

Апеллятив Литва в «Энеиде» И.П. Котляревского и его культурно-историческая параллель в «Неистовом Роланде» Л. Ариосто.

А. Непокупнуй (Кужив)

В своем обстоятельном историко-филологическом исследовании об имени Литва А. Непокупный указывает на культурное взаимодействие и литературные взаимоотношения, существующие между Италией и Украиной, как это очевидно из параллели между строфой Энеиды Котляревского и октавой Неистового Роланда Ариосто, чья поэма должна была быть известной украинскому писателю, поскольку она уже издавалась в России в 1791-1793 годах. Действительно, в обоих произведениях мы находим ссылки на "медвежий театр" литовского происхождения, известный в Италии уже в XVI в. и имевший давнюю традицию на Украине. Это и подтверждает наличие общего ареала культурного взаимодействия двух народов.

Res Balticae, 5, 1999, pp. 103-120.

ON A PECULIAR TYPE OF DEBITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
IN LATVIAN*

AXEL HOLVOET
Warszawa, p.t. Vilnius

In an earlier publication (Holvoet 1997) I have pointed out that the Latvian debitive is an agglutinative form reminiscent, in some respects, of a combination of a modal verb with a lexical verb. The debitive form consists of two parts, both of which can, to a certain extent, inflect independently of each other. On the one hand, there is the basic component of the debitive, consisting of the prefix *jā-* and a lexical part, which will usually be identical to the 3rd person present of the verb (e.g., *jābrauc, jāstaigā, jātur*), with the sole exception of the verb *būt*, which appears in the infinitive (*jābūt*). On the other hand, there is the auxiliary *būt*, which is often deleted in the present tense but obligatorily occurs in other tenses as well as in the marked moods. The basic paradigm of the debitive, the only one to be mentioned in grammars (cf. Endzelīns 1951, 885-6, Bergmane e.a. 1959, 615ff.), is built on variation of the tense and mood forms of the auxiliary: *man (ir) jāstaigā, man bija jāstaigā, man būs jāstaigā, man ir bijis jāstaigā, man būtu jāstaigā, man esot jāstaigā*, etc.

But it is not only the form of the auxiliary that is variable. The lexical component may also appear in more than one shape. It can

* I wish to thank Aleksey Andronov (St. Petersburg State University) for his comments on the draft version of this paper. Of course, he should not be held responsible for any of its shortcomings.

be derived from the basic (simple tense) stem of the verb, as in the paradigm described above; but there are also debitive forms derived from the compound tense stem consisting of the auxiliary *būt* and a past active participle (they are mentioned in Eiche 1983, 36; cf. also Holvoet 1997). In this case, as in the case of the verb *būt* generally, the debitive is based on the infinitive rather than on the 3rd person present:

man ir jābūt izlasījušam (-ai)
mums ir jābūt izlasījušiem (-ām)
man bija jābūt izlasījušam (-ai)
man būs jābūt izlasījušam (-ai) etc.

Forms of this type correspond to combinations of modal verbs with compound infinitives used in languages that have compound tenses, such as English. Cf.

Kaut kam jābūt notikušam.
 "Something must have happened."

Such constructions are a characteristic feature of the epistemic use of modal verbs. An epistemic modal assesses the necessary or contingent truth of a proposition in the light of the speaker's knowledge. If this proposition refers to the past, a language may mark this in two ways:

(a) it may include time reference into the proposition, so that the latter may be considered true at the moment of speaking ("It is true that X did A at a certain moment in the past"), or

(b) it may qualify the proposition as having been true in the past ("The proposition 'X is doing A' was true at a certain moment in the past").

If a modal verb with an infinitive is used to express such a modal predicate, then there are two possibilities. As the proposition itself must be expressed by an infinitive (which is not marked for tense, so that its time reference must be deduced from the tense marking of the modal verb), past tense reference can be assigned to it only if a language has compound infinitives of the type *to have read*. This is the case of the Baltic languages as well as of Germanic and Romance. Most Slavonic languages have no such compound tenses, and in similar cases must mark time reference onto the modal verb, cf. Polish:

Coś musiało się stać.
 "Something must have happened."

Of course, the latter type may also occur in languages that do have compound tense forms of some kind. Lithuanian, which has compound tenses similar to those of Latvian, may nevertheless use constructions of both types: one with the preterite of the modal verb and a simple infinitive (as in Polish), and one with the present of the modal verb and the compound infinitive (as in Latvian):

Kažkas turėjo atsitikti.
Kažkas turi būti atsitikę.
 "Something must have happened."

