HISTORIOGRAPHIA LINGUISTICA

International Journal for the History of the Language Sciences
Revue internationale pour l'histoire des sciences du langage
Internationale Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften

AIM AND SCOPE

Historiographia Linguistica (HL) serves the ever growing community of scholars interested in the history of the sciences concerned with language such as linguistics, philology, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, pedagogy, psychology, neurology, and other disciplines.

Central objectives of *HL* are the critical presentation of the origin and development of particular ideas, concepts, methods, schools of thought or trends, and the discussion of the methodological and philosophical foundations of a historiography of the language sciences, including its relationship with the history and philosophy of science.

HL is published in 3 issues per year of about 450 pages altogether. Each volume contains a dozen articles or more, at least one review article or a bibliography devoted to a particular topic, a great number of reviews and review notes as well as information on recent or forthcoming activities and events in the field.

LC no. 73-88206 – ISS no. 0302 - 5160

Amsteldijk 44 – P.O Box 52519 – 1007 HA AMSTERDAM – (Holland)
Telephone (020) 73 81 56 – Fax (020) 73 97 73

821 Bethlehem Pike – PHILADELPHIA/Pa. 19118 – U.S.A.
Telephone (215) 836-1200 – Fax (215) 836-1204

Historiographia Linguistica XVII:3. 309-338 (1990).

GREENLANDIC IN COMPARISON: MARCUS WÖLDIKE'S "MELETEMA" (1746)

FRANS PLANK
Universität Konstanz

David Fabricius (1546-1617), a learned parson of East Frisia, was a keen observer of the universe. He discovered a star (*Mira reti*) and the sunspots, and Greenland, an inhospitable part of the globe unknown to the ancients, came into his view, too, if rather more dimly:

> Idt sollen dar ock klene Dwerglin gefunden werden / de Minschen gestalt an sick hebben / vnde synt auer eren gantzen Lyff harich / beth an den lesten knökel der Fingeren / de Menner hebben Bärde beth vp de Knee / ydt soll auerst gelyck wol weinich vorstandes in solcken Dwerglin syn / ock nene vorstendlyke sprake hebben / sondern alse de Gänse einen geludt van sick geuen. (*Van Isslandt vnde Grönlandt*, Dat XII. Cap., 1616)

In these days scientific progress was rapid, however, and only forty years later the distinguished astronomer's report of hairy and mindlessly cackling midgets in faraway Greenland was rendered obsolete by the more discerning account of Adam Olearius (1599-1671), the renowned traveller to the Orient in the service of Duke Friedrich III of Schleswig-Holstein.[1]

After his return from that ill-fated expedition to Russia and Persia and subsequent diplomatic missions, Olearius had settled at the court of Gottorf in Schleswig as ducal mathematician and librarian, and as he was preparing a second edition of his justly acclaimed *Offt begehrte Beschreibung der Newen Orientalischen Rejse*, first published in 1647, news came in about Greenland. Under the auspices of King Frederik III of Denmark, Captain David Dannel had sailed to Greenland thrice between 1652 and 1654, abducting four natives upon the last of these visits, named Jhiob (who died on the journey), Küneling, Kabelau, and Sigoko. The surviving three women were put under the tutelage of Reinhold Horrn, a Pomeranian sur-

geon from the former crew of Captain Dannel, whose task was to improve them, which of course included teaching them Danish. As the plague was raging through Denmark, the royal entourage fled to Flensburg in Schleswig, and the recent Greenlandic acquisitions were proudly presented also at the nearby court of Gottorf, where Olearius, as avid as ever for useful and entertaining knowledge, seized the opportunity of examining them personally as they were lodging in his house. Chapter 4 of Book 4 of his *Vermehrte Newe Beschreibung der Muscowitischen vnd Persischen Reyse* (1656:163-179), following a chapter on Samoyedic and other northern peoples whose territories he had not traversed himself, relates what Olearius had been able to discover — at first hand, from Reinhold Horrn, and from the scant literature on the subject — about the history, manners, and physique of the Greenlanders. They were indeed rather small, but their bodies were not at all hairy, and their complexion (except Kabelau's) was surprisingly dark, considering their cold climate. In these traits and numerous others they were by no means unique but reminded Olearius of what he had read about the Samoyeds and the Crimean and other Tatars, on the one hand, and about North-American natives, on the other. Since there was reason to believe that Greenland was not a genuine island but was, perhaps by ice, linked to Tartary in the east and America in the west, he concluded that the Greenlanders must have originated from the intermingling of immigrant Tatars and North Americans.[2] The existence of a Norse colony in Greenland, thriving especially in the 13th century but now long vanished and virtually forgotten, was beginning to be remembered. The theory that the first and presumably only inhabitants ever of Greenland had been Norwegians stranded on their way to America, advocated by Hugo Grotius and other savants, however, did not seem to Olearius to stand up in particular to the linguistic evidence that had now become available owing to the capture of Küneling, Kabelau, and Sigoko. Olearius was in possession of a list of a hundred words which Horrn had elicited from his wards and which he, after they had been repeated in his own presence, reproduced on page 171 of the *Vermehrte Newe Beschreibung*. Some of these words admittedly sounded Norwegian or Danish, but they could well have been borrowings from occasional visitors to Greenland; and there were also a few similarities with Greek and Latin, but these were surely fortuitous. The overwhelming majority, however, bore no resemblance at all to anything European, rendering it very unlikely that Küneling, Kabelau, Sigoko, and their compatriots were of respectable descent. The overly palatal, guttural, and nasal

manner of their articulation indeed could pass for Tataric, or so it seemed to their examiner. Moreover, like the Chinese, themselves presumably intermingled with Tatars from Mongolia, they could not pronounce *r*'s and instead uttered *l*'s. The speed at which they spoke reminded Olearius, too, of the cackling of geese.

Back in Copenhagen, the three expatriate women were lodged in the house of Caspar Bartholin (1618-1670), a councillor at the chancery and son-in-law of Henrik Müller, the royal treasurer and financier who had equipped the expeditions of Captain Dannel. In 1675, after Caspar Bartholin's death, a word list almost three times as long as that of Olearius but sharing with it many items, appeared in the *Acta medica et philosophica Hafniensia*, edited by Thomas Bartholin, professor of medicine,[3] who had inherited it from his late brother Caspar. Caspar Bartholin in turn may have obtained it from Reinhold Horrn, or may himself have assisted in the interrogation of his exotic lodgers. Yet another version of the collected words of Küneling, Kabelau, and Sigoko was included in the unpublished *Atlas Danicus* of Peder Hans Resen, dating from the 1680s. In general, however, it was through Olearius's *Vermehrte Newe Beschreibung* that word was spread further.[4] It had almost instantly reached Johann Balthasar Schupp (1610-1661), the Hamburg preacher and moralist, who mentioned the visitors from Greenland in his *Salomo oder Regenten-Spiegel* of 1657. A more detailed rendering of Olearius's account was given in the *Cimbrische Heyden-Bekehrung* (1702: 317-330) of Troers Arnkiel (1638-1712), parson and provost at Aabenraa in Schleswig, who felt that the barbarous language of the Greenlanders, not even distantly related to the ancient Gothic, was no obstacle to their eventual conversion to Christianity, which it was about time to undertake.

Around A.D. 1700, Greenland was indeed on the map again, at least on those of the whalers and traders of the maritime countries of Northern Europe. Scandinavian antiquaries, too, had managed to refreshen the memory of Old Greenland. When Hans Povelsen Egede (1686-1758) resolved upon going to Greenland as a missionary, he sought information from commercial as well as scientific sources. From reading Peder Claussøn Friis' *Norriges oc omliggende øers sandfærdige bescriffuelse* (1632) he allegedly first got the idea that there might still be heathens in Greenland awaiting conversion; and one of those he approached for practical details was Niels Rask, his brother-in-law from Bergen, who had actually sailed to Greenland himself. Jacob Rasch (or Rask), another relative of his wife's, had

been involved in the eventually abandoned plan for a Greenlandic expedition, conceived by Joachim von Ahlefeldt, the leading Danish statesman under the reign of Frederik IV, in consultation with Christian Müller, son of Henrik Müller, the patron of Captain Dannel, and brother-in-law of Caspar Bartholin, the sometime host of Künèling, Kabelau, and Sigoko.

