect of 'Middle Lowland', that is of Viduklė region, as being the best dialect" (choice of dialect) and "there were more [people] who realized that Lithuanian texts had to be addressed in the language understandable not only to Lowlanders, but also to Highlanders" (area of usage). If we did not distinguish between these two categories it would seem that Poška intended his standard language to be used only by those living in Viduklė region.

The third category is the relationship between the written and the spoken standard language. In order to understand this relationship, one should first answer the question whether at that time the ideas about spoken standard were already becoming widespread. As can be seen from the monograph, some (but not all) Lowland authors were beginning to think about the spoken standard language alongside the written one (Poška, Jurgis Ambraziejus Pabrėža, Juozapas Čiulda).

The fourth category which is sometimes difficult to determine, is the author's prioritisation of rules or usage. Quite often it also has to be

reconstructed. Some authors gave a priority to dialect and usage, others—to language rules, grammar, the rational aspect of the language.

There is yet another feature of **methodology** that can be found in the monograph, that is, the **description** of different **writing systems** used by different authors and restoration of their evolution. We can consider, with certain small exceptions, the alphabet of the grammar *Universitas Lingvarum Litvaniae* (1737) to be the dominant literary tradition of LMaj in the eighteenth century and earlier: *a, q, b, c, [č], d, e, ė, g, i, j, k, l, ł, m, n, ŋ, o, p, r, s, [ś], t, u, w, y, z, ź, ž*. It also contained the diphthongs written with *y* (*ay, ey*, rare variants written with *ai, ei*); the digraphs *cz, fz* (and their variants); the diphthong [au] written as *aw* (variant *au*); the diphthong *uo*; and the regressive sign of palatalization *i* after soft *g, k* (sometimes after *r, fz, t, z*) before [e]: (*gie* [g'e], *kie* [k'e]). The graphemes *ć* and *ś* were the only letters very popular in Lithuanian texts of the eighteenth century which were hardly used in *Universitas*. With the help of this alphabet we can see what authors introduced which innovations, how much they observed traditions. It is worth restoring the evolution of orthography of those authors whose writing system contained distinct deviations from the tradition and was constantly changing because the authors were looking for more precise ways of expression (for example, Poška, Kipr. Nezabitauskis, Jurgis Pliateris, Pabrėža, Simonas Daukantas).

\* \* \*

There were not many written texts based on the Middle Lowland dialect in LMaj from the beginning of literature in Lithuanian in the sixteenth century up to the middle of the eighteenth century and there were almost no printed texts in this dialect. At that time books were usually published in two commonly used varieties of written language based on Highland subdialects: Middle Highland and East Highland. After texts in the East Highland dialect ceased to be published in the eighteenth century, most of the texts in LMaj were published in the Middle Highland dialect.

Lowland texts began to appear in the eighteenth century for at least several reasons. First of all, the number of noblemen in Lowland was

approximately twice as great (ca. 10%) as in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (5,3%). Lowland peasants were more powerful economically than their Highland counterparts. In addition, there were more peasant children learning in schools in Lowland than in Highland. Lowland noblemen as well as peasants forsook their native speech in favour of Polish (which at the time dominated Highland as a language of culture) to a much lesser degree than Highlanders.

The history of the standard languages of Europe allows us to divide these languages into two groups according to the periods of final selection of a dialect for a future standard. For example, the dialect of the Paris aristocracy was selected as the French standard in the fourteenth century. In England, the dialect of London and London area as well as of the university towns of Oxford and Cambridge rose as a standard variety in about 1500. The standard variety of the Italian, German and Polish languages were finally settled at a similar time. European languages with such history can conditionally be termed standard languages of *early selection of dialect*, with their standard variety finally selected during the Renaissance.

However, the development of certain other European languages during the Renaissance slowed down. This was because influential social groups favoured other languages. The final dialect for standard variety of such languages like Bulgarian, Croatian, Slovak and some others was usually selected as late as in the period of Romanticism or even later. In the beginning of the nineteenth century the Lithuanian language of LMaj could also be assigned to the latter group of standard languages, that is, the *late selection of dialect* made in the Romantic period (or even Neo-Romantic). This monograph describes the competition between Highland and Lowland dialects in Lithuania in the beginning of the nineteenth century to become a standard variety as at that time the issue of selection of dialect was still unresolved.

Modern definitions cannot be applied to the yet underdeveloped Lithuanian standard. Therefore, the notion of the standard language of the beginning and middle of the nineteenth century can be reconstructed in the following way: *the standard language will be a common and uniform public language of all the nation*. Here, it is particularly important to

understand the aspects of commonality and uniformity, as well as the future tense.

When considering the applicability of the term *standard Lowland language* (it does not matter that we speak not about the accepted standard language, but about the ideas, models and projects that existed at the time), at least three points should be taken into account: 1) the dialect intended to constitute a basis for the standard; 2) an area to accept the standard variety; 3) the native place of an author or other place where the standard was designed. The term *Lowland standard* is applied only to those projects and models which would contain three parameters of a Lowland origin: based on a Lowland dialect, intended only for Lowland and created by a Lowlander in Lowland. Such a model was being formed by Pabrėža. He was developing a genuine standard Lowland language. Most of the authors analysed in the present monograph, however, lacked one of these three principal aspects. We can say that Antanas Klementas' and Dionizas Poška's models contain two parameters—selection of a Lowland dialect and a Lowland author in Lowland. Their intentions cannot be termed *standard Lowland language* (the same is true of most other models and projects) as they did not correspond the main parameter: the area to accept the standard variety. Their proposed standard language was intended for use not only in Lowland but also in Highland, that is by all the ethnic Lithuanian lands of LMaj. This means that such model could be called the *standard Lithuanian language* and it should be added that it is *based on a Lowland dialect*. True, in the nineteenth century the word *Lowland* could mean the same as *Lithuanian* today. That is, the meaning of the word *Lowland* was broader: it encompassed not only Lowlanders, but also Highlanders of LMaj. The term in this old meaning can be applied to the standard Lowland modelled by Klementas, Poška, Čiulda, although in this case a more modern term has been chosen: *the standard Lithuanian language*. Therefore the title of the monograph *Ideas about Standard Lowland Lithuanian (Žemaičių bendrinės kalbos idėjos)*, first of all, means “ideas of Lowlanders” (ideas of Lowlanders about standard language) and not the “Lowland language.”

A comparison of several texts of an author, a study of his biography and data about his cultural environment can be very helpful in determining a more concrete period when the author decided on the standard language he would like to develop and introduce and strive towards its *uniformity* and *commonalty*. Hardly any earlier Lowland authors, particularly in the eighteenth century, intended to create a standard language common to all, because at that time authors were mostly concerned with conveying information and not uniformity of the language. In the monograph such texts are termed *written language* and not standard written language. Speaking exclusively about the non-standard written language the term *Lowland language (Lowland written language)* is suitable, because in the absence of the area aspect, the aspect of dialect choice remains as the most important.

## 2. Lowland Dialect Texts of the Eighteenth Century

One of the first books printed in Lowland dialect is *The Life of Jesus Christ, Our Lord and God (Ziwtas Pona yr Diewa Musu Jezusa Christusa, 1759)*. Its language is dominated by Lowland dialectal features: all of the least and only occasionally noticeable features are consistently maintained; also somewhat of a Lowland nature are two of the usually noticeable ones: [ɛi] (*anyi* ‘anie’) and [ɔu] (*anuw* ‘anuo’). Only [ā] (-*ay*), [ē] (-*ey*) in word final position and dat. sg. in [ɔu] (*wiruy* ‘vyrui’) were consciously changed into the Highland diphthongs. There are almost no erroneously reconstructed Highland forms (hypercorrections). Such a distribution makes it evident that the anonymous author of *Ziwtas* wrote in Lowland because those were his intentions and not because he could not speak the Highland dialect. This, nevertheless, does not permit us to assume that the author had intentions to standardize the Lowland written language.

It is reasonable to suggest that the graphemic peculiarities *uw* and *qw* [ɔu] (*duwbies* ‘duobės’; *anqw* ‘anuo’) and *yi* [ɛi] (*šyrdyis* ‘širdies’), as well as the palatalization digraph *iy* after consonants [č’], [k’], [š’] (*taiemničiy* ‘paslapti’; *kiyty* ‘kiti’; *šiytay* ‘šitai’) are orthographic innovations of the *Ziwtas* author. Later Klementas, Pabrėža and, in the begin-

ning, Daukantas were also influenced to a certain extent by the orthography of *Zi Watkins*.

Two other texts that contain even more Lowland features, can perhaps be attributed to the same unidentified person: *The Homily of K. Mykolas Karpavičius* (*Kozonius K. Mykōla Karpawicius*, 1794) and the insurgent document issued as *The Edict Regarding the Lithuanian Treasury* (*Sudas Skarba Lyituwos siolayka*, 1794). All dialectal features in question are Lowland: least, occasionally and usually noticeable (*anyi* 'anie', *duwk* 'duok', *broła* voc. pl. 'brołiai', *Ponuw* 'ponui'). The author/translator of *Kozonius* and *Sudas* made his language as Lowland as was possible at that time. It is likely that he borrowed digraphs *yi*, *uw* (*pražudy* 'pražude', *duwna* 'duona') from *Zi Watkins*. However, in contrast to *Zi Watkins*' digraph *yi* he introduced *ij* which follows palatalized consonants [k'], [š'] (*kijno* 'kieno', *užmušij* 'užmuše'). In other cases after palatalized [g'], [k'], [š'], [ž'] he used analogously only the letter *i* (not *y*): *gimiet* 'gimēt', *yszjuwkima* 'išjuokimo', *parplefzi* 'perplėšė', *nezina* 'nežino'.

Two public proclamations of the Insurrection of 1794 written by Lowlanders have survived: one signed by Ksaveras Nesiolovskis and the *Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Nation* (*Augščiausos lietuvių tautiškosios Tarybos*). These Lowlanders, however, made evident conscious efforts to follow the Highland Lithuanian variety in their texts.

