Giedrius Subačius

Simonas Daukantas's
Rīga Orthography (1827–1834)

Summary

Simonas Daukantas (1793–1864) was one of the most prominent activists of the Lithuanian national revival in the 19th century. He chose to write and publish his texts in Lithuanian, although at that time the dominant language of culture in Lithuania was Polish. Daukantas was the first historian ever to compose a history of Lithuania in Lithuanian. In addition to his volumes on Lithuanian history, Daukantas prepared several translations of histories of antiquity, dictionaries, popular pamphlets on husbandry, a primer, a grammar book, a prayer book, and an adventure book for children.

In the first half of the 19th century Lithuanian orthography was not yet standardized. It was quite open to innovations and new ideas. Daukantas was an enthusiastic innovator of spelling, and he never really stopped innovating. His orthographic variations were probably greater than those of any other author who ever wrote in Lithuanian.

1. RĪGA PERIOD MANUSCRIPTS. Daukantas's intellectual activity may be divided into four major periods according to the places where he resided: Vilnius (1814–1822), Rīga (~1823–1834), St. Petersburg (1834–1850), and the Lithuanian Lowlands (Western Lithuania; 1850–1864). This book covers the first period, the Vilnius period, only to a limited extent (there are no authentic texts of Daukantas from that time). It concentrates considerably, however, on the second period, the Rīga period. Ten manuscript texts of varying scope were identified as produced then; eight of them were written by Daukantas, and two were copies written by someone who has not been identified. Based on analysis of paper (watermarks), of orthography and of other extra-linguistic factors, the chronology of Daukantas's Rīga manuscripts was reconstructed as follows:

(1) about 1827—*Excerpts from Books* (*Išrašai iš knygų*; *IK*; 4 pp.);

(2) about 1827–1828—*Little Lithuanian Songs* (*Canticula Lithuanica*; *CL*; 20 pp.);

(3) about 1828 or somewhat later—*Excerpts from Books on Ethnography and History* (*Išrašai iš knygų apie etnografiją ir istoriją*; *IKEI*; 12 pp.);

(4) about 1828 or somewhat later—a *Copy of the Grammar by Daniel Klein* (*DaKlG*; 77 pp.);

(5) about 1831—"The Dictionary of Milke" ("Dikcionar. Milke. Patarles Letuwiszkas"; *DicM*; 0.5 pp.);

(6) about 1831—"On Duplicity of Nouns" ("De Duplicitate substantivi"; *DDS*; 0.5 pp.);

(7) about 1831–1834—*History of the Lithuanian Lowlands* (*Istorija žemaitiška*; *IŽ*; 553 ll. = 1106 pp.);

(8) about 1833—"On Latvian Captivity" ("O Niewoli Łotiskiey"; *ONŁ*; 10 pp.);

(9) about 1833–1834—*The Life of Rubinaitis Peliūzė* (*Rubinaičio Peliūzės gyvenimas*; *RPG*; 397 pp.);

(10) about 1833–1834 or later—*Lives of the Great Warriors* (*Gyvatos didžiųjų karvaidų*; *GDKr*; 228 pp.).

Daukantas's manuscripts of the Rīga period have been preserved in three libraries: (1) The Library of the Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore in Vilnius (№ 1, 3–9), (2) The National Martynas Mažvydas Library of Lithuania in Vilnius (№ 2), and (3) The Vilnius University Library (№ 10).

2. GRAPHEMES, DIGRAPHS, TURNING POINTS, AND SALIENT SEGMENTS. The graphemes and digraphs (trigraphs) that Daukantas introduced and/or modified in Rīga were especially diverse: <y, ę, e, i, ij, yi, iey, ęi, ei, iei, ë, ou, ow, ů, ų, û, ô, ù, aô, auo, ł, l, è, à, i̇, ą, å̧, å, on, ai, ay, ijs, ys>. One of the most conspicuous features of Daukantas's Rīga orthography was the introduction of multiple *diacritics*, with which he converted his rather plain Vilnius orthography into a highly diacritical one.

Most of Daukantas's diacritic graphemes marked the desirable dialectal sound more precisely than variants of other types; usually their relation to the non-diacritical letters was *diaprecise*: <à, ą, å̧, å> : <a>; <ę, è, ë> : <e>; <û, ų, ù> : <u>; <ô> : <o>; <ł> : <l>; <i̇> : <i>. A diacritical letter usually marked a phonetic or morphologic feature. Absence of the diacritic rendered a phonetic or a morphologic feature less specific. Thus, diacritical <à, ą, å̧, å> signified more concrete sounds [aˑ, e, a/ọ] and <ą> also the morphologic accusative singular case, while simple <a> remained more vague. Analogically <ę, è, ë> marked concrete vowels [ę, eˑ, ie/e]; <û, ų, ù> marked [u/uⁿ, ọ] plus the genitive plural and sometimes the accusative singular case; <ô>—[uo, oˑ]; <ł>—[l]; <i̇>—the accusative singular case. Simple <e, u, o, l, i> were of less precise phonetic or morphologic content.