Caspar Bartholin the younger, son of Thomas, who had published the word list, in fact had been Hans Egede's preceptor at the University of Copenhagen, but it is unknown whether the Greenlandic guests that had once stayed in the house of his uncle came up in their conversations. Egede will, at any rate, have seen their painting in the Royal Museum of Art. And when he finally arrived in Greenland in the summer of 1721, to found a colony and mission for the King of Denmark and Norway and also for a commercial company of Bergen, he knew no more about Greenlandic than what he had been able to glean from the word lists of Olearius, Bartholin, and probably also that of Resen. It had been Thomas von Westen, the apostle to the Lapps, well aware of the problems of missionizing ununderstanding heathens, who had brought Olearius's work to Egede's attention. Curiously, however, Olearius's arguments about the non-Norse origin of the contemporary Greenlanders seem not to have impressed Egede at all, for his persistent expectation was that the heathens he would encounter would be the descendants of Christian Norsemen. A meeting with relatives of Küneling, Kabelau, and Sigoko on an excursion to the Baals Revier in 1722, who could still remember the abduction, provided one opportunity among many to correct this misconception. Egede's report to the Company at Bergen of 1724, published in 1729 under the title *Det gamle Grønlands Nye Perlustration*, once more commented on the previous word lists, but already revealed a growing awareness of the intricacies of the painfully non-Norse language of Küneling, Kabelau, and Sigoko, now systematically investigated in situ by Egede, his two sons, and an assistant minister, Albert Top (1697-1742). Their further progress is documented by numerous manuscripts of vocabularies, grammar sketches, and translations, which, however, remained unpublished. After his return to Copenhagen in 1736, Hans Egede used these materials in his instruction of future missionaries, but they were also accessible to others.[5]

Johann Anderson (1674-1743), the sometime mayor of Hamburg, as knowledgeable about maritime trade as about Germanic antiquities including languages, had come to know about Greenlandic from sailors of the Bergen Company, and had been able to obtain, via an unnamed noble

friend, linguistic notebooks of Hans Egede's, allegedly dating from as early as 1725. These, comprising a *Dictionariolum*, a collection of useful phrases, the inflectional paradigm of the verb *negligpunga* or *neglissaraunga* 'to love', some further grammatical notes, and translations into Greenlandic of the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, chapter 1 of *Genesis*, a brief gospel extract, and heart-rending sermons by Egede, were published as an appendix of Anderson's posthumous *Nachrichten von Island, Grönland und der Straße Davis* (1746:285-328). What Anderson, who had also seen the word list in Thomas Bartholin's (misnamed 'Borrichius') *Acta*, found most remarkable about Greenlandic, apart from its inimitably contorted pronunciation, were its elaborate verb conjugation, the pronominal suffixes of verbs as well as of nouns, the suffixes which stood for prepositions and conjunctions, and the existence of a dual. All this seemed truly strange to him, indeed unique: he could detect no likeness whatsoever between Greenlandic and continental North Germanic, Icelandic (or Old Gothic), Finnish, Lapp, the idioms of Canada (as reported in Lahontan's sensational *Voyages* from the end of the last century), or the thirty-two Tataric languages recorded in the *Tabula polyglotta* contained in Strahlenberg's recent *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia* (1730). Nonetheless, as the Greenlanders must have come from somewhere, Anderson deemed that their ancestors were probably descended from Samoyeds or Siberian Tatars, North-Asiatic peoples reportedly possessed of an equally unsavoury bloodthirst.

Shortly after Anderson's *Nachrichten* comprehensive accounts of the vocabulary (1750) and grammar (1760) of Greenlandic were finally released to the public at large by Paul Egede (1708-1789), Hans's elder son, whose practical knowledge of the language was unrivalled among non-Greenlanders. It took another century for these to be definitively superseded by the grammar (1851) and dictionary (1871) of Samuel Kleinschmidt (1814-1886), once a member of the Moravian Brethren, colleagues and sometimes competitors of the Danish missionaries in Greenland since the early 1730s.[6]

As it turned out, the early comparisons of Greenlandic had been premature. Perhaps there was a sense in which the speech of Greenlanders, especially of young women, was more like the cackling of geese than, say, the gobbling of turkeys, of which one was reminded when listening to Hottentots (at least Vasco da Gama was); but there were meaningful noises which it resembled more closely still, even if these were not ones produced by Europeans communicating their thoughts. On the lexical evidence avail-

able to him, Adam Olearius was indeed entitled to deny that Greenlandic and European languages were intrinsically related in this respect; but there was no way he could tell whether this was valid also for grammar, having failed to elicit any from his consultants. In view of his ignorance about the idioms of Great Tartary and Siberia, regarding these as Greenlandic's closest relatives was clearly a shot in the dark, even if he was able to give a reason why Greenlandic was to be expected to be similar to 'Tataric', which after all was the language of peoples presumed, on non-linguistic grounds, to have been, together with North Americans, the ancestors of the Greenlanders. In a way, Johann Anderson's denying all linguistic relationships was a more responsible position; it was, nevertheless, a little too negative, since some of the evidence meanwhile accessible was rather telling. Owing to his vastly superior knowledge of Greenlandic, Paul Egede was in a far better position to draw comparisons, and he came down on the side of North Americans, whose linguistic dowry had seemed negligible to Olearius. In the preface of his *Grammatica Grönlandica Danico-Latina* of 1760, it was in fact Eskimo, rather than any other of the American languages, all apparently differing greatly from one another, which was singled out as resembling Greenlandic most closely, sharing with it, among other things, a preference for involved words rather than complex sentences ("constructiones quae non in longis perplexisque sententiis, sed in vocibus multifariam compositis, consistunt"). Asiatic or European origins of Greenlandic are considered unlikely, as are significant mixtures in its prehistory. If the similarities with Eskimo were to be accounted for by a common origin of the two peoples, the split between them must have occurred a very long time ago, with Greenlandic, according to Egede, having remained solitary and largely unchanged ever since.[7] All such comparative deliberations, however, were peripheral to Paul Egede's main task, which was to describe Greenlandic in its own terms.

Nevertheless, a new era of the comparative study of Greenlandic had already been inaugurated, and this had not gone unnoticed by Paul Egede. In support of his claim about the antiquity of Greenlandic, he, again in the preface of his *Grammatica*, mentioned one Doctor Wöldike, who, in his "Betænkning om det Grønlandske Sprogs Oprindelse" (1746), had shown that it is older than Norwegian, Icelandic, or even Gothic. The man here referred to was Marcus Wöldike (1699-1750) from the Duchy of Schleswig, since 1731 professor of theology at the Royal University of Copenhagen, in which capacity he also lectured on oriental languages, in particular Hebrew

(having taken over this task from Caspar Bartholin the younger, once Hans Egede's preceptor), and since 1734 assessor of the Mission College, where Hans, and since 1740 also Paul, Egede taught after their return from Greenland, with Wöldike as their most reliable supporter in administrative matters.[8] In 1742 Wöldike became a member of the *Kiøbenhavnske Selskab af Lærdoms og Videnskabers Elskere*, and three years later he read to that Society the paper alluded to in Paul Egede's grammar. Apparently the only genuinely linguistic publication of Wöldike, it appeared in 1746 in the Society's proceedings, which were issued in Danish as well as in Latin translation. As indicated by the full title, "Betænkning om det Grønlandske Sprogs Oprindelse og Uliighed med andre Sprog / Meletema, de lingvæ groenlandicæ origine, ejusqve a cæteris lingvis differentia", Wöldike's concerns were not exclusively historical. For him, genealogical reasoning had to be grounded on the results of grammatical and lexical comparison, and to this end he sought to determine just how similar to or different from other languages Greenlandic actually was. Owing to the pioneering descriptive work of the Egedes, it was now possible for Wöldike to be more confident about the extent at least of the *dis*similarity between Greenlandic and some of its previously alleged relatives. On the positive side, there emerged a likeness that had not been suspected before.

Although Marcus Wöldike's story commences with the Flood and takes a momentous turn at Babel, what he was really interested in were later, more controversial events, not vouched for by authorities of the stature of a Moses. There was, first of all, the much debated question of the peopling of America. A European origin of its first inhabitants, arriving there from or via Iceland, seemed improbable to Wöldike for geographical and historical reasons. What had more appeal for him was a theory advanced, not long ago, in the third instalment of Adrian Reland's *Dissertationes miscellaneae* (1708), which located the homes of the first North Americans in North Asia, specifically in Kamchadalia, the easternmost province of North Tartary, and of the first South Americans in lands east and west of Java, Timor, and the Moluccan islands. Proof of this would have to come also from similarities between the respective languages. However, as long as knowledge about the tongues of the supposed immigrants to America was scarce, Wöldike deemed it wise to reserve judgment on this whole issue. His approach to the question of the descent of the Greenlanders was equally cautious. Most likely their ancestors, too, were of Tataric extraction, but this could not yet be proven linguistically. There were simi-

larities in manner and physique between the current inhabitants of Greenland and Canada, now Nouvelle France, which would seem to point to a common origin of these peoples. On the other hand, the linguistic differences between them were so considerable, and were apparently of such long standing (Greenlandic being such a pure and perfect, i.e., unmixed and highly inflecting, language that it could not have much changed for the worse over the centuries), that it was unlikely that they were descended from one and the same nation, even though their forebears presumably came from roughly the same region.[9]

Now, the languages which Wöldike compared with Greenlandic, in various degrees of detail, in order to put conjectures about migrations and affinities on a firmer footing, included those spoken on the northern and north-western margins of Europe, viz. Lapp (*lingua Finnmarchica*), Finnish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic, Breton (*Armorica*), Welsh (*Cambrica*), Irish (*Hibernica*), and English. Further members of the European contingent were German,[10] Russian or Church Slavonic (*Slavonica*), Ancient Greek, Latin, Italian, French, and, with significant eastern connections, Hungarian. Wöldike's oriental specimens were Hebrew, Arabic, and Turkish. 'Malay' is only represented by a single lexical item, *kiki*, meaning "tooth", like Greenlandic *kigut*. So far as Wöldike knew, only two languages, or language stocks, were in use between the Mississippi and Hudson Bay, viz. Algonkin and Huron; Natick or Massachusett (*Virginica*), a North American idiom he also mentioned in passing, presumably was a variety of Algonkin. From further south in the Americas were Pokomam (*Pocomanica*), Carib, and Tupi (*Brasilica*). Eskimo, presumed Greenlandic's closest relative by Paul Egede in 1760, is absent from Wöldike's comparison; at the time of his writing there in fact was virtually no published information on it he could have made use of.[11] The Tataric lands, as Wöldike saw it, were *terra incognita*, at least for purposes of comparative grammar and lexicology, which was perhaps a trifle too pessimistic.

