

DANIEL PETIT

École Normale Supérieure, Paris

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8432-5600>

Fields of research: Baltic studies, Indo-European studies.

DOI: doi.org/10.35321/all85-16

Ona Aleknavičienė & Gracilda Blažienė
POVILO FRYDRICHO
RUIGIO GRAMATIKA
*ANFANGSGRÜNDE EINER
LITTAUISCHEN GRAMMATICK,*
1747. FAKSIMILĖ, KRITINIS
LEIDIMAS, VERTIMAS.

Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2020, 564 p. ISBN 978-609-411-264-5

Ona Aleknavičienė & Gracilda Blažienė
POVILAS FRYDRICHAS RUIGYS.
MONOGRAFIJA, GRAMATIKOS
INDEKSAI.

Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2020, 414 p. ISBN 978-609-411-265-2

The Lithuanian grammatical tradition goes back to the seventeenth century, over a century after the first documents written in the Lithuanian language. The first grammar by Daniel Klein (1653) was followed by an unbroken chain of grammatical works until the nineteenth century. Among these early grammars of Lithuanian, the *Anfangsgründe einer Littauischen Grammatick* by Paul Friedrich Ruhig (1747) occupy a special position. For the majority of us, the name 'Ruhig' evokes Philipp Ruhig (1675–1749), who authored a path-breaking

treatise on the Lithuanian language (*Betrachtung der Littauischen Sprache, in ihrem Ursprunge, Wesen und Eigenschaften*, 1745) and a dictionary (*Littauisch-Deutsches und Deutsch-Littauisches Lexicon*, 1747). His son, Paul Friedrich Ruhig (ca 1721/1722–after 1784), is not as well known, but his name remains associated with the *Anfangsgründe* (1747), a grammar of Lithuanian published in Königsberg together with his father's dictionary. According to Zinkevičius (1990: 260), Paul Friedrich Ruhig's grammar is based on notes taken by his father, with a strong influence of previous works such as Klein (1653), Sappuhn & Schultz (1673) and Hack (1730). The present work, published jointly by Ona Aleknavičienė & Grasilda Blažienė, is a critical edition of the *Anfangsgründe* accompanied by a monography on its author and on the cultural context in which it was published. The editors are to be thanked for making available to the scholarly community this important milestone in the history of the Lithuanian language.

The present book consists of two volumes. The first volume contains a facsimile edition of the original text (I 51–226), a critical edition of the German text on the left accompanied by a Lithuanian translation on the right (I 227–553) and finally a register of notions, persons and places (I 555–563). The second volume contains a biography of Paul Friedrich Ruhig by Grasilda Blažienė (II 17–121), an overall presentation of his grammar by Ona Aleknavičienė (II 123–271) and a conclusion on the value of this grammar in the history of Lithuanian philology co-written by both authors (II 273–276), followed by German summary (II 277–277), a complete word concordance (II 289–379), a bibliography (II 380–402) and an index of personal names (II 403–413).

It is extremely useful, and even downright essential, to have here a facsimile of the *Anfangsgründe* (I 51–226): this opens a direct access to the text and sheds light on its material presentation. In the foreword of the grammar, Paul Friedrich Ruhig writes that the redaction of this text was initiated by his father, who had to face some obstacles and therefore asked his son to replace him. The grammar itself is both traditional and innovative. In many aspects, it reflects a long-standing tradition of grammatical description, beginning with 'letters' (*Buchstaben*), i.e. orthography and phonetics, then moving to word formation and declension (nouns, adjectives, pronouns, verbs) and ending with a few observations on syntax. The grammar has exactly the same structure as Sappuhn & Schultz (1673) and Hack (1730), but is considerably more developed than Klein (1653), who has no section on syntax, and the *Universitas Linguarum Lituaniae* (1737), whose section on syntax is pretty puny. The grammar is written in German, on a par with Daniel Klein's *Compendium Lituanico-Germanicum* (1654) and Hack's *Kurtzgefasste Litthauische Grammatic* (1730), whereas the majority of previous works was in Latin (Klein 1653, Sappuhn, Schultz 1673, *Universitas* 1737). The choice of the German language, motivated by the intended readership, implies

