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Verbal Morphology

1. HEBREW AND CHRISTIAN HUMANISM. Studies of Hebrew have always been an important and integral part of Christianity. It is enough to mention the translation of the Old Testament into Greek carried out by the legendary “seventy” translators and the works of St. Jerome (Eusebius Hieronymus, 347/348–419/420), who was a perfect vir trilinguis of his times. Nevertheless, only the Renaissance, the rebirth of humanism, stimulated a dramatic increase of interest in Hebrew studies. The influx of Christian scholars into the field starting from the beginning of the 16th century is unparalleled in earlier history. The call ad fontes and a rapid development of Biblical Humanism made Hebrew studies one of the cornerstones of newly emerging forms of Christianity. Mastering the triad of Biblical languages enabled the leaders of the Reformation to use primary (available) texts and legitimize new translations or editions of Scripture, new exegetical texts and revolutionary theological postulates.

2. THE COLLEGIUM TRILINGUE AND KÖNIGSBERG UNIVERSITY. In 1517 Desiderius Erasmus’ (1466/1469–1536) initiatives gained the support of Hieronymus van Busleyden (1470–1517) and the Collegium Trilingue was founded in Leuven. This institution, specifically aimed at the study of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, was the first

* I would like to thank all participants of the seminar “Das Baltikum im sprachgeschichtlichen Kontext der europäischen Reformation” for their valuable comments and suggestions. I am also indebted to Steven Young for useful remarks and for improving the English of my article. Needless to say, all errors and misinterpretations are mine.
of its kind in Europe (as a formally independent unit). The model of
trilingual education spread quickly during the first decades of the
16th century. It is quite difficult to establish when it reached borders
of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and when the Humanist curricu-
lum was first implemented for the needs of Lithuanians1.

A highly probable candidate for collegium trilingue is a school
established ca. 1540 by Abraham Culvensis (Lith. Abraomas Kul-
vietis, ca. 1509–1545) in Vilnius. Little is known about the activi-
ties of this school and one may only hazard guesses based on the
education and library of its founder. A list of books Culvensis
owned presents him as a typical homo trilinguis, and his path of
studies included the universities of Cracow, Leipzig, Wittenberg
and finally Siena, where he received a doctorate of law in 15372.

In 1542 Culvensis was accused of disseminating Protestant ideas
and had to flee from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The school
ceased to exist and its founder took refuge in Prussia. At that time,
Duke of Prussia Albert of Hohenzollern (1490–1568) was engaged
in the foundation of a collegium type of school in Königsberg. In
1541–1542 a so-called Partikular (studium particulare) was estab-
lished, followed by the proclamation of Königsberg University
(Academy) in 1544. The foundation acts of both institutions
explicitly state their humanistic and trilingual character:

Wollen demnach in Kraft dieses unserm Briefes in bemeldte Stadt Kneiphoff
Königsberg im Thumb [...] eine freye Schul und Particular [...]geleget, geordnet,
und fundiret haben, zu welcher nach Gelegenheit und viele der Schüler allerley
Sprachen, Lateinisch, Griechisch, und Hebräisch, nicht weniger auch Theologia,
Jus, Medicina, und die andere herrliche und lõöliche freye Künste jedermännlich
zu ordentlicher und gebührender Zeit gelesen, und vorgetragen werden mögen3.

Culvensis became a vice-rector of the Partikular4 and the first
professor of Greek at the university, where he also taught Hebrew
and commented on the Psalms (Wotschke 1905, 165). Based on these
facts one may assume that Culvensis could be engaged in similar
activities at his school in Vilnius. Königsberg University became a
strong centre of attraction for Lithuanian humanists.