### 3. The First Decade of the Nineteenth Century

At the very beginning of the nineteenth century it was *The Association of the Devotees of Science* in Warsaw which first became interested in researching the Lithuanian language. On behalf of this association Tadas Čackis suggested that Vilnius University begin gathering Lithuanian language data. In 1804 a commission of professors of the university did some research and as a result today we have a 27 paragraph summary of their work which was written by Čackis.

One could draw two contrary conclusions from this data of the Lithuanian language: (a) Lithuanian is an independent language; or (b) Lithuanian is only a mixture of other languages. Thus, the data gathered did not settle the question of what kind of language Lithuanian was; it did, however, impel further research. Later, in 1806, at a meeting

of the same association another Lithuanian, Ksaveras Bogušas, presented his investigation of the Lithuanian language and delivered a paper "On the Beginning of the Lithuanian Nation and Language" (published in 1808). By then his response to the question was unequivocal: "Lithuanian is a separate language" ("Język Litewski iest pierwotny"), that is, noble in its own right and not mixed with other languages.

In the twentieth century it is often emphasized that the "little book by Bogušas is of no scientific value" (Vincas Maciūnas). In the nineteenth century, however, the evaluation given by Bishop Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis revealed the urgency of the issue at the time: "one can only agree with prelate Bogušas, that in the past [the Lithuanian language] was the language used for public and scientific purposes." Lowlanders who had used their dialect long before Bogušas' book, acquired a powerful basis for the defense of their dialect's public use. Those who were skeptical about the future of a Lithuanian standard, who spoke and wrote only Polish, and who always cared only about the opinion generated in Warsaw rather than Vilnius, were astonished by the research from Warsaw itself and even from the respectable *Association of the Devotees of Science*, which "undeniably proved" the separate and independent nature of the Lithuanian language. One can assume that in this case the source of information issued was much more important than the arguments themselves. The Bogušas' book became a kind of ideological manifesto for those who cared about the future of Lithuanian. Bogušas' publication caused the first wave of reflections on the need for a written Lithuanian standard.

Parallel to the book in question was the study on the origin of Lithuanian by a mathematician, Professor Zacharijus Nemčevskis of Vilnius University published in France (1807). His opinion, although most probably not influenced by the work of Bogušas, was totally analogous. Having described the features of Lithuanian which are distinct from many other European languages, Nemčevskis emphasized the question of contrast: "The Lithuanian language, as we have described, differs in the extreme from Polish and Russian" ("la langue lithuanienne, telle que nous l'avons retracée, diffère extrêmement du polonais et du russe").

Bogušas', Nemčevskis' and other works were not intended to standardize the language, they were not prescriptive but descriptive works. However, they established a theoretical basis which brought the ideas and models of the Lithuanian standard to maturity. Thus, the first decade of the nineteenth century, more generally put, is the decade of recognition of the Lithuanian language in LMaj as an object of scholarship. It is also the decade of comprehension that the Lithuanian language is different from all other languages and the decade of decision that Lithuania's own vocabulary was to be respected much more than loan-words taken from other languages. Ultimately this is the decade which formed the linguistic bases of an ideological *desire* to standardize the Lithuanian language.

#### 4. Antanas Klementas

One of the first Lowlanders who attempted to model a Lithuanian standard was poet Antanas Klementas (1756-1823). He dedicated and donated a collection of poems written in Lowland, *A Tribute of Respect (Donis Pridera, 1810)*, to the Catholic Lowland Bishop Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis. In this collection he made an effort to base the norms of standard Lithuanian on the Lowland tradition. The reconstruction of intentions testifies to such a position of Klementas: almost all the Lowland dialectal features of the three degrees of noticeability are maintained (in the order of degree of noticeability: *anus* 'anuos', *girdiecio* 'girdėčiau', *garbie* 'garbė', *sznek* 'šnėka', *Ziemayciūsi* 'Žemaičiuose', *garbinkiem* 'garbinkim', *susytyki* 'susitike', *tyisa* 'tiesa', *duuta* 'duota', *Giedrayciuu* 'Giedraičiui'). Only one feature was replaced with a Highland variant more often, namely, [ā], [ē] in word final position (*gieray* 'gerai'), but the majority of Lowland authors did the same. It seems that following the example of an analogous situation in Polish dialectology Klementas depicted the area for his model of standard Lithuanian as all LMaj, not Lowland alone. Thus, he wished to see even the users of Highland dialect learn his Lowland version of a standard written language, although its territory was smaller than that of Highland. Klementas wanted to foster the vocabulary of the spoken standard language in the same way as of the written one, but he did not seek uniformity of pro-

nunciation. Therefore, we can only speak of Klementas' model of standard *written* but not spoken language. It looks like his prescriptions were derived from points of grammar rather than of actual usage.

In the course of time Klementas changed and developed his orthography and this is also a sign of his prescriptive intentions. Thus, at the initial stage of his writing in Lithuanian (1806), Klementas did not use the letter *u*, but later (1808-1810) he began to use it more and more often in his texts (*Telszių* 'Telšių'), although it was absolutely unpopular in LMaj. Gradually Klementas substituted the diphthong configuration *yj* (*dyjna* 'diena') for the diphthong *yi* (characteristic of *Ziwatas* and *Kozonius*) and made efforts to introduce the orthographic style of regressive palatalization which had been used in *Kozonius* by placing the allograph *ij* after palatalized vowels not after [k'], [š'] like in *Kozonius*, but after [g'], [k'], [l'] (*gijsmela* 'giesmelė', *kijk=wyjnam* 'kiekvienam', *Lijtuwifzkay* 'lietuviškai'). An increase in the occurrence of the letters *ć*, *ś* with their special diacritical marks for palatalization is evident as well (*Guduši* 'Guduose', *Giedrayčiu* 'Giedraičiu').

However, neither Giedraitis, nor anybody else accepted Klementas' suggestions and he did not have any known followers. His model remained but a theoretical attempt. Bishop Giedraitis did not support the parameters of the evolving standard language described to him by Klementas. On Klementas' part this was not a determined attempt to convince, but a modest suggestion.

#### 5. Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis

Having compared the language of two Lithuanian religious books, *An Explanation of the Offering of Holy Mass (Izsguldimas Afieras Misiu Szwentu, 1805 [IAMS1805])* and *The Lithuanian Gospels (Lietuwiszkas Ewangielias, 1806 [LE1806])* it became obvious that they were written by the same principal author/editor on the basis of the following: 1) both books are written by a Lowlander (the least noticeable Lowland dialectal features not replaced by Highland substitutes: *kurius* 'kuriuos' and *kurius* 'ibid.', *norećio* 'norėčiau' and *regiecio* 'regėčiau' respectively), 2) both books contain ample recurring examples of conscious efforts to substitute Highland for native Lowland dialect (all of the usually noticeable Lowland

dialectal features and a few occasionally noticeable ones: 3 pres. [*eyna* ‘eina’ and *eyna* ‘ibid.’], dat. pl. [*wisiems* ‘visiems’ and *kuriems* ‘kuriems’], loc. pl. [*metuose* ‘metuose’ and *danguose* ‘danguose’]), 3) the orthography is more or less the same. It is also obvious that there are analogous errors of dialectal interference (hypercorrections): *IAMS1805 neys* ‘nes’, *widuoje* ‘viduje’, *apsileydimu* ‘apsileidima’, *LE1806 neys* ‘nes’, *wirszuoje* ‘viršuje’, *wardo* ‘varda’, etc. Therefore, it is almost certain that the principal author/editor of both books must have been the same person.

Historical sources have not been of much help in establishing the authorship of these works as their evidence has been contradictory. They point to the following probable authors/editors of either one or the other book: Silvestras Rucevičius (1747-1831), Dominykas Mogenis (1745-ca. 1826), Bonaventūra Gailevičius (1752-1834). Although Rucevičius was also a Lowlander, his linguistic usage permits to reject his authorship: Rucevičius switched to the Highland dialect forms to a much lesser degree than the author/editor of *IAMS1805* and *LE1806* (cf. dat. pl. *wisems* ‘visiems’), his frequent erroneously reconstructed Highland forms are of a very different type as well (*prieliginima* ‘prilyginima’, *nuoweste* ‘nuvesti’). There is no single Lithuanian text extant which we could positively identify as being by Mogenis. The geographical distribution of his surname, *Mogenis*, does not border on any territory where the Lowland dialect is spoken. Mogenis attended secondary school in the area remote from the Lowlands. Thus, we may assume that Mogenis was not a native Lowlander and consequently could not have produced the *IAMS1805* and *LE1806*.

A comparison of *IAMS1805* and *LE1806* with the original Gailevičius’ texts proves that most of their linguistic forms are consistently analogous. Some Highland dialect features are slightly more frequent in the original Gailevičius’ texts. However, this difference can be explained by the long gap in time: Gailevičius could have learned a better Highland by then. So we possess no convincing arguments to deny Gailevičius’ authorship of the *IAMS1805* and *LE1806* texts.

Gailevičius was a close friend of Bishop Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis (1757-1838), and as it says in the title page, the book *LE1806* “was published by order of his Grace Duke Bishop of Lowland.” In the book’s

approbation it is said that the book was prepared by a group of priests of the Lowland diocese (“aliquot huius Diaeceseos Sacerdotum”), which means that there should have been favourable cultural conditions and a group of people who were concerned with issuing a number of these books.

We can learn about the attitude of the Lowland diocese towards the written language from the method of preparation of the book which is innovative and unusual for religious texts: *LE1806* contains many footnotes with comments of words, synonyms, even discussions about synonyms and an essay “A Warning Regarding Meanings of Words” (“Parsegiejmas apy žodziu iszsimanima”) which is in fact a linguistic key for a reader, explanation of various words by synonyms. For instance, in the footnote the word *nekayp* is explained “Aliter *neg*, *neko*,” and a very similar comment is given in “Parsegiejmas:” “*neg*, *neko*, *nekayp*, *pakolne*.” Such a caring attitude towards synonyms allows us to draw a conclusion that more attention was given to language and its regulation in 1806, as this feature sets this book apart significantly from *IAMS1805*.

The language of religious texts prepared by the Lowland diocese was gradually evolving. It was deliberately made Highland, although it was also intended to be read by Lowlanders. The title itself *The Lithuanian Gospels* (not Lowland or Lithuanian and Lowland) implies a perception of a certain ethnic homogeneity of readers. The explanation on the title page: “Revised, comprehensively written and with different words explained because not everybody in Lithuania understands them uniformly,” clearly shows that the text is aimed at all the readers of LMaj, that attempts are made to write in a written language, which is acceptable in the entire territory of LMaj.

