AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND
HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE

General Editor
E. F. KONRAD KOERNER
(University of Ottawa)

Series III – STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE SCIENCES

Volume 87

Dieter Stein and Rosanna Sornicola (eds)

The Virtues of Language
History in language, linguistics and texts

THE VIRTUES OF LANGUAGE

HISTORY IN LANGUAGE, LINGUISTICS AND TEXTS

PAPERS IN MEMORY OF THOMAS FRANK

DIETER STEIN
Heinrich-Heine-Universität, Düsseldorf
ROSANNA SORNICOLA
Università di Napoli "Federico II"

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

The Interpretation of Historical Sources as a Problem for Diachronic Typology

Word-order in English Rhetorical and Grammatical Treatises of the XVIth and Early XVIIth Centuries

Rosanna Sornicola
Università di Napoli "Federico II"

> Nec scribitur Anglice nec dicitur sine figura. Sed ut in caelo clariora sunt lumina quam quae oculi ferant, et obscura adeo ut visum vix feriant; sic et apud nos sunt Metaplasmi, Eclipses, aliae, quas aures non nisi perpurgatissimae diiudicant. (Gill 1972 [1619]:91)

1. General Linguistics and the problem of historical interpretation

The general linguist wishing to investigate the diachrony of a given phenomenon should come to terms with the preliminary problem of how to use historical data in the search for regular patterns. The general linguist's interest in diachrony is not self-evident; it has been revived in recent years with the crisis in classical structural paradigms, of which it may be considered an aspect. If by diachrony is meant the study of the dynamics of a given phenomenon in time, it is not irrelevant to pose the question of whether one can "know" linguistic phenomena in time in the same way as one can "know" linguistic phenomena in a state contemporary to the observer. In both cases one is dealing with "interpretations" of data, although not of the same kind, and they each require their own criteria.

In the domain traditionally defined as "language history" the possibilities and limits of research have always been constrained by awareness

of the classical problems in the theory of historiography, such as the notion of "source", the conditions it imposes on historical interpretation and the inherent complexity of the interpretation itself. This can be seen not only in the methodological practices regarding individual language histories and in the more or less explicit epistemological paradigms underlying them, but more especially in the tradition of linguistic historiography.[1] In fact, the philologically-oriented study of linguistic phenomena occurring in a given text, as well as the study of the grammatical treatments of individual languages, have always taken into account the relation between empirical data and the rhetorical / grammatical or, more generally, cultural traditions surrounding them: no language historian could interpret "pure" linguistic data without considering the broader environment of the traditions in which they occur.

Much less defined is the epistemological paradigm of a general linguistics oriented towards diachrony. The problem of the historical specificity of sources and of the possibilities and limits of their use does not seem to have been an integral part of an area of research that appears to be developing in an ill-defined and uncertain way. Can the general linguist study a given phenomenon in time *per se*, while disregarding the inevitable limits imposed by the nature of the historical sources?

2. Word-order in English rhetorical and grammatical sources of the XVIth and early XVIIth centuries

One of the many examples of the problem discussed in chapter 1 comes from the examination of theories of WO in XVIth and early XVIIth century English rhetorical and grammatical works. The usefulness of these sources for the study of the diachrony of English WO seems obvious at a first sight. But how are the relevant pieces of information to be considered? Do they attest to a given objective "state of development" and perhaps also to the grammarian's awareness of changes having occurred either before or during his lifetime? Or do they perpetuate cultural traditions of which the grammarian is not necessarily aware? And, if so, what precisely is the nature of the relation between a given phenomenon and how it is viewed in the rhetorical and grammatical tradition? These questions are further complicated by a fundamental problem with historical knowledge, i.e. identification of the very phenomenon assumed as the observational unit in time: to what extent is it legitimate to anachronically impose on a given context a model which has been elaborated against a different historical and cultural background? More precisely, can WO in rhetorical treatises and grammars of XVIth and XVIIth centuries be considered a clearly defined phenomenon, as it is conceived of today? Is it possible to consider WO in those sources without reference to specific representations of the time, i.e. as a manifestation of case, for example? The answer is, of course, no.

It may be of some interest to examine in detail the early rhetorical and grammatical treatments of English WO in sources from the second half of XVIth to the first half of XVIIth century. This period was marked by a crucial transition in European cultural and linguistic history,[2] when Humanistic and Renaissance aspirations merged with new values and motivations strengthening the national awareness that arose in England – as in other Protestant countries – with the Reformation.

A study by Kohonen, devoted to describing WO in grammatical, logical and rhetorical treatises between 1550 and 1660 raises certain points which touch on the problems just mentioned. The Finnish scholar has pointed out the scarcity of observations on WO by the rhetoricians and grammarians of the period under investigation, which he considered "an indication of their dependence on the tradition of Latin grammar".[3] He observed that syntax had been confined to the traditional study of agreement and government and thus to the examination of the "use and interdependence of morphologically definable units".[4] Nonetheless he believed that descriptions of WO had crept into grammars "through the back door of morphology".[5] Kohonen's conclusion that "this is where one of the real innovations of early grammarians occurs" would seem to be especially questionable. He claims that

> Because of the unquestioned dominance of Latin grammar, English grammarians took it for granted that Latin case system had to exist in English as well. Therefore, in attempting to find criteria for the distinction of the nominative and accusative cases, they arrived at a functional interpretation of sentence position in English.[6]

This idea contrasts with Kohonen's own admission that "the solution was prompted by the medieval tradition of construing Latin in terms of the SVO order"[7] and with his acknowledgement, with respect to Bullokar's *Bref Grammar*, that the positional criterion of nominative preceding and accusative following the verb had been influenced by Lily and Colet's authoritative *Royal Latin Grammar*, and might even have been older, since it was present in XVth century Latin pedagogical grammars.[8] In spite of this, he put forward an interpretation of the documentation examined in terms of a gradual awareness of the peculiarities of English WO: "the discovery is still a significant step forward in the liberation of English syntax from the largely unfitting mould of

Latin grammar".[9] Kohonen sees this process as a struggle towards full awareness,[10] revealing his debt to the principles of romantic historiography. Both Kohonen's approach and his conclusions raise problems of method and interpretation.

(a) In spite of the concessions mentioned above, what has not really been taken into account is that the treatment of WO in the sources investigated was pervasively influenced by the traditions of classical and medieval rhetoric and grammars. In fact, both the rhetorical and grammatical treatises under examination perpetuate a tradition which had its roots in the Middle Ages and even further back in Classical Antiquity, and which was often reinforced by pedagogical criteria. This can be clearly seen, for example, in the role played by so-called *sign-theory* and by the concept of *constructio*. Rather than a struggle for a new awareness of the structural possibilities of English WO, one can see in the sources investigated by Kohonen continuation of the scholastic culture, which had been pervasive and persistent in England throughout the Middle Ages, especially at Oxford. Since the end of XIIth century this city had been the centre of learning not only for the cultural and literary *élites* but also for sections of the country's upper classes.[11]

(b) The rhetorical and grammatical treatises are not considered in their historical and cultural context, and it is only with reference to these that they can be understood; as a result the various authors' statements have become categorical and rigid.

(c) English is taken as an objectively definable entity which pre-existed the setting up of grammars; in particular, WO properties are assumed to have been already established in all their detail in such a way as to allow emerging awareness of them.

But there are, in fact, good reasons to suppose that rhetorical and grammatical treatises are themselves contributing factors in the shaping of languages: the former may have had particular influence on the written learned language, while the latter may have played a non negligible role in the education of those who could attend the "grammar schools". Furthermore, if contemporary language models are applied to the past, one should allow for the fact that XVIth and XVIIth century English must, like any developing language, have had variations and oscillations which also affected WO. In other words, it seems plausible to suppose that speakers from different sociolinguistic environments had divergent WO patterns, as well as the variations in register and psycholinguistic conditions well known from contemporary studies on discourse variation. One may well ask whether these

oscillations have left any trace in the documentation to hand. The answer to this question is not simple and requires caution. However, Vorlat's observations concerning English Renaissance scholars are consistent with this point of view:

> Contact with reality is harsher and more deceiving for these authors: English, which in the Middle-Ages had not been taught in the schools and had never been used for scientific purposes, is "rude" and "poor" at the beginning of the Renaissance, or felt as such. Its poverty of expression is amazing in the eyes of some Renaissance scholars; more than one "college-bred man felt an awkwardness when he came to use this native tongue for learned purposes". *This meant, after all, that it lacked a pronunciation and orthography, uniformly accepted on the national level, as well as a (uniform) grammar and syntax.*[12]

The evidence from the rhetorical and grammatical works investigated can be interpreted as reflecting a slow cultural separation of the grammars of the vernacular from those of Latin, a process which was much more pervasive and complex than infered by the establishment of real (or alleged) properties of English. The effect of this process was so deep and far-reaching as to mark not only the English cultural and linguistic area, but also that of the whole of Europe, and one might perhaps venture to say that the process itself has never been completed. It is precisely the fact that we can look at the diachrony of English linguistic *phenomena* only in the distorting mirror of the Latin tradition that prevents the kind of considerations and conclusions put forward by Kohonen. These seem to spring from a naturalistic conception of the diachronic development of languages, which – among other things – is anachronistic with respect to the period under examination. It is not accidental that the first grammars providing descriptive data in the modern sense are the *Logonomia Anglica* by Alexander Gill and the *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* by John Wallis. Both (but especially the latter) were rooted in the experimental conception of science, which was to pervade British thought of the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries in general, as well as the linguistic domain.

We do not deny that empirical grammars can, in principle, provide information about ongoing processes / tendencies of a given language or on a given "state of language". There is no need, for example, to underline the importance and usefulness of works like the *Appendix Probi* for the study of the history of Latin. However, it is an illusion to think that they provide "direct" data, which do not require any further interpretation. Moreover, not all grammatical treatises are of this kind, and in fact early English grammars are not "empirical", although they can all be qualified as such. They must be brought back to the domain of historical interpretation, before it can be decided whether they tell us anything about the English of the period.

In the next paragraphs (3. - 8.) some alleged sources for the study of English WO will be scrutinized; in chapter 9 we shall return to the more general problems raised here, in order to arrive at a few conclusions.

3. Thomas Wilson's and Obadiah Walker's rhetorical treatises

Kohonen summarizes the conceptual core themes emerging under three major headings. In his view, from the rhetorical works investigated:

> "(i) emphasis on the importance of rhetorical schemes, accompanied by warnings that they should be used with discretion; (ii) instructions to use rhythmically heavy sentence endings; (iii) the relationship between natural and artificial WO, with occasional contrastive observations elicited by the use of figures involving syntactic disorder (*hyperbaton*).".[13]

He maintains that the rhetoricians' observations are mostly confined to the expression of general principles obviously related to classical and/or Renaissance sources.[14] Nevertheless in his opinion

> a step towards a more independent recognition of English structure is seen in the frequent instructions for a discreet use of figures and in the warnings against separating closely associated words too far. True, such warnings can be traced back to the figure of *cacosyntheton*, already mentioned, for example, by Quintilian, and they are an important part of the anti-Ciceronian movement of the seventeenth century favouring a simple and plain style. In English, however, these warnings seem to indicate an awareness of the importance of a tight word order. This movement is certainly very articulate in the contrastive observations of Puttenham, Richardson and Walker. Their comments show an independent insight into the basic structural difference between English and Latin, and its implication for English word order. Consequently, what these rhetoricians are teaching resembles the grammarians' notion of the SV order, which is quite different from the periodic structure taught by their Latin predecessors. This means that their instructions on the use of figurative speech refer, rather, to an artistic function of tropes and such schemes that do not transpose the SV order, and to aesthetic arrangements of adverbial modifiers and clauses, i.e., areas where English allows a fair amount of syntactic freedom.[15]

To support these conclusions Kohonen quotes a passage from Gill's *Logonomia*, which states that figures can alter the style, but not the fundamental syntactic "nature" of the language, and that the rhetorician must abide by the limits of grammar (see here 8.). His general conclusion, therefore,

is that

> it is through such observations as those exemplified in the present paper that an awareness of English syntax in its own right gradually came about. They are also indication of the dynamic character of English grammar: early grammarians and rhetoricians learned to pay increasing attention to the structural differences between English and Latin.[16]

Like those related to the grammarians, these conclusions seem too simplistic. Unfortunately Kohonen did not realize that the passage from Gill is a paraphrased translation from Cicero and Quintilian. It is not that perceptions of the differences between English and Latin cannot be found in the sources investigated; they can, but they are expressed in a subtler and more indirect way and as such interpretation of them is problematic.

Let us consider the reflections on WO by two of the rhetoricians examined by Kohonen, Thomas Wilson and Obadiah Walker. Their treatises are separated by the space of approximately a century and are the expression not only of two different cultural figures, but of two different historical mentalities as well.

A political and a cultural personality in Tudor England,[17] Wilson (born perhaps in 1525, died in 1581) intended to cast English in the form of logic and to embellish it with rhetoric.[18] His linguistic ideas were attuned with his political vision proudly claiming the freedom of England from the influence of the "Roman tyrants": "Anglia serua diu, et quondam uexata Tyrannis, / Libera nunc regnat, Rege potita pio: / Et cui iura dedit Roma imperiosa tot annos, / Legibus ipsa suis uiuit, et imperiis".[19]

Master of University College at Oxford, Walker (1616-1699) was a figure connected mainly with academic *milieux*. His life was marred by the upheavals and changes brought about by the civil war, the Restoration and the accession and fall of James II. He had cultural ties with Rome, where he spent some time "to improve himself in all kinds of polite literature". His interest in the Catholic world and his connections in England with the "popist" circles marginalized him, in the second half of his life, as an anti-establishment figure.[20]

A close scrutiny of the passages from Wilson's and Walker's treatises dealing with *composicion* reveals their strict dependence on Latin sources and possibly also the medieval rhetorical tradition, which had adopted the classical heritage but within the context of a new mentality.[21] Of particular importance, especially with respect to understanding Walker's work, is a body of doctrines whose lineage can be traced back to the treatises on poetry by Geoffrey de Vinsauf and John of Garland, two rhetoricians whose impact on the English

academic circles of the XIIIth and XIVth centuries is well known.[22]

It should be pointed out, however, that in both Wilson's and Walker's works it would be anachronistic to try to single out theories of WO in the modern sense. Their ideas on the linking of words are "set" in the traditional vision of *compositio*, in a way that can be compared to their integration in the conception of case and / or so-called *sign-theory* in the grammatical treatises.