Graphic representation		Vilnius	Rīga			1831–1833				1833–1834		~1834
		~1822	1827 *IK*	1827–1828 *CL*	1828 or later *IKEI*	*IŽ* 1 ss	*IŽ* 2 ss	*IŽ* 3 ss	*IŽ* 4 ss	*IŽ* 5 ss	*IŽ* 6 ss	*RPG, GDKr*
\<y\> [ę]	K	+	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	+			
	G	+	+	+		(+) end	(+) beginn.		(+)			
	\<-ty\> inf.	+	+	+								
\<ę\> [ę]	K					(+)						
	G			(+)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
\<e\> [ę]	K		(+)		(+)	(+)						
	G		(+)		(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	er, esz(-)	+	+	+								
	\<-te\> inf.				+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
\<i\> [i, ę]	K				(+)	+				+	+	+
	ir, isz(-)			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
\<yi\> [ęi]	*kuryi*	+	+				+	+	+			
	K	+	+	+		(+)	(+) beginn.	+	+			
	\<kyi-\>	+		+		(+)						
\<ęi\> [ęi]	K					(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	\<kęi-\>					(+)						
\<ei\> [ęi]	K			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	\<kei-\>					(+)	(+)					
\<ij\> [ęi]	*kurij*					+	(+) beginn.			+	+	+
	K					(+)	(+) beginn.			+	+	+
	\<kij-\>						(+)					
	\<ij\> 'jị'	+			+	+	+	+	+	(+)		
\<iey\> [ęi]	K					(+)						
	\<kiey-\>					(+)	(+)	+	+	+	+	+
\<iei\> [ęi] (\<kiei-\>)						(+)	(+) beginn.					
\<ou\> (\<ow\>) [ọu, uo]		+	+	+								
\<ů\> [ọu, uo]			(+)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
\<ų\> [uⁿ, uˑ] gen. pl.						(+)	(+) beginn.					
\<û\> [uⁿ, uˑ] gen. pl.					(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
\<ô\> [uo, o]					(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
\<-ù\> [ọ]					(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
\<ll, tt, ss, rr, pp, kk, nn\>					+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
\<-awo\> (\<-awa\>)		+	+	+								
\<-aô\>						+	+					
\<-auo\>					+ 1×			+	+	+	+	+
\<ł\> [l]		+	+	+						(+)	+	+
\<l\> [l]					+	+	+	+	+	(+)		
\<è\> [eˑ] adv.						(+) end	(+)	(+)	(+)	+	+	
\<ɨ\> 'jị'; acc. sg.										(+)	+	+
\<ą\> acc. sg.										+	+	
\<å\> [eˑ, e]						(+)	(+)	(+)		(+)	(+)	(+)

Graphic representation	Vilnius	Rīga									~1834
	~1822	1827 *IK*	1827–1828 *CL*	1828 or later *IKEI*	1831–1833				1833–1834		*RPG, GDKr*
					IŽ 1 ss	*IŽ* 2 ss	*IŽ* 3 ss	*IŽ* 4 ss	*IŽ* 5 ss	*IŽ* 6 ss	
<å> [ǫ] (<ån>)					(+)						
<on> [ǫn]	+	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	+	+	+	+
<-ai> [aˑ, ai] *kursai*	+				+	+	(+)		+		
<-ay> [aˑ, ai] *kursay*				+ 1×			(+)	+		+	+
<-ay> [aˑ, ai] nom. pl. m.										+	+
<-a, -e> [aˑ, ai, eˑ, ei] nom. pl. m.	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
<-ijs> [is, iˑs]										(+)	(+)
<-ys> [is, iˑs]											(+)

Table 1. Tendencies of graphic variation in the Rīga period; a plus in parentheses (+) means not unique parallel or less often variant.

The general direction of Daukantas's orthographic innovation was toward a certain merger of the way Lithuanians traditionally spelled in Lithuania (then part of the Russian Empire) with the way Lithuanians spelled in East Prussia. At the time, concepts of nationhood were often based on the commonality of language, and in the case of Daukantas they were expressed in attempts to achieve a convergence of at least two Lithuanian orthographic traditions.

Daukantas's *History of the Lithuanian Lowlands* (*IŽ*) was an especially lengthy and multi-faceted book. The orthographic variation in this manuscript was extraordinary. I have identified 56 deliberate orthographic modifications that Daukantas made throughout the manuscript. They were concentrated mostly in five different places of *IŽ*, marking five major orthographic *turning points,* i.e. five auto-spelling reforms within a single manuscript:

(1) ll. 30v–47r;
(2) ll. 249v–256v;
(3) l. 319r;
(4) ll. 419r–422v;
(5) l. 547r.

These major turning points divide *IŽ* into six *salient segments* (ss) of different orthography and length:

(1) about 30 leaves (1r–30v; transition 30v–47r);
(2) about 202 leaves (47r–249v; transition 249v–256v);
(3) about 63 leaves (256v–319r);
(4) about 100 leaves (319r–419r; transition 419r–422v);
(5) about 125 leaves (422v–547r);
(6) about 6 leaves (547r–553r).