For Latvian, the pattern with a compound infinitive can be illustrated by means of the impersonal modal *vajadzēt*. The meaning is the same as in the construction with the debitive cited above.

Kaut kam vajag būt notikušam.
 "Something must have happened."

Here the parallelism between the debitive construction and that with the modal verb *vajadzēt* becomes evident. Let us pretend, for the sake of argument, that the prefix *jā-* is an independent modal verb rather than a prefix added to the verb stem:

<i>Kaut kam</i>	<i>vajag</i>	<i>būt notikušam</i>
<i>Kaut kam</i>	<i>jā-</i>	<i>būt notikušam.</i>

A consequence of the fact that *jā-* cannot assume its own inflectional ending is that the auxiliary *būt* has to be added in order to mark tense and mood, whereas *vajadzēt*, as a verb, has its own tense endings. The combination of a finite form of *būt* with the prefix *jā-* thus functions as an impersonal modal verb, in the same way as *vajadzēt*.

<i>Kaut kam</i>	<i>vajadzēja</i>	<i>būt notikušam.</i>
<i>Kaut kam</i>	<i>bija jā-</i>	<i>būt notikušam.</i>

Both constructions are parallel in structure and the same compound infinitive, *būt notikušam*, seems to be contained in both.

This parallelism is not basically affected if we replace the compound tense stem with the simple tense stem:

<i>Kaut kam</i>	<i>vajag</i>	<i>notikt.</i>
<i>Kaut kam</i>	<i>jā-</i>	<i>notiek.</i>

"Something must/should happen."

As we can see, both components of the debitive can, to a certain extent, be inflected independently, though the lexical part can distinguish only the compound tense stem, marking anteriority, from the simple tense stem. We can state this fact in a different way, by saying that a compound verb form may be debitivised (i.e., a debitive form is derived from it) at two levels: at the level of the auxiliary or at the level of the lexical component. Cf.

Es esmu lasīj-is/-usi šīs grāmatas.
 "I have read these books."
Man ir jābūt lasījuš-am/-ai šīs grāmatas.
 "I must have read these books."
Man ir bijis / bijušas jālasa šīs grāmatas¹.
 "I have had to read these books."

¹ Latvian grammars say nothing about the correctness or incorrectness of the varieties *Man ir bijis jālasa šīs grāmatas* and *Man ir bijušas jālasa šīs grāmatas*, though both are explicitly mentioned, cf. Endzelins 1951, 981, Bergmane e.a. 1959, 617. The agreement of the auxiliary with the nominative noun phrase seems to be optional here. The status of the nominative noun phrase with the debitive is not completely clear. The construction with agreement would suggest its interpretation as a subject, but most subject properties (e.g., control properties) seem to be associated with the dative noun phrase, and it is probably correct to speak of a nominative object. On subject properties with the debitive cf. Fennell (1973), Holvoet (1993).

As can be seen, the Latvian counterpart of the construction with the present tense of the modal verb and the compound infinitive is the debitive of the compound tense auxiliary, whereas that of the construction with the compound past tense of the auxiliary is the debitive of the lexical verb, with its auxiliary in the compound past tense:

vajag būt lasījuš-am
ir vajadzējis lasīt

jābūt lasījuš-am
ir bijis jālasa

The distinction corresponds roughly to that between epistemic and deontic modals on the one hand, and "root modals", or what Palmer (1986, 103) calls "dynamic" modals on the other². Apart from the epistemic use mentioned above, forms of the type *jābūt lasījuš-am* "one must/should have read" may also be used in deontic contexts, e.g. in

Uz rītdienu jums jābūt izlasījušiem manu grāmatu.
"By tomorrow you must have read my book."

Compound tense forms of the debitive such as *ir bijis jālasa*, on the other hand, never express deontic meaning, but always refer to a course of behaviour taken by someone in the past under the pressure of external circumstances. They are always factive,

² I am following Palmer in restricting the notion of "root modals" to the "subject-oriented modality" expressed by modals like "can" (= "be able, have the opportunity") and "have to", which do not involve any opinion or attitude of the speaker, but describe the situation of some subject. These are clearly opposed to both epistemic and deontic modals, as illustrated by the different types of debitives discussed here.

whereas deontic predicates referring to situations in the past ("you should have done this or that") are normally counterfactive.

Man ir bijis jāizlasa viņa grāmatas.
"I've had to read his books."