3.1. Wilson's The Arte of Rhetorique

The entire discussion about composition in Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique* is a paraphrase of various passages of *Institutio Oratoria* and, possibly, of other Latin sources, like *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Cicero's *De Oratore*. Wilson maintains that it is necessary to learn the meaning of single words first and then their appropriate connection, in such a way that "the eare maie delite, in hearyng the harmonie".[23] He praises the English writers gifted with the art of *composicion*, who thus "delite the wise and learned".[24] This social and cultural level is the goal not only of Wilson's treatise, but also of Gill's grammar, and in these once again can be seen the influence of the classical sources, wherein the *eruditi viri* were considered both the *audience* and the reference group for linguistic usage.[25] In particular, the discussion of the flaws that composition should avoid is a close paraphrase of the whole of book VIII of *Institutio Oratoria* and of other *loci* in the same work, following a technique typical of many medieval translations into vernaculars. Wilson also faithfully reproduces Quintilian's well known simile between rhetorical colours and eyes:

> And nowe (quod he) I woulde not haue all the bodye to be full of eyes, or nothinge but eyes: for then other partes shoulde wante their due place and proporcion (Wilson 1553: 89v).[26]

What seems really original is the wit of the paraphrase,[27] as when of a preacher overusing the rhymed prose it is said that some ill-disposed listeners "wished [him] a lute, that with his rimed sermon he myght use some pleasaunt melodye, and so the people myghte take pleasure diuers wayes, and daunce if they liste".[28] However, wit and humour are themselves ideals that the classical sources recommended as the orator's virtues.

The "apte joynyng together of wordes" must avoid that "any man shalbe dulled with ouerlong drawing out of a sentence, nor yet muche confounded with myngelyng of clauses, suche as are nedelesse, beyng heaped together without reason and used without nomber".[29] Like Cicero and Quintilian, Wilson underlines the importance of the listener's psychological needs, the necessity for him not to be misled and not to lose the thread of the discourse. This was, in

fact, a fundamental principle in both classical and medieval rhetoric.[30]

Wilson's examination of WO problems is preceded by a list of faults of composition, which mirrors Quintilian's discussion of possible defects: excessive brevity,[31] excessive obscurity,[32] repetitions of words or "letters",[33] preciosity and inappropriate use of poetic style,[34] negligence of vowel clash,[35] mentioning first what matters less and then what matters more,[36] use of an unvarying style causing tediousness,[37] the *copia verborum*,[38] excessive interpositions.[39] Likewise, criticism of the overuse of *homoeoteleuton* and *homoeoptoton*[40] and contempt for the disregard of chronological order of events in the narrative[41] reflect typical precepts of classical rhetoric, though in the latter two cases the source may not be *Institutio Oratoria*.[42] The whole passage, however, is pervaded by the classical conception of "moderation" in the artistic disposition of the period: the ornament must be "virilis et fortis et sanctus", the overuse of figures must be avoided, style must be appropriate to both the situation and the listener's cultural and social level.[43] In the Middle Ages this idea found continuation in the theory of *discretio*, especially in the Italian circles of *artes dictandi* and *artes dictaminis;*[44] later on, and mainly due to the influence of humanistic and Renaissance values, this theory was assimilated into both the continental and English grammatical and rhetorical culture. On the other hand, in the works of masters from the other side of the Alps, simplicity and adjustment to the interlocutor's needs were recommended as important values.[45]

Another principle which was borrowed from classical rhetoric is clarity (*perspicuitas*). Both Cicero and Quintilian had underlined its importance, asserting its logical precedence as regards ornament.[46] The strength of the classical tradition is also evident in the passage dealing with WO:[47]

> Some ouerthwartelye sette their woordes, placynge some one a myle frome his felowes, not contented with a playne and easye composition, but seke to sette wordes they can not tell howe, and therfore one not likynge to be called and by printe published Doctoure of Phisike, woulde neades be named of Phisike Doctour, wherin appeared a wonderfull composition (as he thought) straunge undoubtedlye, but whether wise or no, lette the learned sitte in iudgement upon that matter (Wilson 1553: 89v).

This passage echoes Quintilian's recommendation of not overusing the figure of *hyperbaton*:

> Plus tamen est obscuritatis in contextu et continuatione sermonis et plures modi. Quare nec sit tam longus, ut eum prosequi non possit intentio, nec traiectione vel ultra modum hyperbato finis eius differatur (*Inst. Or.* VIII, ii, 14);

> Quaedam vero transgressiones et longae sunt nimis, ut superioribus diximus libris, et interim etiam compositione vitiosae, quae in hoc ipsum petuntur, ut exultent atque lasciviant (*Inst. Or.* IX, iv, 28).[48]

In fact, the examples of defective sentences Wilson puts forward ("As I rose in the mornynge (quod one) I mette a carte full of stones emptye") are structurally very similar to those presented by Quintilian ("Sole et aurora rubent plurima, Ne exequias quidem unus inter miserrimos viderem meas"). Furthermore, like Quintilian, Wilson relates WO to the broader problem of composition and, in particular, to the issue of ambiguity arising when this is faulty.[49] The passage quoted above also echoes Quintilian's exhortation that "nobis prima sit virtus perspicuitas, propria verba, rectus ordo, non in longum dilata conclusio".[50]

Though Wilson takes on the classical ideal of (good) taste and appropriateness, on the whole he interprets Quintilian in a sketchy and conventional way, without reproducing the subtleties of his thought. This is one of the reasons why his work has the flavour of the early translations into vernaculars, with their schematicisation; like these it shows an undiscriminating identification with the source, a picture "out of perspective". Wilson's attempts at mimicking the faults of the "common manner of speaking" are stereotyped, being shaped as they are on Latin examples. Though they are not devoid of realism, they can hardly be considered a description of real linguistic usage. Rather, they seem to conform to the medieval technique of using *exempla* to represent the real world.

3.2. *Walker's* Some Instructions in the Art of Grammar

A greater flexibility in its relationship to the source can be seen in Walker's work, which may be considered a version of the *Institutio Oratoria* "with a sense of perspective"; what is more interesting for us, it shows an ability to provide an elaboration of English. Walker's treatise is both closer to the spirit of its classical sources and more independent. This can be seen in the fact that (a) he translates the Latin terms into strict English correspondents; (b) he intersperses the discussion with direct quotations from the sources; (c) he provides both Latin and English examples dividing them into two groups. One can really see here an awareness of specific English patterns emerging in a subtle and complex way. Walker is conscious of the difference between "languages distinguishing *Numbers, Tenses, Cases,* by their proper *terminations*"[51] and "tongues that are, in their *Cases* and *Tenses* invariable"[52]. He is also aware of the fact that the former are less exposed than the latter to the ambiguities arising from WO patterns that differ from the grammatical

construction. This distinction reflects post-Elizabethan grammarians' conceptions and in this can be seen a further clear difference between Walker and Wilson. In Wilson's work classicism and contemporariness are indistinguishable, and nothing "typical" of the language of the time comes through. On the other hand, Walker's knowledge of classical grammar and rhetoric is filtered through the mature interpretation of Humanism and Renaissance. It is through this fully assimilated experience and through the acquisition of new grammatical conceptions developed in England during the XVIIth century that Walker arrives at an awareness of "typical" English structures.[53]

The discussion concerning "the placing of the several words in a *Period*" and their *transposition*[54] with respect to the "*Grammatical* construction"[55] has its source, directly or indirectly, in the passages of *Institutio Oratoria* dealing with *hyperbaton* and *compositio*.[56] Many of the ideas put forward seem to closely reformulate Geoffrey de Vinsauf's adaptation of classical concepts in his *Poetria Nova*. Walker observes that transposition is useful and has always been practised, especially in languages which differentiate number, tense and case through "their proper terminations". He then quotes the passage from *Institutio Oratoria* where it is explained why the transposition of a word is often required by the *ratio compositionis* and *decor*. This is a remarkable passage in the history of treatments of WO in modern languages and is thus worth quoting in full:

> Fit ... frequentissime aspera et dura, et dissoluta et hians oratio, si ad necessitatem ordinis sui verba redigantur et, ut quodque oritur, ita proximis, etiamsi vinciri non potest, adligetur. Differenda igitur quaedam et praesumenda, atque ut in structuris lapidum impolitorum loco, quo convenit, quodque ponendum. Non enim recidere ea nec polire possumus, quo coagmentata se magis iungant, sed utendum iis, qualia sunt, eligendaeque sedes. Nec aliud potest sermonem facere numerosum quam opportuna ordinis permutatio (*Inst. Or.* VIII, vi, 62-64).

Certain problems of interpretation arise here.[57] If "necessitas ordinis" is understood as the grammatically correct order, the following sentence ("ut quodque oritur, ita proximis, etiamsi vinciri non potest, adligetur") needs to be looked into. It seems to refer to the linking of words as they occur, even when they cannot be construed. What is particularly interesting here is the underlying idea of a harmonic contrast between a necessity related to an inevitable "natural" fact (as the comparison with stones suggests) and an artistic arrangement. The conception of the harmonic relation between nature and art – which plays an important role in Quintilian's treatise[58] – is also reflected in his conception of WO permutation. True, he considers *hyperbaton* among figures

that can embellish discourse. On the other hand, like all the *virtutes* producing an artistic effect, it has a natural foundation. This conception seems to have deeply influenced English scholars like Gill and Walker, who had fully assimilated the classical mentality. They maintained that in English, as in Latin, a clear-cut opposition between nature and art, between grammar and style, could not be traced. In this respect, medieval rhetorical sources, such as Geoffrey de Vinsauf's *Poetria Nova* and John of Garland's *Parisiana Poetria*, also seem to be influential.

Walker lists the reasons why transposition is useful and presents examples only from Latin, though in the general discussion he also takes into account the characteristics of modern languages.

(a) Transposition adds emphasis to the most important words; in particular, the beginnings and endings are the most suitable places to host such words, as "[they] make deepest impression".[59] To give prominence to a certain word the sentence is usually started with "things" rather than "persons", that is, with Accusative rather than Nominative, "which also may have more reference to what next precedes". Walker is clearly describing here a *compositio* deviating from *constructio*, as is evident from the subsequent instruction to conclude "with that, without which the sense is not perfect (to keep the Auditor in an attentive suspence, till all is said) and upon which the rest chiefly depends", i.e. usually either a verb or a participle, or else an adjective.[60] Then he quotes Quintilian's conception that "verbo sensum claudere multo, si compositio patiatur, optimum est. In verbis enim sermonis vis est".[61]

(b) Transposition allows a better connection between the parts of the sentence, in that "those words might be placed together which have neerer dependence one of an other" (for example, the oblique cases). Here the pendulum seems to swing towards an interest in the modern languages, as Walker immediately adds: "without which location, doubt many times happens, in tongues that are, in their *Cases* and *Tenses*, invariable". Clarity, therefore, constitutes another possible aim of the use of transposition, in that "the confirmation of any thing claims the next place to it". Walker goes on to emphasize the predominance of clarity over other aims of the orator, which again is a close translation of an ideal expressed in the *Institutio Oratoria* ("Nobis prima sit virtus perspicuitas"[62]), as is probably the conception that transposition can be used for a better connection of the period.[63] However, the idea that transposition enhances clarity is also found in Geoffrey de Vinsauf's *Poetria Nova*.[64] But it would be a mistake to think that awareness of the importance of the relation between transposition and clarity in the modern languages is something new. A useful key to understanding the origin of this

idea is provided in a subsequent chapter, which forms part of the discussion on transposition in the modern languages. The title of this chapter is "Of placing the *oblique cases* with their *signs* or *prepositions*... before the *verb* of which they are governed; or between the *Auxiliar verbs* and the *Participle* or *Adjective* following it".[65] This is especially enlightening, as it shows that the fundamental principle inspiring Walker's conception does not arise from any "natural property" of English (or of any modern European language), nor has it anything to do with *constructio*, which was anyway connected to an elementary pedagogical practice. Rather it was related to the idea, already been expressed in *Doctrinale* and in *Parisiana Poetria*, that the element governed by the verb should be preposed to the verb itself for reasons of ar,[66] it is also related to the idea that the dependent elements "are not so fit to conclude the sense".[67] This last point reflects Quintilian's aforementioned conception that the verb is best placed in the sentence final position.

(c) Transposition can improve the prosodic structure of the period, which is artistically interwoven "and gravely suspended"[68] by means of interpositions which move corresponding words ("correspondents") or words with the same case-ending away from each other. Thus Nominatives and Verbs, Accusatives and Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives can frequently be separated in an elegant way. This artificial arrangement of words and their permutation "do confer a much better Rhythme and Harmony to the speech (or sometimes a variation, pleasanter than it) to the clauses".[69] This passage appears to be a translation of vv. 1056-1065 of *Poetria Nova*: "Surgit item quaedam gravitas ex ordine solo / Quando, quae sociat constructio, separat ordo... Structura propinqua / Declarat levius sensum; sed plus sedet auri / Plusque saporis habet moderata remotio vocum".[70] Walker tries to adapt the classical and medieval sources[71] to the *unlearned* languages, when he states that one of the norms prescribed for the *learned* languages, i.e. the separation of words with the same ending, is paralleled in the unlearned languages by the separation of "words of the same part of speech and relating to one an other (whether Substantives, Adjectives, Participles, or Verbs)".[72]

Walker then discusses a problem of particular interest to us. He observes:

> Although these *transpositions* are more incident to the *learned* tongues, yet of them the *modern* are not wholly destitute; which because they by most are not made use of; or never used by design, but only by chance; It (perhaps) may not be amiss here to set you down some examples of those of which our own Tongue is capable; which I have borrowed out of Hooker, one in our language very eloquent. Where you may see, that we also have a graceful liberty (Walker 1682: 46-47).[73]

Though influenced (either directly or indirectly) by medieval rhetorical treatises, here Walker shows a deep sensitivity to classical sources, as well as an awareness, grounded in "observation", of the syntactic characteristics of English, comparable only to Gill's. The passage quoted above reveals an inclination towards the research and discovery of phenomena which are not immediately apparent, which is paralleled by Gill's early experimental attitude.

The influence of classical sources is evident in, among other things, the contrast of *design* and *chance* – a particular theme of the classical treatment of tropes and figures of speech – as well as in the implicit comparison between Latin and English aimed at presenting the latter as not completely "destitute" of transpositions.[74] On the whole, it would be difficult to distinguish what is related to the properties of Latin from what is related to English, as the passage still shows the symbiosis of the two languages and cultures that is typical of most rhetorical treatises and grammars of the time. Once again there is a blending of tradition and innovation.