In *LE1806* language purification is not defined in any special way. However, one comes across implications which allow to think that editors understood the superiority of a language free of loan-words. The word *loska* is probably rejected because it is borrowed from Polish. A word *tobulas* which is “practically unknown to Lithuanians” is suggested instead of a well-known albeit Polish word *doskonalas*. From these implications it is evident that care was taken to disseminate genuine

Lithuanian words, to purify the language. In the same year of 1806, like *The Lithuanian Gospels*, in his famous paper delivered at the *Association of the Devotees of Science* Bogušas condemned the excessive use of loan-words in the church language. It is hard to believe that as a former school inspector who had travelled extensively in the Lowland, Bogušas did not know at least some of the priests who prepared *LE1806*, if not the bishop himself. It is possible that while preparing his paper he could have seen this book. He was the first to declare from a podium the importance of avoiding loan-words and it could be that he had this book at hand as an example. The fact that the harm done to the Lithuanian language by loan-words was mentioned twice almost at the same time in different sources proves that the time was ripe for such ideas in Lithuania. This means that the year 1806 was very significant in the history of standardization of Lithuanian as the time of appearance of documents concerned with conscious efforts to purify the Lithuanian language. After that all the authors who were preoccupied with the standardization of language regarded purity an indisputable merit of a standard language.

The dialect of the Lithuanian *New Testament*, which was published in 1816 (*GieNI1816*) and signed by Giedraitis himself contained even more Highland forms than the books *IAMS1805* and *LE1806*. Frequent attempts have been made to determine whether Giedraitis translated the *New Testament* himself. First of all, the translation exhibits certain extremely consistent Lowland dialect features (*anus* ‘*anuos*’, *gierans* ‘*gerias*’, *dransumą* ‘*drašumą*’), not to speak of the inconsistent ones (*tuszus* ‘*luošas*’, *karszteys* ‘*karščiais*’, *neteysi* ‘*neteisūs*’). The appearance of inconsistent Lowland dialect features alongside the consistent ones shows that the former were not accidental. The random hypercorrections of Highland dialect features (*žodziose* ‘*žodžiuose*’, *szioy naktiey* ‘*šioje naktj*’) would point to the fact that a Lowlander also had a hand on it. Sometimes it is maintained that priests Tomas Venslauskis and Leonas Kazlauskis who copied the *New Testament*, “edited the language of the text to a certain extent, introduced Lowland dialect features here and there” (Zinkevičius). However, it is unlikely that a Lowland copyist who had the manuscript in front of him with correct Highland forms would

have introduced such consistent Lowland dialect features and hypercorrections. It would have been impossible to introduce consistently certain Lowland dialect features (there would have been inconsistencies) and hypercorrections in the original Highland text. We may conclude that this erroneous reconstruction of Highland dialect features (hypercorrections) could only appear in the original text and later were not replaced by Highland forms.

This probably means that there was a primary manuscript of *GieNI1816* composed by a Lowlander (who was probably trying to make the text more Highland) and reedited by Highlanders later, though it is impossible that these Highlanders did not notice the Lowland dialectal features. The peculiarities of the language permit to assume that Gailevičius could also be the primary translator of the *New Testament*.

Giedraitis and his colleagues fostered the idea of forming a standard Lithuanian based on the Highland dialect. As the example of Gailevičius demonstrates, Lowlanders themselves made conscious efforts to make texts more Highland. As was said before, Giedraitis and his colleagues oriented their model to all LMaj but not to Lithuania Minor (LMin). This can be illustrated by the following quotations from Giedraitis: “In Lithuania there is no *Holy Bible* in the vernacular, only in Prussia they have it but with German touches;” “In the Lithuanian part of Prussia they use Gothic [letters], while in Lithuania—Latin or Polish. The latter letters should be used as the most appropriate.” Therefore, although Giedraitis was familiar with the tradition of the written language in LMin, he was more concerned about an independent written language of LMaj.

Giedraitis also briefly explained what he thought about spoken language: “In order to write well in Lithuanian one has to know Lithuanian well and speak Lowland. The structure of the language should be Lithuanian, but pronunciation—Lowland, as this pronunciation is pure and pleasant.” The ideas of Giedraitis that “one has to know Lithuanian well” and “the structure of the language should be Lithuanian,” should probably be interpreted as the suggestion to develop and use a written standard language based on Highland dialect forms and his sayings “to speak Lowland” and “Lowland pronunciation”—as a per-

mission to speak or even read in Lowland. This shows that Giedraitis did not have intentions to standardize the spoken language, because to develop a written standard language based on one dialect and read it in another dialect meant that one could pronounce in any ways.

Similarly to Klementas, Giedraitis probably regarded rules as being more important than usage. Giedraitis wanted that “a grammar [and not the dictionary] of the Lithuanian language be written first on the basis of which this language could be further improved.” The priority given to grammar as if shows the priority of rules over usage. Giedraitis maintained that “if a dictionary were prepared according to the current way of speaking, the author would come up with neither Polish nor Lithuanian language.” According to him, usage is poor.

One may say that the concept of the standard written language which was being instilled by Giedraitis and his colleagues, dominated the religious texts produced by the Lowland diocese and it is likely that Mogenis’ grammar was written to support it. We have to acknowledge the importance of the linguistic efforts of Bishop Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis and his circle in the formation of the modern standard Lithuanian language. The language planning policy of the Lowland bishopric during the first quarter of the nineteenth century contributed to the fact that at the end of the nineteenth century the Highland dialect was ultimately selected for the standard, not the Lowland one.

Klementas’ and Giedraitis’ works are the only surviving theoretical treatises on the standardization of Lithuanian which date from the second decade of the nineteenth century (the contents of the Lithuanian grammar by Aleksandras Butkevičius of 1811 did not survive). Thus, this decade can be considered a period of standardization theory which was developing quietly and was still not explicitly defined. The cautious and perfunctory way of thinking of Klementas as well as Gailevičius and Giedraitis was but a prelude to more specific projects.

The beginning of the third decade abounded in external changes. In 1823 alone several non-religious (or not only religious) Lithuanian books are published. Simonas Stanevičius publishes excerpts from Mikalojus Daukša’s *Postilla*, books *About Cooking the Iceland Lichen* (*Apey darima walge ysz kiarpiu islandu*) and *Holy History* (*Historyja szwenta*) with a

Lithuanian vocabulary, Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis publishes a small book *A Treatise on the Keeping of Bees* (*Surinkimas dasekimu [...] apey bytes*), Juozapas Rupeika—*Jonas from Swistocz* (*Jonas isz Swistoczczes*). In 1822 Kazimieras Kontrimas presents a project of the Lithuanian language course at Vilnius University. Dionizas Poška makes up his mind as to the model of the standard language he would like to develop.

## 6. Dionizas Poška

The first Lithuanian texts of Dionizas Poška (1765-1830) were letters written to Bishop Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis (1809). They contain much more Lowland features than those of Giedraitis and his colleagues. This is particularly evident from Poška’s dat. pl. (*lenkiskims* ‘lenkiškiems’) and loc. pl. (*Bardziuse* ‘Bardžiūse’), as well as from [e] (*dwy wity* ‘dvi vietos’) and Lowl. *ie* (*tiewiszka* ‘tėviško’) to a certain extent. There is no doubt, however, that we see efforts to adapt to traditional Middle Highland written language, that is, to the standard written language promoted by Giedraitis himself. First of all, Highland [i] and Lowland [e] are written as *i* (*ilipiti* ‘ilipyti’), quite often we come across Highland *ie* (*kiek*) and *uo* (*duoti*). Thus, Poška’s texts are not purely Lowland. At this initial stage he obviously intended to adapt, to a certain degree, his written language forms to Giedraitis’ ideas, that is, to more traditional Middle Highland texts.

Later, however, Poška’s practices changed substantially: especially in the second and third decades he began to change the Highland forms of his texts into the Lowland ones. It is clear that he makes a conscious distinction between [e] and [i] (*tykra* ‘tikrà’), uses many scarcely distinguishable Dūnininkai-Lowland monophthongs [ū] (*duna* ‘duona’) or even diphthongoids [ī] (*anij* ‘anie’). Poška’s efforts to standardize towards the Lowland dialect, move away from the influential linguistic environment of Giedraitis and traditional texts of LMaj and follow an independent way of the written standard language are clearly discernible. Nevertheless, Poška never used either purely Highland forms at the beginning of his creative work or purely Lowland forms at the end of it.

Poška was constantly correcting and improving his orthography. He did not fully adopt either the written Lowland forms of *Ziwatas* and *Klementas*, or the Highland written forms of *Gailevičius* and *Giedraitis*. Among the unique graphemes is *ō*=Lowl. [uo] (*Zinōti* 'žinoti') created and used by Poška only in one manuscript *To Priest Ksaveras Bogušas Lietuvis and Joachimias Lelevelis Mozūras (Pas Kuniga Xawera Bohusza Lietuwi, yr Iokima Leleweli Mozura*, ca. 1823). During the second decade Poška replaced the earlier used *ie* by digraph *ij*=Lowl. [i] or [i̯] (*anij* 'anie') and later when writing his dictionary before his death (1825-1830), he changed it into *ji* (*wjina* 'viena'). Poška tried a variety of ways to express the affricate [č]. At first, in 1809, he expressed it as *c* or *cz* (*Kunigakszczia* 'kunigaikščio', *Kunigaykszczia* 'ibid.'), during the second decade, though, he began to replace it by *tc*, by *tcz* around 1823 (*Ziemaytcziu* 'žemaičiu') and by *tć*, *ć* around 1825 (*Ziemaytćia* 'žemaičio', *gužućia* 'gužučio'). Poška was brave enough to walk the paths yet untrodden.

