Roth, Kevin

Learning Russian via Latin in the 17th century

KEVIN ROTH

(UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO)

LEARNING RUSSIAN VIA LATIN IN THE 17th CENTURY

The linguistic status quo of 17th century Russia was marked by diglossia between the spoken vernacular (Russian) and the learned medium of writing (Slavonic). Consequently, very little was written in Russian and nothing at all about Russian per se *until a foreigner composed a short treatise in Latin on the spoken language. Heinrich Ludolf's* Grammatica Russica *of 1696 is a useful source of information not only concerning the language about which it was written, but also the language in which it was written. The textbook is surprisingly reminiscent of modern learning resources, especially in its inclusion of sample conversations, which presents a little-seen facet of Latin: the colloquial side of a pre-eminently literary language. The model conversations, written in parallel Latin and Russian columns (with a German translation at the bottom of each page), especially when compared to the rest of the work, reveal a stylistic dichotomy that reflects the special features of colloquial Latin, in particular: 1) Colloquial Latin utilizes both methods of indirect discourse, but the use of* quod *as a conjunction was heavily favored over the accusative-infinitive construction. In literary Latin only the latter construction is found. 2) In colloquial Latin some pronouns (*ipse, ille, is*) were functionally merged as 3rd person pronouns, and others largely fell from usage (*hic, iste*). In contrast, literary Latin makes more distinctive use of all varieties. 3) Words to describe facets of the contemporary world unknown to the Romans were either created by Latinization (mostly the case with proper nouns) or the application of an ancient word to a new sense. The Latinization can be inconsistent, since differing versions of the same word do appear. Ludolf's work demonstrates how writers used and modified an ancient language to describe the modern world around them in a way that could reach the educated reading public of nearly all Europe.*

Key words: Neo-Latin, Russian, Heinrich Wilhelm Ludolf, 17th century, Peter the Great, Slavonic, Old Church Slavic, diglossia, colloquia, foreign language pedagogy

Though Russian has long been a widespread and fully-fledged literary language, in 1696 it existed almost solely as a spoken idiom and to only a very limited extent served as a medium of writing. In that year *Grammatica Russica*, the earliest written analysis of the Russian language, was

published. This grammar is in itself a remarkable testament to the movement of people and ideas across borders. The short book is about Russian, is written in Latin, and was published in England by a German, who worked as a diplomat for the king of Denmark. Heinrich Wilhelm Ludolf's decision to inform others about Russian through the medium of Latin highlights the continued importance of that language in Europe at the turn of the 18th century as a way to spread ideas and information across a continent divided by a multitude of tongues. The work, of course, reveals a great deal about early Russian, but is an equally fruitful resource for examination of Neo-Latin, the variety of the language used and spoken in early modern times.[1] The book is also interesting in its own right, opening a window into the Europe of the turn of the 18th century and presenting a surprisingly modern sight. Finally, it gives a model for the active use of spoken Latin in the modern classroom, a growing trend.

Grammatica Russica consists of 97 numbered pages, preceded by an unnumbered dedication and preface. The work is dedicated in highly sycophantic language to Boris Alexeyevich Golitsyn (1654–1714), a scion of a very prominent noble house in Russia and one of Czar Peter the Great's closest associates in his westernization project, memorably described as highly educated and fluent in Latin (very rare for a Russian noble in those days) but also a drunkard and an uncouth savage: in other words, the perfect companion for Peter, who had once founded a drinking club called the All-Joking, All-Drunken Synod of Fools and Jesters. Ludolf evidently got to know Golitsyn quite well during his time in Russia from 1692 to 1694.

Early in the book there is a short passage about the differences between Slavonic and Russian (pp. 4–5). The first grammar of what Ludolf called Slavonic and what modern linguists refer to as Church Slavic had been published in the 1619, Meletii Smotritsky's *Grammatiki Slavenskię Pravilnoe Sintagma*.[2] There seems to have been some awareness of this work in the west, as Ludolf implies that some of his readers might already know Slavonic (13–14). Ludolf's work, however, was the first to specifically address Russian, which point he makes at length in the preface. The linguistic *status quo* in Russia at the time was clearly diglossia, the state in which prestige and non-prestige varieties of what is considered the same language are used in complementary distribution, the high form for writing and learned discourse, and the low form for everyday use. In 17th century Russia Church Slavic was the high form and Russian the low. As Ludolf states in the preface to his work, "loquendum est Russice & scribendum est Slavonice" (one