The *design* vs *chance* opposition deserves further comments, as it is important in understanding the XVIIth century ideas on English WO. In the *Institutio Oratoria* Quintilian sums up a debate on the meaning, the *genera* and *species* of figures.[75] He observes that the term *figura* is used in two different senses: "in the first it is applied to any form in which thought is expressed, just as it is to bodies which, whatever their composition, must have some shape; in the second and special sense, in which it is called a *schema*, it means a rational change in meaning or language from the ordinary and simple form, that is to say, a change analogous to that involved by sitting, lying down on something or looking back".[76]

It is the second sense that Quintilian refers to when he defines *figura* as "arte aliqua novata forma dicendi".[77] He then introduces a further subtle distinction due to either the *ratio loquendi* or the *collocatio*, the former being grammatical, while the latter is rhetorical. What is most interesting for us is that the former have the same origin as linguistic errors, in that any figure of this kind would be a mistake "si non peteretur sed accideret". But as a rule such figures "are defended by authority, age and usage, and not infrequently by some reason as well". Though they involve a divergence from direct and simple language, they shall be considered as *virtutes*, "si habet probabile aliquid, quod sequatur"[78] Quintilian's examples also show how he associates the notion of figure with linguistic change induced by variation in usage, a type of change which is often *natural*.[79] It is this conception that both Gill and Walker seem to follow: accidentality and intentionality are not irreconcilable oppositions. In this their opinions diverge from others of the period, and in particular from an English tradition that can be traced back to Kilwardby, according to whom figures involving solecisms had to be avoided .[80]

For the general linguist it may be interesting to take a closer look at Walker's examples with respect to the issues summarised in paragraph (a) above.[81] Regarding the "many of those elegancies in the correspondent beginnings and endings of sentences ... where the apt disposing of words of the same part of speech, and that have some relation to one another "he notices that the effect "is many times very *Emphatical*".[82] He reports the following "observed" examples: "It is but justice to exact of you; and persevereness it is in you to deny, etc."; "Your teachings we heard; we read your writings; They thought it better, to be somewhat hardly yoked at home, than for ever abroad discredited; The exercise of this kind of judgement our Saviour required in the Jews, in them of Beraea, the Scripture commendeth it; They accuse you and against you they plead". Whatever the rhetorical properties of these structures are (and most of them show chiastic parallels), they obviously involve various kinds of leftward constituent movement phenomena. Further examples of this sort can be found in the book entitled "Of placing the *Accusative Case* (and so the *Infinitive Mood*) before the *Nominative*, and before the *Verb*": "Dangerous it was, etc., The other way they would rather accept, Two things of principal moment there are". Such structures are widely documented in English literary texts of various periods as well as in various registers of contemporary English.[83]

4. Early English Grammars

Among the thirteen grammars examined by Kohonen,[84] only the following include a discussion of what, in contemporary terms, would be called "relative order of basic constituents': *Bref Grammar of English* by Bullokar, *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue* by Hume, *Logonomia Anglica* by Gill, *An English Grammar* by Butler, *The English Accidence* by Poole, *A Common Writing* and *The Groundwork of a New Perfect Language* by Lodowyck, *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* by Wallis, *The Universal Character* by Beck (for the editions see the bibliography here).

a) W. Bullokar, *Bref Grammar of English* (1586).

This is a pedagogical grammar, written to help not only "the small in years", but any native or foreign speaker as well, to learn English easily. According to

Vorlat, "it is a rather poor grammar, awkwardly composed, with repetitions and omissions and many inaccuracies" (Vorlat 1975: 12; cf. also Poldauf 1948: 68). Vorlat notes, however, that this was the first step taken in England towards setting up a grammar and that Bullokar "had no other example but a far from ideal Latin work" (Vorlat 1975: 12). Bullokar's *Bref Grammar* is therefore to be considered the result of a characteristic tension between Renaissance nationalism and the humanistic tradition which defined the grammatical conceptions of the time (cf. Funke 1941: 13-26). On Bullokar see also Robins 1994.

b) A. Hume, *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue* (about 1617).

Written for Scottish schools, this short treatise aims mainly at removing the orthographical uncertainties of the language. The grammatical terminology is scant and the whole plan of the work is incomplete and awkward (cf. Poldauf 1948: 70; Vorlat 1975: 13-14).

c) A. Gill, *Logonomia Anglica* (1619).

This is the first complete grammatical treatise, with an extensive discussion of syntax (cf. Poldauf 1948: 70; Vorlat 1975: 15 and 431). Gill stands out from the other grammarians of the time. As has been observed by Poldauf, "a scholar of the Age of Bacon and Descartes, Gill feels himself a member of the great society of learned men, solving universal problems and exchanging their ideas by means of a common universal language" (Poldauf 1948: 71-72). Funke (1941: 29-30) characterizes him as a Puritan and typical representative of Baroque, a description that perhaps does not do justice to the complexity of Gill's personality. It is worth pointing out, in the words of Vorlat, that "there is... a shift of mentality in his work: the timid comparisons of the early grammarians between English and other languages and their complaints about its backwardness have changed into pride in its value and even superiority" (Vorlat 1975: 15).

d) Ch. Butler, *An English Grammar* (1634).

The modest aim of this grammar is to overcome the "opprobrious Cacography & tedious Difficulty of learning (English)". A characteristically "Elizabethan" grammar, it is the last of its kind (Poldauf 1948: 75). Its framework is extremely sketchy, its conceptual tools, which were influenced by Ramus, are very poor. There is no discussion of syntax and the stereotyped information on the order of Noun Cases is presented in chapter 3, with the title "Of Woords".

e) F. Lodowyck, *A Common Writing* (1647).

f) F. Lodowyck, *The Groundwork of a New Perfect Language* (1652).

These two short treatises aim at building up a universal grammar. Lodowyck belonged to a group of English scholars who had a deep interest in this purpose, especially in the years from 1645 to 1670 (see Salmon 1972).

g) J. Wallis, *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* (1653).

Funke rightly underlines Bacon's influence on Wallis, especially as regards the physiological study of sounds and the characterization of languages. Wallis' *Grammatica* is the first work systematically based on the empirical analysis of linguistic data (cf. Funke 1941: 36; Vorlat 1975: 28). The literature on Wallis (especially Poldauf 1948: 78 ff.) has often pointed to the fact that Wallis' *Grammatica* is the first attempt at describing English in a way autonomous from Latin. Poldauf' s observations seem to catch the spirit of the scholar's innovation: "there is a scientific foundation in Wallis' work, austerely simple, empirical and rational, which leaves Wallis without a match among the English grammarians of more than a hundred years after him ... Wallis is in more than one respect a symbol of his age, the age of classicism and enlightenment, the age of Dryden and Newton" (Poldauf 1948: 82).

h) J. Poole, *The English Accidence* (1654).

This grammar is marked by a strong pedagogical orientation; its aim is the teaching of English to school-boys who had not yet started the study of Latin. This approach was based on the idea that the teaching of the mother-tongue had to precede that of Latin. However, learning the classical language remained the ultimate objective. Vorlat (1975: 19) observes that "[Poole's treatise] is hardly worth calling an English grammar, as it describes this language in grammatical categories which are strange to it". Cf. also Poldauf 1948: 77-78. Enkvist (1975: 289) considers *The English Accidence* to be "the culmination of changes in the balance between the object language, Latin, and the metalanguage, English, in favour of the latter". On Poole see also Enkvist 1975: 290-292.

i) C. Beck, *The Universal Character* (1657).

This is a treatise – as its sub-title makes clear – "by which all the Nations in the World may understand one another conceptions, reading out of one common writing their own Mother Tongues". The discussion of grammar is exceedingly small; the main interest, in fact, is oriented towards setting up a dictionary of numerical characters, each corresponding to a word of the vernacular, in such a way that "a child of ten years old, learning five sentences a day, may in four moneths space be perfect in the whole Character" (Beck 1657, "To the Reader"). On Beck see Salmon 1979: 177-190.

Funke (1941: 56) and Vorlat (1975: 428 ff.) singled out Lily (or a Latin grammar in the tradition of Lily) as the main source of Bullokar's and Poole's treatises; they also singled out Ramus as the source of Hume's *Orthographie* (also influenced by Lily), as well as of Gill's *Logonomia* (also influenced by Lily and Greaves) and Butler's *English Grammar* (also influenced by Lily and Gill). Wallis' sources are different, as his *Grammatica* was conceived in the new philosophical climate of the "observational methods", which had been strongly influenced by Bacon (cf. Funke 1941: 56-57; Salmon 1996: 4).

5. The Relation of Early English Grammars to the Scholastic Tradition and Classical Rhetoric

5.1. *The* Artes Dictandi *and the grammatical and rhetorical culture between the XVIth and XVIIth centuries*

Like the rhetorical treatises, the grammatical sources investigated also have a continuity with both the classical and the medieval traditions. This can be shown with respect to certain technical aspects and is due to a fundamentally important historical factor: the substantially unbroken continuity of scholastic teaching – in England as in other European countries – until the first half of the XVIIth century.[85] The *artes dictandi* had given a new systematization to the grammatical and rhetorical learning of classical antiquity.[86] From the Middle Ages to the XVIth and the first half of XVIIth centuries they continued to serve as a reference point with respect to general culture and linguistic doctrine in particular for the educated classes of Europe.[87] This role was particularly pronounced in French and English Universities, which took the lead in the systematization of the doctrines of the arts. Oxford, in particular, was the main centre in England for the transmission of grammatical and rhetorical thought

from XIIIth century to the end of XVth.[88]

The cultural background of the early grammarians was not only related to scholasticism. Superimposed on this was the influence of Humanism with its new interpretation of the classical *auctores*, an influence that was more or less pervasive in all grammars preceding Wallis'.[89] Cicero and Quintilian were the two most authoritative classical rhetoricians of the XVIth century, who influenced not only writers of rhetorical treatises but also grammarians with wider cultural horizons, like Gill.[90]

It was only from the second half of the XVIIth century onwards, that the pervasive prestige of Latin decreased,[91] with the new climate brought about by the development of experimental science[92] and by the efforts of the Reformation *milieux* of various European countries to modernize medieval learning.[93]

It is possible that some of the grammarians under examination, like Butler or Gill, knew other XVIth century rhetorical works, such as those of Melanchton, Susenbrot, Scaligerus,[94] which – like those of Sanctius, Scioppius, Vossius – were renowned in many learned European circles.[95]

5.2. *The representation of syntax*

Not all the grammars investigated have a general definition of syntax. Gill's and Poole's definitions are a close translation from Priscian. As a matter of fact, Priscian's grammatical categories, which had been transmitted by the modists, were still predominant among English grammarians in the first half of the XVIIth century, who tried occasionally, however, to draw attention to the similarities and differences between English and Latin:[96]

> Syntaxis est tertia Logonomiae pars, de vocum constructione (Gill 1619: 62).
> Syntaxis or Construction is the right and due joyning of parts of speech together (Poole 1654: 20).

The interchanging of the terms *syntaxis* and *construction* goes back to Priscian,[97] who used *constructio* as a translation of Apollonius' term Συνταξις.[98]

However, the general frameworks of the early grammars are deeply affected by scholastic grammatical learning and by medieval thought. This is evident in the division of grammar into four parts: *Orthography* (*Grammatica*), *Etymology* (*Etymologia*), *Syntaxis*, *Prosody* (*Prosodia*),[99] as in Gill and Beck. This division can be traced back to a schema, prevalent in the XIIIth century, influenced by Donatus' works.[100] The use of the term *Etymology* to refer to

what pertains to declension, conjugation, word-formation as well as to the meaning of words goes back to this time as well.[101] The idea, found in Gill, Poole and Beck, that syntax consists of agreement and government[102] is also rooted in Thomas of Erfurt's grammatical thought,[103] although it was already present in Lily and Ramus.[104]

5.3. *The* ordo verborum

5.3.1. *The conceptions of order*

What matters most for our discussion is the pervasive influence of the scholastic doctrines on conceptions of WO in all the grammars investigated. This can be seen in at least two ways:

(a) the treatment of WO as a side-effect of noun-case and parts of speech, though the various grammars put a different emphasis on this relation; as we will see in a moment, in fact, the description of order is almost never autonomous, but is connected to the properties of noun cases.
(b) the kind of relation which is established between order and case.

These two aspects are closely intertwined and deserve a more detailed examination.

5.3.1.1 *Classification of the parts of speech and the definition of case*

The studies on early English grammars have variously underlined the presence of a "long-lived confusion of the three methods of classifying the parts of speech: the formal (i.e. morphological), the structural (i.e. by their position in the sentence) and the semasiological (i.e. by their relationship to the categories of reality)".[105] Yet this is an anchronistic description, as it projects a modern conception, which clearly separates the three methods, onto a different mentality, which – once again – has to be interpreted on its own terms. Salmon notes that "all three methods of classifying the parts of speech had been used since the earliest Latin grammars composed especially for English scholars, and often written in English".[106] If the influence of the morphological and the structural methods was mainly due to Ramus, the popularization of the semasiological criterion can be ascribed to Lily, who in his *Latin Grammar* defined both the noun and the verb in terms of meaning.[107]

The same combination of criteria can be seen in the treatment of case. This was sometimes conceived in a purely morphological way, as a particular

noun ending, sometimes as an *affectio nominis*, which can be recognized from *signs* like syntactic position or prepositions.[108]

The combination of different criteria in the definition of case can also be found over a longer period of time, again leading us back to the speculative grammars of the Middle Ages.[109] In particular, position was one of the criteria for the definition of case in Thomas of Erfurt's work.[110] This idea is closely related to another, typical of modistic thought: each *pars orationis* "is a grammatical unit with the capability of consignifying, i.e. of signifying syntactically", that is of being connected with other *partes orationis* in the construction;[111] it has a complex relation with a *signum* and a *dictio*: the sign acquires the ability to signify (*ratio significandi*) and as a result becomes a *dictio*; this, in turn, acquires the *modus significandi* from the mind, thus becoming a *pars orationis*.[112]

The notion of *consignificatio* is thus of great importance for the definition of any part of speech, as this would – in contemporary terms – be "functionally useless" if it could not be combined with other parts of speech.[113] Consistent with this conception is the fact that Case, which is one of the accidental modes of the noun[114] and a principle of construction,[115] is defined in terms of syntactic position, that is of *ratio consignificandi*. This theory survived in the English frameworks until the early grammarians of the vernacular and even longer. In literature on English grammars it is known as *sign theory*. If in the short term Lily can be considered the source of *sign theory* in the form it takes from Alexander Hume onwards,[116] its deepest roots must be sought in the scholastic doctrines.