Unsurprisingly, the Duchy of Prussia is considered a cradle of

---

1 I am referring here to Lithuanians as residents of the Grand Duchy of
Lithuania and certainly do not limit myself to ethnic Lithuanians.
2 Theodor Wotschke suggested that Culvensis also had a doctorate in
theology (Theodor Wotschke, “Abraham Culvensis. Urkunden zur
Reformationsgeschichte Litauens”, Altpreußische
Monatschrift 42 [=Altpreußische Provinzial-
Blätter 108], 1905, 155; cf.
Paul Tschantz [Hrsg.],
Urkundenbuch
zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogtums Preußen I.
Einleitung, Leipzig; Verlag
von S. Hirzel, 1890, 249,
Anm. 2). A list of
Culvensis’ books
“Inventarium omnium
librorum et suppelletliis
d. doctoris Abrahami”
is presented by Wotschke
(1905, 189–190) and
commented upon
by Marcelinas Ročka in:
Marcelinas Ročka,
“A. Kulvičio bibliotekos
autorai ir knygos”,
Knygotyra 10(8), 1970,
115–128 and “A. Kulvičio
bibliotekos pobūdis”,
Knygotyra 2(9), 1972,
149–159.
3 “Beylagen zur Historie
der Königsbergischen
Universität. Num. 4.
Fondation des Particulart
to Königsberg”, Daniel
Heinrich Arnold,
Ausführliche und mit
Urkunden versehene Historie
der Königsbergischen
Universität 1, Königsberg
in Preußen; Johann
Heinrich Hartung, 1746,
10; cf. 25–26: “Alii graecae
& hebraicae linguae
authores proponent,
quad hae linguae fontes
Doctrinae Ecclesiasticae
continuunt” (“Num. 6.
Diploma des Marg-
grafen Albrechts,
die Fondation der Königsb.
Academie betreffend”).
4 He was de facto the head
of the Partikular as the
position of rector was
still unoccupied at that
time.
Lithuanian written language and printing; it was here that the first book was published in 1547 (a Catechism prepared by Martinus Mosvidius [Lith. Martynas Mažvydas, ca. 1520–1563]) and that a full translation of the Bible was made in 1579–1590 (by Johannes Bretke [Lith. Jonas Bretkūnas, 1536—1602, manuscript]). Natural developments followed in the 17th century, when grammars and dictionaries were compiled.

3. DANIEL KLEIN AND THE FIRST PRINTED LITHUANIAN GRAMMARS. Daniel Klein (Lith. Danielius Kleinas, 1609–1666) was born in Tilsit (Lith. Tilžė) in Prussia. He studied at Königsberg University and received a magister artium in 1636. Klein was well trained in classical languages, had excellent command of Lithuanian and had some knowledge of Polish, Czech and French. It is clear that Klein studied not only Hebrew, but other Semitic languages as well, cf. the address of Johannes Behm in a brief laudatory poem: “Nam cum Germanus[,] Graecus sit atque Latinus[,] Lithuanus, Syrus, tandem Iudaicus et Arabus”\(^5\). In 1637 Klein returned to Tilsit and worked all his life as a pastor. Klein is renowned for compiling the first printed Lithuanian grammars in Latin (Grammatica Litvanica, 1653, further on referred to as KIG 1653) and German (Compendium Lituanico-Germanicum, 1654, further on referred to as KIC 1654)\(^6\) and for preparing a revised and enlarged edition of a hymnal (1666). He also wrote a dictionary of Lithuanian (KIG 1653, fol. A5v–A6r [PLKG 1957, 76–77]), although its fate is unclear.

The grammars of Klein are usually referred to as the first Lithuanian grammars. To be more precise, one should note that these are the first known printed grammars. At least by 1643 Christoph Sappuhn (Lith. Kristupas Sapūnas, 1589–1659) had finished a manuscript of Lithuanian grammar, but it was only published in 1673 by Teophil Schultz (Lith. Teofilis Šulcas, 1629–1673), who is also believed to have edited the text to some extent\(^7\). Little is known about another grammar possibly compiled in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In 1570 a Jesuit college was established in Vilnius and transformed into a university in 1579. Jesuit scholarship gave Lithuanian culture the prominent figure of Constantinus Syrwid (Lith. Konstantinas Sirvydas, Pol. Konstantyn Szyrwid, 1578/1581–1631). He is renowned for compiling the first printed Lithuanian dictionary (Latin—Polish—Lithuanian, first edition ca. 1620) and a Lithuanian—Polish sermon book (1629, 1644). The Jesuit historian Philippe Alegambe and his successors provide us with the information that Syrwid also compiled the Clavis Linguæ Lithuanicae\(^8\). The fate of this

---


\(^6\) I refer to quotes from KIG and KIC by their original pagination followed by the page numbers used in the facsimile edition in: PLKG 1957.