Three periods in the development of Dionizas Poška's attitude toward a standard variety can be reconstructed. 1) During the second decade of the nineteenth century Poška began to look for his own means of expression, move away from the written language with the traditional Highland dialect as a basis. This could be regarded the first movement in the development of Poška's ideas of standardization, the first effort to break away from tradition and follow an independent way. Poška must have understood by then the necessity of the standard language and that it had to be developed. 2) Another stage (the first half of the third decade) marks Poška's theoretical self-determination as to what type of standard language should be developed for Lithuanians and Lowlanders. Poška believed that the standard language should be based on the Lowland dialect of the town of Viduklė and formulated his arguments very clearly: "It seems to me that the middle dialect of Lowland Duchy is the best and should be chosen as a model," "I did not invent or guess this third dialect, this is how they speak in the very middle of Lowland [...], where they preserved a genuine dialect of the Lithuanian language, not mangled at the borders [of the country]." This was a true manifesto of a self-determined person: the standard language should

be created on the basis of Dūnininkai-Lowland dialect of the town of Viduklė. This was a final decision, a foundation for the standard language was chosen at the theoretical level. This means that it became obvious that not only the standard language was necessary, but also what type was necessary. 3) The third stage, from around 1825, was the period of Poška's practical efforts: he was compiling a prescriptive (and scholarly) dictionary. Having nurtured his theory about the standard language and its standardization, Poška naturally felt the need to compile a dictionary. He knew that if a person wished to introduce norms of the standard language in practice he must, first of all, publish a dictionary: "[...] it is impossible to write a good grammar while there is no good dictionary, as this would be building walls without a foundation." This contradicted the opinion of Bishop Giedraitis, who gave priority not to the dictionary but to grammar. This proves once again that Poška was independent, had his own opinion about the formation of the standard language, did not give in to the ideas of the Lowland bishopric. Poška began compiling his dictionary and soon outrivalled the dictionary which had been started earlier by Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis. The latter stopped his work at letter *K* probably because of the superior quality of Poška's dictionary.

Poška had planned a project of development of the standard language comprising at least three major parts: dictionary, grammar and history written in Lithuanian. As was mentioned before, Poška considered dictionary as the main tool of standardization. Which means that having designed a complex project of establishment of the standard language he took upon himself the principal task. It must have been obvious to Poška that it would be impossible for Gailevičius, Giedraitis, Kipr. Nezabitauskis and other creators of models of the standard language to outrival a dictionary, grammar and history written and published in Lithuanian on the basis of his own dialect and orthography. However, "having raised the idea of the standard language Poška lacked the strength to put it into practice. Nobody had it at that time in Lithuania, of course. The time had been ripe for this idea to come, but not yet to become a substance" (Vytautas Vanagas). A few years or even a decade later Pabrėža developed a different, his own project comprising

three plus one parts, the fourth one being botanical works, of the Lowland standard language only. Although Pabrėža achieved more than Poška and there were manuscripts of the Lowland grammar, dictionary, history and botany prepared by Pabrėža and others on the basis of his model, they remained unpublished and, therefore, not influential.

Poška oriented his model of the standard language to the territory of LMaj. In his texts he always speaks about Lowlanders and Lithuanians (Highlanders) of LMaj as one nation (“we, Lithuanians and Lowlanders,” “for us, Lithuanians and Lowlanders,” “Lithuania and Lowland used to have its own letters, or the alphabet”). However, he did not include LMin into the area of his standard language usage. He ignored the written language tradition of LMaj, did not even take notice of its existence, wanted to create the standard language anew. When Poška wrote that “we, the unfortunate Lithuanians and Lowlanders, without our national Lithuanian language, without a good dictionary, without any grammar,” he deliberately “forgot” the rich tradition of LMin—dictionaries and grammars of Ruigys and Milkus, as well as other works published there. In other words, to Poška these works were not important. This means that the area of his standard language project coincided with the areas of standard language users as seen by Klementas and Giedraitis. This confirms once again that at that time these three standard language models competed and not complemented each other.

However, differently from Klementas and Giedraitis, Poška understood at a theoretical level that words should read as they are written, that the spoken language should also be standardized. Referring to the Polish language as an example Poška wrote: “Poles have good dictionaries and grammar, certain rules and examples how to *pronounce* and write every single word *in the same way* and those who do not follow the rules they err.” Therefore, the theoretical principle is clear. However, Poška was not yet ready to instil it in practice, it could be that he did not feel any demand for it. For example, when giving guarantees that the grammar of his text would absolutely coincide with that of Kaj. Nezabitauskis, he also added that “only pronunciation may differ.” He was

glad that orthography was being standardized and differences in pronunciation did not disappoint him at all. This means that unlike in the case of the written standard language, Poška did not have a comprehensive programme for the spoken standard, only a theoretical concept.

But again, like Klementas and Giedraitis, Poška gave priority to grammar rules, although his definition was slightly more subtle: even after codifying the language according to grammar rules one cannot ignore usage, it must remain an important supplementary source for codifying the standard. Poška believed that the Lithuanian language was not codified yet and thus its spoken variety could be the only source of correct language. According to him, a dictionary and grammar have to be written on the basis of the spoken variety. Once they appear it is necessary to apply standardized rules as a basis; this would be another level of language correctness, superior to the first one, when the correctness of usage is the only guide. To say that Poška gave priority to spoken language would mean to simplify his model. However, even after the language is codified one cannot forget usage, it remains a criteria for verification of rules.

Poška had an adherent and a follower of his ideas on the standard language in Kajetonas Nezabitauskis, thirty years his junior (1800-1876). Only one Lithuanian book by Kajetonas Nezabitauskis, a primer *A New Reader for Children of Lowland and Lithuania (Naujas mokslas skaytima diel mažū waykū Žemaycziu yr Lietuwos, 1824)*, survived. He was born a Dūnininkas-Lowlander and was very much inclined to use the Dūnininkai-Lowland forms. One could say that he was one of those rare cases when an author was trying to move from a Lowland subdialect not to the Highland dialect, but to another Lowland subdialect. In orthography Kaj. Nezabitauskis adopted or used many forms as Poška: for example, the letter of LMin ū (Kaj. Nezabitauskis explained: “As for letter ū, Lithuanians and Prussians [Highlanders of LMin] read it as *o*, Lowlanders as *u* and some write it and pronounce as *ou*, for example: *Dou-na, Sesou*”); as well as *ij* and *ji* in the meaning of Poška’s diphthongoid [i̯] (*drijzas* ‘driežas’, *Kjily* ‘kielė’).

Poška praised him for this. The following words about the orthography and the written language could refer only to a close adherent: “First of all, the style [of Kaj. Nezabitauskis] employed in this primer is very good, clear and coherent, and this is not an overstatement; second, the orthography is flawless and nothing needs to be corrected; third, in my opinion, the grammar of our Lithuanian language as it is in the middle of Lowland, is very good [...]. To sum it up, this orthography and grammar can be regarded as models until the appearance of a dictionary and grammar of the Lithuanian language in future.” Poška wrote elsewhere that “the orthography [of Kaj. Nezabitauskis] is impeccable and no corrections are needed.” At that time nobody’s orthography received so much biased praise.

Certainly, Poška sensed that there were other competing models of the standard language. As was said earlier, one of his rivals was Kaj. Nezabitauskis’ brother Kiprijonas (1779-1837). He began compiling a Lithuanian dictionary before Poška, but Poška defeated him: count Nikolaj Rumyantsev, chancellor of all Russia, had promised to cover the expenses of the publication of Kipr. Nezabitauskis’ dictionary; however, after Rumyantsev learned about the compilation of Poška’s more elaborate dictionary, he transferred his support from Kiprijonas to Poška. Kipr. Nezabitauskis’ model of standard Lithuanian was different from Poška’s and his brother Kaj. Nezabitauskis’.

Kipr. Nezabitauskis made efforts to include many Highland dialectal features in his written language. One of the most characteristic peculiarities (mentioned by most historians of the Lithuanian language) is the enormous number of hypercorrections; no one at the time produced them so intensely. Cf. a) acc. sg. in *-o* (*už tieso* ‘už tiesą’); b) the Lowland letter *o* which was supposed to be read as the Highland diphthong [uo] (*užodžia* ‘užuodžia’); c) 3 pres. (*ture* ‘turi’); d) the artificial Highland affricates (*akuczes* ‘akutes’); e) gen. sg. and nom. pl. forms of the *ē* stem (*galwikios* ‘galvikės’). Poška noticed the accusative in *-o* and jeered almost openly at Kiprijonas in the letter addressed to Vilnius University Professor Ivan Loboiko: “It seems that ‘his [Kajetonas]’ little brother Nezabitauskis would translate those four lines by Bogušas as follows: *Perkun [...] DieWAYti! Ne muszk Zemayti, bet muszk Gudo, Kayp Szuni Rudo.*

Because his every word, which ends in *as*, in the second and fourth cases always end with the letter *o*.\*” The *little brother* is, perhaps, the only surviving Poška’s indiscreet remark about Kipr. Nezabitauskis. An indiscreet remark because it is crossed out very carefully with ink and is almost illegible. We may concur with the contemporary opinion of Ivan Loboiko that Kipr. Nezabitauskis “did not possess the nature of a philologist.”

Nevertheless, although Kipr. Nezabitauskis used very many Highland dialectal features, he maintained the least noticeable Lowland features in his texts (*tus* ‘tuos’, *netikieczio* ‘netikėčiau’), and of the occasionally noticeable ones he retained the diphthong *ie* (West Highl. *é*: *noriedamas* ‘norėdamas’); he differentiated well between [e] and [i] (*ysz-mesty* ‘išmesti’) and continued this practice later, after he emigrated to France following the Lithuanian Insurrection of 1831. In his texts written in emigration he restored the supposedly Highland hyperaccusative in *-o* back as if to the Lowland form and began to write *-uo* (*daiktuo* ‘daikta’, *ing Kurszuo* ‘į Kuršą’). It is clear that he did not want to reject Lowland dialectal forms completely. We may presume that Nezabitauskis attempted at writing not just in Highland forms, but at using a combination or a mixture of Highland and Lowland dialectal forms.