1   IJSEWIJN (1990: v).

2   GASPAROV (2001: 22).

must speak in Russian and write in Slavonic). Ludolf knows of only a single book written in Russian, a collection of laws. He is, therefore, breaking new ground in deliberately trying to write about Russian, and specifically comments that his orthography is phonetic rather than traditional. He gives the example of the word 'today' which is written as *segodnya* in Church Slavic but pronounced as *sevodni* in the spoken language (both phrases literally mean 'of this day'). Modern Russian has compromised by retaining the traditional spelling, but standardizing at least part of the vernacular pronunciation as *sevodnya*. Ludolf actively encourages the ecclesiastical hierarchy (which had a monopoly on publishing in Russia in those days) to permit the publication of books written in the vernacular. It is worth noting that Ludolf makes such an appeal through Latin, the use of which had been and was still in Ludolf's time the most serious obstacle to the development of vernacular writing in Western Europe, and which had been promoted by the Catholic Church in exactly the same way as the Russian Orthodox Church promoted Church Slavic.

The bulk of the book's first half consists of a section on Russian grammar (pp. 6–45), composed largely of paradigms of nouns and verbs. The grammar of Russian is made to correspond to that of Latin as much as possible, and accordingly Russian nouns are declined with the six cases of Latin. This is problematic in two respects: firstly Russian (in contrast to Church Slavic and certain modern Slavic languages) totally lacks the vocative case. Ludolf lists *similis est nominativo* for the vocative in all nominal paradigms. He does make a special note of this, though, commenting that while the vocative case is for the most part lacking, certain Church Slavic vocatives are used in fixed expressions: *bozhe pomilui*, *miserere Deus* (15). One imagines that Ludolf, having noted this, would have simply left the vocative out of the paradigms completely, were it not for the inescapable temptation to make the grammar conform as closely as possible to that of Latin. The second problematic element is the fact Russian lacks the ablative case, but has instead a locative (often called prepositional, since it only occurs with prepositions) and instrumental case. Ludolf names these *ablativus* and *ablativus instrumentalis*.

The second half of the work begins with a collection of sample dialogues that demonstrate the actual workings of the language (46–82). These dialogues follow in the tradition of *colloquia*, model conversations used since the Middle Ages to teach Latin to schoolchildren. Despite the monastic setting of most education then, early Medieval colloquia treat not only secular, but also mundane and even vulgar matters. The conversations are organized around particular subjects: *variae expressions communies, de cibo et potu, de rebus domesticis inter servum et Dominum, de itinere et aliis rebus*, and

last but by far the longest *de cultu Divino*. This chapter is followed by a brief thematically-arranged vocabulary *rerum naturalium* (83–90) consisting mostly of nouns. The dialogues feature parallel Latin and Russian versions, with a German translation at the bottom. The vocabulary section is arranged in three columns: Latin, Russian, and German. Ludolf mentions that he chose to include German in the work as well because that language was the *lingua franca* of the small community of western expatriates in Russia at the time. Peter the Great himself learned German and Dutch from this community. The works ends with a short appendix (91–7) written entirely in Latin that describes the country itself, specifically its minerals, vegetation, animals, and men. Most interestingly, Ludolf mentions that in Siberia men dig up what he transliterates (but does not attempt to translate into Latin) as *mammotovoi kost*, 'mammoth bone,' and use it as medicine, along with the intriguingly named *cornu monocerotis*, 'unicorn horn' (92). Ludolf also mentions watermelons (*arbusi*) as something exotic, seemingly little known in western Europe at the time (94).

The most important insight into Russian that this book provides is that it has changed little since 1696. Anyone with an adequate command of the contemporary language, and who is familiar with the orthographic conventions that predate the Russian Revolution, can understand the Russian. Admittedly, comprehension is facilitated by familiarity with the archaic features of the language found in the classics of 19th century Russian literature, which constitute an important component of modern Russian education. That is to say, any Russian who pays a modicum of attention in school should be quite familiar with such archaisms. The form of the letters has a distinctly archaic look, since the work was composed before Peter the Great's introduction of the civil alphabet (*grazhdanskij shrift*), the basis for the current standard, in 1708–10.[3] Disappointingly for a textbook, the unpredictable stress of Russian words is never marked. Stress has never been regularly indicated in standard Russian orthography, apart from in dictionaries and educational materials for young children and foreigners. One result of this today is that even among native Russian speakers there is sometimes confusion over the correct accentuation of less common words. Ludolf himself does note the phonemic status of accentuation (9). He marks the stress of Slavonic words in the section on grammatical terms (1–3) and in a lengthy closing prayer at the end of the conversation on religion (79–81), but not in the passage about salient differences between Russian and Slavonic (4–5). In so doing he seems to imply that Slavonic, rather than Russian, was appropriate for