The first salient segment can be characterized by the unique letters <-ų> and <å> that almost entirely disappeared in the segments that

followed. In the third segment, the spellings *kuryi* 'which, what' (plural masculine ending); <kiey-> [k'ei]; *sauo* 'own'; <-ay> (*kursay* 'which one' [singular masculine]) appeared or began to dominate. In the fifth ss, the letter <y> was abandoned in the five positions where it had been used before, and the innovations of both *i̇* 'him', <-i̇> (accusative singular), and <ł> (non-palatal position) were introduced. In the sixth ss, the endings <-ą> (accusative singular) and <-ijs> (in some endings) were newly introduced; and the graphemes <i̇> (accusative singular), <ł> (non-palatal position), <-è> (adv. ending), and <-û> (genitive plural ending) were reinforced.

3. VARIANTS AND VARIATION. During the preceding Vilnius period, Daukantas may have been more consistent in his graphemic choices, but in Rīga he unmade his orthographic system and initiated a new way of spelling.

The sources of Daukantas's orthographic variants were diverse. For instance, Daukantas chose the grapheme <i> for his dialectal [ę] sound position from Highland Lithuanian texts. He used the letter <y> after the Lowland Lithuanian tradition of the time, and he adjusted the diacritical <ę> to his own Lowland Lithuanian pronunciation. The letter <e> reflected an approximate pronunciation. The letter <i> was preferred only in the root position (*diapositional* relation). In the *IK* and *CL* manuscripts, the variants <y> and <e> for the same [ę] sound were also partly diapositional (<y> used in stems and endings; <e> in word-initial position), but this distinction disappeared from the *IKEI* manuscript. Variants <i> and <e, ę, y> should be considered *diatopic*, <i, e> and <y, ę>—*diaprecise*, <e, y> and <ę, i>—*diaphasic*.

In *IŻ*, the Lowland Lithuanian diphthong [ęi] (or its Highland equivalent [ie]) was rendered in seven main digraphs and trigraphs: <ei, ęi, ie, iei, iey, ij, yi>, four of which were dominant: <ei, ęi, ij, yi>. The variant <yi> must have been taken from the draft version of the manuscript (an old tradition of Lowland Lithuanian texts); <ei> was introduced in 1828 or somewhat later in *IKEI* (an assimilation with another diphthong [ei]); <ij> appeared only in *IŻ* (it was an innovation related to the extended use of <j> in some Lowland Lithuanian texts and in Polish orthography); <ęi> was also Daukantas's innovation after he reinterpreted the meaning of the East Prussian Lithuanian grapheme <ę> (a transformed cultural influence).

In *IŻ*, there were four major variational types of marking the diphthong [ęi] in roots (in word-medial position).

(1) Daukantas consistently represented [ęi] as <ei> in certain words (in their roots and in their derivatives): *deina* 'a day' (the standard Lithuanian equivalent is *diena*), *deiws* 'God' (the standard is *Dievas*), *weita* 'place, location' (the standard is *vieta*).

(2) The words of the second variational group were spelled mostly with the digraph <ei>, and often with the diacritical variant <ęi> as well: *apreite* ~ aprietė '(they) bent (it) down' : *apręista* ~ apriesta '(one that) is bent down (feminine)'; *greite* ~ grieti 'to plunder; to spoil' : *gręite*.

(3) The third type of variation was also characterized by the same variants <ei> and <ęi> (present throughout the entire *IŽ* as well), but along with them, by the significant "additional" variants <yi> and <ij>. The latter two, however, were concentrated only in specific areas (segments) within the manuscript: both <yi> and <ij> on ll. 31r–43r (the end of the first ss), just <yi> on ll. 319r–421r (the fourth ss), and only <ij> on ll. 421v–553r (the fifth and sixth ss): *leipe* ~ liepė '(he, she) ordered, directed': *lęipe* : *lyipe* : *lijpe*; *teikte* ~ tiekti 'to render; to distribute' : *tęikies* ~ tiekės(i) '(he, she) rendered; distributed' : *tyikę* : *tijkies*. In this third group, many roots begin with *a long grapheme* (containing a long *ascender* or *descender*). It was quite common in some sections of the manuscript (especially in the second half of *IŽ*, the third through the sixth ss) to correlate the long initial graphemes <l-, t-, p-> with the digraphs <yi> and <ij> (each of them also contained a letter with a long descender). Daukantas must have correlated the shapes of the graphemes. He chose some letters just because of their graphic form. He was ornamenting his manuscript orthographically. Aesthetic composition of the signs mattered in this case.