The orthography of Kipr. Nezabitauskis prior to the Insurrection of 1831 was not in any way pretentious or exceptional; many features corresponded with the traditional Lithuanian orthography of the eighteenth century. However, during his emigration in France Kipr. Nezabitauskis gradually began to change it. For example, he completely dropped the separate letter *o* and instead began to use the diphthong *uo* (*nuoriejuoté* ‘norėjote’). This means, that he completely mixed up West Highl. *o* and *uo* and came up with one digraph *uo* (cf. *atsyduoda* ‘atsiduoda’). In the native Dounininkai-Lowland dialect of Kipr. Nezabitauskis these positions were pronounced as [uo] and [ɔu] respectively. Similarly Kipr. Nezabitauskis eliminated the difference between West Highl. *é* and *ie* and toward the end of his life he began using digraph *ié* (cf. *diéwiéjuo* ‘dėvėjo’ and *liéptum* ‘lieptų’). Such compromise digraphs that represent some-

\* The text placed between <...> brackets is crossed out in the original manuscript.

times Highland and, at other times, Lowland pronunciation, could also be the result of the desire of Kipr. Nezabitauskis to combine different dialects.

The attempt of Kipr. Nezabitauskis in France to create his own version of a standard written language can be seen from the introduction of many letters with diacritical marks (*ă, â, cz, é, ê, ĩ, ŷ, ů, û*) and from constant improvement of orthography to the end of his life. There is one interesting example which proves that Kipr. Nezabitauskis still felt the need to compete with the written language versions offered by other authors: he copied “The Song of Birutė” by Silvestras Valiūnas from the magazine *Kolumb* in his own orthography and included a subtitle: “About Birutė’s Hill in Palanga. Written by Valiūnas, the Orthography Revised as Required in this Language” (“Apėi Kaľnuo Bŷruta po Palaľga; Sudiėjŷmas Walenawicŷias, pagaľ rėikaľuo rasŷimuo tuoja Kaľbuoja, partaisitas”). Thus, the poem by Valiūnas revised “as required in this language.”

Historical sources maintain that Kipr. Nezabitauskis was the author of a dictionary of the Lithuanian language and of a book on bees, *A Treatise on the Keeping of Bees (Surinkimas dasekimu [...] apėi bytes, KiNeSDAB1823)*. However, it is often assumed that both works were prepared not by Kiprijonas, but by his younger brother Kajetonas Nezabitauskis. But as the linguistic analysis shows, the *KiNeSDAB1823* contains a particular combination of orthographic, phonological and morphological forms which in the nineteenth century could only be used by Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis; he is also an indisputable translator of the text. According to contemporary sources (letters of Kipr. Nezabitauskis, Loboiko, Rumyantsev), the dictionary was also compiled by Kipr. Nezabitauskis. However, it was the younger Kaj. Nezabitauskis who was traditionally believed to be the author. The monograph argues that Kajetonas (a civil servant and later head of the Warsaw censorship committee) tried to misappropriate the works of his brother and spread widely the rumour about his supposed works. On the other hand, the monograph also maintains that the authorship of the translation of *Wendraunikas* and *Litania pakielawinga* traditionally assigned to Kipr. Nezabitauskis

should also be rejected, because, judging from dialectal forms, the translator (or translators) of these texts must have been an East Highlander.

Another probable competitor of Poŷka and a probable ally of Kipr. Nezabitauskis’ model of the standard language was Aleksandras Butkevičius, whose grammar manuscript did not survive. It could be that one of the reasons why Butkevičius’ grammar was not published was that Poŷka tried to eliminate competitors. In his letter to Loboiko Poŷka, who had never seen the manuscript of Butkevičius, wrote: “[...] I see the Polish-Lithuanian grammar written by Basilian priest A. Butkevičius, still in the form of a manuscript, which I would not suggest publishing before we have a good dictionary, otherwise it would be like a building constructed on ice, or a beginning without an end. However, if a decision has already been made to print it, I kindly ask you to give it to Mr. Kajetonas Nezabitauskis to read it carefully.” This points not only to the fear of a competitor, but also to confidence in Kaj. Nezabitauskis.

Gailevičius and Giedraitis, as well as Klementas can also be mentioned among the rivals of Poŷka’s project of standard language.

### 7. X.D.K.P.S. Grammar

The Czartoryscy Library in Kraków (Biblioteka Czartoryskich) has preserved a manuscript of Lowland grammar by an anonymous author, or rather signed as X.D.K.P.S. The water marks on the manuscript paper show the year of 1820, that is the year of the manufacture of the paper. Therefore, the X.D.K.P.S. manuscript could be written around or after 1820.

Linguists hold to the opinion that the author of X.D.K.P.S. attempted at combining Highland and Lowland dialectal forms. In the grammar text, however, Lowland dialectal forms dominate (in the order of degree of noticeability: *katrus* ‘katruos’, *Dyrbtio* ‘dirbčiau’, *biegu* ‘bėgu’, *rejk* ‘reikia’, *gerewsyms* ‘geriausiams’, *Broluse* ‘broliuose’, *bukiem* ‘būkim’, *turietyny* ‘turėtini’, *Szey* ‘šie’, *owłas* ‘uolos’, *Tiewow* ‘tėvui’). Only one feature—monophthongs [ā] and [ē] at word final position—were consistently expressed in Highland forms (*baltays* ‘baltais’). Two of these features were replaced inconsistently by Highland forms, that is, Lowl.

[eɪ] and [ɔu]: *wienas* ‘vienas’, *dodąs* ‘duodąs’ (only two words with [ɔu] were replaced with Highland forms: *duoti* and *duona*). It is evident that the author set the tone of his native Lowland dialect, but he did not codify his language to a sufficient degree (we cannot discern any strict concept of codification) neither did he achieve an adequate level of accuracy. Forms with [eɪ] instead of West Highl. *ę* (*kętas* ‘kietas’ cf. with analogous *ę* used in *atsygrežk* ‘atsigrežk’) and with [ɔu] instead of West Highl. *ą* (*owżowtas* ‘ąžuolas’) testify to the fact that the author came from Dounininkai-Lowland of the north-west of the littoral area.

The analysis of dialectal forms and orthography does not reveal any convincing signs of influence of traditional Dounininkai-Lowland texts, *Ziwatas* and *Kozonius*, or Pabrėža’s manuscripts. This also indicates that the author was rather independent while selecting dialectal norms and graphemes for orthography.

Nevertheless, the grammar is neither big nor comprehensive. It was intended for beginners and for publication. This allows us to presume that the author wanted to prepare a manual, maybe he was concerned about the teaching of the native language in schools. On the other hand, it is evident that the author felt the viability of a future Lithuanian standard: this enables us to speak at least about his initial desire to have a standard language.

Although he chose the Dounininkai-Lowland dialect, the author’s plausible territory for the standard was the one coinciding with the Lithuanian ethnic areas of LMaj, not Lowland alone (thus, very similarly to the intentions of Klementas, Giedraitis, Poška); even the term the *Lowland language* is absent from his texts and the term the *Lithuanian language* is used. It seems that an overly syncretic attitude toward orthography and pronunciation hindered the grammarian to differentiate a spoken standard language form the written one: he still recognized only one syncretic variety of the future standard language. In this regard his model differed from those of Giedraitis and Poška, who understood and emphasized the difference between the written and the spoken languages. The author’s priorities also depended on rules. By his erroneous rules he modified entire word paradigms, for example, he considered *akmow* ‘akmuo’, *nosys* ‘nosis’ as erroneous forms and *ak-*

*menis*, *nose* as their correct equivalents. Even though he gives a priority to rules, he can be said to have sensed syncretically the importance of the spoken language.

A possible version is that the author of the grammar signed X.D.K.P.S. was a priest of noble origin. He could have also been a teacher at some parish school. He was not a determined man and his grammar was intended for beginners: the book offers only very basic grammar. There is no evidence of a conscious resolution to create his own model of the standard language, only a nascent need for a standard language.

## 8. Simonas Stanevičius

The texts of Simonas Stanevičius (1799-1848) may be divided into two different types: his own original writings and his editions of earlier works by other authors.

Stanevičius prepared his own texts in a consistent Lowland dialect. Almost all the phonetic and morphological peculiarities were not modified into Highland forms, his Dūnininkai-Lowland subdialect was preserved (in the order of degree of noticeability: *kurius* ‘kuriuos’, *miegynyma* ‘mėginimo’, *prider* ‘pridera’, *mayszityms* ‘maišytiems’, *baltūsūs Gudūs* ‘Baltuosiuose Guduose’, *miliėkiate* ‘mylėkite’, *kyty* ‘kiti’, *winas* ‘vienas’, *asztūny* ‘aštuoni’). Thus, Stanevičius’ intentions were to write in his native Lowland dialect. Sometimes for some reason, however, he used (though inconsistently) the Highland loc. pl. (cf. *laukuose* ‘laukuose’).

Stanevičius, in contrast to Poška and Kaj. Nezabitauskis, did not create orthographic innovations but simply used the traditional eighteenth century alphabet of LMaj. Extremely important exceptions to this rule are diacritical marks for intonation (Aleksas Girdenis), which were introduced in certain texts of Stanevičius (*nederiėjymas* ‘nederėjimas’, *laukū* ‘laukū’). Stanevičius seems to have been a subtle philologist who knew the language well and was fond of his work. The marked intonations served most probably to express the author’s philological craftsmanship rather than to offer his readers a guide to proper accentuation.

Stanevičius had a substantially different attitude toward the texts of previous centuries which he edited and arranged to be reprinted. First of all, he reprinted an excerpt of Mikalojus Daukša’s *Poštillė* as *An*

Excerpt of *Lowland Sermons* (WYIĄTEK Z KAZAŃ ŻMUDZKICH, StWKŻ1823). When editing this text Stanevičius did not seek to change any peculiarities of the original language to help the contemporary reader comprehend the old text better. He preserved very accurate lexical (*mázintelis*—StWKŻ1823 *mázintelis*, *wiřsatimes*—StWKŻ1823 *wissatimes*), morphological (*butúmbim'*—StWKŻ1823 *butumbim*, *iúřemp*—StWKŻ1823 *iusemp*) and phonological (*Giedókime*—StWKŻ1823 *giedokime*, *akřómintúře*—StWKŻ1823 *aksómintuose*) features. Language inconsistencies appeared only where the editor failed to understand illegible words or made errors, or maybe where publishers themselves made mistakes (*kriaktus*—StWKŻ1823 *kriauktus*, *łumo*—StWKŻ1823 *tumo*, *řwalgikiteg*—StWKŻ1823 *řwalgikitey*). A conscious effort to retain original linguistic features testifies to great respect for the source language.