For Greenlandic, Wöldike had the expertise of his acquaintances, the Egedes, at his disposal. He acknowledged in particular a grammar and a dictionary compiled by Paul, as yet unpublished; but his actual grammatical source in fact appears to have been a manuscript dating from the spring of 1739, *Grammatica Grönlandica per Johannem Egede concepta*, which was to form the nucleus of the *Grammatica* published in 1760 under Paul Egede's name.[12] His chief source for American languages was Adrian Reland's dissertation "De linguis Americanis" (1708:141-229), supplemented by José de

Anchieta's early grammar of Tupi (1595) and the Baron de Lahontan's *Nouveaux voyages* (also consulted by Wöldike's near-contemporary, Johann Anderson), whose second volume, *Memoires de l'Amerique Septentrionale* (1703), provided sketches of Algonkin and Huron. Anchieta and Lahontan had already been exploited by Reland, and the former's *Arte de grammatica da lingao mais vsada na costa do Brasil* is unlikely to have been consulted personally by Wöldike. Reland's authority for Natick had been John Eliot, whose extraordinary *Indian Grammar Begun* (1666) Wöldike ignored to his disadvantage. For Hungarian, he relied on Ferenc Fóris Otrokocsi's *Origines Hungaricae* (1693) and a more recent article by Mátyás Bél, "De peregrinitate lingvae Hungaricæ", from the Berlin Academy of Sciences' *Miscellanea Berolinensia*.[13] For Celtic, he had been supplied with unidentified grammars and dictionaries by another member of the Copenhagen Society of Friends of Learning and Science, the barrister Hans Gram, his benefactor, who may also have lent a hand with Icelandic and other *septemtrionalia*. Further sources remain unacknowledged by Wöldike, but were not tapped extensively, either.

What follows — here presented in the form of a questionnaire — is the lengthy list of grammatical properties which Wöldike took into account in his comparison, to the extent that he had obtained relevant information.

1. Does the language use the letter, or sound, *c*? (The sound Wöldike has in mind presumably is the affricate /ts/.)
2.-9. Ditto for *d*, *f*, *h*, *b*, *p*, *m*, *l*, *s*.
10. Ditto for *z*. (The identity of the sound at issue is unclear; one, but not the only, possibility, and one that would be inappropriate for Greenlandic, is the voiced alveolar fricative /z/.)
11. Ditto for geminate *rr*.
12. Does the language use clusters of sibilants, such as /ʃtʃ/?
13. Does the language permit the cluster *ks* in syllable-medial position?
14. Ditto for *ts*.
15. Does the language permit consonant clusters (such as *bl*, *br*, *dr*, *fl*, *gl*, *gn*, *gr*, *mn*, *pl*, *pn*, *pr*, *kl*, *kr*, *sk*, *sl*, *sm*, *st*, *str*) in word-initial position?
16. Does the language have indefinite, definite, and perhaps further kinds of articles (regardless of whether these are preposed or postposed)?
17. Is there a special word-class of adjectives?
18. Are adjectives in postnominal position, rather than prenominal?
19. Does the language have the inflectional category of gender? (Differences as to the numbers and kinds of genders are being ignored here.)
20. Is gender a category of nouns?
21. Is gender a category of personal pronouns?
22. Do adjectives agree in gender?

23. Do verbs (including participles) agree in gender?
24. Does the language have a dual as a third number category?
25. Is a dual found with nouns?
26. Is a dual found with all nouns, rather than only with a subclass of them denoting natural pairs (such as hands, feet, shoes)?
27. Is a dual found with personal pronouns?
28. Is a dual found in verbal number-agreement or cross-reference?
29. Is the number marking uniform for all nouns?
30. Does the language have the inflectional category of case?
31. Does the language have the full set of morphological cases, i.e. the six known from Latin?
32. Are local and other relations of nominals expressed by particles, rather than by genuine terminations?[14]
33. Are these relational particles postpositional, rather than prepositional?
34. Do these relational particles inseparably coalesce with nouns?
35. Is the marking for a given relation uniform for all nouns?
36. Are there distinct markers for all distinguishable relations, instead of certain relations being expressed syncretically?
37. Is gradation (comparative, superlative) expressed by adjectival morphology, rather than periphrastically?
38. Do personal pronouns distinguish between inclusive and exclusive 1st person plural?
39. Are verbal person-number markers forms of independent pronouns?
40. Are the nominal markers for person-number of the possessor identical to verbal person-number markers?
41. Are these verbal as well as nominal person-number markers suffixes, rather than prefixes?
42. Are there formal mutations of adjacent elements if such person-number markers co-occur with relational markers on nouns?
43. Is the root or theme, i.e. basic form, of verbs the 3rd person singular present indicative form (provided it is an actual inflectional form at all)?
44. Is negation an inflectional category of verbs?
45. Is the verbal negative marker interposed between stem and further inflections?
46. Does the language have the three basic tenses of present, preterite, and future?
47. Does the language have as many as six verbal moods, viz. an indicative, interrogative, imperative, permissive, subjunctive, and infinitive?
48. Is there a formal distinction between a present and a future imperative?
49. Is there a genuine, non-periphrastic passive?
50. Is there a single conjugation for all verbs?
51. Are verbal roots polysyllabic, rather than monosyllabic?
52. Does the language productively use derivational morphology to form verbs (e.g., causatives)?
53. Can verbs be productively derived from nouns?[15]
54. Do verbs productively combine with verbs to form compounds?
55. Do verbs productively combine with nouns to form verbal compounds, which in fact function as complete sentences?

56. Do nouns productively combine with nouns to form compounds?
57. Does the language productively use derivational morphology to form nouns?
58. Can nouns be productively derived from verbs?
59. In particular, are there deverbal instrumental and local nouns?
60. Can nouns be productively derived from nouns?
61. In particular, are there diminutives and augmentatives?
62. Does the series of basic numerals end at six?[16]
63. Are conjunctions and other particles separate words, rather than annexes of other words?

Table 1, where the numbering of criteria corresponds to that of the questionnaire, summarizes Wöldike's answers.

The checklist for Wöldike's comparison was manifestly derived from the grammar of Greenlandic the manuscript of which he had borrowed from Paul Egede and of which he virtually provided an abridgment. This was only natural since the structure of Greenlandic was to serve as the standard against which other languages had to be compared as a prerequisite to the assessment of their genealogical affinity to Greenlandic. None of these languages were actually compared to Greenlandic on all criteria, with Hungarian and, as representatives of a group often referred to summarily as 'the' or 'some European languages', Latin and Danish receiving the most extensive coverage. In retrospect Wöldike's comparative probing seems most perfunctory for the American group and for Oriental specimens such as Turkish; but then his sources were often lamentably inarticulate on points of grammar, with Reland's *Dissertationes* (1708) in particular revealing almost nothing about morphology and syntax. Of course, if he had been able to procure a copy of John Eliot's *Indian Grammar Begun* (1666), many gaps in the column for Natick could have been filled. François Mesgnien Meninski's comparative grammar of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian (1680), touching on many further languages including Hungarian, would have been very useful, too (unfortunately it was only re-edited in 1756): Turkish was here shown to resemble Hungarian for instance in the absence of gender, the use of postpositions rather than prepositions (sometimes separable, sometimes inseparable), the identity of verbal and nominal markers for person and number, the unmarkedness of 3rd person verb forms, and in some word order patterns — characteristics also figuring in Wöldike's scheme.[17]

Considering that Wöldike's comparative checklist was essentially assembled from a single grammar, he managed to include in it an impressive array of traits with respect to which languages in general could be

CRITERIA	Tupi	Carib	Huron	Natick	Algonkin	Greenlandic	Hungarian	Lapp	Finnish	Icelandic	Norwegian	Danish	English	German	Irish	Welsh	Breton	Latin	Italian	French	A. Greek	Slavonic	Hebrew	Arabic	Turkish
1.	+		+			−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
2.	+		+			−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+[1]	+	+	+	+	+	+			
3.	−		−	−	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
4.	+		+[2]			±[2]	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
5.	+		−			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
6.	+		−			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
7.	+		−			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
8.	−		+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
9.	−		+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
10.	−		+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
11.	−					+																			
12.						−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+			
13.						−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
14.						−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
15.						−[3]	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−[3]		
16.						−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	−			
17.						±[4]	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
18.						+						−		−		+						+			
19.						−	−			+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−
20.						−	−											+							
21.						−	−																		
22.						−	−																		
23.						−	−																		
24.						+	−					−	−	−	−	+		−	−	−	+	+[5]	+		
25.						+	−					−	−	−	−	+		−	−	−		+	+		
26.						+	−					−	−	−	−	−		−	−	−			−		
27.						+	−					−	−	−	−			−	−	−					
28.						+	−					−	−	−	−			−	−	−	+		−		
29.						−																			
30.						+	+	+										+			+				
31.						−[6]						−						+			−				
32.						+	+	+				+				+		±			±				
33.						+	+	+				−				−		−			−				
34.						+	+	−				−						−			−				
35.						+	−											−			−				
36.						−[7]	−																		
37.						−						+	+	+	+	+		+			+	±	−		
38.				−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	
39.						+	+					−	−	−	−	+[8]		−			−		+		
40.	+	+				+	+					−	−	−	−	+		−			−		+		
41.	−	−				+	+									+							+		
42.						+																	−		
43.						+	+									−							−		
44.						+						−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−			+	
45.						+						−	−	−	−	−		−	−	−	−			+	
46.						+										−		+			+				
47.						+						−	−	−	−	−		−	−	−	−		−		
48.						+						−	−	−	−	−		−	−	−	−		−		
49.						−												+							
50.						−[9]						−						−							
51.						+	−																		
52.						+	+					−											+		+
53.						+																	+		
54.						+																			
55.						+						−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−		−		
56.						+						+		+		+		+			+		−		
57.						+	+					+		+		+		+	+		+		+	+	
58.						+	+					+		+				+			+		+	+	
59.						+[10]	+					+		+				+			+		+	+	
60.					+	+						+						+	+		+				
61.					+	+													+						
62.	−		−		−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	
63.						±				+	+	+	+	+	+										

NOTES TO TABLE 1

1) Wöldike attributes to Welsh as many as three different *f*-sounds, viz. *f*, *ff*, and *ph*; he is here misguided by orthography, which represents /f/ by *ff* and (in lenition) *ph* and /v/ by *f*.