(4) The fourth type of spelling variation representing the diphthong [ęi] was reconstructed in position after the palatal consonant [k'] (after the grapheme <k->) in such words as *kiek* 'how many, how much', *kiekvienas* 'everybody', *kiemas* 'yard', *skiesti* 'to separate, to detach' (here in standard spelling). In the first half of the *IŽ* manuscript, Daukantas wrote many variants interchangeably (<kei-, kyi-, kie-, kiei-, kiey->), but from l. 256v on he switched to one single spelling <kiey->: *kieyk*, *kieykweinas*, *kieymû*, *skieysteis*. He was influenced by the spelling of the name of the Grand Duke of Lithuania *Kieyſtutus* ~ Kęstutis in the old history of Lithuania by Alberto Wiivk Koialowicz. This was Daukantas's firm decision, and he maintained it not only to the end of *IŽ*, but in many of his later texts.

Relations between the four dominant spelling variants of the diphthong [ęi] in word-medial position (in the root) were: (1) *diachronic* <yi> : <ei> : <ęi, ij> (one followed approximately after another); (2) *diaphasic* <yi> : <ei, ęi, ij> (at different periods in Daukantas's life); (3) *diaprecise* <ei, ij> : <ęi, yi> (different precision of phonetic representation); (4) *aesthetic* <ei, ęi> : <yi, ij> (the length of the graphemes within digraphs matched the length of preceding consonants—with long ascenders and descenders, such as in <l>, <t>, and <p>).

In the *IK* manuscript, the diphthong [ęi] was rendered as <-yi> in the nominative plural endings of pronouns *kurie* 'which', *tie* 'those'. In *IŽ*, it was written in two different ways in three salient segments: the variant <-ij> dominated in the first ss and in the beginning of the second ss (*kurij, tij*), <-yi> was used from the second quarter of the second ss till the fifth ss (*kuryi, tyi*), and then again <-ij> in the fifth to the sixth ss. At the end of *IŽ*, and in *ONŁ*, *RPG*, and *GDKr* Daukantas wrote <-ij>.

Two other diphthongs, [ai, ei], were also marked differently in word-medial and word-final positions. In roots, Daukantas preferred letter <i>—<ai, ei> (*laikidamis* ~ laikydami '(those) that kept at'; *apleidau* '(I have) abandoned'. In endings, the spellings fluctuated: even if the conjunction *bei* 'and' was spelled consistently with <-y> (*bey*), the nominative singular masculine of the word *kursai* 'which one' (and similar ones) was rendered inconsistently—both with <-i> and <-y> (*kursai* and *kursay*). By the end of the *IŽ* manuscript, in the sixth ss, Daukantas also introduced novelties in nominative plural masculine endings (especially in nouns, adjectives, and participles): instead of his Lowland Lithuanian monophthongs he introduced the Highland diphthongs, and he marked them with the letter <-y> (*jaway* ~ javai 'grain crops'; *apsiejemay* ~ apsiėjimai 'habits').

In *IŽ*, Daukantas's spelling rules were often of a low degree of generalization (*lexical-phonetic*). Besides, Daukantas not only created new rules, but he also repeatedly modified them. The level of orthographic variation in the *IŽ* manuscript is extremely high. At this stage of the development of Lithuanian spellings, such extensive variation comes as a surprise, as an exception to the general trends of the time.

In a sense, the orthography of Daukantas contained in *IŽ* was partially experimental. It was a loose attempt to merge different orthographic trends, an unpaved path that Daukantas undertook. Daukantas apparently accepted the experimentation and ornamentation which resulted in such a variety in spellings.

4. PAPER, WATERMARKS, AND CHRONOLOGY. The first half of the *IK* manuscript was written on paper containing a watermark "Rall" and its variant "Rall D5" (pp. 1–38). It was manufactured in a paper mill of Alexander F. Rall, a banker and baron in Yekaterinhoff (St. Petersburg). By 1834, this paper mill was closed. Daukantas stayed in Rīga till the summer of that year, and therefore Rall's paper is associated with Daukantas's Rīga period. *IK* Lithuanian inscriptions were inserted approximately in 1827 (maybe in 1828).

The paper of the *CL* manuscript also has the same or similar watermarks: "Rall" and "Rall D5" (maybe D3). Comparison of the paper of *CL* and *IK* lets us infer that both manuscripts were composed at about the same time (*IK* was at least started at a very similar time to that of *CL*), although some minute orthographic differences allow us to presume that *IK* (1827) preceded *CL* (1827–1828).

The following sheets of the *IK* manuscript contain different watermarks of the same baron Rall ("A. F. R." [Alexander F. Rall] with a "Pro Patria" image): p. 39–40, 65–66. This "A. F. R." *IK* paper must have been used later than the "Rall" paper, but it was still acquired in Rīga. The fact that the *IK* manuscript also contains inscriptions of 1836 from approximately p. 27 on means that Daukantas took his partially unfinished *IK* manuscript to St. Petersburg to continue compiling it.

Daukantas used a third kind of Rall's paper at the end of his manuscript *Margumynai* (*Ma*; pp. 225–240) to write a small text—*ONŁ* (pp. 231–238). The watermark contained the letters "AFRALL" (on pp. 231–232, on the right side of the folded sheet) and a lion in a circle holding a sword in his paw and the inscription "Pro Patria" at the bottom (on pp. 229–230, on the left side of the sheet); it also contained the letters "AFRALL M" (with the letter "M", on pp. 227–228; "Pro Patria" was very blurry on the right side of the folded sheet on pp. 233–234). This "AFRALL" type of paper must also have been produced during Daukantas's stay in Rīga. Orthographic analysis of *ONŁ* revealed that this manuscript was approximately synchronic with the fifth ss of *IZ*, and so it may have been composed at about the first half of 1833 or a bit later.