terminological choices, particularly for grammatical categories or formations that are not represented in Latin or German. As a rule, the Latin terminology is simply incorporated in the German text and applied to the Lithuanian language without too much difficulty, either directly (e.g. *Vocales* ‘vowels’, *Consonantes* ‘consonants’, *Nomina* ‘nouns’, *Conjunctiones* ‘conjunctions’, *Praepositiones* ‘prepositions’, *Verba activa* and *passiva* ‘active and passive verbs’, etc.), more rarely through German (e.g. *Syllben* ‘syllables’). The use of the Latin term *Ancipites* ‘two-headed (vowels)’ to refer to vowels that are both short or long is striking (I 69); it is ultimately based on the Greek term δίχρονοι ‘of two quantities’ used by Dionysos Thrax. Grammatical categories are usually identified with those of Latin. Three genders are ascribed to Lithuanian adjectives, *Masculinum* ‘masculine’, *Fæmininum* ‘feminine’ and *Neutrum* ‘neuter’ (I 100). The conditional (e.g. *būčiau* ‘I would be’) is called *Modus Coniunctivus* ‘conjunctive mood’ (I 134). The strong Latin template may easily reach its limits, in particular for the description of the case system, where Lithuanian is said (I 85) to possess six cases like Latin (*Nominativus* ‘nominative’, *Genitivus* ‘genitive’, *Dativus* ‘dative’, *Accusativus* ‘accusative’, *Vocativus* ‘vocative’ and *Ablativus* ‘ablative’), the latter subdivided into an *Instrumentalis* ‘instrumental’ (e.g. Lith. *dangumi*) and a *Localis* ‘locative’ (e.g. Lith. *danguje*), which is artificial. Definite adjectives (e.g. Lith. *gerasis* ‘the good one’) are presented as adjective forms combined with the ‘demonstrative pronoun’ *jis* (I 109sq), but do not receive any specific name.

The grammar focuses on the Lithuanian language as it was spoken at the mid-eighteenth century in East Prussia (based on the dialects of Insterburg, nowadays Черняховск, and Ragnit, nowadays Неман), but includes a section on other dialects (I 195–198, cf. also II 223–234), in which, inter alia, one finds a brief, but interesting mention of the Samogitian stress retraction (I 196). It is rich in observations on fine-grained details of the Lithuanian grammar and testifies to a good command of the language. In some aspects, Ruhig’s grammar represents a significant advance over its predecessors. The Lithuanian tone system, generally overlooked in previous works (with the exception of the *Universitas*, 1737), is submitted to a brief overview (I 72–74), using the Ancient Greek terminology (*Acutus* ‘acute’, *Gravis* ‘grave’, *Circumflexus* ‘circumflex’). The aspectual use of the preverb *be-* is duly signaled in a section on ‘continuative verbs’ (*Continua*, I 169), e.g. Lith. *Beeimi ich gehe so nach und nach fort* ‘I am going continuously’. The section on syntax (I 199–220) reflects the predominant approach to syntax at that time, limited to a few questions such as grammatical agreement, the functions of cases, the syntax of prepositions, and finally some very brief comments on word order. It does not avoid the common prejudices of the time, in particular the idea that certain syntactic configurations can be regarded as more ‘natural’ than others. Ruhig, for example, presents the

word order [noun + genitive] in *Sunùs Diëwo* ‘Son of God’ as *natürlich* ‘natural’ (I 218), without putting forward any ground in that regard.