Most probably Stanevičius was also the editor of another version of the same excerpt of Daukša's work: *A Sermon on the Day of God's Nativity* (*Sakimas ont dienos Diewo Užgimimo*, SODDU) (linguistic features, at least, support this opinion). However, this text was edited much more than StWKŻ1823. Not all the vocabulary was preserved (*ąblubėnikas*—SODDU *jaunikis*, *iřg iřcios mergós*—SODDU *isz žiwato panos*), grammatical forms were edited more (*butúmbim'*—SODDU *butumem*, *iřkalbėtis*—SODDU *isřikalbėti*), phonological forms were sometimes changed a little by the Lowland ones (*Jozephās*—SODDU *Juzapas*, *norėio*—SODDU *noriejo*). But one can find no trace of any intention on Stanevičius' part to codify any particular language forms in SODDU, only to make the text clear, the idea lucid, and help the nineteenth century reader to understand the text better, that is, to make it somewhat more accessible to his contemporaries. If both texts were really edited by Stanevičius, then, from the typological point of view, it seems very possible that SODDU dates from an earlier period than StWKŻ1823. In both editions it is obvious that editor Stanevičius did not want to demonstrate forms of his native dialect and his orthography, and one can feel editor's respect for the original text (in the case of SODDU—also an attempt to adapt to the needs of the nineteenth century reader).

The third important text which Stanevičius edited was the anonymous grammar of 1737 *Universitas Lingvarum Litvaniae*, published in

1829 as *A Short Course of Instruction in the Lithuanian or Lowland Language* (*Trumpas pamokimas kałbos lituwiszkos arba žemaytyszkos*, TPKLŻ1829). This is one of the first Lithuanian reprints of grammatical texts which explicitly acknowledge the editor's role (certain attempt of a critical edition). Stanevičius tried to preserve the lexical, morphological, phonological, orthographic features of *Universitas*, even its accentuation and intonation marking system. The traditional opinion claims that Stanevičius did make corrections here and there. He indeed replaced a few words (*Ģtuokřnis*—TPKLŻ1829 *Ģtuofnis*, *řkràudus*—TPKLŻ1829 *řkàudus*), added dual forms of nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs. He also added a few footnotes. For example, Stanevičius made a comment about noun dat. dual. endings *am* (m.) and *om* (f.) alluded to by the author of *Universitas*: "This ending is archaic. Now the correct dat. masculine ending is *om* or *um*, female—*em* (see declensions)." In some places he even adjusted orthography, for example, where in *Universitas* the diacritical mark—a dot—was missing above *ř*, Stanevičius marked it consistently throughout the text (*Mazoji*—TPKLŻ1829 *Mžojo*, *Zmonies*—TPKLŻ1829 *Žmonies*).

Nevertheless, these and some other corrections made by Stanevičius were inserted in an orderly manner. First of all, Stanevičius tried to separate very clearly his own text from the original. He gave his inserted examples in brackets or explained changes in footnotes so that the reader could distinguish between the text of *Universitas* and Stanevičius' amendments. These are the features of critical editing. And again we witness deference to the original. While in those cases where Stanevičius changed words or orthography he must have regarded it not as the editing of the text but proof-reading (those changes are very slight). We may draw a conclusion that Stanevičius held to the principle to follow strictly the forms and the orthography of the original.

Second, besides publishing the original text, Stanevičius was also keen to show as accurately as possible the grammatical structure of the Lithuanian language, in other words, to depict in as scholarly manner as possible the contemporary grammar of the Lithuanian language (this was the purpose of insertions and additions). There is no doubt that

both objectives were directed toward a reader who was interested in research of the language *per se* rather than in its practical usage.

The fourth and fifth reprints prepared by Stanevičius were those of Kristijonas Donelaitis: excerpts from *The Seasons (Metai)* and fables. The language of the excerpt from *Metai* remained almost unchanged, only the orthography was changed (*Arkleis—arkleys, iŝpláutą—iszpláuta, Langus—langus*). Here, the position of Stanevičius must have been to preserve the original language, and correct or adapt the orthography if needed.

The reprint of fables also reveals that Stanevičius tried to withhold from editing the features of the language, albeit not always successfully (that is, he made very slight corrections: 2 cond. sg. forms with formant *-b-*, loc. pl. *Girroŝa*, dual forms, affricate *ŝodŝeis*); he essentially reedited the usage of nasal characters by marking them in accordance with his own Lowland dialect: *atsitupe, isztiesŝs, kaŝnėli* and *ráta*. Thus, in some cases, peculiarities of Stanevičius dialect made their way into the text. Nevertheless, Stanevičius' goal of preserving characteristics of the language of LMin was fulfilled quite successfully.

All five of Stanevičius' reprints as if demonstrate that philologist Stanevičius was inclined to move as close to the original as possible. All these works attest to efforts toward descriptive rather than prescriptive scholarship. Most probably Stanevičius considered the old reprinted Lithuanian texts a material basis for the future written language but not an expression of the desired standard itself—they were to be studied as a scholarly subject matter and in the future used as material for other philological works.

Coming back to the original Lowland texts by Stanevičius, we may draw a conclusion that these texts in almost pure Dūnininkai dialect were not intended for the promotion of the Lowland dialectal forms. A close link with his native dialect tells us not about the desire to create a standard language but about scholarly explication of a dialect as one of the language varieties. The Lowland texts had to meet the same standards as other publications, that is, to represent the original form of language. For Stanevičius both Lowland texts and publications were objects for his research as well as material for codification of the written

language. However, none of them were offered as examples of the standard language.

Stanevičius was preoccupied with codification of the Lithuanian language in most general terms, and this is testified by his "happiness about the parents' tongue coming into life," pain about "the degradation of the Lithuanian language." However, at that time at least, he did not plan to put this general theoretical principle into practice. Although Stanevičius saw the future of the standard language, in 1829, when he wrote the foreword "Skaytisentymŝ" that can be regarded as his manifesto, this future looked more like a blurry vision rather than a concrete model. Stanevičius wrote: "At this time most Lowlanders learn, read and write in Lithuanian, some of them out of their love to the native tongue, others—out of their desire to learn everything;" "for some this text [*Universitas*] may become a source of happiness, while for others—a guide to a better knowledge of the language and still others may wish to correct and disseminate it." The aspect which Stanevičius applied to himself as well, is described as writing and reading in Lithuanian out of the desire to learn things or simply to gain a better knowledge of the language. Language correction and dissemination, that is, codification, was a totally different aspect and strictly separated from the first one. Stanevičius did not have a strict concept of application of standard language categories. We may state with assurance that Stanevičius was the first among the scholars of the Lithuanian language in LMaj to distinguish clearly between the prescriptive language research and the descriptive one.

Unlike Dionizas Poška, before the beginning of concrete codification, Stanevičius wished to do a major preparatory work first. Later in his life he was compiling a Lithuanian-Polish dictionary which is now lost. The dictionary reached the letter *L* and comprised about eight thousand words. Thus, there is ground to believe that Stanevičius intended his dictionary to be a work with 24 thousand words. Of all the dictionaries with the Lithuanian index the one compiled by Stanevičius must have been among the more comprehensive ones (only the manuscript of a four volume dictionary compiled by Dominykas Sutkevičius in 1842 was bigger—it contained nearly 30 thousand words). It could have had

more features of a comprehensive dictionary of Lithuanian words arranged in alphabetical order rather than of a codifying or historical dictionary. However, we have to reject once and for all the widespread opinion of Jonas Šliūpas that allegedly Stanevičius was also writing a grammar book; the grammar referred to by Šliūpas was written by Jurgis Pliateris, not by Stanevičius.

The standard language project fostered by Poška, his efforts to introduce it to others seem to have passed unnoticed by Stanevičius. We know, though, that Kajetonas Nezabitauskis who studied with Stanevičius and shared some of Stanevičius' ideas was under strong influence of Poška. Perhaps Stanevičius did not feel the need to join the project.

There is evidence of Stanevičius' cooperation or contacts with Poška's follower—Kaj. Nezabitauskis. It is known that Kaj. Nezabitauskis wrote a small grammar book (begun in 1818 and completed in 1823, but it did not survive) which was edited by Stanevičius: "This manuscript was reviewed in a few lines by Simonas Stanevičius who pointed out these main mistakes." However, we do not know what kind of revision it was. On the other hand, Kaj. Nezabitauskis was influenced by the intonational system of Stanevičius, and some traces of it are evident in his Primer. Some places in the book have accents. As the intonational system is identical with that of Stanevičius (the rising intonation marked with a grave, e.g., *pawardziù* 'pavardžiū' and the falling intonation marked with a circumflex, e.g., *skaitīty* 'skaitī'), there are two hypotheses that seem to be most plausible. First, Kaj. Nezabitauskis could have asked Stanevičius to edit certain places in his book; second, Nezabitauskis could be learning from Stanevičius his intonational system and marking accents according to the advice of his friend.

Kaj. Nezabitauskis and Stanevičius must have been on good terms, they must have been together in the hypothetical circle of Lowland students in Vilnius. It is very doubtful, though, that Daukantas was an active member. It sounds more realistic that Daukantas kept distance from it. Kaj. Nezabitauskis, who must have been one of the more active members of the circle, wrote to Daukantas several years later: "I regret so much that I had no pleasure of meeting you personally!" Had Daukantas been a member of the circle, Kaj. Nezabitauskis would have

known him well. It is important to note that earlier it was thought that a big portion of Daukantas' *The Works of Ancient Lithuanians and Lowlanders* (*Darbay senuju Lituwiu yr žemaycziu*, DaDSLŽ1822, pp. 65-601) was copied in Stanevičius' hand, but the handwriting appears to be not his and it has not been identified yet.