2) Whereas Huron, according to Lahontan, abounds in aspirations, Greenlandic, as Wöldike learned from the Egedes, uses /h/ only in a handful of interjections.

3) In loanwords such as *Christus* Greenlanders tend to insert a schwa between the initial consonants, which reminded Wöldike of the *schwa mobile* in Hebrew.

4) So far as Wöldike could tell, genuine adjectives are very rare and 3rd person preterite verbs are employed in their stead.

5) According to Wöldike the dual is strictly speaking used as a paucal in Slavonic.

6) Only genitive and vocative are mentioned as genuine cases of Greenlandic.

7) Wöldike notes, for example, a syncretism of ablative and causative markers.

8) These markers are here attached to prepositions rather than to verbs or nouns, as Wöldike does not fail to observe.

9) Wöldike does not ignore that inflectional categories differ in this respect, with the exponents of some showing no allomorphy at all.

10) It seems noteworthy to Wöldike that Greenlandic, unlike other languages, has distinct suffixes for instrumental and local derivatives.

---

expected to differ as well as to agree, mostly in terms of either possessing or lacking these traits: sounds (or what is represented by the letters of Latin-style alphabets), sound sequences permissible in particular positions within syllables and words, word classes, inflectional categories and formal properties of their exponents, agreement, word order, and categories and techniques of word-formation. With the wisdom of hindsight one would wish for one or another further trait to have been added. For instance, as is evident from inserts in an earlier manuscript grammar (cf. Bergsland & Rischel 1986:29), the Egedes and/or Albert Top had already become aware of the ergative pattern of Greenlandic case marking, observing that the genitive (later re-named relative or ergative) ending could be affixed to the nominative with subjects of transitive verbs; but this peculiarity, seized upon by 19th century and later comparatists, was passed over in Paul Egede's published grammar of 1760, and also escaped Wöldike's attention.

It is worth noting that Wöldike, even though he occasionally cited words or phrases from Greenlandic and other languages (especially Hungarian) as examples, disregarded the actual material shape of grammatical formatives: as far as grammar was concerned, what he compared were

categories and patterns, not forms as such.[18] It was in the domain of the vocabulary where form, in its relation to meaning, had to be taken into account. However, as it turned out, there was not much mileage to be gotten out of lexical comparisons. Wöldike's procedure here was to select several hundred everyday words — verbs denoting ordinary activities and experiences, nouns denoting kin relations, body parts and salient utensils, all these notions presumably being cross-cultural invariants — from Paul Egede's forthcoming dictionary of Greenlandic, and to see whether he could find analogues in any of the other languages within his sample. Words counted as analogues if they were identical or closely similar in meaning as well as in form, with allowances being made in particular for interchanges of homorganic consonants and transpositions of consonants. (No attempt was made to reconstruct historically original forms of the words compared.) The lexical information Wöldike had been able to procure for some languages, including the American ones but apparently also Hungarian, was admittedly fragmentary; even so, the yield of his search for analogues was disappointingly meagre. He succeeded to find matches for no more than 69 members of the core vocabulary of Greenlandic. Moreover, the provenance of these analogues was utterly varied: one or two could be culled from virtually any of the languages under investigation, with Latin, Hebrew (15 analogues each), Danish (12), Ancient Greek (11), Turkish (7), Welsh and Hungarian (6 analogues each) standing out as somewhat more rewarding quarries.

What was to be concluded from such comparative grammatical and lexical findings? Marcus Wöldike's natural inclination was towards caution. In a way he felt that he had shown little more than that the Greenlanders, like more polished peoples, had at their disposal a highly regular grammar which enabled them to communicate their thoughts among one another in an orderly fashion and, above all, to do penance for their sins and be granted absolution in the name of Jesus, Amen. (Troers Arnkiel had been equally optimistic in this respect.) But there was another truth, not particularly elevating and in fact rather puzzling, which Wöldike could not help noticing: the marvellous communicative instrument the Greenlanders were endowed with, holding out the prospect of eventual salvation if put to good use, was remarkably similar to that the Hungarians employed when they went to confession and otherwise. At least it was Hungarian that Greenlandic shared by far the most grammatical features with of all languages under consideration — 29, as opposed to 16 disagreements (and 20 indeterminacies), as is revealed by the above table. Hebrew, Lapp, Slavonic, and perhaps Algonkin followed at some distance, each with marginally more grammatical agreements than disagreements with Greenlandic (15/11, 13/11, 13/12, and 3/2, respectively). Finnish and Welsh struck a balance between agreements and disagreements, and the latter clearly predominated in languages such as Latin, Danish, Icelandic, and also Huron and Tupi (20/30, 19/29, 11/19, 5/7, and 6/9, respectively). Wöldike in fact recognized a rule underlying this pattern of differences and identities: wherever Hungarian diverged from the European norm, it coincided with Greenlandic. This applied to the prohibition of initial consonant clusters (criterion No.15 above), the absence of gender (No.19), the postposing of relational particles (No.33), the pronominal nature of verbal person-number markers (No.39), the basicness of the 3rd person singular present indicative verb form (No.43), and the richness of verbal derivational morphology (No.52). Wöldike's lexical comparisons, producing a considerably more random distribution of similarities, unfortunately did not fit in with this picture, and were indeed at odds with it insofar as the Hungarian analogues to Greenlandic words were clearly outnumbered by Hebrew, Latin, Danish, and Ancient Greek ones.

Wöldike was so preoccupied with Greenlandic that he overlooked, or at least failed to mention, some overall congruities in grammar which were as conspicuous as those uniting the Germanic or the Celtic groups. On all criteria for which he had furnished information, Lapp was in agreement with Finnish. Even though decent grammars of Lapp had only just begun to appear,[19] this in a way was what one expected. What was far more remarkable was that Lapp and Finnish should turn out to share 20 and 17 grammatical features respectively with Hungarian, as opposed to almost no disagreements (2 and 1, respectively).[20] To be sure, the Finno-Ugrian hypothesis had been in the air for several centuries, and had only recently been reiterated in a book known to Johann Anderson but apparently not Wöldike, *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia* (1730) by the Swedish captain Philipp Johann Strahlenberg (1676-1747), who had been held captive for thirteen years in Siberia. But support for it had so far come almost exclusively from vocabulary,[21] and the proposed lexical equations were not always beyond doubt. Of Wöldike's Hungarian sources, Fóris Otrokocsi had championed the Hungaro-Hebrew hypothesis, which had traditionally been supported by grammatical similarities like those figuring in Wöldike's comparison (cf. Hegedűs 1966:74-76, 90-107), while Mátyás

Bél (1734), in violent opposition to Strahlenberg, favoured the Hunno-Scythian theory and attributed the similarities between Hungarian and Finnish to later contacts. Wöldike's grammatical comparison, thus, deserves a place of honour in Finno-Ugrian linguistics, since it effectively anticipated, if perhaps unwittingly, János Sajnovics's (1733-1785) *Demonstratio idioma Ungarorum et Lapponum idem esse* of 1770 and Sámuel Gyarmathi's (1751-1830) *Affinitas linguae Hungaricae cum linguis Fennicae originis grammatice demonstrata* of 1799. Wöldike in fact is among the distinguished authors to whom the Hungarian Jesuit Sajnovics expressed his indebtedness in the concluding chapter of his *Demonstratio*, originally read to the Royal Danish Society of Sciences at Copenhagen, of which Sajnovics was a member, like the late Professor Wöldike. Sajnovics and later also Gyarmathi added few grammatical features to those contained in their predecessor's checklist, but were less neglectful of the material shapes of formatives.