\(^7\) The facsimile edition of the Sappuhn—Schultz Grammar in: SSG 1673.

\(^8\) “Scripta idiomate Polonico & Lithuanico […] Clavis Linguæ Lithuanicae” (Philippe Alegambe, Bibliotheca scriptorum Societatis Jesu, 1643, 84, cf. 538).
work is unclear and since clavis is an ambiguous term, one may only wonder if this was a grammar or another edition of Syrwyd’s dictionary.

4. HEBREW IN THE GRAMMARS OF KLEIN. In explaining the patterns of Lithuanian, Klein makes quite frequent references to classical and vernacular languages. In so doing, he tries to achieve two goals. On one hand, the reader is able to use his/her knowledge of these languages to understand the grammar of Lithuanian. On the other hand, demonstrating similarities with classical languages legitimates Lithuanian as a “civilized” language. The latter goal is very important to Klein, since he has to convince the opponents of his time that Lithuanian has a systematic grammar and is not some mixed language (“mixta & confusa lingva”, KIG 1653, fol. A7r [PLKG 1957, 79]). As for Hebrew, Klein makes references to it in all sections of the grammar, viz. phonetics, morphology and syntax (e.g., KIG 1653, 8, 10, 13 f., 60, 83 f., 146, 163 [PLKG 1957, 102, 104, 107 f., 156, 179 f., 242, 259]; KIC 1654, 53, 110 [PLKG 1957, 333, 390]). I would like to focus here on matters of verbal morphology only. I will begin with Klein’s Grammatica Litavica (1653) and then discuss his Compendium Litvano-Germanicum (1654). Finally, I will provide some notes on Hebrew verbal categories in later Lithuanian grammars edited in Prussia.

The introductory chapter on the verb in KIG 1653, 83–87 (PLKG 1957, 179–183) is structured as follows. First, verbal “accidents” are enumerated: “Verbo accidunt octo: Distentio, Perfona: Numerus, Tempus, Modus, Conjugatio, Species & Figura”. Distinctio is explained as covering three aspects: “Distentivitur Verbum, vel ex significatione, vel ex formâ, vel perfonâ”. Significatio consists of five members: “Ex significatione aliiud verbum eft Activum, ut: wadinnu voco, mušu verbero. Aliud Paffivum, ut: wadinnamas efmi vocor, mušamas efmi verborer. Aliud Neutrum, ut: ftiwium [f], bęgu curro, giwenu vivo”. Having enumerated these three “significations”, Klein adds another two which come from Hebrew grammar, namely, hif’il and hitpa’el. Before proceeding further, I will try to explain these terms in brief. Hebrew, being a Semitic language, has seven morphophonemic verbal patterns (Heb. binyanim, literally ‘buildings, constructions’), which prototypically express simple, intensive, causative and reflexive actions and/or voice (active/passive). Table 1 gives us a hint about how a root can be modified through all seven binyanim (only a small number of roots can occur in all seven patterns).
TABLE 1. The binyan system: Root—Pattern—Verb. Triconsonantal root K-T-V ‘write’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>binyan</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Resultative verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) K-T-V</td>
<td>PAAL</td>
<td>CaCaC</td>
<td>KαταV / ‘wrote’ (‘basic/simple’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) K-T-V</td>
<td>NIFAL</td>
<td>niCaC</td>
<td>κινταV / ‘was written’ (‘b./s.-passive’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) K-T-V</td>
<td>PIEL</td>
<td>CiCoC</td>
<td>KιταV / ‘inscribed’ (‘intensive’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) K-T-V</td>
<td>PUAL</td>
<td>KuCaC</td>
<td>KυταV / ‘was inscribed’ (‘intensive-passive’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) K-T-V</td>
<td>HIFIL</td>
<td>hiCrIC</td>
<td>KιτιV / ‘dictated’ (‘causative’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) K-T-V</td>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td>huCaC</td>
<td>ΚυταV / ‘was dictated’ (‘passive-causative’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) K-T-V</td>
<td>HTPAEI</td>
<td>hiCaCoC</td>
<td>ΚιταV / ‘corresponded’ (‘reflexive’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. HIF’IL IN THE GRAMMATICA LITVANICA. Lithuanian hif’il verbs are described by Klein as follows: “Aliud [ex significacione verbum] etf Transfitivum, more Hebraorum in Hiphil, ut: raﬁydinu / id etf, duymi raﬁyi / ich lafe ﬂchreiben / jükünü ridere facio, ich mache lachen / puldinu facio labi, ich mache fallen[] Ejus nota etf litera n / ceu characteritica ante u in ultimâ. <Observes tamen, non omnia verba in nu definentia effe transfitiva, fed qua simplicibus illud superaddunt, ut à raﬁyi est transtitii. raﬁyduinu / à pulu puldinu.>” (KIG 1653, 83–83[=84, fol. F3v] [PLKG 1957, 179 f.]). It is clear that Klein is speaking about Lithuanian verbs we would now describe as causative. I will focus on two aspects: (1) what transfitivum means here and (2) what paraphrases we are used to explain the Lithuanian formations.

