

Observations on the Finnish grammar of Rasmus Rask

Petri LAUERMA

Institute for the Languages of Finland, Helsinki
petri.lauerma@kotus.fi

Though the famous Danish scholar Rasmus Rask (1787–1832) was one of the founders of comparative Indo-European linguistics, his studies also covered many non-Indo-European languages. In his book on the origin of the Old Norse or Icelandic language Rask (1818) compared Icelandic to various European languages and concluded that Icelandic is related to Germanic, Romance and Slavic languages, but not to Finnish, Hungarian or Greenlandic. Rask started this study as early as 1811, when the Danish Academy of Sciences announced a competition to study the origins of Scandinavian languages. It was this project that led Rask to study also Finnish, though later he was more interested in other Finno-Ugric languages, especially Saami, whose possible relationship with Greenlandic puzzled Rask (Hovdhaugen – Karlsson – Henriksen – Sigurd 2000: 159–164, 211–212; Häkli 2017: 8–10).

Rask's earliest notes on Finnish are from the years 1810–1811. These were based on studies conducted on his own, but as early as 1812 Rask found his first Finnish teacher. During a trip to Stockholm Rask met Franz Mikael Franzén (1772–1847), a poet, historian and clergyman, who had written his dissertation on linguistics and had worked in Abo university before he fled to Sweden after Finland's occupation by Russia in 1808–1809. Five years later Rask had another opportunity to study Finnish briefly in Stockholm, this time under the guidance of historian Adolf Ivar Arwidsson (1791–1858), who lent him the latest Finnish grammar written by Johan Strahlman (1816) (Häkli 2017: 8–10). But now Rask was on his way to Finland, where he was to set out on his long trip that eventually led him through Russia to places as distant as the Caucasus and Ceylon.

In March 1818 Rask had arrived in Abo, where he stayed 18 days, learning Finnish and meeting eminent Finnish scholars. At first Rask started to take Finnish lessons from Gustaf Renvall (1781–1841), who at that time was

adjunct (associate professor) of history and docent of Finnish language. Rask was encouraged to study Renvall's dissertations, but not to rely on the grammar of Strahlman (1816), which was not very highly valued; the grammar of Jacob Judén (1818), which had been unknown to Rask, was also criticized. When Rask expressed interest in Finnish vocabulary, he was shown the unpublished manuscript of Christfried Ganander's *Nytt Finsk Lexicon* in the library of the university as the only available major source. (On Rask's trip to Finland and its consequences see Ekman 1899; Korhonen 1986: 24–25; Lauerma 2005: 125; Häkli 2017: 10–12.)

The story of how Rask started to organize the publishing of this work (which eventually became Renvall's dictionary of Finnish) is already well known (see Ekman 1899; Korhonen 1986: 24–25; Häkli 2017: 12–14). Neither has Renvall's and Rask's discussion on editing the dictionary been completely forgotten, thanks to the early publication of Renvall's letters (R. A. Renvall 1863). Finnish scholars seem, however, to have been almost unaware of the fact that Rask himself wrote an unpublished sketch on Finnish grammar in 1818–1819. After Setälä (1921: 220) only Lauerma (2015) and Häkli (2017: 22–23) have mentioned this work, though the manuscript is listed in the printed catalogues attached to Rask's selected works (1838: 29) and published letters (Bjerrum 1968: 549–550).

The manuscript and its copy

Rask wrote the main part of his manuscript on Finnish grammar in 1818–1819. The work has been written in Danish with a rather long title, *Utkast-Optegnelser til en Finsk Sproglære*, which could be translated as 'Draft notes for a Finnish grammar'. In spite of its name, the work forms a whole, though some of its sections are less polished than others. The old catalogue of Rask's works (Rask 1838: 29) refers to the Finnish grammar as "nearly completed".¹

The original manuscript (Rask 1818–1819a) comprises 54 pages, including, however, some additions. There are notes, pages and even short chapters written in 1818–1819, as well as some later additions written in the 1820s (on the sections of the original manuscript see Bjerrum 1968: 549–550). The main addition is the section "Bemärkningar om den finske Sproglære", which contains Rask's earliest notes on the Finnish grammatical system written in the years 1810–11 and later published in his study on Icelandic

¹ The comment was written by Rask's brother H. K. Rask, who also copied some parts of this manuscript (Bjerrum 1968: 588).

(1818). These pages are largely a result of Rask's autodidact studies of Bartholdus Vhael's (1733) *Finsk Grammatik*. The later additions contain some paradigms and notes copied from the grammars of Johan Strahlman (1816) and Reinhold von Becker (1824). In the binding of the original manuscript these sections have been placed in their thematic connection, though this has caused some repetition and even inconsistency.

Rask's materials on Finnish grammar were later copied by Wilhelm Thomsen, who in 1864 donated his copy to the archives of the Finnish Literature Society,² where I came across this work. My observations are mainly based on this copy (Rask 1818–1819b), though I have also compared it to the original manuscript. Both the earlier and later additions are included in the copy, but they are placed at the end of the work. The copy has altogether 73 pages (without additions about 60 pages).