It seems reasonable, therefore, to reconsider in terms of this broader historical perspective periodizations based on shorter time spans, such as that proposed by Vorlat, who claims that English grammars developed in three stages:

(1) imposition of Latin grammatical categories;

(2) "sign theory";

(3) criticism of the application of Latin grammatical categories.[117]

Reconsideration within a broader historical perspective seems particularly appropriate with respect to the study of Gill's grammar, which reveals a remarkable sophistication in that it does not merely contain passive repetition of ideas from the standard authoritative treatises of the time, but, rather shows a new systematization of the elaborate conceptual tools of

scholastic grammatical thought, in the context of XVIIth century experiences. Gill, for example, is the only grammarian using the old scholastic term *Consignificatiui* (*con-significants*), which notion he adapts to English grammatical structure. Furthermore, he adopts the idea of *transformation* of a given part of speech into another, which is found in the works of early XIIIth century masters of rhetoric, like Geoffrey de Vinsauf.[118]

5.3.1.2 Order and Case

A combination of structural (i.e. positional) and semantic criteria can be found in the two grammars which look to Lily as their source. In addition to its positional definition, the Nominative is said to answer the question "who?" or "what?":

> [The Nominative case] is commonly set before the verb, or sign of his tense, and answereth to the question, who? or what? made upon the verb or his sign: except a question be asked by the verb, or that the verb be the imperative mood, ot that *it* or *there* come before the verb or his sign, or that the nominative case be set after this word *Had*, where *if* is to be understanded (Bullokar 1586: 340-341, [normalised spelling]).

Likewise,

> The Accusative case doth generally follow the verb, participle, preposition, or gerundial, and answereth to the question, whom? or what? made upon the verb, participle, preposition, or gerundial (Bullokar 1586: 340-341[normalised spelling]).

According to Poole,

> The Nominative Case most commonly is the word that commeth before the Verb; and answereth to the question who, or what (Poole 1654: 20).

Butler still uses the notion of Case in an unquestioning way:

> The Rect case of a noun Substantive is the Nominative: which, in construction, may come before the Verb: as *A man loveth* (Butler 1634: 34, r. 34-36 [normalised spelling]).
> The other Oblique cases of the Latins, are supplyed by the Rect, either with, or without prepositions, as the sense shall require: as *the learning of the master, I give the master* or *to the master, I praise the master, I speak against*, or *for the master* (Butler 1634: 35, r. 22-26).

Hume is the first grammarian to appeal to *sign theory*:

> Case is an affection of a noun for distinction of person ... This difference we declyne, not as doth the latines and greekes, be terminationes, but with noates, after the maner of the hebrues, quhilk they cal particles. The nominative hath no other noat but the particle of determination; as, *the peple is a beast with manie heades*; *a horse serves man to manie uses*; *men in auctoritie sould be lanternes of light* ... The accusative hath noe other noat then the nominative; as, *the head governes the bodie* (Hume 1617: 28-29).

But Gill, Poole, Lodowyck and Beck also appeal to *sign theory*:

> The Nominative case ... hath no other signe but *a* or *the*: as *a man, the Master* (Poole 1654: 4).

> The Nominative nor Passive have any signe, but the latter is distinguishable from the former, by a following the Verb, with a fore going nominative, or else following the said nominative before the verb. The rest of the Cases will be distinguished by their posed signes (Lodowyck 1647: 12).

> The Nominative and the Accusative Case differ not in signification, only the Nominative is set before the Verb, and the Accusative after it. But if the Nominative be put after the Verb, it will serve as well (as in the Latine and Greek Nouns, the Nominative and Accusative are often alike) (Beck 1657: 12).

Gill's assertion that position or prepositions are *signs* of Case accords with a formal (morphological) characterisation of Rameian inspiration:

> Genitiuo possidentis excepto, omnes casus nostri terminatione sunt unus casus, signis tantum dissitus, aut loco, quia nominatiuus censebitur, quando praecedit uerbo: accusatiuus quando subsequitur. Signa autem illa sunt praepositiones (Gill 1619: 72).

Wallis' point of view – on this as in other matters – is the most innovative. He emphatically denies that English has noun cases: "Nomina substantiva, apud nos, nullum vel *Generum* vel *Casuum* discrimen sortiuntur".[119] where the traditional terminology is preserved:

> Diversitatem Casuum (quos habent praesertim Graeci et Latini) Anglicana Lingua (ut dictum est) neutiquam agnoscit: Sed Praepositionum auxilio rem omnem illam praestamus quam Graeci & Latini, partim Praepositionibus partim Casuum diversitate perficiunt... Vox substantiva verbo praefixa ut Latinorum casus Nominativus (quam igitur Vocem Nominativum, distinctionis ergo, vocabimus); aut etiam Absolute posita (ut loquuntur Latini); aut denique Verbo transitivo postposita ut Latinorum casus Accusativus (quam igitur vocem Accusativam dicemus); nuda solet poni sine praefixa Praepositione (Wallis 1653: 81-82).[120]

Yet, for the first time the terminology of the scholastic doctrines is integrated

into a new perspective, where observational evidence has become the fundamental criterion for the description of the language. This turning point can be seen, for example, in the acknowledgement that – with the exception of interrogatives and imperatives, where "vox Nominativa suo Verbo postponitur"– the Nominative "alibi plerumque (nec semper tamen) praeponitur".[121]

The idea that Nominative precedes and Accusative follows the Verb is found in all the grammars of the time, with greater or lesser flexibility. Other quotations from various sources may be added to those from *Bref Grammar*, which have been reported above:

> The Nominative case commonly commeth before the Verbe... The Accusative most commonly followeth the Verbe (Poole 1654: 4); The Nominative case most commonly is the word that commeth before the Verb (Poole 1654: 20).

There is nothing original here, nor is there anything specifically related to English. The idea that Case can be represented in terms of position was already found in Alexander de Villadei's *Doctrinale* and persisted in the treatises of *artes dictandi* of the Middle Ages. [122] It is particularly interesting that this idea emerged in a pedagogical context where the grammarian is teaching his pupils the *construction* of Latin by rules of Case placement.[123] Though arising in such a context, this practice is obviously rooted in a cultural and linguistic environment with extensive exposure to the Romance and Germanic vernaculars. The role of this environment in the development of the *constructio* seems far from clear.[124] The fact that the positional criterion occurs initially in most early English grammars as a characterisation of Case, and then in Wallis as a conscious affirmation of a regular characteristic of English, is yet further evidence of the symbiotic relationship that all the languages of medieval and modern Europe have with Latin. It also shows that the combination of emancipation from Latin grammatical categories and search for new categories that were more suitable to the vernaculars, which were acquiring their own status, was a complex process which does not lend itself to one-dimensional interpretations.

An important indication of the new grammatical sensitivity in the context of English is the characterisation of exceptions to the positional rule of the *constructio*.

Gill maintains that exceptions to verb syntax may concern (1) position, (2) Person and (3) Number.[125] As to point 1), he observes:

> Interrogatio praeponit verbum nominatiuo: vt *Kanst ðou dv ðis*? Potes tu hoc facere? Et secunda persona Imperatiui praesentis; vt *Luv ðou* ama tu... Itemque interdum fit quando verbo praeponitur Aduerbium *hier* hic, vt *hier am I* hic adsum. Semper in pleonasmo *it* et *ðer*: vt, *ðer kam a man tv mi* venit ad me quidam. *It iz mj bruðer* est frater meus. Sic cum Coniunctionibus nonnullis aut positis, vt *Neiðer art ðou hi whvm I lvk for*... aut subintellectis, vt *wer I abl tv dv az yv sai*... Quoties vocula relationem ad praecedentia subindicans antecedit verbum, nominatiuus non raro sequetur, vt *Ðat sai I*, hoc dico ego, *So did our faðerz* sic fecerunt patres nostri... Verum hoc non obtinet vbique: vt *So I sai* Sic dico (Gill 1619: 70).

Similar observations can be also found in Poole:

> Sometimes the Nominative case is set after the Verb, when a question is asked: as, lovest thou me? When the Verb is of the Imperative mood: as, *answer thou me*; or when these signes *it*; or *there* commeth before the Verb: as, *it is my book, there is no man* (Poole 1654: 20).[126]

As for Wallis, in chapter XI of his grammar titled "De sede Vocis Nominativae et Accusativae, aliisque ad Verborum syntaxin spectantibus", he says:

> Interrogando et Imperando, vox Nominativa suo Verbo postponitur; (nempe Auxiliarium primo, si quod adsit; vel, si non adsit auxiliare, ipsi verbo Absoluto): alibi plerumque (nec semper tamen) praeponitur (Wallis 1653: 111); Eadem fere forma nonnumquam postpositio vocis Nominativae (post Praeteritum Imperfectum) supplet defectum conjugationis *if* si. Si petiisset, obtinuisset; *had he asked* (pro *if he had asked*), *he had obtained*) (Wallis 1653: 112).

Concerning Accusative, after repeating that "Vox Accusativa Verbis Transitivis (nunc dierum) plerumque postponitur; ut urit me, *he burneth me*", Wallis adds as an auxiliary observation, but one invaluable for the historical linguist:

> At olim solebat saepe praeponi, *he me burneth, me he burneth*; prout adhuc Germanos et Belgas usu fit; et aliquando etiam apud Anglos, praesertim Poetas (Wallis 1653: 113).

In the observations by Gill, Poole and Wallis quoted so far, the notion of "particular structures" of English is beginning to take shape; the procedure it follows closely resembles a descriptive model in the modern sense. Yet, on the whole, the documentation investigated cannot be interpreted as reflecting the "real English" of the time, as far as WO is concerned, except to a very limited extent. The clues hardly surface from below a thick strata of hints or references to traditions. In order to interpret them it is necessary – as in any archeological work – that each feature be attributed to its stratum (or strata). But what little is left, after this operation has been fulfilled, is highly problematic for the typologist.

6. The treatment of English as a mother-tongue and related pedagogical problems

Those passages from some of the grammars investigated where positional properties are explicitly related to *parsing* or *construction*[127] are of particular interest. This is an important point, as all the grammars under examination have pedagogical aims.[128] In the "Bref notes in verse for parsing English in many points agreeing with Latin", Bullokar advised:

> First mark the parts of speech of words / in every sentence, / Noting signs and equivocals / to understand their sense. / Then note each verbs nominative, set most before the verb, / Except the verb ask question, / or be the biding mood. / Or had, resolved into plain phrase, / conjunction, *if*, may get. / For then the case nominative / before the verb is set, / As is when *it* or *there* do come / before the verb right-fit (Bullokar 1586: 376 [normalised spelling]).

In England, as in other Protestant countries, the intellectual circles of the Reformation, initially influenced by the works of Ramus, amongst others, endorsed a linguistic policy oriented towards the mother-tongue.[129]

The nationalistic claims of these circles, which later on contributed to the setting up of the Royal Society and formation of the group of so-called "language planners", kept pace with the new Protestant Ethic which was reorienting linguistic values towards simplicity and the education of the masses through the knowledge of religious texts.[130] Of special importance was the idea of "teaching the unknown by means of the known", which was first launched by the English Humanists. This implied that English was to be taught before Latin.[131]

In this context Poole stands out as a scholar with particular interest in the problems of teaching. He maintains that "if the signe of a case be farre off from the verb, or after the noune, the sense must direct a man to place the word in their naturall order".[132] This passage is interesting, as it suggests a criterion for translating from English into Latin: "If a phrase seeme hard in English to be turned into latine, turne it into some other English of the like sense".[133]

According to Poldauf, Poole was the first to apply to Latin the discovery that familiarity with one's own mother tongue could make the learning of other languages easier.[134] This is possible, though Poole may have been influenced by Brinsley, who had emphasized the importance of learning the vernacular at school.[135] As far as WO in particular is concerned, Brinsley claimed the importance of the *natural order* and popularized a pedagogical technique which had been followed in about the middle of the XVIth century by Roger

Ascham, a leading humanist of his time, who was a public orator at Cambridge and the tutor of Queen Elizabeth.[136] Ascham's technique, which was known as *golden rule*, consisted in parsing the text and construing its various parts before translating it into Latin.

However, once again it seems appropriate to integrate the short-term perspective with the longer-term. Awareness of the pedagogical importance of the *constructio* and of *ordo naturalis* was common throughout the Middle Ages; the *constructio* persisted for centuries as a standard practice in the first stages of Latin instruction. An XIth century grammatical treatise from Northern Italy had already assigned the *ordo naturalis*, that is the *recta et simplex constructio*, to use with an audience with minimal literacy ("cum minus peritis sive ydiotis sermo dictantis porrigitur"), while the *ordo artificialis* (or *appositio*) was "apposita dictionum ordinatio a constructionis serie remota".[137] This idea is common from the XIIIth century onwards, for example in the *Ars Poetica* by Gervais de Melkley, and it is still documented in the XIVth century.[138] It is plausible to think that it never went beyond the teaching practices of the conservative academic *milieux* and that Roger Ascham's only merit was to reformulate it explicitly in about the middle of the XVIth century.[139] On the other hand, all the grammarians investigated must have been familiar with the technique of *constructio* from the years of their university studies.

Thus the pedagogical dimension with respect to issues of WO cannot be considered as a source for the study of English nor as evidence for awareness of the specific characteristics of English in contrast with Latin.[140] It can at most be regarded as an indication of the development – presumably from the XIIth century onwards – of teaching practices whose relation to ongoing tendencies in the language is unclear. According to some, pedagogical practices mirrored a tendency on the part of various vernaculars of Europe towards what would today be defined as "basic SVO order". Such evidence, however, is not specific to the XVIth and XVIIth centuries, nor is it specific to English, as it can also hold true for the Romance vernaculars. For the typologist it holds little importance. However, one would be justified in having reservations about the relationship between the development of the *constructio* and the actual characteristics of vernaculars.[141]

7. Awareness of language specific characteristics

But what impact could awareness of specifically English characteristics have

on early scientific descriptions of the language? Most studies concerned with this problem follow the interpretative schema of a gradual increase in awareness of the modern language; they consider such awareness as an emancipation from the fetters of Latin and try to reconstruct this complicated process in the various grammars.

The Renaissance context, which was characterised by opposing perceptions of the inferiority and superiority of English with respect to Latin,[142] and by a certain reluctance towards "experimentation" with respect to a grammar of English,[143] was replaced by the new mentality conspicuous in Wallis' *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*. This work may be regarded as a product of the new naturalistic and scientific climate that developed in the circles influenced by Bacon and the Royal Society.[144]

This mentality, characteristic of the broader historical and cultural context, was foreshadowed by a gradual increase in the study of English "for his own sake and not necessarily as a preparation for Latin".[145] Poldauf notes that "Wallis described English from a standpoint much detached from the Latin tradition".[146] However, this detachment may have been overemphasized. Wallis probably had an implicit standard, since he regarded English as a "lingua in se facillima". And what could such a standard have been, if not the classical languages?[147] If this is the case, Wallis' own awareness of specific English characteristics and of the necessity to free their description from the fetters of Latin would appear to be not so clear-cut and unilinear as it has been interpreted as being.