Klein notes that “Transfitivum aliás idem est Grammaticis, quod Verbum Activum; nobis autem hic magis quid significat, nimimum non solum actionem agentis, sed etiam actionem in alium transferentis, ut ex verbis superius adscriptis facilé videatur est” (KIG 1653, 83[=84, fol. F3v] [PLKG 1957, 180]). Therefore Klein is very careful in choosing his words. He realizes that one could understand transfitivum as a term of Latin grammar (roughly the same as the contemporary meaning of transitive), cf.: “Activum est, quod in O desinit, & actionem significat [...] Actionem ergo intellige hic transitivam, hoc est, qua in alium personam aut rem transit, sim exercetur” (Philipp Melanchthon, Grammatica, 1610, 209 f.). Klein’s usage of transitivum corresponds to modern causatium and his note that the action is transferred onto the other action (“actionem in alium transferentis”) is based on Hebrew grammatical tradition, cf.: “TERTIA [conjugatio] vocatur Hiphil [...] Significat enim translationem actionis vel qualitatis primae Conjugationis, in aliam rem vel personam” (Christophorus Helvicus, Hebraeae linguae institution, 1608, fol. D2v).
Paraphrases like Inf. + facere, machen, lassen are standard for explaining hif’il in Hebrew grammars of 16th and 17th centuries. Even if a reader is not familiar with Hebrew (which is unlikely for an educated person of that time), the paraphrases given are quite helpful. I would like to draw the reader’s attention to the sole Lithuanian paraphrase: “rašydinu / id eft, dūmi rašyti / ich lafe schreiben”. Klein undoubtedly noticed that Lithuanian formations in -dinti are synonymous with the analytical constructions duoti + Inf. in Old Lithuanian (for Klein also contemporary) texts edited in the Duchy of Prussia. Here are some examples found in Bretek’s Bible translation¹¹: Tadda fuunte tofpi [crossed out] Abimelech Karalius Geraro [?], ir atvejdana ie [---dave ie atvefti] / Da sandte Abimelech der König zu Gerar nach ir, vnd lies sie holden (Gen 20,2); ir thu muneftadina [---dave thu muneftiti] Tierval faava / vnd liessen in jrem Vater bringen (Gen 37,32); Ir fuvadindina [---dave fuvadinti] wifus Wirianfius kunigus ir Raflchtiniku / Vnd lies versamalen alle Hehopriester vnd Schriftgelerten (Matt 2,4); Ir ifsuinte, ir wifus Bernelius Bethleheme nufavindina [---dave wifus Bernelius Bethleheme nufa-winti] / Vnd schicket aus, vnd lies alle Kinder zu Bethlehem tödden (Matt 2,16)¹².

