MISCELLANEA: NOTES / NOTIZEN — DOCUMENTS / DOKUMENTE

Language Origins, Language Diversity, and Language Classification in Early Christian Latin Authors.

Outline of a research project in progress (2011–2015)*

Tim Denecker, Gert Partoens, Pierre Swiggers & Toon Van Hal
University of Leuven

The writings of early Christian Latin authors have so far received only scant attention from historiographers of linguistics; apart from Edelstein (1985), extant studies mostly focus on their grammatical or semiotic views, especially on Augustine's theory of the sign (Markus 1957, Darrell Jackson 1969, Simone 1972, Ruef 1981, Kirwan 1994, Vecchio 1994; for a brief overview, cf. Swiggers 1989). The views held by early Christian Latin authors on the nature of language and linguistic diversity have mostly been ignored by scholars interested in the history of language-theoretical conceptions. This is the more surprising since these authors were inevitably led to deal with at least two foreign languages, viz. Hebrew and Greek, the main source languages of the Bible.

The need for further research on this topic has repeatedly been emphasized (e.g., by Werner 1992). The recently initiated research project presented here will offer a systematic study of the conceptions held by early Christian Latin authors relating to the origin, the evolution, and the function(s) of language, as well as to linguistic diversity and classification. The research project is funded through a KU Leuven research grant for the period 2011–2015 and is conducted by Pierre Swiggers, Gert Partoens, Toon Van Hal (project directors), and Tim Denecker (scientific collaborator).¹ In the following we will briefly (1) discuss the corpus of texts that will be examined, (2) discuss the methodological approach, and (3) offer three illustrative examples.

* The authors wish to thank two members of the *HL* editorial team for helpful comments on earlier versions of this account.

¹ <<http://www.kuleuven.be/onderzoek/onderzoeksdatabase/project/3H11/3H110520.htm>>. A full description of the project is available from the authors upon request.

1. *The text corpus*

The text corpus comprises Latin texts of early Christianity, ranging from the works of Lactantius (c.250–c.325)² to the encyclopedic writings of Isidore of Seville (c.560–636). Within the corpus, special attention is given to (a) authors who had a broad cultural experience as translators, philologists, and historians (e.g., Rufinus, Jerome, and Augustine); (b) authors who functioned as crucial links in the chain of encyclopedic and scholarly learning, such as Lactantius, Marius Victorinus (late 4th cent.), Augustine (354–430), Cassiodorus (c.490–583), and Isidore; (c) authors who witnessed the fading of the knowledge of the classical Greek and Latin languages (e.g., Gregory the Great [Pope Gregory I, c.540–604] and Gregory of Tours [c.538–594]); (d) authors who reflected on language as an instrument of salvation in a multilingual context, as for instance Augustine and Gregory the Great. An important aspect of these Latin sources is the fact that they offer a synthesis of the body of knowledge accumulated in Antiquity. In view of our historiographical perspective, Greek texts will only be taken into account as sources of the ideas encountered in the Latin texts studied; such texts include those by ancient geographers and historiographers, as well as those by early Greek Christian authors.³ At the current stage of our research, the corpus of texts is founded on the *Index linguisticae* in *Patrologia Latina* [PL], vol. 221, cols. 643–752.⁴ This initial corpus is being expanded on the basis of (i) references found in secondary literature; (ii) further cross-references in the source texts; (iii) references in the medieval and humanist reception of early Christian authors; (iv) available databases covering the entire Latin literature of Antiquity (*Patrologia Latina Database*; *Library of Latin Texts*; *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* [MHG]).

2. *Methodological approach*

² Life dates are based on Döpp & Geerlings (1999).

³ Cf. *infra*, 3.1 and 3.2 (and footnote 9).

⁴ This volume of the *Patrologia Latina* was published by Jacques-Paul Migne (1800–1875) in 1864. The wide-ranging scope of the hardly explored *index* becomes clear from its full title: *Index linguisticae, in quo notantur quaecunque tradidere patres de variarum linguarum et idiomatum origine, ingenio, usu, etc. Una simul dantur innovationes verborumve corruptiones quae labentibus annis irrepsere, etc.* ['Index relating to language, indicating everything that was transmitted by the Fathers on the origin, the nature, the use, etc. of different languages and idioms; listing also the innovations and corruptions of words that have slipped in over the years, etc.'].

In view of the fact that the writings of the early Christian Latin authors do not offer a systematic exposition of their ideas on language, it was necessary to set up an analytical grid of topical questions in order to submit all the texts included in the corpus to a systematic *descriptive* and *interpretive* frame. This analytical grid consists of two subsets of research questions.

