

Terje MATHIASSEN

Oslo University

SOME ASPECTS OF THE HISTORY OF LITHUANIAN AND LATVIAN GRAMMATICAL TERMINOLOGY

First of all, I should like to insert a short digression before I start writing about my topic *sensu stricto*.

My first visit in Vilnius dates back to 1975 when I participated in the All Union Conference on Baltic Studies (in the terminology of those days). I was met at the airport by colleagues and now also good friends Sabaliauskas and Zinkevičius, both of whom had marginally become acquainted with my teacher Christian Stang at a Moscow conference in 1958. Being good psychologists and pedagogues, the two Lithuanians waited for me with my monograph *Studien zum slavischen und indoeuropäischen Langvokalismus* in their hands as a help to identify the guest (it had my portrait on the back cover). Five years later I attended the same kind of conference in Riga and in 1985 again in Vilnius. After that – when the political situation had changed so radically and communication with the Baltics had become much easier – as a private irony of the fate I was prevented from participating in Vilnius in 1991 and Riga 1995 because of health problems. On the first occasion I was actually on my way to Vilnius from a symposium in Vienna, but got a heavy cornea inflammation which forced me to give up the remaining leg to Vilnius. In 1995 I had to stay in a Oslo hospital at the time of the conference for an operation which could not be postponed. The year of 1997 I felt confident would be without complications as far as my participation in Vilnius would be concerned, but in the middle of June I became the victim of a rather serious traffic accident just outside the University of Oslo. I was brought to hospital and thereupon disabled for so long that my participation here was uncertain almost until the last minute. But now I am standing before you, so let us switch over to the topic.

A few years ago I dreamt about writing a book(let) on the history of grammatical terminology of Lithuanian and Latvian which I held (and still hold) to be a very interesting field that aroused my curiosity. For this purpose, however, a lengthy stay in a place (or places) better supplied with relevant sources than Oslo would be needed. In the meantime I have launched also other projects within Baltic linguistics which keep me busy, so it may well be that my contribution to the history of Baltic grammatical terminology will be limited to this paper alone.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

LITHUANIAN:

The most important source for investigating the history of designations of grammatical concepts in Lithuanian is a candidate's dissertation from 1961 by A. Balašaitis. His *author's referatas* bears the heading *История литовской лингвистической терминологии*. (I am indebted to professor Evalda Jakaitienė for having made it available to me in Oslo.) Furthermore, Lithuanian grammatical terminology in a historical context is mentioned in works of Jonas Palionis and Zigmantas Zinkevičius.

In the history of grammatical terminology in Lithuanian several layers are distinguished:

The Latin influence was very strong, and the first grammars, e. g. *Kleinas*, 1653; *Ruigys* (*Ruhig*), 1747 and *Milkus* (*Mielcke*), 1800, were written in that language.

During a period of transition (until the era of national awakening in the middle of the 19th century) contributions to Lithuanian grammar were to some extent written in Polish. Also the German tradition should be mentioned.

The Latin influence continued indirectly after grammars had started to be written in Lithuanian. Thus, people like Daukantas, Baranauskas and Jaunius translated many linguistic terms still used in Lithuanian from Latin, cf., for example, *dalyvis* < *participium*, *linksniavimas/linksnis* < *declinatio*, *laipsnis* < *gradus*, *laipsniavimas* < *gradatio*, *priegaidė* < *accentus*, *priesaga* < *suffixum*.

Until the beginning of the 19th century *calques* were also made on the basis of Polish.

During the second half of the 19th century the Lithuanian intelligentsia according to Balašaitis studied in Russian schools and universities and was brought in contact with Russian linguists, a fact which had an impact on the formation of linguistic terms. At that time many terms were coined according to Russian models, e. g. *kirtis* < ударение, *žodynas* < словарь, *prokalbė* < праязык. Many calques from Russian were made by Jonas Jablonskis who is said (Balašaitis) to have been inspired by Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij. In addition to those terms just mentioned Jablonskis also created terms such as *kiekiniai* < количественные, *papildinys* < дополнение, *priedėlis* < приложение, *sangražiniai* < возвратные, *tarinys* < сказуемое and others.