Another manuscript, *IKEI*, contained mostly quotations from books that had been printed in 1828 or before. The first sheet of *IKEI* (ll. 1r–2v) was written on paper produced by the family of Khlyustyns in Troitskaya village in 1828: the watermarks were "[М У] С Т" and "[18]28" with the "Pro Patria" type motive. This means that *IKEI* must have been compiled in 1828 or a bit later. *IKEI* orthography was also somewhat newer of that of *IK* (1827) and *CL* (1827–1828).

After ll. 1r–2v, a significant part of *IKEI* paper lacked watermarks (ll. 4r–28r, up to the end of the manuscript), but its text must also have been compiled in 1828 or somewhat later. Another manuscript—a copy of Daniel Klein's grammar *DaKlG*—was written in Daukantas's hand on the same sort of paper with no watermarks. Accordingly, it may be assumed that this paper was acquired at the same time and that the manuscript *DaKlG* was also written in about 1828 (or slightly later).

Ma also contains a short text—*DicM* (on p. 159). Pp. 159–162 were written on another kind of paper, which was produced, however, by the same Khlyustyns family. They contained very ornamented watermark letters "Г Г. Х" (Господ Хлюстиныхъ) (pp. 161–162) and the year "1831 г." (pp. 159–160). This confirms that *DicM* was not written before 1831.

The paper of *IZ* lacks watermarks, but the one additionally glued-in small sheet of paper on page 237v also has the analogous watermark "Г Г. Х" (the part with the year indication, however, was cut of). The only identifiable difference is the distance of the dot after the letter "Г." and the following letter "Х": these elements in *IZ* were positioned at about 5 mm more to the right than those in *Ma*. But the filigrees must have been made by the same master and at a similar time. Some parts of the filigrees could even have been the same. Most probably Daukantas obtained those papers at the same time. He could have used them both for the additional small sheet of paper in *IZ* at l. 237v and for his *Ma* at p. 159–162. Since the attachment to the *IZ* at l. 237v was made during the second ss (near the beginning of the manuscript), the manuscript *IZ* itself must be dated no earlier than 1831. Such a date may be confirmed by analogous spellings — some orthographic features addressed

in *DicM* by Daukantas (e.g. genitive singular <-ų>) were synchronic only with the beginning of *IŽ* (the first ss and the beginning of the second ss).

In 1831 an insurrection against the Russian Empire raged in Lithuania. Daukantas was then living in Rīga, at a distance from the insurrection. We may presume with certainty that the closure of Vilnius University after the failure of the insurrection was one of the impulses that drove Daukantas to compile a voluminous history of Lithuania (*IŽ*). In Lithuania, in the period after the insurrection, huge manuscripts were also compiled by Jurgis Ambraziejus Pabrėža, Simonas Grosas, and Juozapas Butavičius. Like many former alumnae and professors of Vilnius University, they rushed to write. Daukantas was a conscientious employee of the empire, but he simultaneously compiled a radical history of Lithuania (*IŽ*), which at least indirectly questioned the legitimacy of the empire in Lithuania's territory.

Both the *RPG* and *GDKr* manuscripts were written on paper with an unidentified watermark—"C. K.". Certain peculiarities of orthography allow us to assume that at approximately the time of the *IŽ* sixth ss Daukantas may have already completed about seven eighths (88%) of his *RPG* text (351 pages of 397), and about one fifth (19%) of *GDKr* (44 pages of 228). The original of *RPG* could have been initiated at the time of the *IŽ* fifth ss (if not slightly earlier), although the most obvious correlation is with the sixth ss. The most obvious orthographic match of *GDKr* was also with the sixth ss (although correlation with the fifth ss was also present). The conclusion of *GDKr*, however, must have been written after the completion of *IŽ* and *RPG*. An unknown copier must have rewritten *RPG* and *GDKr* in a different order from the drafts of the author, Daukantas: first *GDKr*, and then *RPG*.

From about the middle of *IŽ* (the third to the fifth ss), Daukantas began penning more hastily, in bigger letters, in a more boring longhand. His handwriting lost some of its gracefulness. One of the reasons for this may have been the shift of Daukantas's attention to *RPG* and *GDKr*, works which were newly planned and being compiled partly at the same time.

5. EDITING. Daukantas edited his own manuscripts, especially the big ones (*IŽ*, *RPG*, and *GDKr*). Particular changes in orthography allow us to identify different stages of editing.

In *IŽ*, corrections may be divided into two big groups: *early* and *late* (corrections made before the copy of *IŽ* was made by Juozapas Butavičius [*Bt*] in 1835 and corrections made afterwards). The early corrections in their turn may be divided into insertions on separate small sheets of paper, corrections in pencil and corrections in ink.