---

3   SOKOLSKY (1966: 117).

prayers. To this day Slavonic remains the liturgical language of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Ludolf's understanding of Russian is impressive in light of the relatively short length of his sojourn in Russia (less than two years) and because he is breaking new academic ground in studying the vernacular. In his treatment of nouns he expresses a sentiment shared subsequently by many a student of Russian: *magnam nomina habent difficultatem* (11). He notes that the endings of nouns themselves change, as in Greek and Latin, and not just the article, *uti in maxima parte Vernacularum* (*sic*) *Europae*. Ludolf seems influenced by his native German in making this claim, since the four cases of German are fully expressed only by definite and indefinite articles. Besides German, such an arrangement is not at all common among European languages. At that time, however, the grammar of other languages was likened to Latin as much as possible, so that even languages such as French (which has completely lost case apart from pronouns) were understood to possess declinable nouns in a paradigm such as the following:[4]

Nominativus, accusativus, vocativus

charetier	auriga, aurigam, o auriga
le charetier	hic auriga, hunc aurigam
un charettier	unus auriga, unum aurigam

Genitivus, ablativus

de charetier	aurigae
du charetier	huius aurigae
d'un charetier	unius aurigae

Dativus

à charetier, au charetier, à un charetier huic aurigae

The various cases were distinguished based on the definite article and prepositions. Ludolf is perhaps thinking along these lines when he writes that most European languages distinguish case only with articles.

Ludolf's most significant shortcoming in describing Russian grammar is his lack of understanding of the basic feature of the Slavic verb: the aspectual pairing of perfective and imperfective forms of the same verb. The complete paradigm for a Slavic verb consists of two verbs. There are some instances of suppletion, but usually one is derived from the other, though there are many methods of derivation. For example, the Russian verb 'to do' consists of two verbs: the imperfective *delat'* and the perfective *sdelat'*. The latter is derived from the former by the addition a prefix. The imperfective verb is conjugated for three tenses: past, present, and future. The perfective verb lacks a future form, but the present conjugation is future in

---

4   Pɪʟʟᴏᴛ (1550: 9).

meaning (since a perfective present action is logically impossible). Ludolf is aware of this phenomenon. At the beginning of his section on verbs he establishes as dichotomy of *verba primitiva* and *derivativa* and specifies that the most common use of the *derivativa* is frequentative (26). This is only partially correct, since although in many instances the imperfective form is derived from the perfective, in many other cases the perfective is derived from the imperfective. Thus, it is misleading to consider the perfective the basic form and the imperfective derived from it. Furthermore, Ludolf does not seem to understand that the perfective present is future in meaning. He gives the paradigm of *sdelat'*, but translates it with the present tense of *facio* (30). When specifying the formation of the future, Ludolf only mentions the addition of the auxiliary *budu*, which is the future formation for only the imperfective form.

The work also reveals the early origin of a feature that marks Russian to this day: the use of Church Slavic to supply technical and scientific vocabulary. Just as English has long turned to Latin and Greek to supply such terms, Russian makes use of Church Slavic. For example, the Russian word for 'milk' is *moloko*, but the word for 'mammal,' literally 'milk-nourishing one,' is *mlekopitayushchee*. The variation between *moloko* and *mleko* in the first part of the word shows the varying reflexes of so-called TorT groups in the two languages. This use of Church Slavic is exactly what Ludolf meant when he wrote that one must write in Church Slavic. Ludolf presents a lengthy list of Russian grammatical terms, and these very same terms are still used in Russian today (pp. 1–3). The words are, for the most part, calques of Latin grammatical terms, which are themselves calques of Greek grammatical terms. The word 'noun' (which English word itself is derived from the Latin word *nomen* 'word') is *glagol*, which is Church Slavic, for 'word.' The word for singular is *yedinstvenoe*, which shows the Church Slavic form of 'one,' rather than the Russian version, *odin*. The eight parts of speech are *osm*, rather than *vosem*. The epenthetic *v-* is standard in Russian (and is a common colloquialism in Czech), but not good Slavonic. Many of the other terms resemble Russian words. Since at the time of the book's publication Russian was not used for intellectual writings, there can be little doubt that all of the grammatical terms come from Church Slavic, and where the term also happens to be a Russian word this is simply a coincidence due to the inherent similarities of the languages, especially since modern Russian has fully incorporated so great a number of Slavonic words into its own vocabulary that it is easy to mistake them for native Russian words.