Neither manuscript has a table of contents. In Thomsen's copy of the manuscript the first 10 pages of the grammar deal with Finnish orthography and morphophonological alternations. Nominal declensions take up about 20 pages, verbal inflections 10 pages. The remaining 20 pages in the grammar, which I shall not focus on in this article, deal with syntactical questions.

The following article intends not to survey systematically how Rask has described the structure of Finnish language in his grammar, but to focus on the most crucial points of the phonology, morphonology and morphology, especially from the viewpoint of to what extent Rask utilized the works of his Finnish teacher Gustaf Renvall and his other grammatical predecessors when writing his Finnish grammar.

Orthography and the alternations of vocals and consonants

The grammar begins with some observations and suggestions on orthography (p. 4). According to Rask, Finnish orthography would become "beautiful, short and regular", if the following letters for the short vowels were used:

a o ŭ æ œ y e i

Here Danish letter *œ* and only Late Latin ligature *æ* are used for Finnish *ä* and *ö* (and *u* is written with a syllabic mark on it). For the long vowels Rask recommends the following single letters with diacritics:

á ó ú ä ö ü é í

² There is mention of this in the records of the literature archive and in *Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran keskustelemukset v. 1864–1865*, 1.6.1864, § 9 (p. 291).

An acute accent is used for marking the long vowels *a*, *o*, *u*, *e* and *i*, as in Hungarian. Rask uses, however, two dots for marking the long vowels *ä*, *ö* and *ü*, instead of two slashes (e.g. *ő*) used in Hungarian, though in Rask's handwriting (and in Thomsen's copy) the two dots have often come to resemble a tilde. Rask is thus mixing the conventions of Hungarian and Finnish.³ Rask points out also the use of diacritics would solve the problem of writing personal names without contradicting either their etymology or Finnish pronunciation (e.g. *Moses*, *Mooses*, *Móses*). On the other hand he admits that in a form like *lu'un* (genitive of the word *luku* 'number') there is no long vowel and the marking with an apostrophe is therefore acceptable.

Rask seems to have hesitated about the best solution to mark the long vowels, perhaps after the critique he got from Renvall, who (in his letters 30.5. and 20.6.1818) commented on Rask's (probably earlier and different) suggestions. In the margin of his grammar Rask has written an alternative solution in a different order:

a	æ	o	œ	u	y	e	i
á	ǽ	ó	œ́	ú	ý	é	í

In this second version, all long vowels are marked with a single acute accent. Thus also originally Latin ligatures *æ* and *œ* can be used as the basis of the long vowels. Renvall (in his letter 23.9.1818) didn't consider this suggestion (even in its modified form) any better, warning of the practical problems that this kind of orthography would cause in printing houses, as well as of the possible confusion with the conventions in stress marking. Later on in the grammar both these systems of marking the long vowels are discarded in favour of the traditional Finnish orthography using double letters for long vowels. Instead of the letter *y*, however, the German *ü* is used (cf. already Renvall 1811: 36). The vowel *u* is written as *ü*, though I have normalized this to *u* in this article).

Letters for consonants are not listed in Rask's grammar. From the example words and phrases of the grammar one can see that Rask has abandoned the orthography of Old Literary Finnish in agreement with Renvall's dissertation (1810), though a few spelling choices (such as *ks* ~ *x* and *ts* ~ *tz*) are mentioned (p. 4) or discussed later (p. 9).

³ The use of one acute accent for notating long vowels was also known in old Latin manuscripts. This kind of notation was in fact once used in Finnish as early as in 1807, in an unpublished but later widely copied long epic poem written by Ostrobothnian clergyman Carl Borg (Lauerma 2004).

Rask (p. 5) then moves on to the alternations of letters, which in his linguistic usage are not differentiated from sounds. In many forms of words, letters can disappear or change in various ways, though the grammatical endings do not differ. These alternations are listed letter by letter beginning with vowels, giving the following short descriptions (p. 6–7).

A disappears in the plural forms of certain 2-syllable words (*koira* ‘dog’, part. *koiria*) and in certain verb forms (*rakastaa* ‘to love’, *rakastin* ‘I loved’), but changes to *o* in the plural forms of certain words (*kana* ‘hen’, part. *kanoja*). Long *a* shortens to a short vowel sometimes (*seuraa* ‘he follows’, *seurata* ‘to follow’).

O is usually preserved, but it may shorten (*isoon* ‘I thirst’, *isota* ‘to thirst’). The same comment is made about *u* (eg. *suu* ‘mouth’, part. pl. *suita*).

E disappears in verb forms like *tule* ‘come!’, *tulin* ‘I came’, *tulisin* ‘I would come’. *I* varies with *e* (*kuusi* ‘spruce’, pl. *kuuset*), in Åbo dialect also in imperfect forms like *opein* ‘I learned’ (cf. *opi* ‘learn!’). On the other hand, *i* disappears from the diphthong *ie* to avoid the combination of three vowels (eg. *vie* ‘take!’, *vein* ‘I took’).