But not only translations were made. Also neologisms were created, many of which are used even today, e. g. *asmuo* 'person', *bendratis* 'infinitive', *būdvardis* 'adjective', *galininkas* 'accusative (case)', *ištiktukas* 'interjection', *kablelis* 'comma', *klaustukas* 'question mark', *nuosaka* 'mood', *pažyminys* 'attribute', *prielinksnis* 'preposition', *raidė* 'letter', *skyryba* 'punctuation', *veikslas* 'aspect', *veiksnyš* 'subject'.

Following Jablonskis' example Būga introduced a series of successful new terms, e. g. *kalbotyra* 'linguistics', *skoliniai* 'borrowings', *kylančioji / krintančioji / laužtinė priegaidė* : восходящая / нисходящая / прерывистая интонация, *prieškirtinė / pokirtinė intonacija* : предупредительная / заударная интонация, *vietovardžiai* 'toponymy'.

At the beginning of the 20th century Lithuanian linguists started to use international terms such as *fonetika*, *morfologija*, *sintaksė*, *akūtas* (alongside *dešininis*), *cirkumfleksas* (alongside *riestinis*) etc.

Balašaitis has presented a thorough analysis of the development, but it should be borne in mind that his contribution was written during the Soviet period which means that such aspects as general international trends as well as the impact of German tradition seem to be somewhat underscored (even though the tradition of Lithuanian grammars in German from Lithuania Minor is referred to).

LATVIAN:

For Latvian one will find worthwhile documentation (with references) in Konstantin Karulis' etymological dictionary of the Latvian language, but the evolution of grammatical terminology in this language had also been commented upon earlier by P. Abbuls, *Terminoloģija latviešu gramatikā* (Rīga, 1901) and V. Strautiņa, *Valodniecības terminoloģijas attīstība 19. gadsimta 50.–70. gados, – Latviešu valodas teorijas un prakses jautājumi*, Rīga, 1967).

As in Lithuania, the first grammars of Latvian (Rehehusen, 1644; Adolphi, 1685 and others) were written in Latin.

During a transitional period up to the time of the national awakening in the middle of the 19th century Latvian grammars were written in German.

Afterwards much of the same that was said about the conditions in Lithuania could be repeated for Latvia.

It will be instructive to say a few words about the two contributions mentioned above. Strautiņa gives a short and summary survey (about 5 pages), but with references to the main creators of Latvian grammatical terminology, i. e. J. Alunāns, A. Kronvalds, M(atīss) Kaudzīte, A. Stērste. Stērste is the author of the *Latviešu valodas mācība* from the year 1879. The starting point for the creation of grammatical terminology in Latvian was the middle of the 19th century where mention should be made of *Vācu valodas mācība priekš latviešiem* (part I, 1850; part II, 1859) by J. Neikens. According to Strautiņa (op. cit., 104), Neikens „ir sācis veidot latviešu valodas morfoloģijas (the emphasis is mine) terminoloģiju“. Many of his terms are used today (with minor changes), e. g. *patskanis* (vowel), *līdskanis* (consonant), *lietu-vārds* (noun), *īpašības-vārds* (adjective), *vienskaitlis*, *daudzskaitlis*, *skaitļa-vārds* (numeral), *vietnieku(a)-vārds* (pronoun).

Abbuls' contribution has the practical (pedagogical) merit of presenting Latvian grammatical terminology coined by 7 contributors (namely H. Spalviņš, A. Stērste, J. Skuja, A. Laimiņš, J. Kalniņš, R. Cukurs and K. Mühlenbach) in 7 parallel columns which makes a comparison between them very easy. An eighth column is reserved for footnote type

comments¹. Furthermore, Ina D r u v i e t e comments on grammatical terminology in the chapter „Kādiem būt latviešu gramatikas terminiem?“ in her monograph on Kārlis Mīlenbahs. On page 54 and following she writes: „Lai varētu izvēlēties vislabāko terminu, gramatiku autoru ieteikumi jāapkopo. To uzņemas skolotājs P. Abuls. Viņš sagatavo pārskatu par H. Spalviņa [...] un R. Cukura gramatikās lietotajiem terminiem“.