For the sake of brevity, I will henceforth refer to debitives of the former kind as *auxiliary debitives*, and to those of the latter as *stem debitives*. Of course, the overwhelming majority of debitives actually used are stem debitives. Auxiliary debitives are so rare as to be scarcely ever mentioned in the grammars. But however marginal a phenomenon they may be, they are not quite irrelevant to the interpretation of the grammatical status of the debitive.

The auxiliary debitive is probably a recent development. Bielenstein states explicitly that the debitive is derived from the present tense stem only, and he adds:

"Es ist z. B. ein Ding der Unmöglichkeit, einen Satz wie: *morgen werde ich müssen den Brief geschrieben haben* [...] genau so im Lettischen wiederzugeben, sei es mittelst des Praefixes *jā-*, sei es [...] mittelst des Part. Praes. Pass." (Bielenstein 1864, 211).

As we have just seen, it is not "ein Ding der Unmöglichkeit" any more in modern Latvian. It is quite possible, therefore, that the auxiliary debitive, which was not characteristic of the popular dialects known to Bielenstein, came into existence in the literary language at some later time, perhaps under the influence of German, as the German compound infinitive is frequently used

with modal verbs (as in the example cited by Bielenstein), and perhaps also, at a later stage, under the influence of other western European languages. The assumption of external influence is not strictly necessary, however, and the rise of the auxiliary debitive could have been a spontaneous development as well. It does not reflect a change in the nature or structure of the debitive; it merely brings out the agglutinative character of this form. The debitive has never become a mood (as the term "debitive mood", and the descriptions found in Latvian grammars, e.g., Bergmane e.a. 1959, 615ff., wrongly suggest³). As can be seen from the parallelism *vajag būt ~ jābūt*, the debitive behaves as an agglutinative form with an incorporated modal verb. When compound infinitives of the type *būt lasījušam* were introduced into constructions with modal verbs, they were introduced into the debitive as well, and the retention of the infinitive *būt* in the debitive *jābūt* (as against its replacement with the 3rd person present in all other verbs) created the necessary preconditions for this process, as the infinitive *būt* was contained in these compound infinitives as an auxiliary.

³ It is to be hoped that the obviously erroneous treatment of the debitive as a grammatical mood (criticised by Marvan 1967, Mathiassen 1996, 29, Holvoet 1997 and Andronov 1997) will be abandoned in future descriptions of Latvian grammar. The main objection that can be raised against the treatment of the debitive as a mood is that it can itself be marked for several moods, viz., indicative, conditional and relative mood (if the last of these is to be considered a mood). Mathiassen (1996, 29) also points out that the debitive distinguishes as many tenses as the indicative, whereas the marked moods usually distinguish less. Actually, if the auxiliary debitive is taken into account, the number of tenses exceeds that of the indicative and does not fit into any tense paradigm comparable to that of the indicative either.

Auxiliary debitives have one peculiar feature in terms of case marking. Their object is in the accusative:

Uz rītdienu jums jābūt izlasījušiem manu grāmatu.
"By tomorrow you must have read my book."

The nominative *mana grāmata* seems to be impossible here⁴. As is known, the object case form used with the Latvian debitive is subject to dialectal variation, but there are some cases where even those dialects that use the nominative as an object case for nouns show an accusative: these are the cases where a 1st or 2nd person pronoun, or a reflexive pronoun, occurs as object⁵. We thus have:

Man tevi jābrīdina "I must warn you"
Tev mani jāpavada "You must accompany me"
Slimniekam jākopj sevi "The patient must take care of himself".

In the standard language as well as in part of the dialects, nouns are always in the nominative when they occur as objects of the debitive⁶. Why does this rule not apply to auxiliary debitives?

⁴ I am indebted to Dr. Ina Druviete (Riga) for this information.

⁵ Exceptionally, 1st and 2nd person pronouns also occur in the nominative, in which case the auxiliary of the debitive must be conjugated for person, as in *tad tu man arī būsi jākopj* "then I'll have to take care of you as well" (Endzelins 1951, 972).

⁶ Schmalstieg (1991, 430-1) expresses the view that for nouns as well, the accusative may occur alongside the nominative to mark the object of a debitive in modern Latvian, and that a functional differentiation is developing between both types of case marking. As far as I know, it has not yet been investigated whether such an alternation of case forms is really independent of the dialectal background and may occur within one idiolect. As long as this has not been established, speculations on a possible

The simplest way of explaining this puzzling fact would be to assume that *manu grāmatu* is not an object of the debitive in the same way as *mana grāmata* would be in

Jums jāizlasa mana grāmata.