Daukantas added (glued in) 32 small sheets of paper with additional texts to *IŽ* (only 30 have survived). All of them were inserted before Butavičius rewrote the manuscript. Most of the corrections in pencil were spread throughout the first half of the manuscript, from the beginning to l. 259r (the first to the second ss), and also on l. 318v (at the very end of the third ss).

Daukantas corrected in pencil soon after he composed the main text. It is possible that after Daukantas wrote certain segments, he took a pencil and marked his changes (only a few corrections in pencil, mostly on ll. 25r–35r, were made later, and were synchronic with the end of *IŽ*—the sixth ss). Only a few corrections in ink (but not immediate corrections) were made before *Bt*. They can be identified by the different color of ink and by their presence in *Bt* (on ll. 2r–3v, 25r–26v, 38r, 43r, 46r, 77r, 179r, 227r, 281v, 412r). Most of these early corrections in ink must have been inserted at the time Daukantas composed the second half of the *IŽ* manuscript, the third to the sixth ss.

Overall, these *early IŽ* corrections by the author (before *Bt*) may be divided into two stages. First, during the composition of the first to the third ss Daukantas glued in small sheets of paper (7), (12)–(27), and simultaneously made corrections *in pencil* on the first to the second ss and at the very end of the third ss. Secondly, during following compilation of the fourth to the sixth ss, Daukantas inserted other small sheets of paper (29)–(30), (11), (31), (1)–(6), (8)–(10), (28), (32), made some other insertions *in pencil* at the end of the first ss and in some places in the second ss, began to correct *in ink* the first ss, the beginning of the second ss and the very end of the fourth ss. Additional small sheets of paper were glued in both in early and late stages, but pencil was used mostly in the early stage, and ink only in the late stage. Daukantas cared more about the appearance of his *IŽ* manuscript during the initial periods of writing and correcting. He wrote the first to the second ss with grace and inspiration. Corrections *in ink* appeared only during the composition of the last segments of the work, when Daukantas began writing more hastily, when his attention to the aesthetics of the manuscript diminished somewhat.

Daukantas inserted *late* corrections into *IŽ* after Butavičius rewrote it (*Bt*). Those corrections were made almost exclusively *in ink*. We may tentatively divide them in ten groups. The first and the second group (ll. 1r–1v, 47v, 49r–53v) appeared during Daukantas's St. Petersburg period (the first group possibly in 1842–1845, and the second in about 1846). In these two groups Daukantas's prime intention was to modify orthography. The remaining groups three to ten (ll. 56v–519r) appeared later, probably in 1850s, after Daukantas returned to the Lithuanian Lowlands. The goal of the latter corrections was different: to edit thoughts and to correct mistakes.

Overall, nine stages of Daukantas's editing were identified in *IŽ*:

(1) 1831–1833 (before *Bt*); *small sheets of paper* were glued in during the composition of the first through the third ss: (7), (12)–(27);

(2) 1831–1833 (before *Bt*); corrections were made at about the same time *in pencil*, and were also inserted during the compilation of the first through the second ss and at the very end of the third ss;

(3) 1833–1834 (before *Bt*); *small sheets of paper* were glued in during the fourth through the sixth ss: (29)–(30), (11), (31), (1)–(6), (8)–(10), (28), (32);

(4) 1833–1834 (before *Bt*); corrections *in pencil* were made some-what later or almost simultaneously with the fifth through the sixth ss, es-pecially at the end of the first ss, in the beginning of the second ss, and in the glued-in small sheet of paper (30);

(5) 1833–1834 (before *Bt*); corrections *in ink* were made at about the same time as the fifth through the sixth ss, were scattered in the first ss, the second ss and the end of the fourth ss;

(6) maybe 1842–1845 (after *Bt*); corrections *in ink* (group one at the beginning of the first ss);

(7) maybe about 1846 (after *Bt*); corrections *in ink* (group two at the beginning of the second ss);

(8) in 1850s (after *Bt*); corrections *in ink* (group three in the first half of the second ss; earlier than group four);

(9) in 1850s (after *Bt*); corrections *in ink* (groups four to ten from the second half of the second ss to the fifth ss inclusively; later than group three).

These nine stages of editing *IŽ* demonstrate the value of this manu-script to Daukantas. He had it with him most of the time, and he kept it in St. Petersburg and later in the Lithuanian Lowlands. The manuscript had a long life. Daukantas used it to prepare other texts.

Daukantas also corrected the *RPG* and *GDKr* manuscripts. Three stages in Daukantas's hand may be identified in *RPG*:

(1) Soon after the *RPG* text was copied, Daukantas read the entire copy and edited it *in ink*; the orthographic features of his corrections matched those of the main text (only the diacritical mark < ˆ > above the letter <î> in the first quarter of the manuscript appears to have been added somewhat later; the mark < ˆ > may have been inserted during Daukantas's additional reading).