Observing similarities between languages was one thing, explaining them was another. To that end one could turn to universal grammar, customarily conceived of as the repository of those elements and rules which were shared by the grammars of all particular languages. As none of the traits that figured in Wöldike's comparison was in fact shared by all languages of his sample, this was unfeasible here. Alternatively, languages could resemble one another by chance. This of course explained little, but what else could one say if the agreements between two languages were few and the disagreements many. The higher the ratio of agreements to disagreements, however, the greater would be one's discomfort in having to invoke chance. In that case it would be preferable to have recourse to a common historical origin of the languages concerned: the shared properties could thus be explained as their common heritage, with the differences having developed after the breakup of the original language community. Although it is difficult to decide where exactly to draw the line, in Wöldike's comparison the grammatical agreements between Greenlandic and Hungarian in particular outnumbered the disagreements by too wide a margin to be happily attributed to mere chance. However, Wöldike did not jump to the conclusion, either, that these two languages must perforce have the same source. What made him hesitate was the scarcity of lexical analogues. To be sure, languages did not have to share their vocabularies on a massive scale in order to count as genealogically related: the affinity of Danish and English, for example, was primarily established on grammatical rather than lexical grounds (as opposed to that of Danish and Icelandic,

which was said to rest chiefly on the vocabulary, even though Wöldike's own survey actually had not produced any grammatical disagreements). Nonetheless, the ratio of hits to misses in the search for Greenlandic-Hungarian lexical analogues had been so disappointingly low, and indeed so much lower as with some other languages paired with Greenlandic, as not to inspire much confidence in the hypothesis of a genealogical unity.

Caught in this predicament, Wöldike adopted yet another explanatory strategy — one he had used before to account for the partly similar, partly different characteristics of Greenlanders and Canadians. There were reasons to believe that the present habitat of the Hungarians, far from lands ever roamed by Greenlanders, was not their original one. There lived somewhere in Northern Tartary (i.e., in Siberia) a people known as the *Jugors* or *Jugra* (i.e., the ancestors of today's Voguls and Ostyaks) whose language was not, except for a few loanwords, Slavonic, but reportedly resembled Hungarian quite closely.[22] The name of this people in fact also resembled that of the Hungarians, who were referred to as *Juri* or *Uhri* by their Slavonic neighbours. The name the Hungarians used for themselves was *Magyars*, and as such they were also known by the Turks. This name, now, sounded suspiciously similar to that of the Manchurians, a people from Great Tartary about whose language one knew little (except that it was written from top to bottom, but had earlier presumably followed the common Oriental right-to-left mode). If these two peoples, the Ob-Ugrians and the Manchurians, could be assumed not to have strayed too far from their original homes, unlike their probable relatives, the Hungarians, it was perfectly possible for the Greenlanders to have been in contact with this stock in previous times: their presumable homeland, too, was Tartary. And from there, very likely, hailed also the North Americans. It was, thus, the common areal origin of the ancestors of the speakers of Greenlandic and Manchu-Ugrian, and also Algonkin and Huron, which had to be held responsible for whatever traits their languages now shared. Rather than being joint archaic residues, these traits must have spread from one of the original languages to the others at a time at which their speakers were still in intimate areal contact. What Wöldike reckoned with, thus, was the possibility of extensive grammatical diffusion. It would have been easy for him to extend this *Sprachbund* explanation well into historic times, had his focus been on Hungarian rather than on Greenlandic. He had after all observed that Hungarian tended to be aligned with Greenlandic only if it differed from the common European grammatical norm; but its agreements

with Finnic, Germanic, Celtic, Slavonic, and Latin European neighbours were still considerable — and could be accounted for in terms of diffusion, taking place after the Hungarians had settled down in their new homes.

Much less given to confident fantasizing than many contemporaries, Wöldike made it clear that his developmental scenario was extremely hypothetical, and could not be otherwise, since crucial facts were missing. A top priority, therefore, was to obtain reliable information especially about the languages of Tartary, the area where, once upon a time, much had been set in motion. The accumulation of relevant factual knowledge as such, however, would have been of little help with a remaining explanatory problem, of which Wöldike was not acutely aware: Why is it that some grammatical traits are passed down from ancestors to their descendants for generations, or are borrowed from neighbours of different stock, whereas others are not? Part of the answer to that question could have come from the identification of general constraints on how languages could possibly change, with or without outside interference. Supposing that languages are systems where everything, or at any rate something, hangs together rather than random agglomerations of elements and rules, this would already suffice to curb change: whatever is systemically interrelated is to be expected to change in unison rather than independently. The 17th and 18th centuries saw many, if often crude, attempts to substantiate this cherished supposition.[23] It was widely suspected, for instance, that rich inflectional morphology and rigid word order were mutually exclusive; there were indications that the arrangements of *determinans* and *determinatum* elements in different kinds of constructions (object and verb, attributive adjective and head noun, adposition and noun phrase, adverb and verb) harmonized with one another; the presence of a definite article was hypothesized to be contingent on the rigidity of word order. The Abbé Gabriel Girard (c.1677-1748) was particularly adamant, in his highly influential *Les vrais principes de la langue françoise* (1747), that such sets of interrelated traits, characterizing the *génie* of a language, should be considered altogether immutable (wherefore French could not be a daughter of Latin). To appreciate the systemic nature of crosslinguistic variation, Wöldike would have had to look at his comparative grammatical findings from another angle. His objective was to compare different languages with respect to their grammatical features; but what could also have been compared were these different features with respect to the values they had across languages — i.e. the lines rather than the columns in terms of the above table.

An inspection of the phonological part of the table reveals, for instance, that the feature values never differed for criteria Nos.1 and 2 (presence of *c* and *d*), for Nos.5, 6, and 7 (presence of *b*, *p*, *m*), for Nos.8, 9, and 10 (presence of *l*, *s*, *z*), and for Nos.13 and 14 (syllable-medial *ks* and *ts*). For the languages within Wöldike's purview, the traits within these groups, thus, mutually implied each other, and these languages therefore could not differ in that some had *c*'s while others lacked *d*'s, and analogously for *b*/*p*/*m*, *l*/*s*/*z*, and syllable-medial *ks*/*ts*. Further, as there were languages which had both *c*/*d*'s and *b*/*p*/*m*'s, languages which had only *c*/*d*'s (in fact only one: Huron), and languages which had only *b*/*p*/*m*'s (again only one: Greenlandic), but no languages which lacked both segment groups, the absence of either one of these groups implied the presence of the other. While most languages in this sample permitted syllable-medial clusters *ks*/*ts* and word-initial consonant clusters (criterion No.15), one (Greenlandic) permitted neither, and one (Hungarian) had only syllable-medial clusters; but there was no language with word-initial consonant clusters only, which suggests this rule: languages will not have word-initial clusters unless they also have syllable-medial clusters *ks*/*ts*.

The prohibition against word-initial consonant clusters was one of the features emphasized by Wöldike as uniting Greenlandic and Hungarian, and it is interesting to see whether its values interrelate with those of the morphosyntactic features prompting this unusual coupling. For convenience the attested value combinations for all these pairs of features are repeated here, extracted from the above table; in each case at least one combination is unattested, suggesting that the values of these features are conditional on one another.

(1)	15.	−	−	+	thus:	If a language permits word-initial consonant clusters, it will have inflectional gender. (Equivalently, if a language lacks gender, it will also prohibit word-initial consonant clusters.)
	19.	−	+	+		
(2)	15.	−	+	+	thus:	If a language prohibits word-initial consonant clusters, it will have postpositions.
	33.	+	−	+		
(3)	15.	−	+		thus:	If a language prohibits word-initial consonant clusters, its verbal person-number markers will be pronominal, and vice versa.[24]
	39.	+	−			
(4)	15.	−	+	−	thus:	If a language permits word-initial consonant clusters, the basic verb form will not be the 3rd person singular indicative present.
	43.	+	−	−		
(5)	15.	−	+		thus:	If a language prohibits word-initial consonant clusters, it will have productive derivational verb morphology, and vice versa.
	52.	+	−			

Such incomplete patterns recur with all further pairings of these features:

(6)	19.	−	+		thus:	If a language lacks gender, it will have post-positions, and vice versa.
	33.	+	−			
(7)	19.	−	+	+	thus:	If a language lacks gender, its verbal person-number markers will be pronominal.
	39.	+	−	+		
(8)	19.	−	+		thus:	If a language lacks gender, the basic verb form will be the 3rd person singular indicative present, and vice versa.
	43.	+	−			
(9)	19.	−	+	+	thus:	If a language lacks gender, it will have productive derivational verb morphology.
	52.	+	−	+		
(10)	33.	−	+		thus:	If a language has postpositions, its verbal person-number markers will be pronominal, and vice versa.
	39.	−	+			
(11)	33.	−	+		thus:	If a language has postpositions, the basic verb form will be the 3rd person singular indicative present, and vice versa.
	43.	−	+			
(12)	33.	−	+		thus:	If a language has postpositions, it will have productive derivational verb morphology, and vice versa.
	52.	−	+			
(13)	39.	+	+		thus:	If a language has the 3rd person singular indicative present as basic verb form, verbal person-number markers will be pronominal.[25]
	43.	−	+			
(14)	39.	−	+		thus:	If a language has pronominal verbal person-number markers, it will have productive derivational verb morphology, and vice versa.
	52.	−	+			
(15)	43.	−	+		thus:	If a language has the 3rd person singular indicative present as basic verb form, it will have productive derivational verb morphology.[26]
	52.	+	+			

Among the further systemic interrelations hidden in the above table, at least one deserves to be mentioned: If adjectives precede their head nouns (criterion No.18), a language will have prepositions rather than postpositions; or equivalently, if there are postpositions, adjectives will follow their nouns.