It may also be observed that Wallis' approach to the grammatical structure of English was overshadowed by his predominant interest in phonetics. As far as syntax is concerned, the real novelty seems rather to lie in the declaration of principles, than in actual descriptive practice. In the preface to *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*, a propos of his forerunners Gill, Jonson and Hexham, he states that they had cast English into the Latin norm, providing many useless rules on Case, Gender and Flexion of nouns, and on Tense, Mood and Conjugation of verbs, "quae a lingua nostra sunt prorsus aliena".[148] This is the reason why he intends to follow a new method, which he claims was imitated by French followers of *the Grammaire Universelle*.[149] This method is no longer based on the *ratio* of Latin, but on that of English and there is therefore no need to incorporate "Casuum, Generum, Modorum, Temporumque fictam et ineptam plane congeriem" in the treatment of the language, as these notions have no basis in it.[150]

Once again it must be emphasized that the change in outlook is complicated and more oriented towards continuity rather than discontinuity.

Vorlat perceives this problem, when – a propos of Wallis' "discovery" of the structural differences between Latin and English – she observes: "This does not mean that from now on all traces of Latin grammar will disappear. They won't, not even in Wallis's work and they will come back later on. Nor does it mean that there was nothing in the grammar prior to Wallis's to prepare for this development".[151]

The key figure in the transition seems Gill. In Poldauf's words, "in comparing differences of languages he is not so much attracted by similarities of sound as by differences in structure. He even thinks it necessary to define the features he considers to be most characteristic of English, for "uti omnis alia lingua, sic etiam Anglica suos habet idiotismos, qui latine vix aut omnino reddi non possunt'".[152] Consequently, at the beginning of his discussion on syntax Gill states:

> Syntaxis est tertia Logonomiae pars, de vocum constructione. Eius regulas praecipue tradam, quae linguae Anglicanae sunt homogeneae: quae autem ex Latini sermonis regulis innotescere possunt, eas subindicasse satis habebo, aut etiam omnino neglexisse (Gill 1619: 62).

8. Do Gill and Wallis really represent an opposition of the Baroque vs Baconian spirit?

It is Gill more than Wallis who marks the turning point between two ages. His work offers an interesting mixture of continuity and discontinuity with the past. Its complexity is also reflected in at least two problematic aspects of its interpretation: study of the sources does not seem to have resulted in a satisfying comprehensive interpretation; the interpretation itself is far from unitary: should Gill be considered as a scholar of the Baroque age, disinclined to the new rationalistic and scientific mentality already in the air and perfectly represented a few years later by Wallis, or should he be considered as a forerunner of the Oxonian scientist?[153] In fact, such a comparison is unconvincing, as the two dimensions seem to coexist quite happily. Gill shows a clear orientation towards observing and comparing phenomena (so that some have recognized in a few aspects of his work the beginnings of a "comparative philology" in the English grammatical tradition[154]), combined with a sensitivity to the theme of linguistic universalism that in a few decades was to become a fundamental issue in European thought.[155]

Yet the *Logonomia Anglica* is a treatise showing various important aspects of continuity with the past. Its texture shows multiple layers of

grammatical and rhetorical doctrines reflecting Gill's vast learning. The influence of the classical doctrines, which were known to the author both from direct sources and through the medium of the Renaissance treatises, is deep and pervasive. It was possibly also through the Renaissance treatises that certain notions typical of scholastic learning survived in the work. Because of this complexity, it is not easy to establish the origins of the various ideas expressed in it.

The integrated conception of grammar and rhetoric is perhaps a survivor of scholastic thought which made no clear distinction between the three *artes* of the *trivium,* i.e. grammar, rhetoric and logic.[156] This conception, however, also characterized the classical sources.[157] Whatever route this idea may have had, it strongly diverges from the claim by Ramus and his followers that it was necessary to separate the three arts.[158]

The division of syntax into *simplex*, which is normally used in writing and speaking, and *schematica*, "which, either out of necessity or for the sake of graceful ornament illuminates discourse",[159] can also be traced back to multiple roots: it is found in Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, it persists in various medieval rhetorical treatises and it appears in Sanctius and Linacre :[160]

> Syntaxis est simplex; aut schematica: simplex, qua vulgo inter scribendum vtimur et loquendum: schematica siue figurata est, quae necessitatis, aut ornatus gratia, aliquo sermonis lumine enitescit (Gill 1619: 62).

The description of poetical syntax in chapter XXIV echoes the treatment of the sublime style in classical rhetoric and has clear equivalents in various medieval sources.[161] The same may be said for the examination of ornament and rhythm as means of differentiating poetical from prosaic syntax.[162] The treatment of figures in the sentence has multiple sources, as is clear from Bror Danielsson's and Arvid Grabielson's textual criticism.[163]

Like in the medieval tradition, WO is part of the discussion concerning the *constructio*; yet, at the same time, it is part of the discussion on figures, as it is in the classical tradition:

> In sententia habetur ratio ordinis vocum et sensus. Ordo aut vnus est et continuus in 1. Hirmos: aut obscurus in 2. Synchesis: aut turbatus in 3. Hyperbaton ... Sermonis series vna et praelonga sit Hirmos ... Confundit voces et sensum Synchesis omnem ... Vocum turbatus formabit Hyperbaton ordo (Gill 1619: 109-111).

Danielsson and Gabrielson refer to Peacham's *The Garden of Eloquence* as the source of certain terms and definitions in the passage quoted above; however, the source of Gill's discussion of *hyperbaton* is Susenbrot's *Epitome.*[164]

In a passage of great interest for the study of the emergence of a potential awareness of specific English characteristics, "innovative" ideas once again appear tightly interwoven with the pervasive influence of traditional concepts. Gill anticipates a possible objection by the reader, i. e. that he "may seem to adorn with foreign colours [their] homely language", which he considers to be "new-born":[165]

> Fieri potest (lector) vt multa quae hic de figuris dicturus sum, ab hoc nostro instituto aliena diiudices: a rhetoribus tantum adscititia, vt pullum nostrum peregrinis coloribus adornem (Gill 1619: 90).

Gill reminds us that Cicero and Quintilian considered *colores* as belonging to rhetoric. Yet he maintains that if one has to judge figures of speech by their own objectives, they "spectabunt magis ad logonomum". It is true that the object of rhetoric is to persuade, especially by means of *argumenta* and of *exculta oratio*, but the ability to begin and conclude arguments is linked to logic. The function of the grammarian is "orationem excolere", just as it is the function of the logician to argue. When Cicero discussed the positions of arguments he taught logic, not rhetoric, but when he discussed the *exornationes* of speech his audience was the grammarians, not the orators.[166] The subsequent development of his argument is worth quoting and commenting on in detail:

> Fatebor tamen oratori loca esse quaedam vnde animorum motus impellat, quae omnium optime, Aristoteles declarauit: et figuras etiam arti suae accomodatas, παραλειψιν, υποτύπωσιν, συναθροισμόν, Commorationem, etc. quae quidem vtcunque orationis stilum varient tamen a communi syntaxeos filo, aut quam hic damus figurata eam nihil immutant. Sed vt demus haec ad Grammaticum non spectare, spectabunt tamen ad logonomum; immo et ipse totus Rhetor quantuscunque esse potest, Logonomiae tamen finibus concludetur (Gill 1619: 90-91).

Here Gill refers to a characteristic distinction made in classical rhetoric between figures of speech and figures of thought. In particular, he admits•that some figures of thought, like those concerning simulation, which are very apt to stir the listeners' emotions, can be useful to the art of the orator.[167] Though these deviate from the "common nature" of syntax and of the figures included in his discussion of the rhetorical syntax, they pertain to the domain of study of the *logonomus*. It is clear that, once again, comparison of the text with its sources shows that, on the whole, there is no "innovation" in the author's ideas, since he is following a prestigious tradition of thought. What could really be considered innovative is the fact that Gill claims that all figures belong to *logonomia*, a domain – it should be noted – which does not coincide with grammar.[168] On the other hand, even the following claim that the rhetorician,

however great he may be, has to be restrained by the limits of grammar may have a parallel in the classical sources. In *De Oratore* Cicero says that in the art of embellishing discourse a hierarchy of requisites has to be fulfilled: "Audieram etiam, quae de orationis ipsius ornamentis traderentur: in qua praecipitur primum ut pure et latine loquamur; deinde ut plane et dilucide; tum ut ornate".[169] What really seems innovative appears shortly after in Gill's text:

> Nam quantum Latinorum hominum industria Graecos in hoc studii genere vicit; tantum Latinam supellectilem, reliquamque (existimo) omnem, ornatus Anglicus superauit. Nec scribitur Anglice, nec dicitur sine figura. Sed vt in caelo clariora sunt lumina quam quae oculi ferant, et obscura adeo vt visum vix feriant; sic et apud nos sunt Metaplasmi, Eclipses, aliae, quas aures non nisi perpurgatissimae diiudicant (Gill 1619: 91).

What is important here – in addition to the proud nationalistic claim about the superiority of English ornaments over the Latin ones (a claim which was frequent in the linguistic culture of Gill's time) – is the awareness that English is neither spoken nor written without figures. This idea, though modelled according to the classical conception, is expressed with a "modern" sensitivity: it indicates a mentality which is open to the observation of "phenomena", revealed by the metaphor of the stars that are not visible to the naked eye. The comparison between figures of speech and "lumina" may not be casual. It could be interpreted in the light of Gill's knowledge of astronomy and of the inventions and discoveries – think of the telescope and of Galileo's vision of new heavenly bodies – which had revolutionized the decade immediately before the publication of *Logonomia*.[170]

As to the history of theories of WO, Gill's passage quoted above leads us to think that the English scholar did not conceive of the difference between *simple* and *rhetorical syntax* (where the figures inducing changes of order belong) as an irreconcilable opposition. Like Walker, he seems to reformulate the classical idea of a harmonic relationship between nature and art in light of the new observational mentality. True, the English that Gill refers to is the language of the "culti atque eruditi viri". Yet, as we saw, he is concerned about not altering the "young" language with the overuse of foreign rhetorical colours. Gill's grammar is perhaps the last in which, like other figures of speech, changes in WO are not regarded as purely artificial. The subsequent increasing predominance of *simple syntax* and of *ordo naturalis* in all registers of the language – mainly for political rather than cultural reasons – condemned this conception to fade away.

9. Concluding remarks

It is time to draw some conclusions of a historiographic nature or that may be of methodological interest for a diachronic typology.

A first point concerns the relationship between innovation and tradition in the history of "descriptions" of a language. As in other areas of historical linguistics or in the broader area of cultural history, continuity emerges as a fundamental property. The strength of tradition is not just visible in the documentation examined. Suffice it to mention the fact that the idea that case has an inherent positional specification finds continuity from the Middle Ages right up to today in the Anglo-Saxon domain, especially in contemporary generative grammar. The search for innovations in the sources has to take account of the fact that it would be anachronistic to project the modern criterion of "originality" onto periods of cultural history in which the basic values were closeness to tradition and respect for the *auctoritas*. But there are still further potential optical illusions. In fact, in examining and evaluating linguistic treatments of the "pre-experimental" eras, it would be anachronistic to impose upon them the modern idea of "phenomenon". And it would be no less anachronistic to claim that a dichotomy, such as that between natural syntax, domain of the typologist, and rhetorical syntax, domain of the scholar of "style", is a type of general *a priori*, which could also apply to the investigation of any past situation. As we have tried to show, between the XVIth and XVIIth centuries the difference between natural syntax (*ordo naturalis*) and figurative syntax (*ordo artificialis*) was not perceived as an irreducible opposition. But in trying to eliminate the optical illusions one should be aware that a typological study of the history of a language and of the structural changes it has undergone follows a very narrow path.

A second group of comments concerns more specifically linguistic problems. It has been observed that, in the best cases, the data that the sources such as those examined here may offer the typologist are not very informative. For example, it could be deduced that English in the 1500s and 1600s had the characteristics of basic S V O constituent order. It could also be deduced that it had already lost the presumed "verb-second" character of older phases, since subject inversion is attested only in the presence of adverbs such as *here*. But is this really what a typological study of the past must resign itself to looking for and finding? The typologist who works in contemporary synchrony may model a range of multi-faceted properties, such as WO flexibility in a language, the range of movements allowed the constituents, and so on. But to better

understand these properties the general linguist would want to know from when they date and how they were formed over time. And this is a far more complex subject for historical investigation. Sources such as those examined do not give direct answers to this question. One possible interpretation, however, is that *transposition* (constituent movement) was a "normal" possibility in XVIth and XVIIth century English as it is in contemporary English. If the English of the period had a greater WO flexibility than that of the present day, and if it more closely resembled other European languages in this respect, this has nothing to do with a "natural" regularity; rather it stems from a "cultural" problem, that is, the fact that the linguistic planning which probably led to the affirmation of "plain style" had not yet begun to show any effect.

Two questions were initially raised: the problem of the relationship between "phenomenon" and how it is perceived in tradition, and the problem of the difference between knowing the present and knowing the past of a language. The first question may perhaps be broached via a pictorial comparison. The sources examined are like pictures from a period in the history of art preceding the birth of the "portrait"; as no-one would think of interpreting the figures depicted in such pictures in the same way one would a realistic representation of a person, so the linguistic material drawn from our sources cannot be considered a representation of the "linguistic reality" of the time. The second question opens a much wider field of discussion. We limit ourselves here to observing that the interpretation of the rhetorical and grammatical treatises of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries with respect to WO shows once again that it is not possible to know the linguistic past as one knows the present.

The point of view that we have tried to defend here is not that it is impossible to construct a diachronic typology, but that it is difficult. If such a branch of research has to exist, it must take into account complex questions regarding the limitations of historical knowledge. This should not be taken as a discouraging conclusion. The question: "what can we know?" is perhaps the point of departure for every modern discipline.

NOTES

[1] Cf. Vàrvaro 1972-73.

[2] Cf. Vorlat 1975: 1 ff.

[3] Kohonen 1978: 46.

[4] Kohonen 1978: 46-47.

[5] Kohonen 1978: 47.

[6] Kohonen 1978: 47.

[7] Kohonen 1978: 47.

[8] Cf. Kohonen 1978: 44-45, who quotes a few passages of the anonymous MS 163 from St. John's College, Cambridge (for the edition see Meech 1935).

[9] Kohonen 1978: 47.