Ä disappears in the plural forms of nouns (*härkä* ‘ox’, part. *härkiä*) and in the imperfect forms of the verbs (*elin* ‘I lived’, cf. *elä* ‘live!’). The long vowel *ä* may also shorten (*pää* ‘head’, part. pl. *päättä*).

Ö and *ü* are usually preserved, but they may shorten (*püü* ‘hazel grouse’, part. pl. *püitä*).

In the same fashion Rask also lists various consonantal alternations in alphabetical order (p. 7–9), beginning from alternations with *d* (in word pairs like *kadun* ‘I regret’, *katua* ‘to regret’) and *h* (e.g. *näen* ‘I see’, *nähdä* ‘to see’). On alternations with *j* Rask says that in the dialects of Åbo and (Southern) Ostrobothnia there’s variation between *k* and *j* in forms such as *pohje* ‘back of leg’, gen. *pohken*, *kuljen* ‘I go’, *kulkea* ‘to go’ (mentioning later that in the forms of the words like *selkä* ‘back’ and *särki* ‘roach’ *k* changes to *j* after *l* and *r*, in the forms of the words like *halko* ‘log’ to *v*), but in other dialects there is no *j* in these forms. In general *j* is unchanged (eg. *pohja* ‘bottom’, gen. *pohjan*). On *k* Rask mentions the word pairs *jalka* ‘foot’, gen. *jalan* and *hakkaan* ‘I cut’, *hakata* ‘to cut’, stressing that alternation is also found in the loan words like *lökkü* ‘luck’. But if *k* is preceded by *n* or *s*, *k* is preserved (e.g. in the forms of the words *lanka* ‘thread’ and *koski* ‘rapids’).

From the letter *l* onwards, Rask (p. 8–9) formulates grade alternations in pairs (in both directions), mentioning only isolated word examples with occasional orthographical and dialectological observations. Rask first lists the pairs *ll – lt*, *mm – mp*, *nn – nt*, *pp – p*, *mp – mm*, *p – pp*, *p – v* and *rr – rt*, then

goes on to alternations with *s* like *s – d*, *ks – hd*, *ns – nn* and *rs – rr* mentioning finally the pairs *t – d*, *t – tt*, *lt / nt / rt – ll / nn / rr*, *tt – t* and *v – p*. The list ends with the letters *x* and *z*. Rask mentions that *ks* or *hs* should be used instead of *x*. The sole *z* is said to be an unaltering “Karelian letter” (e.g. *kaizen* ‘I herd’), which corresponds to *tt* in Abo and Tavastian dialects (cf. Renvall 1810: 12). Rask doesn’t present the grade alternation system in a more generalized way until later (p. 15), in connexion with nominal declensions.

Nominal declensions

Rask (p. 11–25) describes the inflection of Finnish nouns in two declensions. To the first declension belong words that end in a vowel and have the same number of syllables both in their singular and plural forms (p. 13). The words *aamu* ‘morning’ and *ilta* ‘evening’ in Rask’s first table of nominal cases belong to the first declension, though he later used the words *lökkü* ‘luck’, *lepo* ‘rest’ and *rüppü* ‘wrinkle’ (p. 14). In this connexion Rask mentions also monosyllabic words of the type *maa* ‘earth’. To the second declension belong words that end in a consonant or have an extra syllable in the plural compared to the singular forms, like *rakas* ‘dear’, *kadeh* ‘envious’ or *tytär* ‘daughter’ (p. 19). After presenting the schemes of these two declensions in the form of a table, Rask continues his survey on a more detailed level giving examples of word groups belonging to these declensions and mentioning also some dialectal features occurring in their inflection (p. 17–18, 21–25).

According to Rask, Finnish has the following 13 cases.

Nominal.	aamu	aamut	rakas	rakkaat
Possessiv.	aamun	aamuin	rakkaan	rakasten / rakkaitten
Quantitativ.	aamua	aamuja	rakasta	rakkaita
Qualitiv.	aamuna	aamuina	rakkaana	rakkaina
Factivus	aamuksi	aamuiksi	rakkaaksi	rakkaiksi
Allat. exter.	aamulle	aamuille	rakkaalle	rakkaille
inter.	aamuun	aamuiin	rakkaaseen	rakkaisiin
Ablat. exter.	aamulta	aamuilta	rakkaalta	rakkailta
inter.	aamusta	aamuista	rakkaasta	rakkaista
Locat. exter.	aamulla	aamuilla	rakkaalla	rakkailla
inter.	aamussa	aamuissa	rakkaassa	rakkaissa
Defectiv.	aamutta	aamuitta	rakkaatta	rakkaitta
Adverbialis	–	aamuin	rakkaasti	rakkain

Rask says that he has arrived at his 13 cases solely on the basis of case endings, that is, on the morphological criteria. On this occasion Rask (p. 12–13) also criticizes both Vhael (1733) and Strahlman (1816) for mixing their criteria in analyzing identical forms as different cases.