2.1 *Questions relating to the ‘Sitz im Leben’ of the authors and the cultural implementation of their language-theoretical views*

The first subset of questions aims at outlining a social and scholarly profile for each of the authors included in the corpus, which will allow us to investigate to what extent they were exposed to, and interested in, foreign languages. Specific attention will be given to theological (or confessional), ideological, and intellectual facts — such as the native language of the early Christian authors, their command of foreign languages, the designations they used for language and for (other) languages (glottonyms),⁵ and their translation activities — that are constitutive for what may be called the authors’ linguistic outlook (cf. Van Hal 2010: 25). This approach will be adopted to establish whether — and, if so, to what extent — their views on foreign languages were influenced or determined by their particular situation (i.e., the biographical and institutional context), and for what scholarly and theological purposes the authors dealt with language-related issues (i.e., the cultural implementation of their views).

2.2 *Questions specifically relating to language-theoretical issues*

The second, and most comprehensive subset assesses the language-theoretical contents found in these early Christian writings. Here we will investigate how the authors formulated and underpinned language-related issues in their interaction with theological and religious matters, and, more specifically, with the reading and commentary of the sacred texts. Special interest is given to doctrinal issues relating to translation and translatability, for instance reflections on the relationship between a source language (mostly Greek or Hebrew) and a target language (Latin). One of the central questions is whether (and, if so, which) structural differences or convergences between the languages involved were visibly engaged with the process of Bible translation.

The status attributed to the various languages will also be assessed. For those authors who discerned relationships between languages, we will investigate whether these are formulated

⁵ For a study of the designations of one language (viz. Latin) and its varieties / registers, see Rochette (2009).

in terms of cultural superiority or inferiority. What virtues and vices were ascribed to the languages discussed? Are Latin, Greek, and Hebrew considered sacred languages, and if so, what should be understood by this denomination (cf. Resnick 1990)? Do the authors discuss the connection between *lingua* and *mores* (denoting either ‘customs’ or ‘ethics’) of a speech community? How do the authors handle the traditional *barbaros*-concept? What importance is attached to a writing system and its relation to spoken language?

Another cluster of topical questions deals with language origin(s), function(s), diversification, and change. Do the authors display some type of awareness of linguistic diversity and evolution, or do they conceive of language in an essentially monolithic, static way? Which language is regarded as the primeval language, and how did this first language emerge? Is language considered a means for conveying truth (in particular, the Christian faith), or simply viewed as a set of expressive forms? What concept of etymology was at play and for what purposes was etymology applied?⁶ How do the authors account for language resemblance or divergence? Are change and diversity in language due to external (political, ethnic, geographical) or also to internal factors (such as sociolinguistic or stylistic variation)? Does early Christian theorizing on language involve concepts such as affinity or genetic relationship? What is the part played in theorizing on language of religious issues and, more specifically, the Biblical passages dealing with language?

2.3 Methodological remarks concerning the analytical grid

The grid’s principal function consists in applying specific and definite questions to texts in which linguistic arguments are mainly ancillary to theology, church history, or ethnohistory, and whose potentially interesting linguistic content only becomes clear in the frame of a linguistic-historiographical inquiry. From the descriptive point of view, the advantage of applying such a grid consists in allowing us, whenever possible, to compare ideas, to see how source texts are interrelated, and to chart the continuity/discontinuity of recurrent themes and issues. The present authors are well aware that the application of this grid requires caution, and that it should not be used to force the ideas found in the source texts into a unified scheme. From a comparative and longitudinal point of view, the grid makes clear the differences in terms of depth of study and themes treated. In the application of the grid to

⁶ For the use(s) of etymology by late ancient and early medieval writers, see Amsler (1989); on the complex history of the term *etymology* and the concepts associated with it, see Herbermann (1981), Joseph (2000), Sanders (1967) and Swiggers (1996).

particular authors and texts, attention will be paid to the specific *context* of each relevant passage under study.

In what follows, we want to illustrate the relevance of our text corpus and methodological approach with three brief case-studies. It is important to note that in the present, initial stage of the project these case-studies do not aim to present comprehensive research results.

3. Three case-studies: Jerome, Hilary of Poitiers, and Isidore of Seville

3.1 *Saint Jerome and multilingual competence*⁷

The case of Jerome (c.347–419), who was highly esteemed as a philologist, a polymath, and, above all, as the translator of the *Sacra Vulgata* from Hebrew and Greek, exemplifies how the command of many languages could be exploited to establish or reaffirm one's authority in theological debates.

Having deepened his knowledge of Latin rhetoric and literature during his studies in Rome and after learning Greek in Antioch, Jerome acquired an extensive, though essentially passive knowledge of Hebrew as well as some notions of Syriac and Aramaic (Fürst 2004–2006: 318; Rebenich 1993: 56). Jerome himself explicitly highlighted his multilingual competence, mainly in order to defend his authority as a translator of and as a commentator on the Scriptures (Rebenich 1993: 56). He refers to his wide linguistic competence on two occasions, significantly in one and the same apologetic work, which played a central role in the so-called Origenist controversy. In this theological dispute, concerning the concepts of Trinity and (divine) Creation, as well as the issue of eschatology (Clark 1992: 3), Jerome opposed Rufinus of Aquileia (c.345–410). At one point in his discussion with Rufinus (*Aduersus Rufinum libri tres*, 2, 22 [ed. Lardet 1982: 58]), Jerome refers to Epiphanius of Salamis (310/320–403), a Christian Greek author who was acknowledged to have mastered Greek, Syriac, Hebrew, Coptic ('*Aegyptiaca lingua*'), and to some extent Latin ('*ex parte et Latinam*'). Therefore, Epiphanius is called πεντάγλωσσος (*pentáglōssos*) in *Adu. Rufin.*, 3, 6 (ed. Lardet 1982: 79), as he spoke five languages ("quia quinque linguis [...] loquitur"