"You must/should read my book."

It certainly seems possible to interpret the verb phrase *būt izlasīj-ušam* (-ušai, -ušiem, -ušām) *manu grāmatu* (this is what remains of the auxiliary debitive after subtraction of the prefix *jā-*) as a copular construction, so that the following two constructions would be exactly parallel:

Jums jābūt cītīgiem. "You must/should be diligent."

Jums jābūt izlasījušiem manu grāmatu.

"You must/should have read my book."

In that case the object *manu grāmatu* would depend exclusively on the participle *izlasījušiem*, not on the debitive as a whole. Of course, this explanation is not without its drawbacks. Combinations with finite forms of the verb *būt*, such as *esmu izlasījis, biju izlasījis, būšu izlasījis* etc. are usually interpreted as compound tense forms rather than as copular constructions. It appears obvious that the use of the compound infinitive is exactly parallel to that of the compound past tense:

Es esmu izlasījis grāmatu.

"I have read the book."

semantic differentiation between nominative and accusative object with the debitive seem to be premature.

Man jābūt izlasījušam grāmatu.

"I must have read the book."

If *esmu izlasījis* is a compound verb form, then it seems reasonable to describe *jābūt izlasījušam* as a compound form as well. Of course, combinations of the verb *būt* with past active participles may be of several kinds. In many of them, the verb *būt* functions as a copula, and the participle has quasi-adjectival function. As instances we may cite *precējies* "married", *norūpējies* "worried", *iemilējies* "in love" etc. An indication of the adjectival function of such participles can be found in their use as predicate nominals with the compound tenses of the copula:

Es viņam teicu, ka esmu bijusi jau precējusies. (P. Rozītis)

"I told him I had been married already."

Iemilējusies Puncūriene viņā nekad nav bijusi. (R. Valdēss)

"Puncūriene has never been in love with him."

But nothing points to a similar status of the combination of *būt* with the past active participle in auxiliary debitives, or in similar constructions with *vajag*. On the contrary, in these constructions we seem to be dealing with compound infinitives marking anteriority, just as in similar constructions with modal verbs in English, French, German etc. In the case of *jābūt izlasījušam* this seems to be the most convincing interpretation, as the participle *izlasījis* does not allow of the adjectival interpretation that would be conceivable in the case of *precējies, norūpējies* etc. (**izlasījis skolnieks* would make no sense).

Probably the most cogent reason for regarding the combinations of *būt* with past active participles as compound

tenses rather than as copular constructions is that the contrary assumption would yield difficulties in describing the compound forms of the stem debitive. As we saw above, we have two competing varieties here: in the one, the participle contained in the compound form of the auxiliary agrees with the nominative noun phrase, in the other it does not.

Man ir bijis jālasa šīs grāmatas.
Man ir bijušas jālasa šīs grāmatas.
 "I have had to read these books."

If these are copular constructions, then *šīs grāmatas* will have to be interpreted as its subject. This faces us with the problem how to interpret the form *jālasa*: we will have to explain it as a predicate nominal, e.g., as a kind of *participium necessitatis* comparable to the present passive participle in *-am-/-ām-*, cf. *Grāmata man ir bijusi izlasāma* "liber mihi legendus fuit". Still, there is no obvious way to explain, along the lines suggested here, those debitive constructions in which the object is in the accusative, e.g., *Man ir bijis tevi jāmeklē* "I've had to look for you". Here, the copular construction would have to be subjectless⁷. But even the variety with a nominative noun phrase is hard to explain as a copular construction because there is no obligatory agreement of the participle with the nominative subject, as one would expect in any copular construction in Latvian. We should thus regard the finite

⁷ The construction would then be comparable to the Latin gerundive with an accusative object, e.g., *agitandum est vigilias* (Ernout & Thomas 1959, 286); but one would hardly consider this a copular construction either.

form of *būt* occurring in these constructions as the auxiliary of a compound tense marker rather than as a copula.

The evidence provided by the compound forms of the stem debitive is not in favour of the interpretation of the combinations of *būt* with past active participles as copular constructions, and therefore we should perhaps look for an alternative explanation that would account for the use of the accusative.

If we regard the combination *būt izlasījušam* as a compound infinitive, then we must compare the constructions discussed here with those with an infinitive dependent on a stem debitive. As is known, in such constructions the object may be either in the nominative or in the accusative (cf. Endzelīns 1951, 971, Bergmane e.a., 1962, 281):

Man jāiet meklēt grāmata / grāmatu.
 "I have to go and look for the book."