Rask (p. 12) gives also information on the dialectal variation of certain (mainly local) case endings. Allativ. exterior ends in *n* in certain “upper dialects” (*aamullen*) and allativ. interior has *h* in some dialects (*aamuhun*, pl. *aamuihin*) (cf. Vhael 1733: 16, 29), which explains the false form *aamuiin* presented in the table (p. 11). Locative interior has only one *s* in “lower dialects” (*aamusa*), but the ending with the *ss* is better in poetry. Defectiv may have only one *t* in some dialects: *tavarata* ‘without a thing’, but this may be confused with the partitive forms, so it is advised to follow the example of Vhael (1733: 7). In “lower dialects” case endings that end in a vowel may drop this vowel (*aamul'*, *aamus'*, *aamuks'*), which, is, however, not advisable in the poetry. This brief information on dialects comes partly from Vhael (1733), while comments on poetical use are from Porthan (1766–1778, § VII).

Although most of the case forms are familiar, only three of Rask’s case names are known in the present terminology of Finnish grammar. Nominative is in Rask’s description *Nominalis*. Allative and ablative have been used in their present-day meaning as *allat. exterior* and *ablat. exterior*, but the term *ablative interior* has been used for the current *elative*, and *allative interior* for the current *illative*. All other case names are different.

These case names are, however, not Rask’s own inventions. Most of them are copied from the first part of Renvall’s (1815: 9–14) later linguistic dissertation, with minor modifications. The order of cases is slightly different, and Renvall uses other example words (*talo* ‘house’, *vieras* ‘guest’), but the only major difference between Rask’s and Renvall’s case descriptions is that Renvall (1815: 13) has a separate comitative case that he calls *Suffixivus* (giving the examples *taloine*, *vieraine*, also in singular). The case ending with *ksi* (current *translative*) is called by Renvall *Qualificativus*, by Rask *Factivus*, but other differences are minimal.

The most interesting case presented by Rask is the last one, *Adverbialis*, which is mentioned also in Renvall’s dissertation. The exceptional nature of the *Adverbialis* case becomes apparent when we look at the inflection of the word *rakas* ‘dear’ (p. 19). Of this word the *adverbial* case form is *rakkaasti* in singular, but *rakkain* in plural form. Renvall (1815: 13) and Rask formulate that the “*adverbial*” case has two separate case endings, *in* and *sti*. Nouns can have only the ending *in*, adjectives can have both *in* and *sti*-endings,

though some have only the ending *sti*. In the table of the second declension Rask, however, mentions an adverbial form *tyttärestä* (p. 19, from the word *tytär* ‘daughter’) and forms *lökästi* and *lökäin ~ lökkäin* (p. 14, from the noun *lökkä* ‘luck, fortune’). From our viewpoint Rask has confused the instructive case with the *sti*-forms of adjectives, but there is a seed of truth even in this analysis. Semantically the *sti*- and *in*-forms of adjectives are rather alike and though it is not possible to form *sti*-forms of nouns, adjectival *sti*-forms are very productive.

Unlike the case names, the case endings are nearly the same as in Modern Finnish (note especially the geminated endings of the type *aamussa, aamutta*), though the plural forms *aamuin, rakasten / rakkaitten* reflect the elder usage. Rask (p. 24) admits that case endings are in principle the same in both singular and plural forms, with the vowel *i* added to singular case endings to form the plural. But Rask adds that some words have only singular or plural forms. Of the latter some examples are given (*housut* ‘trousers’, *kasvot* ‘face’, *vaunut* ‘carriage’). More information is given on certain plural form groups, especially on the formation of the plural genitive. Rask (p. 24–25) lists some of the varying forms, denying what Strahlman (1816) had suggested in his grammar that forms (from the word *kana* ‘hen’) like *kanoin, kanajen* and *kanojen* could be definitive, forms like *kanatten* and *kanaitten* indefinite.

In a short separate chapter Rask (p. 26–27) goes through Finnish forms with possessive suffix, describing the sound alternations occurring with them (e.g. *totuus : totuudeni; kalaksi : kalakseni; pelloksi : pelloksensa*, from the words *totuus* ‘truth’, *kala* ‘fish’, and *pelto* ‘field’), but not even giving these suffixes as a separate list. On the other hand, in this chapter Rask finally presents his ideas on forms of the type *jalkoinensa*. Rask concedes that besides forms ending in the *in*-suffix (like *jalvo-in, rinnoin, parroin, luvin*) there are also longer forms (such as *jalkoinensa, rintoinensa, partoinensa, lupinensa*, from the words *jalka* ‘foot’, *rinta* ‘chest’, *parta* ‘beard’ and *lupa* ‘permission’). However, Rask claims that the latter forms with their possessive suffixes are merely variants of adverbial case forms.

Verbal conjugations

Rask introduces Finnish verbal inflections in a rather straightforward way by giving two models of conjugations, the first one formed on the basis of the word *sanoa* ‘to say’ (p. 31), the second one based on the word *manata* ‘to conjure up, to curse’ (p. 32). In addition to the infinitives ending with either

a or *ta*, the differences in their conjugation can be seen in the forms of the past time with *i* or *si*.