When I first thought about this talk I wanted to include both Latvian and Lithuanian material for the purpose of presenting certain comparisons which would underscore similarities and differences. Among the few contributions I have seen of this profile is Laimute Balode's article „О латышской и литовской лингвистической терминологии. Сходство и различия“ from 1985.

SYNTACTIC TERMS IN LITHUANIAN AND LATVIAN. A COMPARISON

The topic chosen for my paper is a comprehensive one, so for practical reasons one should look for a n i c h e. One of the niches left for further scrutiny would be s y n t a c - t i c a l terminology which we will now concentrate upon after this more general description and characterization of the main lines in the development of Lithuanian and Latvian grammatical terminology.

From today's Lithuanian and Latvian the following fundamental syntactical terms should be mentioned:

| LITHUANIAN | LATVIAN |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| sintaksė | sintakse |
| sakinys | teikums |
| vientisinis sakiny | vienkāršs teikums |
| sudėtinis sakiny | salikts teikums |
| tariny | izteicėjs |
| veiksnys | (teikuma) priekšmets (subjekts) |
| papildinys | papildinātājs |
| aplinkybė | apstākļis |
| pažyminy | apzīmētājs |
| derinimas | saskaņojums |
| žodžių tvarka | vārdu secība (kārtā) |
| sujungimas | sakārtojums |

¹ One is struck by the fact that some of the grammarians apparently use the same terminology in different meanings.

| | |
|---------------|----------------|
| prijungimas | pakārtojums |
| valdymas | pārvaldījums |
| šliejimas | pieklāvums |
| vardininkas | nominatīvs |
| kilmininkas | ģenitīvs |
| naudininkas | datīvs |
| galininkas | akuzatīvs |
| īnagininkas | instrumentālis |
| vietininkas | lokatīvs |
| šauksmininkas | vokatīvs |
| (dalyvis | divdabis) |

The term *sakinys* was coined by Baranauskas whereas *tarinys*, *veiksny*s, *papildinys*, *pažyminys* as well as the designations of the cases are created by Jablonskis, cf. also above. In his 1922 grammar I find also *derinimas* whereas I am not certain about the origin of *šliejimas*, but it harmonizes with Russian примыкание.

The term *teikums* stems from Neikens (1850), but was also used by Kronvalds, *izteicējs* (which replaced *izteikums* used both by Neikens and Kronvalds) and *apstāklis* (or to be more precise: *apstākļa vārds*) stem from Stērste (1879), *priekšmets* from Kronvalds (1865). Neikens due to his topic (*Vācu valodas mācība*) is likely to have been especially inspired by the German grammatical tradition. This is obviously the case with *apstākļa vārds*, cf. German *Umstandswort*, but the term *apstāklis* 'Umstand' in its non-grammatical sense had already been introduced in Latvian (by Kronvalds in 1872)².

² Since Latvia got a university of its own only in 1919, students had to go abroad to study. Many of them went to Tartu (Dorpat). The question may be asked whether Latvians were influenced by Estonian tradition. The answer to this question will both in general and with respect to linguistics and terminology in particular be in the negative because the university of Tartu was dominated by German and Russian tradition. We may expect impact from Russian and German tradition on that of Latvian through the Tartu filter (and it would probably be an interesting task to investigate the relative balance between these two sources of influence in different periods), but not from Estonian properly speaking which (as already implied) was inspired by Russian and German terminology and from around 1920 also by Finnish. The first grammar in and about Estonian was *Eesti keele Grammatik* (1885) by K. A. Hermann. Many of his terms are still used. Syntactic terminology in Estonian was coined some ten years later in Hermann's *Eesti keele Lause-õpetus* and also in school grammars from the beginning of this century. There has been a tendency to use Estonian words for traditional concepts rather than foreign ones. This purism dates back to the 19th century. Nevertheless, for several concepts both Estonian and international terminology is used, cf., for example, *ühildumine* and *kongruents* for 'agreement', *rindlause* and *parataks*. The ties between Estonian and Latvian (and Lithuanian) linguistic are loose. I am indebted to my colleague László Keresztes in Oslo (and indirectly a colleague of his in Tartu) for this instruction on Estonian syntactic and other grammatical terminology. Furthermore, it may be of interest to mention that the German term *Satzlehre* (Syntax) may have been calqued via Swedish *satslära* into Finnish *lauseoppi* and from there transferred to Estonian *lauseõpetus* if (which seems to be more likely) the Estonian term has not been inspired by the German term directly.