[10] Cf. Kohonen 1978: 47. Salmon 1996: 19 seems to accept Kohonen's main theses on WO, but she does not analyze them in detail.

[11] On the importance of Oxford as a center for the study of *ars grammatica*, cf. Thurot 1869: 93 ff; Hunt 1980: 167-197; Vineis and Maierù 1990: 75 ff. On the teaching of rhetoric at Oxford see Murphy 1964; Murphy 1974, chapter 3 *passim*; Schoeck 1968; Camargo 1995: 1-34 *passim*; on the persistance of the scholastic mentality at the time of universal grammar see Salmon 1979.

[12] Vorlat 1975: 4 [italics mine].

[13] Kohonen 1978: 51.

[14] Kohonen 1978: 54.

[15] Kohonen 1978: 54.

[16] Kohonen 1978: 54.

[17] He took part in various diplomatic missions abroad. Appointed Secretary of State in 1577, he became one of Queen Elizabeth's "lay deans" in 1580. His rhetorical and logical works (which during Mary's kingdom had brought him to imprisonment and torture under charge of heresy) and his reputation as a scholar earned him the commission by the government to translate Demosthenes' works. This was also a task of political import, as it had been promoted as a means of stirring up national resistance to the Spanish invasion (cf. DNB 62: 132a-136a).

[18] In the dedication of his treatise to Walter Haddon he takes the credit for improving the English language with rhetoric and "leges loquendi": "*ρητορικην, Λογικη soror, est affata sororem: / Quem didicit nuper, sermo Britannus erat./ *ρητορικη tacuit, magno perculsa dolore: / Nam nondum nostro nouerat ore loqui. / Audiit haec, Λογικης, Vuilsonus forte, magister / Qui fuerat, nostros addideratque sonos: / *ρητορικην mutam, uerbis solatus amicis / Seuocat, et rogitat num esse Britanna uelit. / Deiiciens oculos respondit uelle libenter, / Sed se, qua possit, non reperire, uia. / Ipse uias (inquit) tradam, legesque loquendi: / Quomodo perfecte uerba Britanna loces. / Liberat ille fidem, nostro sermone politur / *ρητορικη, nostra est utraque facta soror. / Anglia, nobilium si charus sermo sororum / Est tibi, sermonis charus et author erit. / Ut Logice, lingua nos est affata Britanna / Sic modo Rhetorice uerba Britanna sonat. / Utraque, nempe soror, patrem cognoscit eundem / Anglia iam natis mater, utramque fouet".

[19] Wilson 1553, dedication page without number.

[20] Cf. DNB 59: 78b-81b.

[21] On the continuity between classical and medieval rhetorical sources cf. Faral 1923, especially 52-54.

[22] On Geoffrey of Vinsauf 's influence cf. Murphy 1974: 33; Camargo 1995: 4, 30.

[23] Wilson 1553: 88r-89v. Cf. *De Orat.* III, 37, 149; III, 49, 173-174; *Inst. Or.* VIII passim, especially VIII, iii, 15 and ff.; IX, iv, 10-12.

[24] Wilson 1553: 88v.

[25] Cf. *Inst. Or.* I, vi, 45: "Ergo consuetudinem sermonis vocabo consensum eruditorum, sicut vivendi consensum bonorum".

[26] Cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, v, 34.

[27] On paraphrase as a technique of translations into vernaculars, see Folena 1991.

[28] Wilson 1553: 89r.

[29] Wilson 1553: 88v. *Inst. Or.* VIII, ii, 22 mentions the "non in longum dilata conclusio" among the characteristics of clarity (*perspicuitas*); cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, ii, 17: "Est etiam in quibusdam turba inanium verborum, qui, dum communem loquendi morem reformidant, ducti specie nitoris circumeunt omnia copiosa loquacitate, eo quod dicere nolunt ipsa; deinde illam seriem cum alia simili iungentes miscentesque, ultra quam ullus spiritus durare possit, extendunt". Furthermore cf. *De Orat.* III, 49, 190. The term *number* (see OED VII, 257c) is related to Latin *numerus*, which was used by Cicero and Quintilian in the sense of 'rhythm' (cf. *De Orat.* I, 42, 187; *Inst. Or.* IX, iv, 22).

[30] For the expression of this principle by Geoffrey de Vinsauf, see Murphy 1974: 171.

[31] "Some ... will bee so shorte, and in suche wise curtall their sentences, that thei had nede to make a commentarie immediately of their meanyng, or els the moste that heare them, shalbe forced to kepe counsaill" (Wilson 1553: 88v); cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, iii, 82: "Ac merito laudatur brevitas integra; sed ea minus praestat, quotiens nihil dicit, nisi quod necesse est"; it is also observed that ambiguity can result from brachilogy. Excessive brevity is also criticized in *Inst. Or.* VIII, ii, 19.

[32] "Some will speake oracles, that a man cannot tell, whiche waie to take theim" (Wilson 1553: 88v); the passage seems to be related to the discussion of *obscuritas*: cf. the whole ch. VIII of *Inst. Or.*, and in particular ii, 12-13.

[33] "Some repeate one woorde so often, that if suche woordes could be eaten, and chopte in so often, as thei are uttered out, thei would choke the widest throte in all England" (Wilson 1553: 88v); cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, iii, 50, where on tatutology "id est eiusdem verbi aut sermonis iteratio" it is said: "Haec enim, quanquam non magnopere a summis auctoribus vitata, interim vitium videri potest". The repetition of "some one letter" is also widely discussed in the classical treatises. The passage "Some will tell one thinge. xx. times, nowe in, nowe out, and when a man would thinke they had almost ended, they are ready to beginne againe as frethe as euer they were. Such vayne repetitions declare both wante of witte, and lacke of learninge" (Wilson 1553: 89v) can be related to repetion as a "figure of thought" (i.e. tautology), on which see *Inst. Or.* VIII, *Prologue* 24; VIII, iii, 50-51.

[34] "Some will be so fine and so poeticall with all, that to their semyng, there shall not stande one heire amisse, and yet euery body els shall thinke them meter for a ladies chamber, then for an earnest matter, in any open assemblie" (Wilson 1553: 88v). The passage seems to refer to the theory of "the three styles" (cf. *Rhet. ad Her.* IV, 11-16; *De Orat.* III, 51, 199; *Inst. Or.* XI, i), which was taken up by both classical and medieval treatises. The highest style (*oratio gravis*), which is the appropriate context for the greatest use of the artistic disposition of words, is specially suitable for poetry, but would be excessive and even ridiculous for everyday speech. On the importance of this conception in the classical learning and its continuation in grammatical and rhetorical thought of the Middle Ages, see Di Capua 1959. Wilson's passage, in particular, may refer to Cicero's opinion that "versus in oratione si efficitur coniunctione verborum, vitium est", though Cicero himself states that "coniunctionem, sicuti versum, numerose cadere et quadrare et perfici volumus" (*De Orat.* III, 42, 175).

[35] "Some will so sette their wordes that they muste be fayne to gape after euerye worde spoken, endinge one worde with a vowell, and beginninge the next wyth an other, whyche undoubtedlye maketh the talke to seme mooste unpleasaunte" (Wilson 1553: 89r); cf. *De Orat.* III, 42, 172; *Inst.Or.* IX, iv, 33.

[36] "Some will set the carte before the horse, as thus. My mother and my father are both at home, euen as thoughe the good man of the house ware no breaches, or that the graye Mare were the better horse. And what thoughe it often so happeneth (God wotte the more pitye) yet in speakinge at the leaste, let us kepe a natural order, and set the man before the woman for maners sake" (Wilson 1553: 89r); Wilson then adds - a propos of a faulty case of composition allegedly taken from everyday speech - that who can say so "is so folyshe as to saye the counsayle and the kynge, but rather the kynge and his counsayle, the father and the sonne, and not contrary". He concludes that "the wise therfore talkinge of diuers worthye menne together, will firste name the worthiest" (Wilson 1553: 89r). Cf. *Inst. Or.* IX, iv, 23: "Est et alius naturalis ordo, ut *viros ac feminas, diem ac noctem, ortum et occasum* dicas potius quam retrorsum".

[37] "Some are so homely in all their doynges, and so grosse for their invention, that they use altogether one maner of trade, and seke no varietie to eschewe tediousnes" (Wilson 1553: 89v). Cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, iii, 52: "Peior hac *homoeideia*, quae nulla varietatis gratia levat taedium atque est tota coloris unius, qua maxime deprehenditur carens arte oratio; eaque et in sententiis et in figuris et in compositione longe non animis solum sed etiam auribus est ingratissima".

[38] "Some burden their talke with nedelesse coppe, and will seme plentifull, when they shoulde be shorte" (Wilson 1553: 89v); cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, ii, 17: "Est etiam in quibusdam turba inanium verborum, qui, dum communem loquendi morem reformidant, ducti specie nitoris, circumeunt omnia copiosa loquacitate, eo quod dicere nolunt ipsa", *Inst. Or.* VIII, iii, 53: "Vitanda etiam *macrologia*, id est longior quam oportet sermo... Est et *pleonasmos* vitium, cum supervacuis verbis oratio oneratur".

[39] "Some use so many interpositions bothe in their talke and in their writinge, that they make their sayinges as darke as hell" (Wilson 1553: 89v); cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, ii, 15: "Etiam interiectione (qua et oratores et historici frequenter utuntur, ut medio sermone aliquem inserant sensum) impediri solet intellectus, nisi quod interponitur breve est".

[40] "Some ende their sentences all alike, making their talke rather appeare rimed meter then to seme playne speache, the whiche as it muche deliteth beynge measurablye used, so it muche offendeth when no meane is regarded" (Wilson 1553: 89r). For a description of these two figures of discourse, cf. *Inst. Or.* IX, iii, 77-78. In the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* it is recommended to use the two figures with moderation.

[41] "The wise therfore... kepe a decent order in reportynge of their tale" (Wilson 1553: 89r). Wilson is here referring to the problem of the *ordo naturalis* in narratives (on this topic, cf. *De Orat.* II, 53, 329; *Rhet. ad Her.* I, 15).

[42] As to overusing *homoeoteleuton* and *homoeoptoton*, Quintilian only expresses a general preoccupation: "cum in eosdem casus aut tempora aut numeros aut etiam pedes continuo quis aut certe nimium frequenter incurrit, praecipere solemus variandas figuras esse vitandae similitudinis gratia" (*Inst. Or.* IX, i, 11). As to the order of events in the narrative, he maintains that the idea of first position being occupied by what chronologically precedes is a "nimia

superstitio". He thus adopts a flexible attitude with respect to *ordo naturalis*, as he admits that this order is often preferable "merely because previous events are often the most important and should consequently be placed before matters of more trivial import" (*Inst. Or.* IX, iv, 25, Butler's translation).

[43] Cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, iii, 6 (also *Inst. Or.* II, v, 10-12; VIII, *Prologue*, 25 ff.; IX, iii, 4-5; IX, iii, 27; IX, iii, 102). Cf. further *Rhet. ad Her.* IV, 16.

[44] Cf. Murphy 1974, but especially the discussion in Di Capua 1959: 289 ff., where the history of the medieval concept of *discretio* is traced, particularly in connection with its role in Dante's linguistic thought.

[45] Cf. vv. 1084-1090 of Geoffrey de Vinsauf's *Poetria Nova*: "in verbis sis tamen unus / Ex aliis; nec sis elati, sed socialis / Eloquii. Veterum clamat doctrina: loquaris ut plures, sapias ut pauci ... Proprias igitur ne respice vires / Immo suas, cum quo loqueris" (cf. Gallo 1971: 72).

[46] Cf. *Rhet. ad Her.* IV, 17; De *Orat.* III, 10, 37-38; *Inst. Or.* VIII, I-II.

[47] This is the only passage Kohonen takes into account in his discussion.

[48] Recommendations of this kind can be found in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (cf. IV, 18) as well as in Cicero (cf. *Orator* 69, 229).

[49] On the ambiguity arising from the defective arrangement of words, cf. *Inst. Or.* IX, iv, 28-32.

[50] *Inst. Or.* VIII, ii, 22.

[51] Walker 1682: 41.

[52] Walker 1682: 53.

[53] Walker also makes the characteristic distinction between the *learned* (i.e. Latin, Greek and Hebrew) and *unlearned* languages (i.e. the modern languages): cf. Walker 1682: 41-50.

[54] The term is a calque on medieval Latin *transpositio*; it is documented since 1582 (cf. OED XI, 278b). Thurot 1869: 344 documents the Latin word with the meaning 'alteration of order' in a XIIIth century manuscript from Sorbonne.The corresponding classical Latin terms were *transgressio* (cf. *Rhet. ad Her.* IV, 44; *De Orat.* III, 54, 207; *Inst. Or.* VIII, vi, 62; VIII, 6, 66, etc.), and *traiectio* (cf. *Rhet. ad Her.* IV, 32, 44; *Orator* 69, 230; *Inst. Or.* VIII, 2, 14).

[55] Walker 1682: 41-50.

[56] Cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, vi, 62-67 and IX, iv.

[57] This interpretation is supported by a passage in *De Oratore* where correct and clear Latin speaking is contrasted with the ability to produce an ornate discourse: correct and clear speaking "cognitionem habent facilem, usum necessarium" (III, 10, 37-38). The concept of *necessitas* seems to be of some importance in both classical and medieval treatments of the matter. In his commentary on Priscian Petrus Helias says that "necessarium appellat gramaticus non quod est inevitabile sed quod *exigit* proprietas huius artis" (*Summa*, 2, 859, 69-71, italics mine). This definition is given in relation to the *necessity* for the noun to precede the verb. This shows that, at least in medieval doctrines, the order of the parts of speech is given the same logical status of *government*: it is well known that the term *regimen* (government) superseded the older *exigentia*: cf. here fn 103.

[58] Cf. *Inst. Or.* II, xvii, 9: "Illud enim admonere satis est, omnia, quae ars consummaverit, a natura initia duxisse"; *Inst. Or.* II, xix, 3: "Denique natura materia doctrinae est; haec fingit, illa fingitur. Nihil ars sine materia, materiae etiam sine arte pretium est, ars summa materia optime melior".

[59] Especially controversial is the issue of the role of end position: cf. *De Orat.* III, 49, 192; *Inst. Or.* IX, iv, 29; *Poetria Nova*, v. 115 (cfr. Gallo 1971: 20). For the idea that *hyperbaton* (*transgressio*) can add emphasis to a given meaning, see *Poetria Nova*, vv. 1056 ff. (cf. Gallo 1971: 70).

[60] Cf. Walker 1682: 42.

[61] *Inst. Or.* IX, iv, 26.