	1.	2.	3.	Passive
Present tense	sanon	sanot	sanoo	sanotaan
	manaan	manaat	manaa	manataan
	sanomme	sanotte	sanovat	
	manaamme	manaatte	manaavat	
Past tense	sanoin	sanoit	sanoi	sanottiin
	manasin	manasit	manasi	manattiin
	sanoimme	sanoitte	sanoit	
	manasimme	manasitte	manasit	
Potential	sanonen	sanonet	sanonee	sanottaneen
	manannen	manannet	mananee	manattaneen
	sanonemme	sanonette	sanonevat	
	manannemme	manannette	manannevat	
Conditional	sanoisin	sanoisit	sanoisi	sanottaisiin
	manaisiin	manaisit	manaisi	manattaisiin
	sanoisimme	sanoisitte	sanoisit	
	manaisimme	manaisitte	manaisit	
Imperative	—	sano	sanokoon	sanottakoon
	—	manaa	manakkoon	manattakoon
	sanokamme	sanokaat	sanokoot	
	manakkamme	manakkaat	manakkoot	

Rask's description resembles the picture given by Renvall (1826) in the grammatical introduction of his dictionary, though Renvall lists passive forms separately, while Rask deals with them among active forms. Even the first of Rask's verbs (*sanoa* 'to say') is the same as in Renvall. Renvall, however, uses Latin terms (Indicativus, Praeteritum, Subjunctivus, Optativus and Imperativus) instead of the translated Danish names used by Rask (e.g. *bydende* 'imperative'), though Rask also mentions the terms Dubitativus and Conditionalis.

The other differences are minor. Rask (p. 31) doesn't mention in his conjugational tables the ending *vAt* in the 3. person plural forms, giving only the forms *sanoit*, *sanoisit* (and *manasit*, *manaisit*, p. 32) instead of the forms *sanoivat* and *sanoisivat* found in Renvall. The longer forms are later mentioned in the text as colloquialisms (cf. Vhael 1733: 92, who considers forms ending in *vAt* typical of Karelian dialects only). Renvall has also used the letter *h* as the mark of aspiration, unlike Rask, who writes certain imperative and infinitive forms in the same way as they were written traditionally and are written nowadays (*sano*, *sanoa*, instead of *sano^h* and *sanoa^h*). Renvall (1826: XIV) mentions in parentheses also imperative forms like *sanovos*, which according to Rask (p. 33) are only typical of Abo dialects. Rask has, however, added a singular 3. person imperative form *sanokan* in his tables, though in brackets, besides the form *sanokoon*. The complicated relationship of imperative and optative forms has caused difficulties even to later grammarians.

Rask (p. 31–32) lists also the following infinitive forms, declined in four cases.

	Active	Passive	Active	Passive
Quantit.	sanoa	sanottaa	manata	manattaa
Factiv.	sanoaksi	sanottaaksi	manataksi	manattaaksi
Locat.	sanoissa	sanottaissa	manatessa	manattaessa
Adverb.	sanoin	—	manaten	—

When listing infinitive forms both Rask and Renvall mention the translative (Factiv) forms *sanoaksi* and *sanottaaksi*, but in the inessive (Locative) and instructive (Adverbialis) Rask gives the forms *sanoissa* and *sanoin* with the vowel *i*, and *manatessa* and *manattaessa* with the vowel *e*. Renvall mentions also the forms *sanoesa* and (in brackets) *sanooden*, *sanoen*.

Participial forms are the same as in Renvall's description, though Rask has put some of the forms in parentheses. Of the verb *manata* Rask (p. 32) gives in brackets also the form *manaja*, as a variant to the form *manava*.

sanova	sanottava	manava (manaja)	manattava
sanonut	sanottu	manannut	manattu
sanominen	—	manaminen	—
sanoma	(sanottama)	manama	(manattama)
sanomatoin	(sanottamatoin)	manamatoin	(manattamatoin)

As in his description of nominal declensions, Rask (p. 33) also later gives information on the dialectal variation of certain verbal endings. Rask mentions that the singular 3. person may in the present “sometimes” end in *pi* and in the Savo dialects also in *vi* (cf. Vhael 1733: 92). In the Abo dialect the 3. person forms have only a short vowel (*sano*, *teke*), but the long *oo* is found in the 1. infinitive forms (*sanoo* instead of *sanoa*). In the Abo dialect, the endings of the plural 1. and 2. person forms are apocopated (*sanom*, *sanot*), as well as the conditional ending in the singular 3. person forms (*sanois*, *lukis*, in passive *sanottais*, *tehdäis*), but in other dialects the plural 1. and 2. person forms may end in *a* (*sanomma*, *sanoitta*) (cf. Vhael 1733: 92–93). In the Savo dialects the plural forms of the past tense and conditional 3. person forms end with *ivat* (*sanoivat*, *sanoisivat*). In common usage, all plural 3. p. forms may, however, be replaced with corresponding singular forms (e.g. *sanoneeko ne* instead of *sanonevatko ne*).