It should also be mentioned that Daukantas and Stanevičius had very different views about the formation of the standard language. Neither the language and orthography of Stanevičius would have suited Daukantas and be recognized by him as fit for usage, nor was the language and orthography of Daukantas acceptable to Stanevičius. In his language and orthography Kaj. Nezabitauskis also followed not Stanevičius, but Poška. There is no evidence to support the assumption that Lowland students in Vilnius could have settled their own common concept of standard language or orthography in the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

### 9. Jurgis Pliateris

Count Jurgis Pliateris (1810-1836) was a pupil of Stanevičius. He was one of those rare cases of the time whereby an aristocrat knew the Lowland dialect well and was involved in projecting the future of the Lithuanian language.

His only surviving original Lithuanian text is a scholarly bibliographic article "A Short Description of the London Edition of the Lithuanian Bible" ("Trumpa Žinia apie Tą Išdawima Lietuwizkos Biblijos Londone," 1831). This text demonstrates Pliateris' extreme efforts as a Lowlander to write in Highland dialect. Thus, he wrote Highl. *ė* or *ē* (*norēje* 'norėjo') instead of his native dialect [ie]; he did not use the letter *y* to represent the Lowland sound [e], *skaityti*; he chose to use Highl. diphthong *ie*, *dienos*; he substituted the polyphonic grapheme *ū* (*afztūniu* 'aštuonių') for his native Dūnininkai-Lowland monophthong [ū] or [ū<sup>v</sup>]; he preferred the diphthongs *ai* and *ei* (*jogey* 'jogei') instead of his native monophthongs; and he used the Highl. dat. sg. (*surinkimui* 'surinkimui'). The substantial impact of LMin texts on Pliateris' orthography is especially evident in the letters *ū*, *i*, *ē*, in the distribution of the letters *y* and *i* (*sulyginau* 'sulyginau') and also in the distribution of digraphs *ai*, *ei*

and *ay, ey* (*łaiŕzko* ‘łaiško’, but *łabay* ‘łabai’). This tendency appears in Pliateris’ texts most probably because of the direct and indirect influence of Liudvikas Rėza (1776-1840). We may presume that Pliateris closely followed the orthography of LMin, although he maintained certain orthographic features of LMaj as well. Such usage of the written language differs greatly from that of Stanevičius’ original texts.

Pliateris, like Stanevičius, copied other authors’ texts. The biggest surviving excerpts (copies) in Pliateris’ hand are Samuelis Bogušlavas Chylinskis’ Bible and a part of Daukantas’ manuscript DaDSLŽ1822. Pliateris recopied Chylinskis’ Bible very carefully, interfering with neither the vocabulary (*teywayniŕtes*—*teywayniŕtes*), the morphology (*jamuy*—*jamuy*, *ŕuŕkaytymop*—*suskaytymop*), the phonology (*parpołe*—*parpołe*, *ŕektes*—*ŕektes*), nor the orthography (*pirmaghi*—*pirmaghi*, *Evos* [Latin *v*]—*Evos*). In the orthography he not always maintained long *f* (*paŕtatyto*—*pastatyto*) and diacritics (*juńkie*—*junkie*, *kałbaŕ*—*kałbas*). This attests to his extreme respect for the original text, even if it was different and contained unusual letters.

Pliateris copied the end of Daukantas’ manuscript DaDSLŽ1822 pp. 603-885, however, according to substantially different principles. Initially on a certain number of pages of DaDSLŽ1822 he made efforts to use his native dialect (*dina* ‘diena’), although in the above mentioned article he used Highland *ie*. And on the following pages he decided to maintain Daukantas’ original orthography and phonology: *yi* [ei] (*dyna* ‘diena’). Pliateris also for some reason substituted Highland forms with *uo* (*anuodu*) for Daukantas’ original *ou*. This quite inconsistent method may attest to an immature concept of transcription as well as to a desire to convey some of the phonetic features of Daukantas’ work.

Pliateris’ ideas on a future standard could be summarized as follows. The written language of LMin is much better and more precise than that of LMaj, although the spoken language is intact and, therefore, valuable in both LMin and LMaj. Although he knew his native Lowland dialect better, he did not criticize the spoken language of LMin either. It is also possible that Pliateris tried to adjust the forms of his grammar (which did not survive) to the traditions of LMin. Pliateris explicitly suggested that every writer follow the Prussian (i.e., High-

land of LMin) dialect. He wrote about a book of LMin: “This is a book which is written in the Prussian dialect and in German print, [...] is edited very carefully, deserves every praise and is a model to be followed.” However, even in the presence of such strong arguments we cannot be sure that Pliateris did not additionally include certain dialectal features of LMaj in his grammar. All we can say is that there is no straightforward answer regarding the dialect selected by Pliateris for his grammar, although there is much direct evidence which would allow us to believe that it did take into consideration the tradition of LMin.

Only if we had more of Stanevičius’ as well as Pliateris’ lost texts of the later periods **about** the Lithuanian language or even **in** the Lithuanian language, could we probably reconstruct their attitudes toward a standard language more fully. Stanevičius could imagine, in most general terms, the formation of the standard language as a long-term process requiring scholarly background and serious research. We may also reconstruct Pliateris’ ideas, which were similar to a certain extent. However, in the absence of sufficient data, we have to abstain from final conclusions.

It is important to note the surprising ability of both Stanevičius and Pliateris to switch from one language code to another, that is, to adjust quite well to the Lithuanian texts written in different traditions and different dialects. If compared with other authors who not only defended their dialect but also offered it for common usage (Klementas, Poška) and did not try to adapt themselves to other language codes, this ability of Stanevičius and Pliateris attests to their philological sophistication. Until then nobody had succeeded in writing not only in the native dialect but also in several systems so well. For example, Pabrėža made attempts to adjust to the Highland dialect of Drangauskynė’s Lithuanian Catholics in LMin, but not with much success.

#### 10. The Texts of the Insurrection of 1831

If we divide texts of the Insurrection of 1831 against Russia into two groups: those written by the insurgents and those written by the suppressors, we shall discern the following tendencies. The texts of insurgents encompass many more Lowland dialectal features, cf. *The Hymn*

of the War in Telšiai County in 1831 (*Gieyšmi Žemaycziū Telsziū Pawieta Wayno Metu 1831, GŽ*), Ignatas Stanevičius' *A Public Proclamation to the Lowland Peasants (Atsilypymas pry Ukynynku Zemaycziū)*. The Russian government's public proclamations, however, though written by certain Lowlanders, were oriented much more to the Highland tradition, cf. Žadauskis' *A Short Explanation of Issues Concerning Those Who Deserted the Army (Trumpas Iszguldynimas prouu, apej Kliduiqcius isz Wayska)*, a translation of the text of Baron Piotr von der Pahlen; the only exception here is the Lithuanian translation of Simonas Mykolas Giedraitis' letter to the priests of the Lowland diocese. As the suppressors of the insurrection were more conservative and attempted to maintain the *status quo*, so an orientation to the old Middle Highland dialect tradition was quite natural for them. The insurgents, however, desired generally to change the situation and they were not afraid to challenge the old tradition of the written language. During the Insurrection they felt that texts should be written in spoken dialects as these were perceived as values very dear to people.

The insurgents of the previous Insurrection of 1794 had used both Lowland and Middle Highland dialects for their texts. In 1831, however, they preferred the Lowland varieties; it was the suppressors who chose the Middle Highland dialect (no texts written by suppressors in 1794 survived). This switch in proportion may attest to rising awareness of the native dialect on the part of the Lowland insurgents, many of whom were Lowland peasants.

The fact that the insurgents still comparatively freely chose to write in their dialect indicates that by 1831 there was not as yet a Lowland written tradition strong enough to have an impact on their public proclamations. Although there were projects of the standard language, they did not leave any significant traces, people did not feel their influence. This means that the entire first three decades of the nineteenth century up to the Insurrection of 1831 can be considered a period of the first manifestation of the need for a standard variety and attempts to select the dialect for a standard rather than a period of fulfilment of that need.

## 11. Conclusion

The monograph exposed certain tendencies in the ideas of a standard variety at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. We may state that there were at least several concurrent models projected for standard Lithuanian: 1) the most "aggressive" model was that of Poška and Kajetonas Nezabitauskis; 2) the most traditional and most influential was that of Gailevičius, Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis, Mogenis and other priests; 3) the weakest was that of Klementas; 4) the most utopian was that of Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis; 5) probably the most global but still not clearly elaborated were those of Simonas Stanevičius and Pliateris.

The *selection of a dialect*. The following intellectuals preferred the selection of a:

1. Lowland dialect: a) the translator of *Ziwatas*, b) the editor of *Kozonius* and *Sudas*, c) Klementas, d) Poška and Kajetonas Nezabitauskis, e) may be poet Silvestras Valiūnas, f) the author of the *X.D.K.P.S.* signed grammar, g) Ignatas Stanevičius, h) the author of *GŽ*, i) the translator of the public proclamation signed by Simonas Giedraitis, j) later Pabrėža and k) Čiulda after that;

2. Highland dialect: a) Gailevičius, Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis, Mogenis, b) Rucevičius, c) Antanas Savickis, d) Žadauskis, e) the translator of the proclamation by Baron Piotr von der Pahlen;

3. Combination of Highland and Lowland dialects: a) Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis, b) probably Butkevičius;

4. Highland dialect of LMin: probably Pliateris;

5. Both Lowland and Highland dialects of LMaj and Highland of LMin: probably Simonas Stanevičius (very problematic).

In terms of *intended territory* for a future standard the models were much more similar:

1. Most authors oriented to both Lowlanders and Highlanders of LMaj;

2. Only a) Pliateris' and, to a certain extent, b) Simonas Stanevičius' conception of the territory for a standard reached far beyond the boundaries of LMaj; analogous ideas of Butkevičius about the territory of LMin are possible although not provable yet;

3. Only Pabrėža and his pupils (Simonas Grosas, Juozapas Butavičius and others) intended to narrow the territory for their project of a standard Lowland language to conform to the boundaries of the Lowland dialect.

The idea that a *spoken standard* alongside the written standard was important:

1. Accepted by: a) Poška, b) later Pabrėža and c) Čiulda after that;
2. The need for a spoken standard absent or the idea not formulated by: a) Klementas, b) Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis, c) Valiūnas, d) the author of the *X.D.K.P.S.* signed grammar, e) perhaps Simonas Stanevičius, f) perhaps Pliateris.