[62] For the entire passage that has been summed up under b), see Walker 1682: 43.

[63] The *ratio compositionis* is considered as a factor that may require *hyperbaton* (cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, vi, 62).

[64] Cf. Murphy 1974: 171.

[65] Walker 1682: 49.

[66] Cf. *Doctrinale*, vv. 1417-1428 (cf. Reichling 1893: 90). The *explanatio* of this passage, which is reported by Reichling, restricts this order rule to "relative and interrogative nouns", adverbs and conjunctions, and makes it clear that a relation of government is involved between these parts of speech and the verb. The treatment of this issue by John of Garland is more general and is related to rhythmical properties: "si uerbum sit trissillabum uel quadrisillabum egregie ponitur in fine orationis, dictione casuali antecedente que regitur a uerbo, vt: "Cognicio Deum omnia gubernare"... Item uerbum absolutum ponitur cum determinatione aduerbiali uel nominali anteposita, quia quod secundum naturam debet postponi, anteponitur eggregie [sic] per artem" (*Parisiana Poetria*, VI, 30-38; cf. Lawler 1974: 110). This idea does not appear in any of the main classical rhetorical and grammatical sources, nor does it appear in any authoritative commentary to Priscian such as Petrus Hispanus' *Summa*.

[67] Walker 1682: 49.

[68] For the notion of *gravitas* in classical rhetoric, cf. *De Orat.* I, 3, 12; cf. also *Poetria Nova*, vv. 770-1098 (cf. Gallo 1971: 55-73) a propos of *ornatus gravis*.

[69] Cf. Walker 1682: 43-44.

[70] Cf. Gallo 1971: 70.

[71] For the idea that *hyperbaton* can give a better rhythm and a greater harmony to discourse, cf. *Inst. Or.* VIII, vi, 64.

[72] Walker 1682: 44.

[73] Richard Hooker (1554? - 1600) was a preacher with a reputation for the force and power of persuasion of his sermons: cf. DNB 9: 1183b-1189a and especially 1188a-1188b.

[74] The adjective *destitute* occurs here with the meaning 'devoid of, wanting or entirely lacking in (something desirable)', which today is obsolete (cf. OED III, 259c).

[75] Cf. *Inst. Or.* IX, i, 10-18.

[76] *Inst. Or.* IX, i, 10-11 (translation from Butler's). As to the second sense, Quintilian maintains that "omnis sermo habeat figuram" and presents the case of *cursitare* and *lectitare*, which are the same figure because they have the same formation.

[77] *Inst. Or.* IX, i, 14.

[78] Cf. *Inst. Or.* IX, iii, 3-4 (English translation from Butler's). This idea was resumed by Donatus and Priscian: cf. Thurot 1869: 465; for its occurrence in medieval treatises see Thurot 1869: 459 ff.

[79] Cf. *Inst. Or.* IX, iii, 1: "Verborum vero figurae et mutatae sunt semper et, utcumque valuit

consuetudo, mutantur". For the "naturalness" of this process cf. the examples in IX, iii, 5 ff, especially 7.

[80] On Kilwardby's idea cf. Sirridge 1990.

[81] The English examples are preceded by Latin ones. English examples are also given for the issues grouped under (c) above.

[82] Walker 1682: 47.

[83] Cf. Sornicola 1998.

[84] For the complete list of the grammars investigated, cf. Kohonen 1978: 46 fn 15. On Early English grammars see also Frank 1976-1977.

[85] As regards the beginning of XVIIth century, Salmon (1979: 130-131) has observed that "the mediaeval learning ... was still current in many schools and universities"; Salmon (1996: 115) emphasises this point; she mentions a study by Baldwin, which shows that students of the grammar schools of Butler's time had full instruction in the three *artes*, in particular in logic and rhetoric, either in their classical versions or through their interpretations by XVIth century scholars.

[86] For an overview of the history of the *artes dictandi* and *dictaminis* cf. Murphy 1974; Camargo 1991. Note that in the Middle Ages as in Classical Antiquity, grammar and rhetoric were not considered as two different disciplines (on the unity of the arts of *trivium* cf. Matthews 1990: 189).

[87] In the Middle Ages the *artes dictandi* were the first level of academic instruction (cf. Murphy 1974; Camargo 1991).

[88] Cf. Murphy 1974, chapter 3, *passim*. Hunt (1980: 167) observes that grammars schools in Oxford "were flourishing at the end of the XIIIth century, and their existence can be traced up to the time of the foundation of Magdalen College School in 1479".

[89] Cf. Funke 1941.

[90] For the influence of Cicero and Quintilian see Salmon 1996: 116, who observes that *Institutio Oratoria* was a standard textbook during the XVIth century. Quintilian, Varro, Priscian and the Italian humanists are referred to as *auctoritates* in Alexander Hume's *Grammatica Nova* (cf. Vorlat 1975: 14). Possibly, however, "the study of classical authors got restricted to a comparatively small group of scholars" (Vorlat 1975: 21).

[91] Cf. Vorlat 1975: 21.

[92] On the role exerted by Bacon on the origin and development of the experimental science in England, see Funke 1941: 36; Poldauf 1948: 79; Vorlat 1975: 28-29; Salmon 1996: 4.

[93] Cf. Salmon 1996: 130-131.

[94] Cf. Salmon 1996: 118.

[95] Cf. Scaglione 1972; Salmon 1979: 67-68 observes that in the XVIIth century Scaligerus revived the learning of medieval speculative grammar.

[96] Cf. Michael 1979: 10-12; Salmon 1996: 18.

[97] Cf. Keil II, 389, 12; II, 550, 17-18, etc.

[98] Priscian defined *constructio* as "ordinatio dictionum" (cf. Keil III, 108, 2) and *ordinatio* as "apta structura" (cf. Keil III, 108, 19). Priscian's definition was resumed by Petrus Helias: "Constructio est congrua dictionum ordinatio" (cf. *Summa* 2, 832, 5 ff.). For a discussion of the relation between Priscian and Petrus' commentary, see Thurot 1869: 214-215. See further

Michael 1979: 35-36.

[99] The English terms are used by Beck (1657: 9), the Latin ones by Gill (1619: 1).

[100] Cf. Thurot 1869: 131-135; Vineis and Maierù 1990: 120. Scaglione 1972: 4 traces the division back to late antiquity, but he may be wrong (I owe this opinion to Vivien Law and Peter Matthews). On classical ideas of the parts of grammar, cf. Pauly-Wissowa VII, 2, especially 1808-1810.

[101] Cf. Thurot 1869: 146-147. This definition is only partially related to the classical conception of *Etymologia* (for which see Varro, *De Lingua Latina*, ch. V-VII). Cf. also Scaglione 1972: 4, who draws attention to the long survival of the term with this meaning in the Anglo-Saxon cultural context.

[102] Cf. Poole 1654: 20; Gill 1619: 63, 72 (the Latin terms are, respectively, *conuenientia* and *rectio*). Thomas of Erfurt maintained that the elements of a construction could have either a relation of agreement (*similitudo*) or of government (*proportio*): cf. Bursill-Hall 1971: 237.

[103] According to Thomas of Erfurt, the relation of *concord* (*congruitas*) depends, in its turn, on the relation of *conformitas* or *proportio*: cf. Bursill-Hall 1971: 133; Covington 1986: 29-30. The history of the terminology is difficult to outline. If *concord* has been regularly used since Lily's *Shorte Introduction*, the verb *govern* and its Latin counterpart *regere*, have a number of Latin forerunners - such as *postulare*, *exigere*, *desiderare*, etc. (cf. Michael 1970: 132-133). The parallel terms in Priscian are *exigere*, *exigentia* (cf. Matthews 1990: 296). The earliest tokens of *regere* documented so far are from two manuscripts, dated from VIIIth and IXth centuries, respectively; the word *regere*, which was rare before the XIth century, frequently occurred in Hugh of San Victor and became regular from Petrus Helias onwards (cf. Thurot 1869: 82 and 239-243). Cf. Bursill-Hall 1971: 63; Vineis and Maierù 1990: 69-71 and fn 223, 113-117, 127 f.

[104] Cf. Michael 1979: 133.

[105] Salmon 1979: 89. The scholar thinks that no XVIIth century grammarian systematically used the morphological criterion to differentiate the parts of speech (with the only exception of P. G.'s *Grammatica Anglicana*); adoption of the structural criterion can be found in Hewes (cf. Salmon 1979: 92).

[106] Salmon 1979: 90.

[107] Cf. Funke 1941: 53; Salmon 1979: 90-91.

[108] On this problem see Vorlat 1975: 151 ff.

[109] Cf. Bursill-Hall 1971: 169.

[110] Cf. Bursill-Hall 1971: 169.

[111] Bursill-Hall 1971: 43 and 54-55.

[112] Cf. Bursill-Hall 1971: 43. The relationship between *signum*, *dictio* and *pars orationis* had already been discussed by Martinus de Dacia in his *De modis significandi* (cf. Roos 1961: 8-9); for Martinus' conception of *consignificatio* see Roos 1961: 7, 8.

[113] Cf. Bursill-Hall 1971: 55.

[114] Cf. Bursill-Hall 1971: 169.

[115] This is especially evident in some modistic treatises, like Michel de Marbais': cf. Thurot 1869: 224.

[116] This is Salmon's opinion (cf. Salmon 1979: 91).

[117] Cf. Vorlat 1975: 423-427.

[118] Chapter XIII of *Logonomia Anglica* is devoted to *uoces consignificatiuae*: "Uox consignificatiua articulos comprehendit, Aduerbia item, Coniunctiones, Praepositiones, Interiectiones" (Gill 1619: 61). The term *consignificatiuus* (consignificant) is typical of the scholastic grammar: cf. Thurot 1869: 153-157; Bursill-Hall 1971: 53-56; cf. also Chenu 1936, for a description of the more general cultural context in which the notion appears. As regards the idea of a transformation of a given part of speech into another, cf. Gill 1619: 61: "De aduerbis illud unicum adnotandum, omnia ferme adiectiva aduerbiascere adiecta particula *-ly*, ut *lauful* legitimus, *laufully* legitime". The source of Gill's idea is the notion of *transumptio* (conversion), which was dealt with by Geoffrey de Vinsauf in his *Poetria Nova* (vv. 1593-1765, cf. Gallo 1971: 98-108); for a discussion of the *transumptio* see Gallo 1971, especially 209.

[119] Wallis 1653: 76.

[120] In the Preface Wallis explicitly says that he intends to keep the Latin terminology (cf. Wallis 1653: XXVII).

[121] Wallis 1653: 111. For a general interpretation of Wallis, cf. Vorlat 1975: 151-159.

[122] Cf. *Doctrinale*, vv. 1390 and ff. (cf. Reichling 1893: 88 and ff.); *Poetria Nova*, vv. 87 and ff. (cf. Gallo 1971: 18-19). Thurot 1869: 341-344 has an interesting collection of the medieval sources of this idea. As to the classical sources, Apollonius discusses the necessity for the noun to precede the verb (cf. Uhlig 1910, 14). This explanation of the order of parts of speech is, however, dictated by logical priority (the noun signifies substance, the verb a certain state of the substance, etc.), as has been observed by Blank (1982: 13-14). Apollonius' passage is taken up by Priscian with a few modifications concerning the explanation of the necessary order: "ante verbum quoque necessario ponitur nomen, quia agere et pati substantiae est proprium" (Keil III, 116, 25 and ff.). For a general examination of the whole problem, see Scaglione 1972: 105-122.

[123] Cf. Sabbadini 1897; Scaglione 1972: 105 and ff.

[124] Thurot 1869: 343 observes that "on se conformait à cet ordre [i.e. the natural order of noun + verb] en expliquant les textes, plutot qu'en parlant et en écrivant", but adds that "les écrivains du moyen âge s'écartent peu, du moins en prose, de l'ordre que nous appellons *analytique*"". On the problem of the relationship between the purely pedagogical and the linguistic aspects of the *constructio*, see Scaglione 1972: 110.

[125] Cf. *Log. Angl.*, 70. Note that he chooses the verb, not the noun, as the criterial part of speech.

[126] Shortly after this passage, the positional criterion is extended by Poole to "all that goes before the verb" (*ibidem*).

[127] The verb *to parse* is documented *ante* 1553 by *OED* XI, 254b-c, with the meaning "to describe (a word in a sentence) grammatically, by stating the part of speech, inflexion and relation to the rest of the sentence; to resolve (a sentence, etc.) into its component parts of speech and describe them grammatically". The nominalization as *parsing* is documented from Ascham (cf. OED, *ibidem*). On the importance of *constructio* and the relation between Latin and English see Enkvist 1975: 288 ff., 294.

[128] Cf. Poldauf 1948: 77.

[129] Cf. Vorlat 1975, ch. I. For the influence of Ramus on the development of this idea in England, see Poldauf 1948: 67.

[130] Cf. Salmon 1979: 129-156; Salmon 1996: 77-97.

[131] Cf. Vorlat 1975: 2-3.

[132] Poole 1654: 24.

[133] Poole 1654: 24.

[134] Cf. Poldauf 1948: 77.

[135] Cf. Salmon 1979: 41; Salmon 1996: 14.

[136] Cf. Salmon 1996: 14. For Ascham's biography see DNB 1, 628c.

[137] Cf. Scaglione 1972: 114-115.

[138] Cf. Thurot 1869: 343-344; Scaglione 1972: 114-115 and fn 21.

[139] Sabbadini (1897: 102-103) observed that "l'età umanistica fece aspra guerra alla "constructio"; he adds, however, that the humanistic opposition could not eradicate this practice, which "durò e si imponeva anche a quelli che non la volevano". As Sabbadini himself notes, it has, at least in Italian schools, persisted until today.

[140] Following Sabbadini, Scaglione maintains that in the Middle Ages "the vernacular was becoming, through the back door, the true master, and Latin the servant" (1972: 111).

[141] The idea of such a relation was endorsed by Sabbadini (1897: 101) and has been recently taken up again by Vineis and Maierù 1990.

[142] Cf. Vorlat 1975: 4-5 and fn 16.

[143] Cf. Poldauf 1948: 48-59. Poldauf also underlines Ramus' influence on this.

[144] For a description of these *milieux*, cf. Salmon 1979: 129-156; Salmon 1996: 3-29.

[145] Vorlat 1975: 21.

[146] Poldauf 1948: 79.

[147] Poldauf 1948: 82 drew attention to Wallis' phonetic interests and to the prejudices of the time that "obscured his view of the grammatical structure of English". Yet his conclusion that these limitations "are not blinkers of the sort that Latin grammar was to his predecessors, since they are imposed by his own predilections" is not convincing.

[148] Wallis 1653: XXV-XXVI.