In principle, then, the reason why Greenlandic and Hungarian showed the same values for an array of different features could well have been that these particular features are interrelated by general conditional or even biconditional bonds. Given a web of interdependencies between the choices languages may take on different criteria, there was actually no need to invoke genealogical affinity or areal proximity to account for overall grammatical similarities. But Wöldike did not take this as given. And, of course, hypothetical interdependencies such as those suggested by Wöldike's comparative findings, though not to himself, would still have had to be validated against a much larger and genealogically and areally yet more diverse sample of languages before one could put much trust in them. Attempts in this direction have been made ever since, but progress in linguistic science had long ceased to be as swift as it once was in the days of David Fabricius and Adam Olearius.

Marcus Wöldike's "Betænkning om det Grønlandske Sprogs Oprindelse og Uliighed med andre Sprog" (or, since *Danica non leguntur*, "Meletema, de lingvae groenlandicæ origine, ejusqve a cæteris lingvis differentia") was acknowledged peripherally in Paul Egede's Greenlandic grammar and in János Sajnovics's unification of Lapp and Hungarian, two works that made history. The Abate Don Lorenzo Hervás (1735-1809) quoted an extract from it about early European visitors to Greenland in his *Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas* (1800: I, 369-372), but misspelt the author's name as well as part of the title ("Mr. Woldire *Melema de lingua groenlandica*"). In the third volume of *Mithridates*, another grand survey, Wöldike's *Meletema* was listed by Johann Severin Vater (1771-1826) among the available "Hülfsmittel der Grönländischen und der Eskimo-Sprache" (1816:434); the grammatical sketch following the reference was allegedly based on Paul Egede's *Grammatica* (1760), but differed only minimally from Wöldike's abridgment. Subsequently Wöldike sank into oblivion. The Eskimos, it transpired, had been closer companions of the Greenlanders than the Magyars, and these probably were not the Manchurians' next of kin, either. But had Wöldike been very specific about how far back one had to go towards Noah's Ark in order to find them all brothers or neighbours? And sometimes I cannot help feeling that his intended audience really were not his fellow theologians nor prehistorians but we comparative grammarians.

Of course, as time went by, the Tataric, i.e., Uralic, Altaic, and (Paleo-) Siberian, connections of Greenlandic, now firmly established as a branch of Eskimo, were revived — among others by Rasmus Rask (1787-1832), another great Dane, who classed Greenlandic as Finno-Ugrian and assumed somewhat more distant relationships to Turkic and Tungus languages such as Tatar, Yakut, and Manchu (cf. Thalbitzer 1921/23). Even Indo-European entered the lists again. Only time will tell if Hugo Grotius et al., Adam Olearius, and Marcus Wöldike have not all had a point here. It would seem that David Fabricius's fairyland connection is the only one to have been severed for good. It should be noted, however, that Fabricius, who was unusually ambiguous on this point and, slain by an angry

parishioner, did not live to sort things out, can also be read as asserting that the hairy fairies were not themselves the regular Greenlanders but an indigenous population coexisting with them. Only the latter were the subject of subsequent linguistic investigations.

Author's address:

Frans Plank
Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft
Universität Konstanz
D-7750 KONSTANZ
Federal Republic of Germany

NOTES

1) On Adam Öhlschlegel, better known as Olearius (Ascanius), see Lohmeier (1971). By editing, and often re-editing, his friend's *Joh. Alberti von Mandelsloh, Fürstl. Holsteinischen Kammer-Junckers, Schreiben von seiner Ostindischen Reise, an Ad. Olearium, auß der Insul Madagascar A. 1639. abgelassen* (Schleßwig 1645), he became one of the first to furnish the Western public with much prized information about India (cf. Willson 1964:13-14).

2) Or Africans (Olearius 1656:179), but this was probably a mistake of the typesetter's. The Lapps were also considered a possible ingredient in this mixture, upon the authority of Georgii Hornii *De originibus Americanis* (1652).

3) The preceding article, "De Grönlandorum unicorno", dealt with the medicinal efficacy of the tusk of the sea unicorn, i.e., the narwhal, which Professor Bartholin doubted. The existence of land unicorns seemed to him less dubious; see his *De unicornu observationes novæ* (1678).

4) Not *very* far, though. To judge from Lourens Feykes Haan's *Beschryving van de straat Davids* (1720), at the time considered essential as a vademecum for seafarers heading for Greenland, Captain Dannel's exploits and the insights they afforded to the science of language remained unknown in Holland, eager though the Dutch were for hegemony over Greenlandic waters and shores.

5) For Hans Egede, I have mainly drawn on Bobé (1952) and Bergsland & Rischel (1986).

6) A grammar (1791) and a dictionary (1804) by Otho Fabricius had come in between those of Egede and Kleinschmidt. The most recent reference grammar is by Fortescue (1984). Kleinschmidt was not the first Moravian in Greenland to produce a grammar; but those of Johann Beck (1755) and C. M. Königseer (1777), though often copied and enlarged, remained unpublished.

7) It is difficult to tell what the time scale was in Olearius's scenario; the migrations from Tartary may for him have been events from the not-too-distant past.

8) For contemporary bio-bibliographic information on Wöldike, see Götten (1737/39/40:708-730). He is also listed in modern Danish biographical dictionaries as well as in Ehrencron-Müller's *Forfatterlexikon* (1932:IX, 216-219), though never on his merits as a grammarian.

9) It is unclear whether Wöldike was familiar with the work of his Schleswig compatriot Olearius, with whom he thus concurred on the un-Americanness of the Greenlandic *language*. Unlike Wöldike, however, Olearius had been a believer in the common descent of the American and Greenlandic *peoples*.

10) Contrary to what Paul Egede attributed to him, Wöldike did not really mention Gothic, at least not as a language distinct from Icelandic.

11) An Eskimo word list had been published the year before he delivered his paper in Arthur Dobbs's *Account of the Countries Adjoining to Hudson's Bay* (1744:203-205). There had long been some confusion about who the 'Esquimaux' actually were, as this term had at first been applied to speakers of Algonkin by European explorers, settlers, and missionaries in Canada (cf. Taylor 1978).

12) As the title page of the 1760 grammar said, it was "*edita* a Paulo Egede" (emphasis added: FP). Bergsland & Rischel (1986:30) feel that Paul Egede should have acknowledged his father's and Albert Top's considerable part in that work more explicitly.

13) I have not yet seen this article, apparently published in 1734. In 1729 Bél, under the pseudonym Meliboeus, had published a Hungarian primer, *Der ungarische SprachMeister*, which was often re-edited, but appears not to have been consulted by Wöldike.

14) Wöldike evidently realized that these particles in Greenlandic simultaneously express relations and number; but this trait was not exploited in his comparisons.

15) What Wöldike may have had in mind here specifically was zero derivation, or the ability of roots to serve as verbs as well as as nouns.

16) Greenlandic in fact had basic terms for 'ten' and for 'twenty', but from 'seven' onwards numerals began to be morphologically complex (7 = second six, 8 = third six, 9 = precursor of ten, 12 = twice six), and this, strictly speaking, was Wöldike's criterion here.

17) Rowe (1974) gives a good impression of the range of languages of which grammars could in principle have been consulted by an early 18th-century comparatist. Many of these grammars, however, seem to have been excessively difficult to get hold of, even if one had tried harder than Wöldike probably did. It is immaterial for present purposes that some of Wöldike's information was inaccurate or erroneous, and that he himself made occasional mistakes (e.g., in attributing a dual to Welsh rather than to Irish).

18) A probable exception are the diminutives of Greenlandic and Algonkin, which apparently struck him as formally similar.

19) In fact perhaps no more than two, Fjellström's (1738) and Ganander's (1743). Knud Leem's *Lappisk Grammatica*, published in Copenhagen in 1748, came slightly too late for Wöldike, but he is likely to have known its author. He presumably also knew Thomas von Westen, the apostle to the Lapps and founder, in 1717, of the Seminarium Lapponicum.

20) Hungarian, by the way, shared a great many features with Welsh (22, with 5 disagreements), Latin (27, 9 disagreements), and Slavonic (15, 6 disagreements) as well.

21) Martin Fogel (1634-1675) had also noticed a number of structural analogies, but his findings, written down in 1669, remained unpublished (cf. Stehr 1957, Lakó 1969, Kangro 1969).

22) Wõldike's sources here were again Fóris Otrokocsi (1693) and, considerably less recent, Aleksander Gwagnin's *Sarmatiæ Europeæ descriptio* (first published in 1578) and Paul Oderborn's *Ioannis Basilidis Magni Moscoviæ Ducis vita* (1585). For a short history of this question and for modern sketches of these languages and peoples see Hajdu (1975:15-17, 119-145).

23) See Plank (1989) for a survey of the highlights of early language typology. Many authors, especially of the mid-18th century, espoused the theory that the modes of subsistence, the climate, the conditions of the soil, property regulations, laws in general, social customs and manners, and also language were necessarily interdependent; but this was rarely demonstrated in any detail as far as grammatical structures were concerned.

24) The combination of two pluses, exemplified by Welsh, is ignored here because the pronominal person-number markers in this language are not really verbal but are attached to prepositions.

25) Strictly speaking, on the fragmentary evidence of the above table, pronominal person-number markers on verbs would have to be considered an unconditional universal in this feature pairing.

26) What was said in Note 25 applies here, too, as only pluses are attested for feature No.52.

REFERENCES

Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1816. *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde [...] fortgesetzt und aus zum Theil ganz neuen oder wenig bekannten Hülfsmitteln bearbeitet von Dr. Johann Severin Vater*. Dritter Theil. Dritte Abtheilung. Berlin: Vossische Buchhandlung.