Rask (p. 33) continues that imperative forms end in Savo dialect with *k* (*sanok*, cf. Vhael 1733: 93, 94), in Abo dialect with *s* (*sanos*), sometimes also with *pas* or *vos*, too (*sanopas*, *sanovos*). In Abo dialects the imperative forms have a short vowel (*sanokon*, *sanokot*), while in other areas these forms may also have *h* (*sanokohon*, *sanokohot*). The same *h* also occurs in other passive forms (e.g. *sanotahan*, *sanottihin*, instead of *sanotaan*, *sanottiin*, in Abo dialect *sanotan*; cf. Vhael 1733: 93, mentioning however only the lack of *h* in Abo dialect).

Concerning passive forms Rask (p. 34) points out that they are always impersonal. Rask also reminds that in addition to the infinitives and participles he has mentioned there are various deverbial derivations (e.g. *hävitys* ‘a destruction’, *kiitos* ‘a praise’, *teko* ‘an act’, *haku* ‘a search’, *hyöriväinen* ‘bustling’).

Rask (p. 34) goes on to the negation verb, presenting its paradigm.

	Present tense			Imperative		
	1.	2.	3.	1.	2.	3.
Singular	en	et	ei	–	älä	älkөөn
Plural	emme	ette	ei (eivät)	älkämme	älkät	älkөөt

The 3. p. plural form *eivät*, which is in parentheses, is said to be a colloquialism in Savo dialects. Rask also gives models for forming negative forms in the present (*en*, *et*, *ei ottanut* / *hakannut*, *emme*, *ette*, *eivät ottaneet* / *hakanneet*, from the verbs *ottaa* ‘to take’ and *hakata* ‘to chop’), in the potential (*en*, *et*, *ei*, *emme*, *ette*, *ei* ~ *eivät ottane* / *hakanne*) and in the imperative (*älä*

ota, älköön ottako, älkämme ottako, älkäs ottako, älkäät ottako). Finally Rask mentions the infinitive with casus defectus (*rakastamata* ‘without loving’, p. 35) and gives the following formation scheme for negative forms in passive.

Present time	ei (minua, sinua, häntä, meitä, teitä)	oteta
Past time		otettu
Potential		otettane
Conditional		otettais
Imperative	älköön	otettako

The description of verbal forms ends in a long but rather sketchy section, where Rask (p. 37–40) lists paradigms of many ordinary verbs representing both conjugations, occasionally mentioning their special features and dialectal variants.

Sources and influence

The grammars of Strahlman and Vhael are mentioned now and then in Rask’s manuscript. The work of Vhael (1733) was Rask’s first introduction to the Finnish language. Some of the information presented by Rask in his study especially on the dialectal variation is found already in this work. There are more references to the grammar of Strahlman (1816), though often with critical comments, but hardly any to the grammar of Judén (1818).

The influence of Renvall can be observed most frequently, though his name is seldom mentioned. Rask’s grammar is obviously based on the notes he made during the period when Renvall taught him Finnish. It should, however, be remembered that Renvall’s influence is easiest to notice in the sections concerning orthography, sound alternations and nominal inflection, because Renvall (1810, 1811, 1815) had already written on these subjects in his dissertations. According to his own statement, Renvall (1840: I) had also written the first draft of his grammar in 1815–1819. In a letter written 1819 Rask says that Renvall has written “an excellent sketch on Finnish grammar”, which could be used as an introduction to his Finnish dictionary, implying that he had seen a copy of this grammar. In 1826 Renvall published the grammatical introduction which was attached to the first bound volume of his dictionary (1826), though it was not written until after 1823, when some copies of the first part were printed (Toivonen 1938). This introduction may thus reflect the earlier phase of his grammar (cf. Lauerma 2005: 129). All this makes it difficult to decide to what extent Renvall’s writings influenced Rask’s own grammar.

Rask's idea that Finnish should be written with ligatures and diacritics was original, but Renvall turned it down in their correspondence. Rask used his writing system only on some pages of his own grammar. Renvall's influence on Rask is also easy to see from Rask's description of the Finnish cases, which is clearly based on the short list that Renvall published as early as 1815, though Rask didn't consider the comitative a separate case. The names of the other cases are about the same, and Rask adopted them, using the names of local cases in pairs and once even suggesting that also grammatical cases could be renamed in this way (e.g. Partitive to Nominal indefinitiv, Defectiv to Possessiv negativus and Factiv to Qvalitativ. futur.). Of the case endings only Locat. inter. differs, Rask giving the geminated *ssa*.

Although Rask's indebtedness to Renvall seems considerable, so is Rask's influence on Renvall. It was Rask who suggested to Renvall later in their correspondence that he should replace most of his case names with new ones (cf. the letter dated 19. 8. 1818, published in 1863). Kalevi Wiik (1988; 1990: 101) has recognized this but has not noticed that new names already appear in Renvall (1826) with the exceptions of Infinitive 'partitive', Factive 'essive' and names for the instructive and comitative cases, which were still in use in Renvall (1840).