[149] Wallis is obviously referring here to the Port-Royalists (cf. Kemp 1972: 32 f.).

[150] Wallis 1653: XXVI-XXVII.

[151] Vorlat 1975: 20.

[152] Poldauf 1948: 71.

[153] The first interpretation was put forward by Funke 1941: 38-39, the latter by Poldauf 1948: 71.

[154] Cf. Poldauf 1948: 71.

[155] Cf. Poldauf 1948: 71-72. However, he maintains that Gill's perception of universalism "has hardly any connection with that which flourished in the middle of the century" in that it is connected instead to a sort of imperialistic mission.

[156] Cf. Scaglione 1972; Murphy 1974.

[157] Cf. Matthews 1990:189.

[158] See Salmon 1979:83 for the two different approaches. Cf. also Percival (1986:64 and fn 12).

[159] Cf. Gill 1619: 134 for the English translation which is quoted here. Salmon 1996: 17 notes that the distinction between the two types of syntax was well known to XVIIth century grammatical culture. Poldauf 1948: 72 considers the distinction to be related to Gill's aristocratic cultural background.

[160] Cf. Thurot 1869: 233-234; Scaglione 1972: 159; Michael 1979: 131.

[161] "Duo igitur sunt quae praeter materiam syntaxin poeticam a soluta disterminant: Ornatus et Numerus. Ornatus ille est quem dixi schematisticus, in soluta oratione rarior ... in poetica frequentior, sed tum denique gratus, quum ita necessarius, vt res videatur aliter exprimi nec posse, nec debere" (Gill 1619: 121-122).

[162] "Ad varios vsus ex omni materia fiunt vasa: at gemma quaeque non nisi in auro elaboratissimo ostenditur. Sic ad omnia animi sensa depromenda accomodatus est sermo: at in carmine, vbi nihil audiendum est, nisi quod rarum, tersum, politum, delicatum, nouum, et a vulgi captu et opinione remotum, laudandus sermo non est, nisi purus, vivus et concinnus" (Gill 1619: 121).

[163] Gill himself refers to the terminological intricacies of the study of figures. He observes that these have been named in different ways by various authors and that the terms are "so numerous on occasion that they obscure a matter in itself quite obvious"; he also observes that some authors separated the treatment of figures that, in his opinion, should have been discussed together (cf. Gill 1619: 116).

[164] Cf. fn 1-4 and 17-18 to ch. XXII of Gill's *Logonomia* (Danielsson and Gabrielson 1972: 223-225). *Hyrmos* had been defined by Peacham as a figure occurring "when an vnfashioned order of speech is long continued, as it were, stretched out to the ende, still after one sorte, voyde of all round and sweete composition"; *synchisis* had been defined as "a confusion of order, in all partes of the construction". Peacham maintained that both figures should be avoided.

[165] The Latin term *pullum* denotes 'a young animal' (cf. LDH 2, 2077a). This semantic value is crucial for the interpretation of the passage (note that it is not expressed in the English translation: cf. Danielsson and Gabrielson 1972: 150).

[166] Cf. Gill 1619: 90.

[167] For the distinction between figures of thought and figures of speech, cf. *Inst. Or.*, IX, i, *passim*; IX, ii. For the figures of simulation and the idea that they are more apt to stir emotions, cf. *Inst. Or.* IX, ii, 26ff.

[168] It should be observed, on the other hand, that Gill makes this claim merely as justification for the fact that he does not intend to discuss all the possible figures.

[169] *De Orat.* I, 32, 144.

[170] For Gill's knowledge of astronomy cf. Danielsson and Gabrielson 1972: 16.

TEXTS

Alexander de Villadei. 1893. "Doctrinale". *Das Doctrinale des Alexander de Villadei.* ed. by Dietrich Reichling (Monumenta Germaniae Pedagogica, 12.), 1-178 Berlin: Hofmann & Comp.

Apollonius Discolus & Gustav Uhlig, eds. 1910. *Apollonii Dyscoli De Constructione Libri Quattuor* (*Grammatici Graeci*, 2, 2). Leipzig: Teubner.

Beck, Cave. 1657. *The Universal Character by which all the Nations in the World may understand one another Conceptions, reading out of one Common Writing their own Mother Tongues.* London: Thomas Maxey for William Weekley.

Bullokar, William. 1586. "Bref Grammar for English". *Geschichte der Fabeldichtung in England bis zu John Gay (1726)* ed. by Max Plessow (*Palaestra* 52.), 333-385. London: Bollifant.

Butler, Charles. 1634/1910. "English Grammar". *Charles Butler's English Grammar* ed. by A. Eichler 1910, (= Neudrücke Frühneuenglischer Grammatiken, 4, 1). Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Cicero. "De Oratore". *Loeb Classical Library*.ed. by E.W. Sutton & H. Rackham. 1996-1997. Cambridge (Mass.) and London: Harvard University Press.

--------. "Orator". *Loeb Classical Library*. ed. by M. Hubbell. 1988. Cambridge (Mass.) and London: Harvard University Press.

Dacia de, Martinus. 1961. "De modis significandi". *Martini de Dacia opera* (*Corpus Philosophorum Danicorum Medii Aevi*, 2.) ed. by Henrik Roos, 3-118 Copenhagen: Bagge.

De Vinsauf, Geoffrey. 1968. *Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi* ed. by Roger P. Parr (= *Mediaeval Philosophical Texts in Translation*, 17.). Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

Garland of, John.1974. "Parisiana Poetria". *The Parisiana Poetria of John of Garland* ed. by Traugott Lawler, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Gervais von Melkley.1964. *Ars poetica* ed. by Hans-Jürgen Gräbener .(= *Forschungen zur romanischen Philologie,* 17). Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Gill, Alexander. 1619. *Logonomia Anglica*, Bror Danielsson & Arvid Gabrielson eds. 1972. *Alexander's Gill's Logonomia Anglica*. Part I: Facsimiles of Gill's presentation copy in the Bodleian Library. Part II: Biographical and Bibliographical Introductions, Translation and Notes (Stockholm Studies in English, 26 & 27). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Hume, Alexander. about 1617. *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue. A Treates, noe shorter then necessarie, for the Schooles*. ed. by Henry B. Wheatley 1864. London: Trübner & Co.

Lodowyck, Francis. 1647. *A Common Writing*. ed. by R.C. Alston 1969. (*English Linguistics 1500-1800. A Collection of Facsimile Reprints*, 147.). Menston: The Scholar Press.

Lodowyck, Francis.1968 [1652]. *The Ground-work of a New Perfect Language*. ed. by R.C. Alston (*English Linguistics 1500-1800. A Collection of Facsimile Reprints*, 103.). Menston: The Scholar Press.

Petrus Helias. 1993. *Summa super Priscianum* ed. by Leo Reilly. (Vol. 2.). Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

Poole, Joshua. 1654. *The English Accidence*. ed. by R. C. Alston 1967. (*English Linguistics 1500-1800. A Collection of Facsimile Reprints*, 5.). Menston: The Scholar Press.

Priscianus. 1961. "De constructione". *Grammatici Latini*. 3. ed. by H. Keil. Hildesheim: Georg Holms.

Quintilianus. *Institutio Oratoria* ed. by E. Butler 1993-1996. (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge (Mass.) & London: Harvard University Press.

Rhetorica ad Herennium ed. by H. Caplan 1989. (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge (Mass.) and London: Harvard University Press & William Heinemann.

Varro. *On the Latin Language* ed. by Roland G. Kent 1933. (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge (Mass.) and London: Harvard University Press.

Vinsauf de, Geoffrey. 1971. "Poetria Nova". *The Poetria Nova and its Sources in Early Rhetorical Doctrin* ed. by Ernest Gallo, The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Walker, Obadiah. 1682 [1659]. *Some Instructions concerning the Art of Oratory, collected for the use of a friend, a young student*. The second edition very much corrected and augmented. Oxford: Lichfield.

Wallis, John. 1653. "Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae, Cui praefigitur, De Loquela sive Sonorum Formatione, Tractatus Grammatico-Physicus". *Grammar of the English Language, with an introductory grammatico-physical Treatise on Speech (or on the formation of all speech sounds)* ed. by J. A. Kemp 1972. John Wallis, London: Longman.

Wilson, Thomas. 1553. *The Arte of Rhetorique for the use of all suche as are studious of Eloquence, sette forth in English* Londini, exc. Richardus Graftonus.

REFERENCES

Blank, David L. 1982. *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar. The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*. Chico (Ca.): Scholars Press.

Bursill-Hall, G.L. 1971. *Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages. The doctrine of* Partes Orationis *of the Modistae*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Camargo, Martin. 1991. *Ars dictaminis, ars dictandi* (*Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental*, 10). Turnhout: Brepols.

--------. 1995. *Medieval Rhetorics of Prose Composition. Five English* Artes dictandi *and their Tradition*. Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies.

Chenu, M.-D. 1936. "Grammaire et Théologie aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles". *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 12. 5-28.

Covington, Michael A. 1986. "Grammatical Theory in the Middle Ages". *Studies in the History of Western Linguistics in honour of R. H. Robins*, ed. by Theodora Bynon & F. R. Palmer. 23-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Di Capua, Francesco. 1959. *Scritti minori*. Roma: Desclée & Co.

DNB. *The Dictionary of National Biographies*. 1949-1953. London: Oxford University Press.

Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1986. "English in Latin Guise". *Historiographia Linguistica* 2, 3: 283-298.

Faral, E. 1923. *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIII siècles* Paris: Champion.

Folena, Gianfranco. 1991. *Volgarizzare e tradurre*. Torino: Einaudi.

Frank, Thomas. 1976-1977. "I primi grammatici inglesi, 1586-1688". *Studi Inglesi* 3-4. 411-457.

Funke, Otto. 1941. *Die Frühzeit der englischen Grammatik* Bern: Herbert Lang.

Hunt, R. W. 1980. *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages. Collected Papers* ed. by G.L. Bursill-Hall. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kohonen, Viljo. 1978. "On the Development of an Awareness of English Syntax in Early (1550-1660) Descriptions of Word Order by English Grammarians, Logicians and Rhetoricians". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 79.1. 44-58.

LDH. *Ausführliches Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch*, ausgearbeitet von Karl Georges..., 1967. Basel/Stuttgart: Schnabe.

Matthews, Peter. H. 1990. "La linguistica greco-latina", Giulio C. Lepschy (ed.) *Storia della linguistica* 1. 187-310. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Meech, Sanford B. 1935. "Early Applications of Latin Grammar to English". *PMLA* 50. 4. 1012-1032.

Michael, I. 1979. *English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murphy, James J. 1964. "A New Look at Chaucer and the Rhetoricians". *The Review of English Studies* 15. 1-20.

--------. 1974. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

OED. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 1961. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pauly-Wissowa. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung unter Mitwirking zahlreicher Fachgenossen herausgegeben von Georg Wissowa. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Percival, W. Keith. 1986. "Renaissance Linguistics. The Old and the New". *Studies in the History of Western Linguistics in honour of R. H. Robins*, ed. by Theodora Bynon & F. R. Palmer. 56-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poldauf, Ivan. 1948. *On the History of Some Problems of English Grammar before 1800*. Praha: Nákladem Filosofické Fakulty University Karlovy.

Robins, Robert H. 1994. "William Bullokar's *Bref Grammar for English*: Text and Context". *Proceedings of the* Anglistentag *(1993)* 15 ed. by Günther Blaicher and Brigitte Glaser, 19-31. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Sabbadini, Remigio. 1897. "Sulla *constructio*". *Rivista di Filologia e di istruzione classica* 25. 100-103.

Salmon, Vivian. 1979. *The Study of Language in XVIIth Century England* (*Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science* III: 17). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

--------. 1996. *Language and Society in Early Modern England. Selected Essays 1981-1994* (*Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science* III: 77). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Scaglione, Aldo. 1972. *The Classical Theory of Composition from its Origins to the Present. A Historical Survey.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Schoeck, R. J. 1968. "On Rhetoric in Fourteenth Century Oxford". *Mediaeval Studies* 30. 214-225.

Sirridge, Mary. 1990. "Robert Kilwardby: Figurative Constructions and the Limits of Grammar". *De Ortu Grammaticae. Studies in Medieval Grammar and Linguistic Theory in Memory of Jan Pinborg* ed. by G. L. Bursill-Hall, Sten Ebbesen & Konrad Koerner (*Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science* III: 43) 321- 337. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Sornicola, Rosanna. 1998. "Basic Word Order from a Pragmatic Perspective". *EUROTYP Survey of the Languages of Europe.* I: *Pragmatic Organization of Discourse* edited by Giuliano Bernini.

Thurot, Ch. 1964 [1869]. *Extraits de divers manuscrits latins pour à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au Moyen Âge.* Frankfurt am Main: Minerva.

Varvaro, Alberto. 1972-1973. "Storia della lingua: passato e prospettive di una categoria controversa".*Romance Philology* 26. 16-51 and 509-531.

Vineis, Edoardo and Maierù, Alfonso. 1990. "La linguistica medioevale", Giulio C. Lepschy (ed.) *Storia della linguistica* 2. 11-168. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Vorlat, Emma. 1975. *The Development of English Grammatical Theory 1586-1737, with Special Reference to the Theory of Parts of Speech.* Leuven: Leuven University Press.

The 'new science' and the New Language in Seventeenth Century England

Gabriella Di Martino
Naples University

Although the language transformation in England at the end of the 16th century and throughout the 17th century was only a part of the profound conflict and change which occurred in almost every aspect of life and culture, it was nonetheless a highly significant one. Language was very much influenced by the contact with new territories, hence new realities, and also by social progress, but the aspect of language transformation considered here is the one brought about by the connection with the "new science", that new dominant force in English life which not only affected the vocabulary, and the whole language system itself, but radically changed the entire character of English prose. All over Europe science was still being written and read in Latin; nevertheless the new scientific ideas were often talked about and spread in the vernacular which gradually began to take the place of classical languages, and became an essential tool still to be refined mainly in order to express new ideas and new realities.

In England the works of Sir John Napier, William Harvey, Isaac Newton, Robert Hooke and Robert Boyle had to be expressed in a language under-standable to artisans, countrymen and merchants according to the well-known ideals of the Royal Society. These ideals were expressed in the desire to reduce the language to its simplest terms, on the model of mathematics, in opposition to the rhetorical prose and all the amplifications of style which would be a superfluous obstacle in the communication of scientific discoveries.

The Puritans were convinced that Man, through science, would dominate nature; science consequently had a vital role. The new scientific movement together with the Puritan movement began to censure the old rhetorical and traditional style, predominant in the first half of the seventeenth