Anchieta, Josephus de. 1595. *Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais vsada na costa do Brasil*. Coimbra: Antonio de Mariz.

Anderson, Johann. 1746. *Nachrichten von Island, Grönland und der Straße Davis, zum wahren Nutzen der Wissenschaften und der Handlung [...]*. Hamburg: Georg Christian Grund. (Another ed., Leipzig, 1747.)

Arnkiel, Trogillus. 1702. *Cimbrische Heyden-Bekehrung / Wie unsere Vorfahren Cimbrischer Nation / die Sachsen / Guten / Wenden und Fresen / und die von denselben herstammende Mitternächtige Völcker durch das Heil. Evangelium sind bekehret / und in diesen Landen das Heydenthumb außgereutet / die Kirche GOttes gepflantzet / und das Christenthumb eingewurtzelt*. Vierdter Theil. Hamburg: Thomas von Wiering.

Bartholinus, Caspar. 1675. "Vocabula Groenlandica". *Acta medica et philosophica Hafniensia anni 1673* ed. by Thomas Bartholinus, vol. II, 71-76. Hafniæ: P. Haubold.

Bartholinus, Thomas. 1678. *De unicornu observationes novæ*. Secunda editione auctiores & emendatiores editæ a filio Casparo Bartholino. Amstelædami: J. Henr. Wetstein.

Beck, Johann. 1755. *Eine grammaticalische Einleitung zur Erlernung der grönländischen Sprache*. Manuscript, Archives of the Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine, Herrnhut.

[Bél, Mátyás] Meliboeus. 1729. *Der ungarische SprachMeister oder, kurtze Anweisung zu der edlen ungarischen Sprache, nebst einem Anhang von Gesprächen*. Preßburg: Royer. (9th ed., Preßburg: Landerer, 1805.)

Belius, Matthias (= Mátyás Bél). 1734. "De peregrinitate lingvæ Hungaricæ in Europa". *Miscellanea Berolinensia ad incrementum scientiarum, ex scriptis Societatis Regiae Scientiarum exhibitis edita*. Berlin.

Bergsland, Knut & Jørgen Rischel, eds. 1986. *Pioneers of Eskimo Grammar. Hans Egede's and Albert Top's Early Manuscripts on Greenlandic*. (= *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague*, 21.) Copenhagen: Reitzel.

Bobé, Louis. 1952. *Hans Egede, Colonizer and Missionary of Greenland*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger.

Claussøn Friis, Peder. 1632. *Norriges oc omliggende øers sandfærdige beskriffuelse [...]*. Kiøbenhaffn: Jochim Moltken.

Dobbs, Arthur. 1744. *An Account of the Countries Adjoining Hudson's Bay, in the North-West Part of America [...]*. London: J. Robinson.

Egede, Hans. 1729. *Det gamle Grønlands nye Perlustration [...]*. Kjøbenhavn: H. C. Paulli. (2nd ed., Kjøbenhavn: J. C. Groth, 1741.)

[Egede, Hans.] 1739. *Grammatica Grönlandica per Johannem Egede concepta*. Manuscript, Ny kgl. Saml. 3564,4°, Royal Library, Copenhagen.

Egede, Paulus. 1750. *Dictionarium Grönlandico-Danico-Latinum [...]*. Hafniæ: G. F. Kisel, Orphanotrophium Regium.

-----. 1760. *Grammatica Grönlandica Danico-Latina*. Ibid.

Ehrencron-Müller, H. 1932. *Forfatterlexikon omfattende Danmark, Norge og Island indtil 1814*. Bind IX: We-Ø og Supplement. København: Aschehoug.

Eliot, John. 1666. *The Indian Grammar Begun; or, an Essay to Bring the Indian Language into Rules [...]*. Cambridge, Mass.: Marmaduke Johnson.

Fabricius, David. 1616. *Van Isslandt vnde Grönlandt / eine korte beschryuinge vth warhafften Scribenten mit vlyte colligeret / vnde in eine richtige Ordnung vorfahtet*. Sine loco. (Re-edited and translated into German by Karl Tannen, *Island und Grönland zu Anfang des 17. Jahrhunderts [...]*. Bremen: H. W. Silomon, 1890.)

Fabricius, Otho. 1791. *Forsøg til en forbedret Grønlandsk Grammatica*. Kiøbenhavn: Det Kongelige Waysenhuses Bogtrykkerie. (2nd ed., 1801.)

-----. 1804. *Den Grønlandske Ordbog, forbedret og forøget*. Kjøbenhavn: C. F. Schubart.

Feykes Haan, Lourens. 1720. *Beschryving van de straat Davids, benevens des zelven inwooners, zede, gestalte, en gewoonte, misgaders hunne visvangst, en andere handelingen*. Amsteldam: G. van Keulen.

Fjellström, Per. 1738. *Grammatica Lapponica*. Holmiæ: J. L. Horrn.

Fóris Otrokocsi, Franciscus. 1639. *Origines Hungaricæ; seu, Liber, quo vera nationis Hungaricae origo & antiquitas, e veterum monumentis & linguis praecipuis, panduntur [...]*. Franequerae: Leonardus Stril.

Fortescue, Michael. 1984. *West Greenlandic*. London: Croom Helm.

Ganander, Hendrik. 1743. *Grammatica Lapponica, linguæ Europearum prope antiquissima*. Holmiæ: L. Salvius

Girard, Gabriel. 1747. *Les vrais principes de la langue françoise: ou La parole réduite en méthode, conformément aux loix de l'usage. En seize discours*. 2 vols. Paris: Le Breton. Amsterdam: J. Wetstein (in 1 volume).

Götten, Gabriel Wilhelm. 1737/39/40. *Das Jeztlebende Gelehrte Europa, oder Nachrichten von den vornehmsten Lebensumständen und Schriften ieztlebender Europäischer Gelehrten*. Der dritte Theil. Zelle: Joachim Andreas Deetz.

Gwagninus, Alexandrus. 1578. *Sarmatiæ Europeæ descriptio* [...]. Cracow. (Another ed., Spiræ: B. Albinus, 1581.)

Gyarmathi, Sámuel. 1799. *Affinitas linguae Hungaricae cum linguis Fennicae originis grammatice demonstrata. Nec non vocabularia dialectorum Tataricarum et Slavicarum cum Hungarica comparata*. Gottingae: J. Chr. Dieterich. (English transl., with an introd. by Victor E. Hanzeli, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1983.)

Hajdu, Peter. 1975. *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*. London: André Deutsch.

Hegedűs, József. 1966. *A magyar nyelv összehasonlításának kezdetei az egykorú európai nyelvtudomány tükrében*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Hervás, Lorenzo. 1800. *Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas, y numeracion, division, y clases de estas segun la diversidad de sus idiomas y dialectos*. Vol.I. Madrid: Imprenta de la Administracion del Real Arbitrio de Beneficencia.

Hornius, Georgius. 1652. *De originibvs Americanis libri qvatvor*. Hagæ Comitis: Adrian Vlacq. (1st ed., 1593.)

Kangro, Hans. 1969. "Martin Fogel aus Hamburg als Gelehrter des 17. Jahrhunderts". *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 41.14-32.

Kleinschmidt, Samuel. 1851. *Grammatik der grönländischen Sprache mit theilweisem Einschluss des Labradordialects*. Berlin: Georg Reimer.

Kleinschmidt, Samuel. 1871. *Den Grønlandske Ordbog [...]*. Ed. by H. F. Jørgensen. Kjøbenhavn: L. Kleins Bogtrykkeri.

Königseer, C. M. 1777. *Verbesserte grönländische Grammatica*. Manuscript, Archives of the Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine, Herrnhut.

Lahontan, Louis Armand de. 1703. *Memoires de l'Amerique Septentrionale, ou La suite des voyages de Mr. le Baron de Lahontan* [...]. La Haye: Les Freres l'Honoré. (Another ed., Amsterdam, 1705.)

Lakó, György. 1969. "Martinus Fogelius' Verdienste bei der Entdeckung der finnougrischen Sprachverwandtschaft". *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 41.3-13.

Leem, Knud. 1748. *En Lappisk Grammatica efter den Dialect som bruges af Field-Lapperne udi Porsanger-Fiorden [...]*. Kiøbenhavn: Paa Missionens Bekostning.

Lohmeier, Dieter. 1971. "Nachwort des Herausgebers". Adam Olearius, *Vermehrte Newe Beschreibung der Muscowitischen vnd Persischen Reyse* (Schleswig 1656) ed. by Dieter Lohmeier, 1*-80*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Mesgnien Meninski, Franciscus à. 1680. *Linguarum orientalium turcicæ, arabicæ, persicæ institutiones seu Grammatica turcica [...]*. Windobonæ: Operâ, typis, & sumptibus Francisci à Mesgnien Meninski. (2nd ed., entitled *Institutiones linguae Turcicae*, Windobonae: Kollar, 1756.)

Oderbornius, Paullus. 1585. *Ioannis Basilidis Magni Moscoviæ Ducis vita*. Witebergæ: Hæredes Ioannis Cratonis.

Olearius, Adam. 1645. *Joh. Alberti von Mandelsloh, Fürstl. Holsteinischen Kammer-Junckers, Schreiben von seiner Ostindischen Reise, an Ad. Olearium, auß der Insul Madagascar A. 1639. abgelassen, und von Olearo, mit etlichen Anmerckungen, ausgegeben*. Schleßwig: Fürstl. Druckerey. (Re-edited several times.)