(2) Daukantas must have made the second stage of corrections (also *in ink*) after his return to the Lithuanian Lowlands in 1850, since it contained graphemes that Daukantas introduced only in 1838, 1842, 1845–1846, and 1850s.

(3) The third stage was quite sparse. It was probably simultaneous with the second one, but was executed only *in pencil*.

The corrections of the second and the third stages may have been in-serted at the time Daukantas worked on a new version of the book. It seems plausible to assume that Daukantas reread *RPG* at least four times.

Daukantas's corrections in *GDKr* were comparatively scarce, and they are reminiscent of the first stage of the *RPG* corrections. *GDKr* corrections must have been inserted soon after the text was copied by the scribe.

6. INFLUENCE OF THE LITHUANIAN TEXTS OF EAST PRUSSIA. The German and Latvian linguistic context of Rīga must have influenced Daukantas's deci-sion to abandon his older Vilnius orthography (as used in *IK* and *CL*). He

also may have been encouraged by contemporary discussions about the inclusion of Lithuanian language instruction into the curriculum of Vilnius University. Nevertheless, the most important influence for Daukantas's orthographic transformations must have been the poem *Metai* (*The Seasons*) by Kristijonas Donelaitis, published by Liudvikas Rėza in 1818 in East Prussia. First, *Metai* was hugely authoritative for Daukantas—he esteemed no other Lithuanian text more than this poem. Secondly, most of the orthographic peculiarities that Daukantas began to employ in Rīga were present in this edition of *Metai*.

It is especially plausible to assume that Daukantas took the example of participles from *Metai*, cf. the past active nominative plural masculine: *truſinėję̇* ~ trusinėję '(they have) worked a little'; *nukapóję̇* ~ nukapoję '(they have) cut off', and under their influence decided to introduce the grapheme <-ę̇> in the unprecedented position of the past tense 3 person ending (in his Lowland dialect pronounced as [ę̇]): *apturieję̇* ~ apturėjo 'obtained'; *giwoię̇* ~ gyvojo 'lived'. Because of *Metai*, Daukantas may have also marked: (a) the letter <u> with the grave < ` > accent (<ù>) to signify his dialectal vowel [ọ] (instrumental singular *teis Pinskù* ~ ties Pinsku 'at Pinsk'); (b) the letter <o> with the < ˆ > circumflex (<ô>) in the position of the Lowland diphthong [uo] (Highland long [oˑ]) (*uôs* ~ vos 'slightly'). Choice of the grapheme <ô> may have been reinforced by Daniel Klein's grammar book of 1653.

Daukantas was familiar with other East Prussian Lithuanian texts as well. For instance, in *DicM* he quoted the Lithuanian–German dictionary of Kristijonas Milkus (1800), which inspired Daukantas's thoughts about the strategy of the graphemes <ù>, <ų>, and <u>, and about partial avoidance of the letter <w> (and the sound [v]). Such strategy is discernible in *IƵ*: <ų> genitive plural in the beginning of *IƵ*; [v] avoidance both in the *IƵ* first to second ss (*saô* 'his, hers, one's...') and in the *IƵ* third to sixth ss, *ONŁ*, *RPG*, and *GDKr* (*sauo* 'his, hers, one's...').

There must have been more sources from East Prussia (other publications by Rėza, religious texts, etc.) that affected Daukantas's orthographic decisions, the direct influence of which, however, is impossible to determine. We may assume that Daukantas imitated certain orthographic features common to most publications in East Prussia at the time, such as rejection of <ł> (*lonkite* ~ lankyti 'to attend'), also the introduction of <ŭ> (*bucziŭte* ~ bučiuoti 'to kiss'), genitive plural <-û> (*Letuiû* ~ lietuvių '[of] Lithuanians'), doublets of consonant graphemes (*kittas* ~ kitas '[an]other'), and partial <-ų> in accusative singular (*karalų* ~ karalių 'king [object]').

In 1827–1828 Daukantas began to avoid the spelling habits he had developed in Vilnius, and he consciously introduced his own version of a modified Lithuanian orthography, partly adapted from East Prussian texts (Donelaitis, Rėza, Klein, and Milkus). This was a new *Rīga orthography* by Daukantas which he adopted for his own use in his manuscripts.

Daukantas's Rīga orthography was one of the very first attempts in the second quarter of the 19th century to create a way of bringing closer (or of practically merging) the traditions of writing in Lithuania and East Prussia.

Still, it was primarily the *graphic* elements from East Prussian orthography that Daukantas appropriated and adapted. Instead of Highland Lithuanian phonetics, however, Daukantas attempted to codify his own Lowland Lithuanian sounds. He borrowed the signs, but not their content. He modified graphics, but still attempted to preserve his dialect.

7. THE INFLUENCE OF LITHUANIAN TEXTS IN LITHUANIA. Daukantas's orthography was also influenced by written texts in Lithuania. Daukantas noted the letter <-ų> and the letter <å> in Mikalojus Daukša's sermons (1599), even though the latter letter was actually absent from that book. He tried these letters out in his *IŽ*, especially in the first ss and the beginning of the second ss.