4.2 HITPA’EL IN THE GRAMMATICA LITVANICA. The notion of hitpa’al is used by Klein to explain the peculiarities of Lithuanian reflexive verbs: “Aliud [ex significatione verbum est] Reciprocum, ut sunt verba apud Hebrews in Hithpahel. E. g.] apfibiaurinu containio me ipfum, paifidiniu magnifico, extollo me ipfum. rupinuš follicitus fim de me ipfo, ich bemūhe mich / ich trage für mich Sorge / dūmes permito me, ich lafe mich” (KIG 1653, 83[=84, fol. F3v] [PLKG 1957, 180]).

The main problem here is why Klein refers again to Hebrew, since mentioning the term reciprocum and providing German parallels already suffice as an explanation of Lithuanian reflexive verbs. My guess is that Klein is fond of the binuyn system. He undoubtedly feels that three “significations” from Latin (activum, passivum and neutrum) plus two “significations” from Hebrew (hif’il

and *hitpa‘el*) make a nice combination based on the classical languages. Therefore, he avoids explicit references here to vernacular languages (German and possibly Polish or Czech). By pointing out parallels between Lithuanian and the classical languages, Klein tries to demonstrate the systematic nature of Lithuanian grammar and thus denies accusations of “mixed” and “confused” language (see 4.1. above).

4.3. HIFIL AND HITPA‘EL IN THE COMPENDIUM LITVANICO-GERMANICUM. In the abridged German edition of his grammar, Klein makes references to both Hebrew verbal formations (*Kic* 1654, 53 [*PLKG* 1957, 333]). He gives no examples of the three usual “significations” (*activum, passivum* and *neutrum*) and notes that Lithuanian has neither *verba deponentia* nor *genus medium*, but draws the reader’s attention to two peculiar verbal “significations”: “Die Littauen haben nicht ein *Verbum Deponens*, wie die Lateiner / oder ein *Medium*, wie die Griechen / doch haben sie über das *Activum, Neutrum* und *Passivum* absonderliche *Verba*”.

In his explanation of Lithuanian causative formations, Klein characterizes them again as *transitiva*, but first uses German paraphrases of Lithuanian examples before referring to *hif’il*: “*Verba Transitiva*, welche fo erklärt werden; drafînu [erratum instead of: drafînu]** ich mache kühn und dreuft / pykinu ich mache einen böfle oder 50nig / darydinu ich laffe machen / oder verfertigen / Walgidinu ich mache ihn effend / oder ich nötige zum Effen / eben auff den fchlag / wie bey den Hebreern die *Verba in Hiphil*”. For the sake of brevity, Klein relies more on German paraphrases and skips explanations of *transitivum* which are present in his *Grammatica Lituana*. Notably, he uses new examples.

As for reflexive formations, their explanation is quite the same compared to the *Grammatica Lituana*, but new examples are provided: “*Verba Reciproca*, welche erklärt werden wie die *Verba in Hithpahel* bey den Hebreern / als: ginûs o[er] apfiginu ich wehre mich / ich bechûte mich / aukûtinu oder paﬁaukûtinu ich erhebe mich / linkûminûs oder paﬁlinkûminûs ich efrene / trûte mich”.

In general, it is important that Hebrew parallels remain in Klein’s *Compendium*. It is an abridged version of the *Grammatica Lituana* and provides only vital information to the reader. Therefore, Klein seems to have thought that references to Hebrew grammar are of first-hand importance.

From a contemporary point of view, at least causative formations should be described together with other derivational catego-
ries (see KIG 1653, 129 f. [PLKG 1957, 225 f.]). We may conclude that since causatives do not fit into the Latin model of the usual three members (inchoativa, frequentativa, diminutiva), Klein describes them as verbal “significations” in the introductory chapters of his grammars.