Olearius Ascanius, Adam. 1656. *Vermehrte Newe Beschreibung Der Muscowitischen vnd Persischen Reyse [...]*. Schleßwig: Fürstl. Druckerey. (1st ed., Schleßwig, 1647; several later editions.)

Plank, Frans. 1989. "Chapters from the Early History of Linguistic Typol-

ogy". Unpublished manuscript.
Relandus, Hadrianus. 1708. *Dissertationum miscellanearum pars tertia, et ultima*. Trajecti ad Rhenum: Gulielmus Broedelet.
Resen, Hans Peder. c.1680. *Atlas Danicus*. Manuscript, Ny kgl. Saml. 1087 fol., Royal Library, Copenhagen. (Greenlandic word list has been edited by Robert Petersen & Jørgen Rischel, *Grønland* 33: issue 5-7, 1985.)
Rowe, John Howland. 1974. "Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Grammars". *Studies in the History of Linguistics. Traditions and Paradigms* ed. by Dell Hymes, 361-379. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.
Sajnovics, Joannis. 1770. *Demonstratio idioma Ungarorum et Lapponum idem esse*. Hafniæ: G. G. Salicath, Orphanotrophium Regium.
Schuppius, Johann Balthasar. 1657. *Salomo; oder, Regenten-Spiegel, vorgestellet aus denen eilff ersten Capitulen des ersten Buchs der Königen [...]*. No place.
Stehr, Alfred. 1957. *Die Anfänge der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachvergleichung 1669-1771*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Göttingen.
Strahlenberg, Philipp Johann. 1730. *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia, in so weit solches das gantze Russische Reich mit Siberien und der grossen Tatarey in sich begreiffet, in einer historisch-geographischen Beschreibung der alten und neuern Zeiten [...]*. Stockholm, Leipzig: Heinsius.
Taylor, J. Garth. 1978. "Did the First Eskimos Speak Algonquian?" *Papers of the Ninth Algonquian Conference* ed. by William Cowan, 96-103. Ottawa: Carleton University.
Thalbitzer, William. 1921/23. "The Aleutian Language Compared with Greenlandic: A Manuscript by Rasmus Rask, Dating from 1820, now in the Royal Library in Copenhagen". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 2.40-57.
Willson, A. Leslie. 1964. *A Mythical Image: The Ideal of India in German Romanticism*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
Wöldike, Marcus. 1746. "Betænkning om det Grønlandske Sprogs Oprindelse og Uliighed med andre Sprog". *Skrifter, som udi Det Kiøbenhavnske Selskab af Lærdoms of Videnskabers Elskere ere fremlagte og oplæste i Aaret 1745*. Anden Deel, 129-156. Kiøbenhavn: Det Kongelige Waysenhuses Bogtrykkerie og Forlag. (Latin translation: "Meletema, de lingvæ Groenlandicæ origine, ejusqve a cæteris lingvis differentia", *Scriptorum á Societate Hafniensi Bonis Artibus Promovendis dedita, Danice editorum, nunc autem in Latinum sermonem conversorum, interprete P. P.*, Pars secunda, 137-162. Hafniae: G. F. Kisel, Orphanotrophium Regium, 1746.)

SUMMARY

The first descriptive grammar of Greenlandic Eskimo was published in 1760 by Paul Egede, continuing the work of his father, Hans, and his missionary collaborator, Albert Top. Curiously, however, the *comparative* study of Greenlandic had already been inaugurated in 1745, when Marcus Wöldike (1699-1750), professor of theology at the University of Copenhagen, read a remarkable paper to the *Kiøbenhavnske Selskab af Lærdoms of Videnskabers Elskere*, published next year in the proceedings of that Society. Based on information obtained from the Egedes, Wöldike presented a grammar of Greenlandic in summary form and compared Greenlandic to about two dozen other languages on some sixty phonological, morphological, and syntactic criteria. As it turned out, Greenlandic was rather similar to Hungarian, sharing with it a great many features (especially such as Hungarian did not share with European languages such as Icelandic, Norwegian, Danish, English, German, Irish, Welsh, Breton, Latin, Italian, French, Ancient Greek, and Slavonic) and showing preciously few differences. American languages, represented by Tupi, Carib, Huron, Natick, and Algonkin, were found to differ considerably from Greenlandic; and Hebrew, Arabic, and Turkish did not much better. Lapp and Finnish came out as close structural relatives of Hungarian — which amounted to the first published demonstration of the Finno-Ugric hypothesis, antedating Sajnovics's of 1770 and Gyarmathi's of 1799. For Wöldike the large-scale agreements especially between Greenlandic and Hungarian were no inexplicable chance coincidences. The explanation he suggested was not typological, drawing on necessary correlations of the structural features shared, but historical. Rather than positing a common *Ursprache*, as was and continued to be the fashion, however, he invoked diffusion within a *Sprachbund*, localized, somewhat vaguely, in Tartary, from where the Greenlanders and Hungarians (and Lapps and Finns too) had supposedly migrated to their present habitats.

RÉSUMÉ

La première grammaire descriptive de la langue esquimau groenlandaise était publiée en 1760 par Paul Egede, continuant le travail de son père Hans et son sous-missionnaire Albert Top. Mais, chose curieuse, l'étude *comparative* du groenlandais avait été inaugurée déjà en 1745, quand Marcus Wöldike, professeur de théologie à l'université de Copenhague, faisait une conférence remarquable chez la *Kiøbenhavnske Selskab af Lærdoms of Videnskabers Elskere*, publiée l'année suivante dans les actes de cette société. Bien informé par les Egede, Wöldike donnait dans son traité une grammaire sommaire du groenlandais et comparait le groenlandais avec deux douzaines d'autres langues sur une soixantaine de critères phonologiques, morphologiques et syntactiques. Resultat: le groenlandais ressemblait beaucoup au hongrois; il y avait beaucoup de caractères communs (en particulier ceux que le hongrois ne partagait pas avec des autres langues européennes, p.ex. les islandais, norvégien, danois, anglais, allemand, irlandais, gallois, breton, latin, italien, français, le grec ancien et slavon) et assez peu de différences. On trouvait en outre que les langues américaines, représentées par les langues tupi, carib, huron, natick et algonquin, et de même les hebreu, arabe et turc, différaient considérablement du groenlandais. Les langues lapone et finnoise se révélaient proches parents du hongrois en structure grammaticale — en effet la première démonstration de l'hypothèse finno-ougrienne, en anticipation de Sajnovics 1770 et Gyarmathi 1799. Pour Wöldike les concordances grammaticales étendues en particulier entre le groenlandais et le hongrois n'étaient pas accidentelles et inexplicables. L'explication qu'il proposait n'était pas typologique, s'appuyant sur des corrélations nécessaires des particularités communes, mais historique. Selon Wöldike la raison pour les concordances n'était pas la descendance d'une langue mère commune — explication éternellement populaire —, mais la diffusion de particularités dans un *Sprachbund*, localisé, un peu vaguement, en Tartarie, d'ou les groenlandais et les hongrois (et aussi les lapons et finnois) présumablement se mettaient en route vers leurs habitats présents.

MANUSCRIPTS

Manuscripts submitted for publication in *Historiographia Linguistica* should be in English, French, or German; occasionally, contributions in other languages using Latin script may also be considered. Manuscripts should be in 3 copies to allow for a speedy review process; authors are advised to retain the original typescript.

Before sending a manuscript, contributors should familiarize themselves with the style adopted in *HL*, as manuscripts deviating significantly from its conventions may be returned without being evaluated for their contents. For details, see the *HL Style Sheet* as printed in HL XVII:1/2 (1990). Particular attention should be paid to the conventions employed in the presentation of data and the citation of sources, for which a recent issue of the journal should be consulted. The same applies to bibliographical references. An *HL Style Sheet* is available from the editors upon request.

All correspondence concerning editorial matters (submission of manuscripts, book reviews, discussions, and reports) should be directed to either of the following editors:

E. F. Konrad Koerner, Editor
Department of Linguistics
University of Ottawa
OTTAWA, Ontario
Canada K1N 6N5
Tel. (613) 564-5778
Fax (613) 564-9100
e-mail: koerner@uottawa(bitnet)

Hans-Josef Niederehe
Associate Editor
Fachbereich II (Romanistik)
Universität Trier
D-5500 TRIER
Germany
Tel. (0651) 201-2228
Fax (0651) 25135

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The annual subscription rates for *Historiographia Linguistica* (one volume of 3 issues of about 450 pages altogether) are:

☐ Hfl. 245,--/$ 140.00 for Libraries and Institutions, plus postage and handling, and
☐ Hfl. 80,--/$ 45.00 for *individual subscribers*, *provided* that their prepaid order is placed directly with the Publisher.

For SUBSCRIPTION and other business information, write to:

John Benjamins B.V.
Publisher
P.O.Box 52519 / Amsteldijk 44
1007 HA AMSTERDAM (Holland)
Telephone (020) 73 81 56
Fax (020) 73 97 73

John Benjamins North America, Inc.
Publisher & Distributor
821 Bethlehem Pike
PHILADELPHIA/Pa. 19118, U.S.A.
Telephone (215) 836-1200
Fax (215) 836-1204