A cursory analysis of the German used in this grammar produces a few insights into the language of the time. All German words are written in

the frustrating *Fraktur* script that dominated German publishing until the 2ⁿᵈ World War. For the most part, the German is very close to the standard *Hochdeutsch* of today. Spelling is somewhat archaic: nouns are not capitalized. There are no umlauts, nor does an *e* follow a vowel that would otherwise have an umlaut over it. The letter *t* sometimes appears as *th* (*thun*) and *i* as *y* (*bey*). Today's ubiquitous 2ⁿᵈ person formal pronoun *Sie* does not appear at all; rather the 2ⁿᵈ person plural *ihr* is used as a translation of the Russian 2ⁿᵈ person singular *ty* and Latin *tu*. This odd arrangement is due to the fact that, then as now, textbooks strove to display the language as actually spoken. Latin did not possess a formal 2ⁿᵈ person pronoun, but German did, and the formal was more regularly used. Thus *ihr* was a better functional translation of Russian *ty* and Latin *tu* than the actual German equivalent, *du*. Although *ihr* is no longer used as a formal 2ⁿᵈ person pronoun in German, having been replaced by *Sie*, it still retains that function in Yiddish.[5] Russian at the time did not regularly use a formal 2ⁿᵈ person pronoun. The use of *vy* in that capacity was a calque originally copied from German and Dutch practice during the reign of Peter the Great, and deeply entrenched in Russian throughout the 18ᵗʰ century by the vogue for French. As readers of Tolstoy can attest, during the 18ᵗʰ century knowledge of French became universal within the Russian aristocracy. The use of *vy* as a formal 2ⁿᵈ person pronoun was originally an innovation among the nobility, who would use it even to address serfs, who would respond using the informal *ty*.[6]

As regards Latin, there is a very prominent stylistic dichotomy among the various sections. The dedication, preface, and appendix are written in the more archaic classicizing style of Neo-Latin, but the rest of the work, especially the model conversations, displays unambiguously the non-Classical features that distinguish Medieval Latin. This is not at all surprising: the conversations are meant to be colloquial. What is surprising is the spectacle of lower-register Latin. To have an adequate command of Latin one did not need to speak like a Ciceronian oration.

The classicizing style of the dedication can be observed in the following details: firstly, indirect statements are always formed with the accusative-infinitive construction, rather than a conjunction. Secondly, there are distinctly archaic lexical items: *Deus ter optimus maximus*, *terrarum orbis*, *ipsemet* (dedication 2). Thirdly, a sentence-initial relative pronoun functions as a demonstrative. Fourthly, the final sentence shows epistolary style: *dabam Oxonii d. 8. Maii 1696*. The same sentence also reveals the limits of Ludolf's pretension toward older style: there is no attempt to record in the

---

5   WEINREICH (1971: 64).

6   COMRIE (1996: 250).

most ancient fashion either the date (*ante diem octavum Idus Maias*) or the year (*AUC* 2449 or *X et Y consulibus*). In the appendix there is evidence that Ludolf's first language influenced his Latin: twice *datur* is used with the meaning 'there is', which seems inspired by the German *es gibt.*

The pronunciation guide for the Cyrillic alphabet gives some clues as to the sound of the Latin then spoken. Today Latin is pronounced according to two schemata, usually called the Classical and Ecclesiastical systems. Both are of comparatively recent date, the Classical originating from linguistic scholarship of the mid 19th century and the Ecclesiastical from the decision of the Catholic Church in the early 20th century to promote the Italianate pronunciation as a standard. Before this, Latin was pronounced as the orthographic conventions of the various languages of Europe dictated: i.e. it was pronounced as a French word would be in France, but as a German word would be in German. In Italy Latin was pronounced as it is in Catholic contexts today. The words are pronounced as though they were English. Erasmus humorously commented on the resulting phonological confusion in his *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione dialogus*, in which Latin-speakers from various European countries cannot understand each other because they all speak with their national accent. The evidence of *Grammatica Russica* confirms this. Ludolf describes the pronunciation of Russian letters in terms of the value of letters in various European languages (German, English, French, Italian, Spanish), but never by reference to Latin values (pp 6–7). This reveals that there was no specific pronunciation of Latin, but rather various national versions.