Why, then, does the nominative not occur in the auxiliary debitive? If the occurrence of the object in an infinitive clause dependent on a debitive is no obstacle to the use of the nominative, then the occurrence of an infinitive that is part of the debitive form itself should, *a fortiori*, be no obstacle either. The possibility of using the accusative in constructions like *Man jāiet meklēt grāmatu* does not bring us any nearer to an answer to the question why the accusative is obligatorily used with the auxiliary debitive⁸.

⁸ The question whether the use of the nominative with infinitives dependent on debitives continues the original state of affairs (as argued in Holvoet, 1993) or whether the nominative was secondarily extended to

A third possible explanation would involve the degree of fusion within the debitive forms themselves. Both in *Man jābut izlasījušam grāmatu* and *Man vajag būt izlasījušam grāmatu* the object behaves as the object of the infinitive *būt izlasījušam*, or of the participle *izlasījušam*. The parallelism between both constructions is striking here, and the only difference is that in the auxiliary debitive the modal verb, or what corresponds to it, is reduced to a mere prefix. With regard to object case marking there is no difference at all. This parallelism is less complete in the non-compound forms: *Man jāizlasa grāmata : Man vajag izlasīt grāmatu*. The degree of fusion of the components is much greater in the case of what I have just termed the "stem debitive". Here it is impossible to single out an infinitive or participle, distinct from the modal marker (the prefix *jā-*), that could be expected to govern an accusative object, as in *jā-būt izlasījušam*⁹; and this has no doubt contributed to the retention of the deviant object case marking. It is not, however, the fact of the object being governed by an infinitive that is decisive, as noted above.

A fourth possible explanation that could be considered is the chronological difference. As mentioned above, the auxiliary debitive is probably a recent development. Is it conceivable that the nominative object rule was not extended to this type of debitive because it had ceased to operate and was only retained

embedded clauses dependent on main clauses with a debitive, does not seem relevant here.

⁹ Though, originally, the debitive was probably derived from the infinitive, cf. Prellwitz 1904, Endzelins, 1905/1971 (the same view had already been put forward by Endzelins 1901, but for partially wrong reasons); as to the replacement of the infinitive with the 3rd person present, cf. Holvoet, forthcoming.

by force of tradition with the older varieties? This does not seem likely, because if the nominative object rule had ceased to be productive, the accusative already used for pronouns would have been generalised. The rule was simply not extended to auxiliary debitives, but otherwise remained operative.

The explanations suggested here are interrelated. If we invoke the degree of fusion as a relevant factor, and if we assume that the occurrence, within the debitive form, of an infinitive recognisable as such contributes to the use of the accusative, then we should take into account the possible use of the nominative in the type *Man jāiet meklēt grāmata / grāmatu*, and then we could not extend this explanation to the auxiliary debitive. Therefore the easiest way to explain the accusative in the latter construction is to assume that the accusative is dependent on the participle only, which means that *būt izlasījušam* cannot be regarded as a compound infinitive after all. This should certainly be accepted as evidence against the existence of compound tense forms in Latvian, but, on the other hand, it is conceivable that the constructions described as compound tenses are only just on their way towards grammaticalisation, and that in some cases they behave as compound tense forms, in other cases as syntactic constructions. In that case we could also assume that this process of grammaticalisation has not yet affected the combinations of past active participles with the infinitive *būt*, which continue to behave as copular constructions.

References

- Andronov, A. 1997. 'Vajadzības izteiksme' latviešu valodas gramatiskajā tradīcijā. In: *VIII Tarptautinio baltistų kongreso "Baltų kalbos XVI ir XVII amžiuje" pranešimų tezės 1997 m. spalio 7-9 d. Vilnius*, 17-18.
- Bergmane, A. e.a. (eds.). 1959, 1962. *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika. I. Fonētika un morfoloģija. II. Sintakse*. Rīga: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība.
- Bielenstein, A. 1863-64. *Die lettische Sprache nach ihren Lauten und Formen erklärend und vergleichend dargestellt*, I-II. Berlin, Ferdinand Dümmler.
- Eiche, A. 1983. *Latvian declinable and indeclinable participles. Their syntactic function, frequency and modality. A synchronic study based on Latvian fiction of the 1960s and 1970s*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Endzelīns, J. 1901/1971. Ursprung und Gebrauch des lettischen Debitivs. "Bezenbergers Beiträge", 26, 66-74 (= *Darbu izlase I*, Rīga: Zinātne, 1971, 143-150).
- Endzelīns, J. 1905/1971. Zur Entstehung des lettischen Debitivs. "Bezenbergers Beiträge", 29, 320-321 (= *Darbu izlase I*, Rīga: Zinātne, 1971, 288-9).
- Endzelīns, J. 1951. *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība.
- Ernout, A. & Thomas, F. 1959. *Syntaxe latine*. 2^e éd. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Fennell, T.G. 1973. The subject of Latvian verbs in the debitive mood. In: Ziedonis, A. e.a., eds., *Baltic Literature and Linguistics*, Columbus, Ohio: Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies, 213-221.
- Holvoet, A. 1993. On the nominative object in Latvian, with particular reference to the debitive. "Linguistica Baltica" 2, 151-161.
- Holvoet, A. 1997. Notes on the Latvian debitive. "Res Balticae", 3, 141-152.