In his grammar (and already in his study on Icelandic, 1818: 98)⁴ Rask presents Finnish nominal inflection in a simpler way than his predecessors, dividing it into only two declensions. Vhael (1733: 17–26) had three declensions, Strahlman (1816: 16–48) four. Renvall, too, has only two declensions, both in his grammatical introduction (1826: VIII–X, XI–XIII) and in his grammar (1840: 42–43, 53–54), but his system is rather complicated with its many details (p. 55–69) and a separate mixed declension (p. 60) which could be called a third declension (Wiik 1990: 112–129).

The presentation of verbal conjugations was simplified in the same way, Vhael (1733: 72–86) having three conjugations, Strahlman (1816: 101–132) four, but Renvall (1826: X–XI, XIII–XVI; 1840: 81–87, 96–98) only two, though he again presents a separate mixed conjugation (88–90). Rask had introduced the idea of two conjugations in Finnish already in his study on Icelandic (1818: 99). However, the forms given by Rask come surprisingly near to those mentioned in Renvall (1826). Rask doesn't mention the *vAt*-ending in the past tense and conditional, because the expansion of these forms was only just beginning in the 1810s. There are also slight differences

⁴ The work was written by 1814 (Diderichsen 1960: 240) and printed after Rask left Denmark without proofreading the text himself (cf. Rask 1818: VII).

in the spelling of some imperatives (Renvall using word final *h*) and in the vocalism of some infinitive forms (Rask preferring forms of the type *sanoïn*, Renvall of the type *sanoen*). It is thus very likely that Rask had been able to utilize models on Finnish conjugation given to him by Renvall during his Finnish lessons.

Though the main bulk of Rask's grammar was written in 1818–1819, Rask later edited some details of his grammar, especially concerning nominal declensions. On some pages the names for cases have been changed to current ones (e. g. in the late addition of the Table of Declination, p. 73) and even their presentation order has been changed by adding numbers. Rask also added to his manuscript comments based on studies published later. There is e.g. a table of pronominal inflections (p. 28–29) based on the grammar of von Becker (1824) and more exact information on how Strahlman's (1816) four conjugations reduce to the two conjugations presented by Rask (p. 68).

Rask never finished his grammar in full detail, but it remained as some sort of a work in progress, with its half-complete sections and occasionally erroneous forms. This is perhaps one reason why Rask never published his work, though we should remember that he left a huge mass of unpublished manuscripts – a whole barnful of them, in fact. But it may be that Rask was also loyal to his teacher Renvall, who originally aimed to publish his own grammar already in the early 1820s, though he only managed to publish it 1840, just a year before he died.

As an unpublished work Rask's grammar found few readers. Rask sent some brief samples of his grammar to Niels Vibe Stockfleth, Norwegian researcher of Saami language, in 1832 (Bjerrum 1968: 385). In the same year Rask died. After his death the work seems to have lain buried in the archives, though it could have shed new light especially on research history (cf. Diderichsen 1960: 79–80). But even on its own, Rask's Finnish grammar is an interesting work written by one of the most eminent grammarians of the early 19th century, in a decade when new studies on Finnish language began to be published in a more scientific manner.

Original sources

Rask, Rasmus 1818–1819a: Utkast-Optegnelser til en Finsk Sproglære. Original manuscript. Kongelig Bibliotek, København.

Rask, Rasmus 1818–1819b: Utkast-Optegnelser til en Finsk Sproglære. Manuscript copy written by Wilhem Thomsen 1864. The Archives of Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura (Finnish Literature Society), Helsinki.