Jurgis Plateris's orthography also must have influenced certain orthographic decisions of Daukantas. For instance, after their possible meeting(s) in the first half of 1833 in Rīga, Daukantas may have decided to return to the diacritical grapheme <ł>. Other common features of Daukantas's and Plateris's spellings were the avoidance of the diacritical letters <ć, ś>, and the general preference for the particulars of East Prussian orthography. In the later works of the St. Petersburg period Daukantas was somewhat influenced by Jurgis Ambraziejus Pabrėža's manuscripts (graphemic vowel doublets <aa, ee>, and diacritical <ó> to denote Lowland dialectal [ọ]).

Generally, Daukantas was prone to influences, but only to a limited extent.

8. POLITICS OF LANGUAGE. Daukantas was concerned about the condition of the Lithuanian language, about its status in society. In his mind, *the Lithuanian language demonstrated the power of the nation*, and language was a real instrument of national politics. When he had been in Vilnius, he had viewed the Lithuanian language as being embellished in the past, but in Rīga his attitude changed. Instead of stressing its former embellishment, he declared that the language of his time was polluted. This was a tactical change in Daukantas's plans for the status of the language. Instead of an orientation towards beauty and perfection, he launched a language purification campaign. Daukantas claimed that the Poles had unjustly split the formerly whole and undivided Lithuanian language into two branches: Prussian Lithuanian and the Lithuanian of Lithuania. He meant that the Poles had introduced their orthography into Lithuanian written texts and had separated the tradition of writing in Lithuania from the tradition of writing in Prussia. Thus, in Daukantas's eyes, not only Poles, but also Polish spellings were to blame. Daukantas believed that the less corrupted, the better branch of the Lithuanian written language was in East Prussia.

Through modification of orthography by partial adherence to the written texts of East Prussia, Daukantas attempted to rectify the influence of Polish spellings and to reconnect what had been divided—the Lithuanian language of East Prussia and that of Lithuania.

Daukantas did not succeed very well in adjusting his language corpus-planning to these status-planning ideas. In some segments of *IŽ* and in some of the particulars of his new Rīga orthography Daukantas indeed tried to distance himself from Polish orthographic prototypes (he avoided <y> [ę], <yi> [ęi], <ł> [l]), and to orient his orthography toward the East Prussian texts (<ę>, <ů>, <û>, <ô>, <ù>, <i>, <l> [l], double consonant letters). Nevertheless, even when following and reinterpreting the East Prussian spelling tradition, Daukantas acknowledged that the Lithuanian language had not yet been put to script, and that this would happen only in the future. Daukantas felt that he was laying the foundation (orthography) for Lithuanian writing. Daukantas's efforts, however, were accompanied by colossal inconsistencies: his orthography was satiated with parallel diversity. Such orthography was an incomplete attempt to find a fitting graphic expression.

During his long creative life, Daukantas modified his orthography often, almost continuously, but he never changed his language ideology. His chosen ideology was more important to him than casual orthography. Daukantas considered it most important to spread the message that a history of Lithuania, the *longest* secular work ever written in Lithuanian, did in fact exist, had been completed, and it was full of the Lithuanian language (his *IŽ*). A convenient and uniform orthography, however, was not a part of that message—potential learned foreign readers would not be able to grasp the nuances of the orthography anyway.

Daukantas put his heart into making the *IŽ* manuscript magnificent visually: it was bound in beautiful leather over cardboard, with a huge folio of 1106 pages, on quality paper, initially prepared very meticulously, often in gracious longhand, with very cautious corrections, often only in pencil. Daukantas sought to make an extraordinary visual impact; he was an aesthete of the material qualities of his work. Daukantas's priority was the *materiality* of his manuscript, not the orthography.

Daukantas's *IŽ* manuscript contains many demonstrative peculiarities. In a sense, it was a piece of propaganda of Lithuanian language power. The exterior is what came into focus most clearly, while concrete matters of dialect or spelling remained in the shadows. His priority was to advertise ideas, not to establish a convenient orthography. Analogous demonstrative goals were also traceable in Daukantas's later three volume manuscript of the *Great Polish–Lithuanian Dictionary* (1852–1856, 1858). Daukantas coined about 3,800 neologisms, but some of them were occasional mechanical derivatives, and they hardly had the potential for broader dissemination. The most important message was to show that every Polish word had a Lithuanian equivalent.

Many of Daukantas's contemporaries (Jurgis Ambraziejus Pabrėža, Motiejus Valančius, Kajetonas Nezabitauskis, and Antanas Baranauskas) found his language and orthography hard to accept. Nevertheless, in the 1880s the well-known newspaper *Aušra* (Dawn) made Daukantas a symbol of the national revival specifically because of his use of the Lithuanian language. The generations that followed ignored Daukantas's spellings; they printed his works in their own reworked orthography. Daukantas's project of a nation whose language was the Lithuanian language was achieved, but his specific model for the written language was rejected.

Daukantas tried to create an image of a strong nation through the *quantity* of his texts; he lacked the time, however, for orthographic *quality*.