For the role played by Mühlenbach (Mīlenbahs) and Ozols, see below. The term *saskaņojums* seems to be inspired by Russian (cf. согласование).

It is interesting to see how terms such as *sakinys* and *teikums*, *tarinys* and *izteicējs*, *papildinys* and *papildinātājs*, *pažyminys* and *apzīmētājs* overlap semantically in Lithuanian and Latvian. The terms *papildinys* and *papildinātājs* may have had a common source in Russian дополнение.

An interesting case is (the designations of) the cases (a field which partly belongs to morphology, partly to syntax):

In Latvian the Latin case terms are used (although Latvian terms have been tried, cf. Metuzāle-Kangere, 1990, 449 f.), i. e. *nominatīvs*, *ģenitīvs*, *akuzatīvs*, *datīvs*, (*instrumentālis*), *lokatīvs* and *vokatīvs* to which correspond the following innovations in Lithuanian: *vardininkas*, *kilmininkas*, *galininkas*, *naudininkas*, *įnagininkas*, *vietininkas* and *šauksmininkas* which with minor modifications are the same as those used by Jablonskis who coined them. The (Latin) model is transparent in *vardininkas*, *kilmininkas*, *vietininkas* and *šauksmininkas* whereas *galininkas*, *naudininkas* and *įnagininkas* cannot be explained on that basis. *Galininkas* is probably linked with *galas* 'end' (since end = goal) is a characteristic function of the (adverbial) accusative as opposed to the genitive, *naudininkas* gives reasonable associations to *nauda* whereas *įnagininkas* as 'instrumentive' is rooted in *įnagis* 'instrument' (cf. Fraenkel's standard etymological dictionary of Lithuanian). For 'case' both Latvian and Lithuanian use their own designations, *locījums* and *linksnis* respectively, both of which are calques descending from Latin *declinatio*.

Broadly speaking one may say about Latvian syntactical terminology from a historical point of view that Latvian grammarians to a considerable extent introduced their own terminology. Very much was done by Kārlis Mīlenbahs on the eve of this century as well as Arturs Ozols after him. In addition also a couple of school grammars have been influential in coining syntactic terminology. Here I refer to Jānis Valdmanis through personal communication. For Lithuanian I naturally contacted Vytautas Ambrazas who wrote to me that very little had been done in this particular field. The same view was expressed by Vitas Labutis.

In footnote 2 Swedish terminology was marginally touched upon within a possible Finnish/Estonian context. Before the conclusion is presented, I should like to include a footnote on Norwegian (and Danish) tradition in order to broaden the perspective and the comparative aspect³.

³ A good source in this respect is B. Fossetøl's 1987 monograph, *Norske grammatikker på 1800-tallet* (i. e. Norwegian grammars in the 19th century). After a general historical survey including the Latin tradition, early Danish grammars (which had an impact on the Norwegian tradition, not least that of Jacob Baden's, but also such classics as Eric Pontoppidan and Peder Syv) and German influence (Adelung and others) he presents a considerable number of Norwegian contributors. Among the „riksmål“ (or „dansk-norske“ (= Danish-Norwegian)) grammarians should be mentioned Maurits Hansen, Ove Hals and above all Knud Knudsen (who has been thoroughly dealt with in Brynjulv Bleken's thesis from 1956). These grammars are characterized by a

In conclusion, I should like to say the following: A general comparison between Lithuanian and Latvian in terms of grammatical terminology reveals that international terms are more frequent in the Latvian tradition than in that of Lithuanian. There are, however, differences between different authors. Thus, in Girdenis' works, for example, internationalisms have been quite widely adopted. Finally, it should be emphasized that there is a common, general Latin basis and partly also a German layer of grammatical terminology which is felt throughout the Baltic area as well as in the Nordic countries.