An important component of any grammatical description lies in its exemplification. Most of the Lithuanian examples found in the *Anfangsgründe* seem to be drawn from religious texts, in particular from the translation of the *Bible*. The religious phraseology is omnipresent; in some cases, Ruhig even indicates the Greek or Hebrew source. Other examples seem to reflect the daily use of the language. It is not difficult to track down examples from previous grammars: one may compare, for example, *Gerriù Wandens* ‘I drink water’ (I 209, Greek πίνω ὕδατος, German *ich trinke Wasser*) with *Gerriù Wandenio* (Sappuhn, Schultz 1673: 80, Greek πίνω ὕδατος, Latin *Bibo aquam*), or *Dùk mán Dùnòs* ‘give me some bread’ (I 209, German *gieb mir Brot*) with *Dùk man Dùnòs* (Hack 1730: 333).

The facsimile is followed by a critical edition of the German text on the left and its Lithuanian translation on the right (I 227–553). The usefulness of this translation is immediately obvious, because it makes the text available to the Lithuanian readership that can be unfamiliar with the German language. Translating into Modern Lithuanian a Lithuanian grammar written in German in the eighteenth century is not an easy task, not only owing to the difficulty of the language itself, but above all because of the various problems raised by the choice of terminological equivalents. The translation is extremely precise and may be used with confidence. It is probably not useless to point out a form of chronological paradox, however: the Lithuanian linguistic terminology used in this translation is generally that established by Jonas Jablonskis (and others) at the beginning of the twentieth century, i.e. almost two centuries after Ruhig’s grammar. In most cases, this terminological transfer is harmless: *Genus Neutrum* is rendered by *bevardė giminė* (I 100), *Infinitivus* by *bendratis* (I 128), *Modus* by *nuosaka* (I 129), etc., which causes no problem of understanding. Sometimes, the terminological equivalence is more challenging. I have already mentioned the Latin term *ancipites* ‘two-headed’ used to refer to vowels that are either short or long; it has no equivalent in Lithuanian. It is rendered here by *svyruojančiosios balsės* ‘hesitating vowels’ (I 251), which is after all a good option. In a small number of cases, one could propose a different translation. The Latin term *Deductio* (literally ‘leading away’) is rendered in Lithuanian either by *vedyba* (e.g. I 367) or by *daryba* (e.g. I 372). I would suggest to choose a uniform translation and perhaps more precisely to render Latin *deductio* by *derioacija*. These are minor details, which do not compromise the very high quality of the Lithuanian translation.

The second volume places Paul Friedrich Ruhig and his grammar in their proper context. It begins with a biography of Paul Friedrich Ruhig by Grasilda

Blažienė (II 17–121). Little is known about Ruhig's life, and the brief mentions that can be found in the literature are desperately short.¹ Even his dates of birth and death are not known with precision. Most sources indicate ca 1725 for his birth, after 1781 for his death, but Blažienė's work proposes different dates (ca 1721/1722–after 1784). Paul Friedrich Ruhig's birth place was Walterkehmen (now Ольховатка) in East Prussia. He began to study in Königsberg in 1740; he was bound to the Lithuanian Seminary, where he taught for a few years. Later, he appear to have worked as a protestant church minister in Latvia since 1752 and to have been eventually repatriated to Königsberg due to mental illness. We lose track of him after 1784. The biography by Grasilda Blažienė (II 17–121) is the most extensive treatment of Ruhig's life to date. It contains all available documents on the life and activity of the Ruhig family, including previously unknown manuscript letters. Paul Friedrich Ruhig's date of birth (ca 1721/1722) can be inferred from his position as the elder brother in the family (before his brother Christian Georg, born in 1724/1725) and from his university registration in 1740 (II 73–74). His death, commonly supposed to have taken place after 1781, can now be postponed to a slightly later date, since he is still mentioned as alive in 1784 (II 74). The sparse information that we possess on his life before the publication of his grammar is limited to his university registration in Königsberg (1740: *Paul Friedrich Ruhig, Walterkaimensis Boruss*), his autograph application form for grant (1743), the only document written in his own hand that has been preserved, and a few mentions of the Lithuanian seminary, where he was active during the 1740s. In the foreword of his dictionary, his father Philip Ruhig mentions that he entrusted his son to write a Lithuanian grammar. Ruhig's grammar apparently had great success after its publication in 1747. It was mentioned as an important source by Gottfried Ostermeyer (1716–1800) in his *Neue Littauische Grammatik* (1791). Johann Severin Vater (1771–1826) uses it in the famous encyclopedia of languages *Mithridates* (1809: 706). Ruhig's later life is less known, and we have no precise sources on his activity in Riga, on his mental illness and on his death. This section is very well-written and informative; it enhances considerably our knowledge on the cultural actors who have contributed to the progress of Lithuanian philology in the eighteenth century.