4.4. HIF’IL AND HITPA’EL IN LATER LITHUANIAN GRAMMARS EDITED IN PRUSSIA (1673–1800). The pioneering works of Klein were of great importance. They had a great influence on later grammatical treatises and played a significant role in the formation of standard written Lithuanian in Prussia.

Interestingly enough, the notions of hif’il and hitpa’el are not mentioned in the grammar of Sappuhn, written before Klein’s Grammatica but published only in 1673 by Schultz. Lithuanian causative and reflexive formations are described in a chapter on verbal derivation (“De Specie & Figurâ”) and are characterized as permissive (permissiva) and intransitive (intransitiva) respectively (SSG 1673, 41 [142]). Causative examples are notably the same as in Klein’s Grammatica (see 4.2. above): “Permissiva, quæ definunt in u / ut: Raﬁjîdinu / permitto icribere. Jûkinu / facio ridere. Puldinu / facio labi”.

The 18th century Lithuanian grammars edited and printed in Prussia demonstrate a full range of possibilities with respect to comparing causatives and reflexives to Hebrew hif’il and hitpa’el formations. Some mention only one, while some mention or “forget” both. The reasons why these grammarians find the notions of hif’il and hitpa’el useful (or of no use) remain unclear to me and need a deeper insight. I will limit myself here to presenting a brief summary in table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Causatives compared to hif’il</th>
<th>Reflexives compared to hitpa’el</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haack 1730</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES (313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruhig 1747</td>
<td>YES (101)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostermeyer 1791</td>
<td>YES (53, 73)</td>
<td>YES (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mielcke 1800</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. CONCLUSIONS. The study of Semitic languages gave Klein and his successors a challenging basis for comparing Lithuanian and Hebrew. These comparisons have to be regarded as the first and quite
successful typological investigations in Lithuanian linguistics. The set of Hebrew, Greek and Latin *comparata* also worked as a significant argument that the Lithuanian language is neither “mixed” nor “confused”, but a tongue which shares grammatical features with all three languages of Scripture.
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und verlegt durch
Johann Reunern / 
M. DC. LIV.

|MELANCHTHON,
PHILIPPUS, 1610:|
Grammatica PHILIPPI
MELANCHTHONIS,
EX ADMODVM
NECESSARIIS NOTIS
M. JOHANNIS FABRI,
Publicæ utilissimi causa
recognita &
locupletata. ACCESSIT
TRACTATUS DE
ORTHOGRAPHIA
RECENS. 1610 Cum
Gratia & Privilegio
Caef. Majefatis.
VVITEBERGÆ,
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Seuberlich, Impfenis
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Gottlieb Mielcke:]
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mit färchen 3ul4gen
und neuen Ausarbei-
tungen verbeffert und
vermehrt worden
von Christian Gottlieb
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Pilckallen. Königsberg,
1800. Druck und
Verlag der
Hartungfchen
Hoofbuchdruckerey.
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TESTAMENTAS Ing
Lietuufſka Liefzya
perrafektas per Janą
Breſtka Labytuow
opleba 1580. DAS
NEUE TESTAMENT in
die litauische Sprache
übersetzt von Johann
Breter, Pastor zu Labauc
1580. Faksimile
der Handschrift, Band
7 und 8, Labau i. Pr.
1580, hrsg. von Jochen
Dieter Range, Friedrich
Scholz, Biblia Slavica.
Serie VI:
Supplementum: Biblia
Lituanica, Band 1.7,
Paderborn, München,
Wien, Zürich Ferdi-
Osterneyer 1791 –
[Gottfried Oster-
meyer:] Neue
Litauffiche Grammatik
ans Licht gefehlt.
von Gottfried Oster-
meyer, der
Trenpfenčen
Gemeine Pfotefce
Seniore und der
Köning=Deutschen
Geffeſchaft 7u
Königsberg
Ehrand=Mitglied.
Königsberg, 1791.
gedruck bey
G. L. Hartung, Königl.
Preüf. Hofbuchdrucker
und Buchhändler.
PLKG 1957 – Pirmoji
lietuvų kalbos graminika.
1653 metai, faksimilinis
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