Literature

- Becker, Reinhold von 1824: Finsk grammatik. Bibel-Sällskapet Tryckeri, Åbo.
- Bjerrum, Marie 1968: Brevkommentar og håndskriftskatalog. – Breve fra og til Rasmus Rask III. Munksgaard, København.
- Diderichsen, Paul 1960: Rasmus Rask og den grammatiske tradition. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser udgivet af Det Kongelige Videnskabernes Selskab, Bind 38, nr. 2. Munksgaard, København.
- Ekman, E. A. 1899: Rasmus Raskin osallisuudesta G. Renvallin sanakirjatyön alkuunpanoon. Virittäjä 3: 17–21, 33–43.
- Hovdhaugen, Even – Karlsson, Fred – Henriksen, Carol – Sigurd, Bengt 2000: The History of Linguistics in Nordic Countries. Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki.
- Häkli, Esko 2017: Rasmus Rasks korrespondens med språkforskare i Finland. Helsingfors. <<http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe201706287562>>
- Judén, Jacob 1818: Försök till utredande af finska språkets grammatik. And. Cederwall, Wiborg.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1986: Finno-Ugrian language studies in Finland 1828–1918. The History of Learning and Science in Finland 11. Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki.
- Lauerma, Petri 2004: Arkkirunoilija Carl Borg – 1800-luvun kirjakielen varhainen uudistaja. Kielikello 3/2004: 18–22.
- Lauerma, Petri 2005: Gustaf Renvall suomen kirjakielen standardoijana [Abstract: Gustaf Renvall and the standardisation of the Finnish Literary Language in the 19th century]. Sananjalka 47: 119–157.
- Lauerma, Petri 2015: The Finnish grammar of Rasmus Rask. In: Congressus Duodecimus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Book of Abstracts. Oulu University, Oulu. 97–98.
- Porthan, Henricus Gabr. 1766–1778: Dissertationis de Poësi Fennica, Particula I–V. Frenckell, Aboæ.
- Rask, Rasmus 1818: Undersögelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse. Gyldendal, Kjöbenhavn.
- Rask, Rasmus 1838: Samlede tildels forher utrykte Afhandlinger af R. K. Rask udgivne efter forfattarens död af H. K. Rask. Tredje del. Poppske, København.
- Renvall, Gustavus 1810: Dissertationis de orthoëpia & orthographia linguæ fennicæ, Pars Prior. Frenckell, Aboæ.
- Renvall, Gustavus 1811: Dissertationis de orthoëpia & orthographia linguæ fennicæ, Pars Posterior. Frenckell, Aboæ.
- Renvall, Gustavus 1815: Dissertatio academica de signis relationum nominalium in lingua fennica I. Frenckell, Aboæ.
- Renvall, Gustavus 1826: Suomalainen Sana-Kirja – Lexicon Linguæ Finnicæ, cum interpretatione duplici, copiosiore latina, brevior germanica I–II. Frenckell, Aboæ.
- Renvall, Gustaf 1840: Finsk Språklära, Enligt den rena Vest-Finska, i Bokspråk vanliga Dialecten. Christ. Ludv. Hjelt, Åbo.
- Renvall, R. A. 1863: Bref ifrån Gustaf Renvall till Rasmus Rask, åren 1818–1819, meddelade af R. A. Renvall. Suomi II: 1, 223–249. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

- Setälä, E. N. 1921: Kielentutkimus ja oikeakielisyys. Tieteellisiä lastuja 1. Otava, Helsinki.
- Strahlmann, Johann 1816: Finnische Sprachlehre für Finnen und Nicht-Finnen. M. C. Iversen, St. Petersburg.
- Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran keskustelemukset v. 1864–1865. Suomi II:4, 273–356. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki, 1865.
- Toivonen, Y. H. 1938: Renvallin sanakirjan ilmestymisvuodet [Referat: Die Druckjahre von Renvalls Lexicon]. Virittäjä 42: 100–105.
- Vhael, Bartholdus G. 1733: Grammatica Fennica. Johan Kiämpe, Aboæ.
- Wiik, Kalevi 1988: Suomen sijojen nimistä. Virittäjä 92: 453–468.
- Wiik, Kalevi 1990: Suomen kielen morfofonologian historia II. Nominien taivutus 1820–1845. Turun yliopisto, Turku.

*

Megjegyzések Rasmus Rask finn nyelvtanáról

Habár a híres dán tudós, Rasmus Rask (1787–1832) leginkább az összehasonlító indoeurópai nyelvészet alapjainak lefektetéséről ismert, kutatásai nem csupán az indoeurópai nyelveket ölelték fel: a finn mellett más finnugor nyelveket, főként a számit is tanulmányozta. Tanulmányomban Rask 1818–1819-ben írott, később kiegészítésekkel ellátott dán nyelvű *Utkast-Optegnelser til en Finsk Sproglære* [Vázlatok egy finn nyelvtanhoz] kéziratával foglalkozom. Célom nem Rask finn nyelvtanának szisztematikus bemutatása, hanem a legfontosabb fonológiai, morfofonológiai és morfológiai jellemzők ismertetése, különös tekintettel arra, hogyan viszonyulnak Rask meglátásai finn tanára, Gustaf Renvall nyelvtanához.

Az első fejezet a kézirat létrejöttének a körülményeit mutatja be. A második fejezet a helyesírással és a hangok jelölésével foglalkozik. Az egyik legszembeötlőbb jellemző, hogy a hosszú magánhangzók jelölésére a magyarban használt mellékjeleket javasolja. Rask részletesen, ábécérendben felsorolva ismerteti a finn nyelvben előforduló hangváltozásokat is. A következő fejezet témája a névszóragozás: Rask 13 nyelvtani esettel számol, melyek nagyban hasonlítanak a Renvall által leírtakra. A tanulmány negyedik részét az igeragozás képezi: Renvall nyomán Rask két ragozási rendszert mutat be, ugyanakkor Renvall-lal ellentétben Rask nem latin, hanem dán terminusokat használ. A tanulmány utolsó egységében ismertetem Rask korábbi szerzők munkáira történő utalásait (pl. Strahlman, Vhael, Renvall), valamint művének későbbi hatásait.

Kulcsszavak: Rasmus Rask, Gustaf Renvall, finn nyelvtan.

PETRI LAUERMA