The next section is a presentation of the *Anfangsgründe* by Ona Aleknavičienė (II 123–271). Ruhig's grammar was first intended for the participants in the Lithuanian seminary in Königsberg, many of whom could understand and speak Lithuanian only imperfectly (II 126); this explains the choice of German as the common language shared by all of them. In comparison with previous works,

¹ Cf. Biržiška (II 120–121), Zinkevičius (1990: 260), *Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija* (LKE 2008: 459).

Ruhig's grammar is relatively extensive and detailed, which accounts for a large part of its success in the following decades as one of the major reference grammars of Lithuanian. Aleknavičienė further describes the material shape of the book edited in 1747, its format, its script, its paratext (II 135). Most interesting is the section about intertextuality in Ruhig's grammar (II 152sq.), comparing it with its potential sources (Klein, Sappuhn & Schultz, Hack). It illustrates perfectly that Lithuanian philology has followed, in its different historical periods, the common thread of a shared cultural identity and should not be approached as the emergence of some isolated individuals in a context where the Lithuanian language was still relatively precarious in terms of its sociolinguistic status. The rest of the section provides a thorough description of the Lithuanian language documented in Ruhig's grammar, its orthography and phonetics (II 234–248), its morphology (II 249–252). More than 9000 Lithuanian word forms are transmitted. The Lithuanian language in Ruhig's grammar appears in a relatively archaic stage of development, with the dual number still fully alive (II 249), with all four secondary locative cases still in use (II 249), with conditional forms in *-b-* (II 252), with comparative adverbs in *-(i)aus* (II 252), etc. As it stands, it offers us a wealth of valuable data on East Prussia Lithuanian at the mid-eighteenth century.

There follows a very short conclusion, co-written by the two authors, Ona Aleknavičienė & Grasilda Blažienė, stressing the importance of Ruhig's grammar for Lithuanian studies (II 275–276). The volume ends with a lengthy German summary (II 277–287), a very useful word index (II 298–379) and a bibliography (II 380–402).

There is no doubt that this exemplary work will remain the reference edition of Paul Friedrich Ruhig's *Anfangsgründe* in the years to come. It is not only very informative, philologically and historically impeccable; it is also well-structured, well-written and edited with the utmost care. I am very grateful to the editors for this excellent work, which enriches considerably our knowledge on the development of Lithuanian philology in the course of its history. As I came to Lithuanian studies at the beginning of the 1990s, shortly after the independence of Lithuania, I was immediately fascinated by the mushrooming of philological work on Old Lithuanian texts, as if editing early documents of the Lithuanian language was for that generation of scholars a means of recovering their identity. The present book shows that, even nowadays, in a world of globalization and growing indifference towards the past, it is still rewarding to look back to the legacy of ancient texts such as this one and to devote special attention to their philological survival.

Daniel Petit (ENS & EPHE)

LITERATURE

Biržiška Vaclovas 1960–1965: *Aleksandrynas. Senųjų lietuvių rašytojų, rašiusių prieš 1865 m., biografijos, bibliografijos ir biobibliografijos 2, XVIII–XIX amžiai*, Čikaga: JAV LB Kultūros Fondas, 1963.