- Holvoet, A. forthcoming. Lietuvių 'dativus cum infinitivo' ir latvių infinityviniai santykiniai sakiniai. "Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai".
- Marvan, J. 1967. Par verbu izteiksmes kategoriju mūsdienu latviešu valodā. In: *Latviešu valodas apcerējumi* (= LVU Zinātniskie raksti, 60), Rīga: Zvaigzne, 1967, 127-133.
- Mathiassen, T. 1996. *Tense, Mood and Aspect in Lithuanian and Latvian*. "Meddelelser", 75, Universitetet i Oslo, Slavisk-baltisk avdeling.
- Palmer, F.R. 1986. *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Prellwitz, W. 1904. Zur Entstehung des lettischen Debitivs. "Bezenbergers Beiträge", 28, 319.
- Schmalstieg, W.R. 1991. A comment on the Latvian debitive. In: Metuzāle-Kangere, B. & Rinholm, H., eds., *Symposium Balticum. A Festschrift to Honour Professor Velta Rūķe-Draviņa*. Hamburg: Buske Verlag, 427-432.

On a peculiar type of debitive constructions in Latvian
Axel Holvoet (Warszawa, p.t. Vilnius)

In this paper a particular type of debitive constructions is discussed, to which hardly any attention has been paid until now. It involves debitive forms derived from the stem of the compound tenses, as in *jābūt izlasījušam* "one must/should have read" rather than from that of the simple tenses, as in *jāizlasa* "one must/should read". In the first part of this paper, the structure of this type of debitives is described against the background of constructions with modal verbs, to which it is similar in several respects. Constructions with this variety of the debitive show deviant behaviour in terms of object case marking, as the object is in the accusative rather than in the nominative, which, in Standard Latvian as well as in part of the dialects, is the usual object case for nouns in the debitive construction. The consequences of this observation for the interpretation of the debitive, and of the so-called compound tense forms of the Latvian verb, are discussed in the second part of the paper.

**SOZIOKULTURELLE BEDEUTUNG UND SPRACHLICHE
LEISTUNG DER DEUTSCHEN PASTOREN FÜR DIE
ENTSTEHUNG DER LETTISCHEN SCHRIFTLICHKEIT
IM 16. JAHRHUNDERT.**

SILVIJA PAVIDIS
Rīga

Objektive Voraussetzungen für die Entstehung der lettischen Schriftlichkeit in der Reformationszeit.

Die lettische Schriftlichkeit nimmt ihre Anfänge im 16. Jahrhundert. Ähnlich wie bei den anderen Völkern Ostmitteleuropas hat die Reformation die Notwendigkeit aktualisiert, auch den Letten das Evangelium in der Muttersprache zu verkünden (Wagner 1986, 59), und eben aus diesem Grund wurden die ersten Texte – die religiösen Schriften – in lettischer Sprache verfaßt, die zuerst weniger für die lettischsprechende Bevölkerung, die noch weitgehend analphabetisch war, als für die deutsche Geistlichkeit selbst bestimmt waren (Nollendorfs 1995, 311). Und mit Recht sagt man, daß das lettische Schrifttum eine Schöpfung der Reformation ist (Arbusow 1921a; Scholz F. 1995; Plakans 1995).

Man muß aber noch eine Besonderheit der ersten Periode der lettischen Schriftlichkeit hervorheben, die in Lettland auch heute Gegenstand einer regen Diskussion ist und die die Quellen der lettischen Literatursprache betrifft. Es geht um die Frage, was als wahre Quelle der lettischen Literatursprache anzusehen ist: die Sprache der lettischen Volkslieder Dainas oder die Sprache der ersten gedruckten Texte aus dem 16. Jahrhundert, deren Verfasser