The priority assigned to *common usage versus grammatical rules*:

1. Usage: a) Valiūnas, b) Pliateris (in addition to grammatical rules), c) the insurgents of the Insurrection of 1831, d) later Pabrėža;
2. Grammatical rules: a) Klementas, b) Gailevičius, Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis, c) Poška (in addition to common usage), d) Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis, e) the author of the *X.D.K.P.S.* signed grammar (in addition to common usage).

It is possible to reconstruct the predominant ideas about a standard among the Lowland intellectuals as follows: 1) the standard variety was to be based either on Lowland dialect or on the traditional written Middle Highland dialect; 2) the standard was to be codified for the territory of LMaj; 3) standard Lithuanian had to be a written variety; and 4) codification had to be based mostly on grammatical rules.

*Dictionaries.* The attitudes of the authors of dictionaries toward selection of dialect for a standard variety differed, and those dictionaries were intended for codification of different dialects:

1. Lowland: a) Poška's Polish-Latin-Lithuanian (up to the letter *K*, from this letter on—Polish-Lithuanian-Latin) dictionary; b) a list of words compiled by the author of the *X.D.K.P.S.* signed grammar;
2. A combination of Highland and Lowland: perhaps that of Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis' Lithuanian-Polish dictionary (lost);
3. A dictionary representing more than one dialect: perhaps that of Simonas Stanevičius' incomplete Lithuanian-Polish dictionary (lost).

*Grammar books.* Authors of grammar books also sought to codify different dialects:

1. Lowland: a) the author of the *X.D.K.P.S.* signed grammar, b) perhaps Kajetonas Nezabitauskis (his grammar was lost).
2. Highland: perhaps Mogenis (grammar did not survive).
3. A combination of Highland and Lowland: perhaps Butkevičius (grammar did not survive).
4. Highland of LMin: perhaps Pliateris (grammar did not survive).

The *geography* of codification of a standard variety. There was no close geographical concentration of models of a standard variety or their authors. Authors lived in different places, namely in: a) Telšiai (Klementas), b) Alsėdžiai and Varniai (Gailevičius, Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis, Mogenis), c) Bardžiai near Kaltinėnai (Poška), d) Veliuona (Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis), e) Vilnius (Kajetonas Nezabitauskis, Simonas Stanevičius, Pliateris), we can even speak about f) Karaliaučius (Königsberg) (Pliateris, Simonas Stanevičius), g) Raseiniai (Simonas Stanevičius, Pliateris, Klementas), e) Kretinga (Pabrėža). We can observe a tendency that the authors of the model of a standard variety containing the biggest number of Lowland features usually lived in Lowland (Klementas, Poška, Pabrėža). It is paradoxical that the most Highland model was also fostered in the very heart of the Lowland diocese—Alsėdžiai and Varniai.

*Dialectal orientation of the social strata.* At the beginning of the nineteenth century the tradition of Middle Highland ceased to be the only authority, first of all, for *laymen* (and noblemen) Klementas, Poška, Kajetonas Nezabitauskis, Stanevičius and Pliateris. They all wrote or made an effort to write in Lowland forms. At the same time *priests* usually did not want or could not cut their links with the earlier Highland texts: Gailevičius, Mogenis, other people of Bishop Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis' circle, Antanas Savickis, Rucevičius, even, to a certain extent, Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis. Of the priests, it was perhaps only the author of the *X.D.K.P.S.* signed grammar (if he was a priest indeed) and Pabrėža with his pupils who chose deliberately Lowland forms. In the following decades the situation would be different. Layman Daukantas would begin to replace Highland forms with Lowland ones even in his prayer

book, priest Kazimieras Prialgauskis would also publish a Lowland prayer book, while priests Valančius, Jeronimas Račkauskis and a number of others would reject some but not all Lowland elements. The Highland period of Bishop Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis would be followed by a period known for greater tolerance of Lowland religious texts.

The *relationship between Lowland subdialects*. Until the Insurrection of 1831 the scene was dominated by the ideas of Dūnininkai-Lowlanders: Poška, Kajetonas Nezabitauskis, Stanevičius (with some exceptions), perhaps Uvainis and Valiūnas. They were the apparent rivals of Bishop Giedraitis' circle promoting the Highland dialect. Dounininkai-Lowlanders—Pabrėža, Daukantas, Čiulda and others—were not as strong, they had not yet finally formed and published their ideas. Dounininkai-Lowlanders Kajetonas and Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis were both trying to desert their dialect: one of them favoured Dūnininkai, the other one tried to partially adjust to Highlanders. Klementas whose dialect was the same, suggested the Dounininkai written version, but failed to disseminate his ideas.

Ultimately, the texts of the insurgents of 1831 testify that, first, none of the competing models of a standard variety gained dominance and, second, that the Lowland dialect became very popular, although the insurgents did not assign priority to either Dūnininkai or Dounininkai subdialect. They simply returned from grammar rules to usage, while the opposite was true of the texts of the suppressors of the Insurrection.

### **List of articles which constitute the basis for the monograph *Ideas about Standard Lowland Lithuanian: Beginning of the Nineteenth Century*:**

1. "Juozas Čiulda ir jo gramatika," in *Lietuvių Atgimimo istorijos studijos*, t. 6: *Juozas Čiulda, Trumpi samprotavimai apie žemaičių kalbos gramatikos taisykles* ("Juozas Čiulda and His Grammar," in *Studies of the History of the Lithuanian Revival*, vol. 6: *Juozas Čiulda, Brief Comments of the Grammar Rules of the Lowland Language*), Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1993, pp. 7-56.

2. "Simono Daukanto požiūris į bendrinę kalbą," in *Lietuvių Atgimimo istorijos studijos*, t. 5: *Simonas Daukantas* ("The Attitude of Simonas Daukantas toward a Standard Variety," in *Studies of the History of the Lithuanian Revival*, vol. 5: *Simonas Daukantas*), Vilnius: Viltis, 1993, pp. 63-68.

3. "Kalba, istorija, žmogus – sintezės ilgesys," in *Metmenys* ("Language, History and Man—a Yearning for Synthesis," in *Metmenys*), Chicago, 1995, No. 68, pp. 122-132.

4. "La concezione della lingua Litwana comune per Simonas Daukantas," in *Res Balticae* (a cura di Pietro U. Dini & Nikolai Mikhailov) ("The Attitude of Simonas Daukantas to the Standard Lithuanian," in *Res Balticae*), Pisa: ECIG, 1995, pp. 165-175.

5. "Jurgio Ambraziejaus Pabrėžos žemaičių kalba," in *Lietuvių Atgimimo istorijos studijos*, t. 8: *Asmuo: tarp tautos ir valstybės* ("The Lowland Language of Jurgis Ambraziejus Pabrėža," in *Studies of the History of the Lithuanian Revival*, vol. 8: *An Individual: between the Nation and the State*), Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996, pp. 10-113.

6. "Kajetono Roko Nezabitauskio elementoriaus kalba ir rašyba," in *Kajetonas Nezabitauskis, Naujas mokslas skaitymo dėl mažų vaikų Žemaičių ir Lietuvos* ("The Language and Orthography of the Primer by Kajeto-

nas Rokas Nezabitauskis," in *Kajetonas Nezabitauskis, A New Reader for the Lowland and Lithuanian Children*), Vilnius: Alma littera, 1996, pp. 79-87.

7. "Kiprijono Nezabitausko žodyno autorius," in *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* ("The Author of the Dictionary of Kiprijonas Nezabitauskis," in *Problems of Lithuanian Linguistics*), Vilnius, 1996, t. 36, pp. 212-213.

8. "Dionizo Poškos bendrinės kalbos kategorijos," in *Baltistica* ("The Categories of Dionizas Poška's Standard Language," in *Baltistica*), Vilnius, 1996, vol. 31(2), pp. 249-259.

9. "Trys XIX a. bendrinės rašomosios kalbos modeliai: J. A. Pabrėža, J. Čiulda, S. Daukantas," in *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* ("Three Models of Standard Written Language of the Nineteenth Century: J. A. Pabrėža, J. Čiulda, S. Daukantas," in *Problems of Lithuanian Linguistics*), Vilnius, 1996, vol. 36, pp. 51-59.

10. "La concezione della lingua comune di Kajetonas Nezabitauskis: fra Poška e Stanevičius," in *Res Balticae* (a cura di Pietro U. Dini & Nikolai Mikhailov) ("The Attitude of Kajetonas Nezabitauskis to the Standard Variety: between Poška and Stanevičius," in *Res Balticae*), Pisa: ECIG, 1997, pp. 215-229.

11. "Antano Klemento kalba," in *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* ("The Language of Antanas Klementas," in *Problems of Lithuanian Linguistics*), Vilnius, 1997, vol. 37, pp. 225-246.

12. "Žemaičių mąstymo apie bendrinę kalbą istorijos metmenys," in *Metmenys* ("An Outline of the History of Lowland Ideas about a Standard Language," in *Metmenys*), Chicago, 1997, No. 72, pp. 125-148.

13. "Three Models of Standard Written Lithuanian Language in the 19th Century: J. A. Pabrėža, J. Čiulda, S. Daukantas," in *Lituanus*, Chicago, 1997, vol. 43(1), pp. 13-25.

14. "Bonaventūra Gailevičius – tikėtinas 1805 m. *Išguldymo afieros mišių šventų* ir 1806 m. *Lietuviškų evangelijų* autorius," in *Baltistica*, 5 priedas ("Bonaventūra Gailevičius—a Possible Author of *Iszguldymas Afieras Misiu Szwentu*, 1805 and *Lietuwiszkas Ewangelias*, 1806," in *Baltistica*, supplement 5), Vilnius, 1998, pp. 201-226.

Giedrius Subačius

ŽEMAIČIŲ BENDRINĖS KALBOS IDĖJOS:  
XIX AMŽIAUS PRADŽIA

Habilitacijai teikiamos humanitarinių mokslų srities monografijos  
SANTRAUKA

SL 655. 2,6 apsk. leidyb. 1.

Tiražas 60 egz. Užsakymas nr.

Išleido Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Antakalnio g. 6, 2055 Vilnius.

Spausdino UAB „Mokslo aidai“, A. Goštauto g. 12, 2600 Vilnius.