Klein Daniel 1653: *Grammatica Litoanica Mandato & Autoritate Serenissimi Electoris Brandenburgici adornata, & praeviâ Cenfurâ primùm in lucem edita à M. Daniele Klein / Paftore Tilf. Litv. Præmiffa eft ad Lectorem Præfatio non minùs utilis, quàm neceffaria. [...]* Regiomonti, Typis & fumptibus Johannis Reusneri, Anno χριστογονίας c1ο Ιc. LIII [1653]. (Faksimilinis leidimas: *Pirmoji lietuvių kalbos gramatika, 1653 metai*), ats. red. J. Kruopas, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1957.

Klein Daniel 1654: *Danielis Kleinii Compendium Litoanico-Germanicum, Oder Kurtz und gantz deutliche Anführung zur Littaufchen Sprache / wie man recht Littauifch lefen / fchreiben und reden fol. Cum Privilegio S. R. M. Pol. et Seren. Elect. Brandenb*, Königsberg: Gedruckt und verlegt durch Iohann Reufnern, M.D.C.LIV.

LKE 2008 – *Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija*, par. K. Morkūnas, red. V. Ambrazas, 2-asis patiksl. ir papild. leidimas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Ostermeyer Gottfried 1791: *Neue Littauische Grammatik*, Königsberg: G. L. Hartung.

Paulauskienė Aldona 2006: *Pirmosios lietuvių kalbos gramatikos*, Vilnius: Gimtasis žodis.

Ruhig Philipp 1745: *Betrachtung der Littauifchen Sprache, in ihrem Ursprunge, Wesen und Eigenschaften; [...] von Philipp Ruhig, Pfarrern und Seniore zu Walterkehmen, im Hauptamt Infterburg*. Königsberg, druckts und verlegts Iohann Heinrich Hartung, 1745. (Faksimilinis leidimas, vertimas į lietuvių kalbą: *Pilypas Ruigys, Lietuvių kalbos kilmės, būdo ir savybių tyrinėjimas*, par. Vytautas Jurgutis, Valerija Vilnonytė, Vilnius: Vaga, 1986).

Ruhig Philipp 1747: *Littauifch-Deutches und Deutch-Littauifches Lexicon, [...] von Philipp Ruhig, Pfarrern und Seniore zu Walterkehmen, Infterburgifchen Hauptamtes*, Königsberg, druckts und verlegts I. H. Hartung, 1747.

Sappuhn Christup, Schultz Theofili 1673: *Compendium Gramaticæ Lithvanicæ Theophili Schultzens Past: Cattenov, Regiomonti: Typis Friderici Reufneri, [...]* Aō: 1673. (Faksimilinis leidimas: *Sapūno ir Šulco gramatika*), par. K. Eigminas, B. Stundžia, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1997.

Hack Friedrich Wilhelm 1730: *Vocabularium Litthvanico-germanicum, et Germanico-Litthvanicum, Darin alle im Neuen Testament und Pfalter befindliche Wörter nach dem Alphabeth enthalten find; Nebft Einem Anhang einer kurtzgefafften Litthauifchen Grammatic Ausgefertiget von Friederich Wilhelm Haack / S.S. Theol. Cultore, zur Zeit*

DANIEL PETIT

Docente im Lithauifchen Seminario zu Halle. Halle, Druckts Stephanus Orban, Univerf. Buchdr. (1730) 2. (Studija, indeksai, rodyklės), par. V. Zubaitienė, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2012.

Universitas Llinguarum Lituuaniae 1737 – Anoniminė 1737 m. gramatika ‘Universitas Linguarum Lituaniae’, par. K. Eigminas, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1981.

Vater Johan Severin 1809: *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde*, Vol. 2, Berlin: Voss.

Zinkevičius Zigmas 1990: *Lietuvių kalbos istorija 4*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Įteikta 2021 m. rugsėjo 11 d.

DANIEL PETIT

École normale supérieure

45, rue d’Ulm, 75005 Paris, France

daniel.petit@ens.fr