The Latin orthography is typical for the time. Consonantal *i* and *u* appear as *j* and *v*. Although the creation of separate vocalic and consonantal characters is a late Medieval / Renaissance development, the decline of *j* in common usage seems to date to the later 19th century. As usual, long vowels are not marked with macrons, but the prepositions *è* and *à* are given grave accents, although such diacritical marks do not distinguish them from any other words. *Quàm*, *ità*, and *unà* appear with a grave accent over the *a*. Occasionally the ablative singular of 1st declension nouns is marked with a circumflex accent. There is confusion between *ti* and *ci*, most obviously in the word *pronunciation* (6,7,8) and related words. The vowel *e* and the diphthong *ae* are often written as *oe*, revealing the merger of the phonetic value of all three in Medieval Latin: *coena* (49) and *foemina* (60). Admittedly, this confusion was hardly confined to Ludolf. Erasmus himself used the form *coena*, as in the line *ne quis super coenam nisi Graece loqueretur*.[7] In a few instances, *y* is written instead of *i*, as was also the case in some

---

7   ERASMUS (1973: 102).

German words: *in Russia hyeme praestat (peregrinari)* (62). *H* shows up at the beginning of words where it should not be, e.g. in the word *erus* 'master.' *Haud* is spelled with a final -*t* as *haut*. This perhaps reveals influence from German, which devoices all final voiced stops, but in could also show confusion with *aut*, especially if the initial *h* of *haud* were not pronounced. *Quattuor* is written with only one *t*: *quatuor* (94); *immo* with one *m*: *imo* (pr4).

One feature of Medieval Latin is that the semantically distinct pronouns of Classical Latin (*hic*, *iste*, *ille*, *is*, *ipse*) all become generic 3ʳᵈ person pronouns in Medieval Latin.[8] *Grammatica Russica* is unique in that the Latin is translated into Russian and German, thus allowing the Russian and German values, which are known and specific, to be compared against the Latin ones. Analysis of the conversational passages confirms the expected: the different pronouns are used synonymously (they are all translated as a form of the Russian 3ʳᵈ person personal pronoun *on* 'he') but do not appear equally. All these words appear far more often as pronouns than as adjectives. Once again, there is a stylistic dichotomy. In the high-register passages all five pronouns appear. All except *iste*, which is seen less often, occur with approximately the same frequency. In contrast, in the conversations *iste* does not appear at all, *hic* very rarely, *is* often except in the nominative case, and *ille* and *ipse* most often. In two instances *seipse* is used reflexively. In at least one case *iste* has a clearly negative connotation, the use Cicero often put it to: the Tatars are described as trading in their own children as slaves as much as horses (94). *Hic* appears as part of the abbreviation *h.e.* (*hic est*, rather than *id est*, i.e.). In the chapter on pronouns, the 3ʳᵈ person pronoun is specified as *ille*. In the Romance languages this Latin pronoun serves as the basis for nearly all 3ʳᵈ person pronouns: Spanish *él*, *ella*, *ellos*, *ellas*; French: *il*, *elle*, *ils*, *elles*; Italian *egli*, *ella* (but *esso*, *essa*, *essi* and *esse* from *ipse*). Latin, a pro-drop language, does not require an explicit subject, but neutral-register today Russian does. Since the subject is almost always clear from the ending of a conjugated verb, Russian could easily function as a pro-drop language, and colloquially it often does. Reflecting the colloquial nature, Ludolf's Russian verbs often lack a specified subject.