SELECTED LITERATURE

LATVIAN:

Abbulis P., 1901, Terminoloģija latveeschu gramatikā, Rīga, 3–21.

Druviete I., 1990, Kādiem būt latviešu gramatikas terminiem, – Kārlis Mīlenbahs, Rīga, 45–57.

Karulis K., 1992, Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca, I–II, Rīga.

Metuzāle-Kangere B., 1990, Linguistic perspectives in Latvia 1900–1914, – Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, V, 443–455.

Strautiņa V., 1967, Valodniecības terminoloģijas attīstība 19. gadsimta 50.–70. gados, – Latviešu valodas teorijas un prakses jautājumi, Rīga, 103–108.

LITHUANIAN:

Балашайтис А., 1961, История литовской лингвистической терминологии. Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени канд. филол. наук, Вильнюс, 3–15.

Balašaitis A., 1964, Simonas Daukantas (100 metų mirties sukaktį minint), – Kalbos kultūra, VII, 3–5.

Palionis J., 1957, J. Jablonskis ir jo lietuvių kalbos vadovėliai, – J. Jablonskis, Rinkiniai raštai, V, Vilnius, 7–56.

Subačius G., 1991, On the category of Mood in Lithuanian and Latin grammars during Renaissance, – Italia ed Europa nella linguistica del rinascimento: Confronti e relazioni, Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ferrara, ed. by M. Tavoni et. al., Ferrara, 207–211.

Ulvydas K., 1995, Nekaitomosios kalbos dalys pirmosiose lietuvių kalbos gramatikose, – Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai, XXXIII, 7–42.

considerable variety in terminology in the same way as in German grammars from approximately the same period. The most widespread school grammar was that of Jacob Løkke's. The Danish language and tradition had an impact in Norway for quite a long period after 1814 when the 400 years of union with Denmark had come to an end. Swedish and Swedish tradition did hardly exert any influence in terms of language, grammar and terminology in Norway during the period 1814–1905 when Norway was united with Sweden. Various „landsmaal“ grammars appeared after 1850. Within this tradition mention should above all be made of Ivar Aasen – and beside him also Marius Nygaard and Marius Hægstad. Fossetøl's book contains also a chapter on syntax, but not much is said about terminology properly speaking. More attention is paid to principles for classifications and categorizations. A source of interest with respect to terminology is the cand. philol. dissertation *Norsk skolegrammatikk. Tradisjon og fornyelse* (= Norwegian school grammar. Tradition and renewal) by Eva Bjørkvold and Frøydis Hertzberg (1976). Finally, it is tempting to mention the comprehensive (1200 pages) *Norsk referansegrammatikk* (Oslo, 1997) by Jan Terje Faarlund, Svein Lie and Kjell Ivar Vannebo for people interested in the most recent contribution to Norwegian grammar.

LATVIAN AND LITHUANIAN:

Балодэ Л., 1985, О латышской и литовской лингвистической терминологии (сходство и различия), – Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai, XXIV, 11–16.

Vanags P., 1991, Description of Latvian grammar categories and Latvian case system in 17th century Latvian grammars (with a comparative insight into Lithuanian grammars), – Italia ed Europa nella linguistica del rinascimento: Confronti e relazioni, Atti del Convegno internazionale Ferrara, ed. by M. Tavoni et. al., Ferrara, 213–221.

OTHER LANGUAGES:

Fossestøl B., 1987, Norske grammatikker på 1800-tallet, Oslo.

Terje MATHIASSEN
Universitetet i Oslo
Institutt for østeuropeiske og orientalske studier
Boks 1030 Blindern
N-0315 Oslo
Norway
E-mail: terje.mathiassen@east.uio.no

Gauta 1998 01 10
Priimta spausdinti 1998 03 23