In Classical Latin there was only one way to express an indirect statement: the accusative-infinitive construction. There were, of course, exceptions (Petronius, Plautus), but these occur exactly where one would expect to find exceptions. This construction was still alive in Medieval Latin, but was to a large degree supplanted by the use of a conjunction (such as the word 'that' in English or *chto* in Russian), as happened almost entirely

---

8   Beeson (1925: 19).

in the Romance languages.[9] Both grammatical constructions are seen in *Grammatica Russica*, with exactly the same frequency. There are fifteen instances of the accusative-infinitive construction, and fifteen of the use of a conjunction. *Quod* is the only conjunction used (*quia* and *quoniam* also perform this role in some Medieval documents), and in all but two cases is followed by the subjunctive mood rather than the indicative. In one instance *quod* retains its Classical Latin value 'because'. It is explicitly translated as 'that' *chto* in the list of conjunctions (42), where *quoniam* serves as 'because' (so used on p. 11). None of the main clause verbs that signal the beginning of an indirect statement favor one construction over the other. Thus, the type of indirect statement used seems to depend entirely on stylistic consideration rather than semantic or syntactic demands. This observation is confirmed by the fact that in passages composed in a higher register only the accusative-infinitive construction is used, while in the conversations the use of the conjunction predominates (though even here the other construction is seen as well). Direct quotes are started with *dico*. Neither *ait* nor *inquit* appear.

   Many facets of 17th century life had not even existed in the ancient world, so new Latin words were coined as needed. It is not surprising that a book about Russian includes the word 'vodka,' but it does present a challenge for the one translating it into Latin. Ludolf does this with a new construction, the euphemistic *aqua aromatica*. The German equivalent is given as *gebranntes wasser* 'burned water,' which is the origin of the English word 'brandy'. It is surprising that vodka, a drink that ideally has no odor at all but if it has any smells of alcohol, is translated with the Latin word for 'fragrant.' It was not, however, until the late 19th century that our current conception of vodka came into existence, as the Russian government compelled the production of the drink to be industrialized. Before this, Russian vodka smelled strongly of the grain from which it had been distilled, so much so that it was often called 'bread wine,' and of infused herbs and berries.[10] It is likely that the drink Ludolf experienced was, in contrast to modern vodka, actually fragrant. It is equally unsurprising that the German Ludolf mentions beer, which the Romans did not drink. He uses the Latin word *cerevisia*, which was borrowed into Latin from Celtic, since the Celts did brew and drink beer. This word, of course, becomes Spanish *cerveza*. Less potently, tea is mentioned as coming from China, and is called *herba The* (97).

---

9   Beeson (1925: 22).
10   Ioffe (2012: 60).

Many comestibles familiar in the 17th century were unknown to the Romans. Among the ones given in Latin by Ludolf are horseradish, *raphanus maior* (85); ginger, *zinziber* (86), cinnamon, *cinamomum* (86). Cabbage is *brassica* rather than *crambe* (95). Rice is the Greek *oryza* (86). Cucumbers are *cucumberes* (95). Ludolf mentions in wonder that Russians eat cabbage and cucumbers, not cooked, but salted. The German Ludolf seems unfamiliar with sauerkraut.

Although the Russian word 'tsar' comes from 'Caesar,' Classical Latin had no ready equivalent for the Russian adjective *tsarskij*, usually translated into English as 'tsarish'. Ludolf simply creates the Latin adjective *tzareus*, as in *tzarea maiestas*, 'his tsarish majesty'. It is noteworthy that the Russian letter *ts* is transliterated as *tz* rather than *ts*. In English the character is transliterated as *ts* or *cz* (as in *tsar* or *czar*, a difference humorously referenced by Woody Allen: the Russian Revolution, which simmered for years and suddenly erupted when the serfs finally realized that the Czar and the Tsar were the same person). The modern German spelling is *Zar*.

There was also the opposite problem: common Latin or European commodities that were rare or unknown in Russia at the time, foremost among them wine. The modern Russian word *vino* вино was incorporated into the language later on, but in Ludolf's work the word appears (in the genitive case) as *renskovo*, 'Rhenish', probably because wine from the Rhineland was the only source of the commodity in Russia at the time. Trade was, after all, dominated by German merchants, who were favored by geographical proximity over other wine producers.

In some instances an old Latin word is given a new meaning. A clear development is the broadening of semantic value from specific to generic. *Horologium* originally referred to a sun dial, but it becomes a modern pendulum clock. A *mitra* was a specific type of ancient head garb, just as a modern mitre is quite specific, but for Ludolf it has become a generic term for 'hat'. *Templum* becomes 'church'. *Orbis* is used for 'plate'. An *ocrea* was originally a greave, the armor worn on the shin, but this becomes the word for 'boot.' The omnipresent Russian patronymic suffix *-vich* becomes the Greek patronymic *-ides*.

Many current proper names had not existed in ancient times. Ludolf Latinizes his own name as *Henricus Wilhelmus Ludolfus*. In good classical style his name appears in the genitive above the title of the book on the title page, but he ends the dedication with his actual German name. The name Boris becomes *Borisius*. The name *David* is declinable as a 3rd declension noun, though it is indeclinable in the Vulgate. The Russian city of Novgorod (literally 'new town') becomes (in the ablative case) *Novogorodio*. Moscow is *Moscovia*, though it also appears as *Moscua* (preface 5). At the time of

publication Peter had not yet founded St. Petersburg. The Russian language is obviously *Russica*, but French is *Gallica*. German is *Germanica* and the country is *Germania*. In Russian Germany is once called *tsesarskuyu*, i.e. imperial, presumably a reference to the Holy Roman Empire. Some of the various indigenous inhabitants of Siberia are *Ostaki, Jakuti, Tongusi,* and *Daurenses* (preface 1). Other lands mentioned are *China, Siberia, Persia, Hollandia, Suecia, India* (96), *Hungaria, Livonia, Tartaria* (94). China also appears as *Sina* (preface 1) and both corresponding adjectival forms occur: *Sinensis, Chinensis.* The modern German word is spelled the same as the English word, but pronounced [çina], as presumably would be Ludolf's pronunciation in Latin as well. Despite the use of *Hollandia*, the country also appears as *Batavia* (60) and the people are frequently named *Batavi* (96). The capital of Austria is *Vienna* (94). The Russian city of Yaroslavl is *Jerislaw* (96), and others appear as *Perma* (91), *Astracan* (91), *Kasan* (91), *Uffa* (91), *Emporium Archangeli* (91), Samarkand (97). The Volga is spelled sometimes as in English but other times as in German *Wolga* (94), the Yenesei *Enesey* (91), the Danube (in the ablative) *Danubio* (94). Seas mentioned include the *mare Balticum* and *mare Caspium* (96). Currency includes *rublus* and *ducatus* (95). In discussing Buddhist peoples on the Russian border he mentions the *Dalailama*, and the false rumor that he is immortal (97). Muslims are *Mahumetani* (97).

From analysis of *Grammatica Russica* one can make the following conclusions about the Latin of the time:

1. As with all languages, the colloquial vernacular of Latin differed in easily recognizable ways from the written standard.

2. Pronunciation depended on the speaker's native phonology. Individual letters had no inherent Latin values. Some diacritical marks were used in orthography, but long vowels were not regularly marked.

3. In colloquial Latin both methods of indirect discourse were utilized, but the use of *quod* as a conjunction was heavily favored over the accusative-infinitive construction. In literary Latin only the latter construction is found.

4. In colloquial Latin some pronouns (*ipse, ille, is*) were functionally merged as 3rd person pronouns, and others largely fell from usage (*hic, iste*). In contrast, literary Latin makes use of all varieties. Latin continued to be used without a formal 2nd person pronoun.

5. Words to describe facets of the contemporary world unknown to the Romans were either created by Latinization (mostly the case with proper nouns) or the application of an ancient word to a new sense. The Latinization can be inconsistent, since differing versions of the same word do appear.

6. These conclusion, of course, are valid only for this particular work, but via analysis of other contemporary works it will be possible to determine whether *Grammatica Russica* follows or defies contemporary norms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BEESON, CHARLES. 1925. *A Primer of Medieval Latin*. Chicago, New York: Scott, Foresman and Company.

COMRIE, BERNARD – STONE, GERALD – POLINSKY, MARIA. 1996. *The Russian Language in the 20th Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

CONTE, GIAN BIAGO. 1994. *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

GASPAROV, BORIS. 2001. *Old Church Slavonic*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

ENTWISTLE, WILLIAM J. – MORISON, WALTER A. 1949. *Russian and the Slavonic Languages*. London: Faber & Faber.

GWARA, SCOTT. 1996. *Latin Colloquies from Pre-Conquest Britain*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies.

IJSEWIJN, JOZEF. 1990. *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*. Leveun, Belgium: University Press.

IOFFE, JULIA. 2012. The Borscht Belt. *The New Yorker*, April 16, 2012.

LUDOLF, HEINRICH WILHELM. 1696. *Grammatica Russica*. Oxford: University Press.

PILLOT, JEAN. 1550. *Gallicae linguae institution*. Paris: Groulleau.

SOKOLSKY, ANATOLE A. 1966. *A History of the Russian Language.* Madrid: Imp. Taravilla.

WEINREICH, URIEL. 1971. *College Yiddish*. New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.