⁷ In order to distinguish between the individual mastery of various languages and a society's multilingual status, we will use in the following the terms *plurilingual(ism)* and *multilingual(ism)*, respectively. This distinction conforms to the (French) terminological distinction between *plurilinguisme* and *multilinguisme*, as adopted by the European Council in 2000 (see the official document [2000] *Un cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues: apprendre, enseigner, évaluer*, prepared by the Conseil de la Coopération Culturelle – Comité de l'Éducation, within the project "Apprentissage des langues et citoyenneté européenne").

[Rebenich 1993: 71]). However, in his *De adulteratione librorum Origenis*, 15, Rufinus had ridiculed Epiphanius' multilingual competence in the following terms:

Denique quidam ex ipsis, qui se uelut euangelizandi necessitatem per omnes gentes et per omnes linguas habere putat de Origene male loquendi [...] (Ed. Amacker & Junod 2002: 318)

[Finally, one of them, who feels compelled, as it were by the necessity of evangelization, to speak ill of Origenes to all the nations and in all languages [...]]

It is against this disparaging statement that Jerome reacts. If Epiphanius is to be scorned for his wide linguistic competence, Jerome argues, one should also reproach the apostles for speaking in all tongues at Pentecost! The allusion here is to *Acts* 2, 1–13, an episode which has traditionally been interpreted as the reversal of the scattering of languages after the building of the Tower of Babel (related in *Gen.* 11, 1–9). Moreover, Jerome contrasts his own command of three languages to Rufinus' linguistic mastery of barely two languages, viz. Greek and Latin. Rufinus' supposed linguistic inferiority is used as a knock-down argument *ad hominem*: 'will you, a bilingual yourself, mock me, a trilingual?' (*Adu. Rufin.*, 2, 22: "me trilinguem bilinguis ipse ridebis?").

While linguistic diversity was mostly regarded as God's punishment for the arrogance of mankind in building the Tower of Babel⁸ and as an obstacle to evangelization,⁹ Jerome saw to it that his personal plurilingual capacities were highly valued in the light of Bible translation and Scriptural exegesis. Used in this expedient way, the phenomenon of individual plurilingualism serves to overrule the multiplicity of languages (multilingualism, in one sense of the word) by which the truth of Christian faith would have been obscured. This positive appraisal of Jerome's plurilingualism was propagated by, among others, Augustine (*De civitate dei*, 18, 42 and *Contra Iulianum*, 1, 7, 34) and Sulpicius Severus (*Dialogi*, 1, 8, 3) (cf. Rebenich 1993: 71n.59).

3.2 Saint Hilary of Poitiers and the complexity of translation

Early Christian sensitivity to differences between languages, enhanced by the process of Bible translation and exegesis, may be illustrated with the example of Hilary of Poitiers (c.315–367/68). It appears that Hilary of Poitiers was well aware of structural and semantic

⁸ The story of the confusion of tongues has been a central theme throughout the history of ancient, medieval and Renaissance linguistic thinking; cf. the comprehensive analysis of Borst (1957–1963), of which vol. 2 is of particular interest for the research project presented here. Throughout the history of linguistics the topic of the unity vs. diversity of languages has been prominent; cf. the account of the general thread in Trabant (2003).

⁹ However, ongoing research by Raf Van Rooy (KU Leuven) suggests that early Christian Greek authors held a more positive view of plurilingualism and multilingualism.

differences between Hebrew and Greek. In *Tractatus in psalmos*, 2, 2, he remarks upon the ambiguity of the Hebrew language (“ambiguitas linguae Hebraicae”). In his opinion, this ambiguity may lead to mistranslations and, hence, to errors in religious doctrine, if a translator does not attain empathy with the Mosaic tradition, which should guide his reading and interpretation of the Hebrew original. In Hilary’s view the translators of the Septuagint were still participants in that tradition, whereas later translators were not.

Hi itaque seniores libros hos transferentes et spiritalem secundum Moysi traditionem occultarum cognitionum scientiam adepti ambigua linguae hebraicae dicta et uaria quaedam ex se nuntiantia secundum uirtutes rerum certis et propriis uerborum significationibus transtulerunt doctrinae scientia multimodam illam sermonum intelligentiam temperantes. Et ex eo fit ut, qui postea transtulerunt, diuersis modis interpretantes magnum gentibus adtulerint errorem, dum occultae illius et a Moyse profectae traditionis ignari ea quae ambigue lingua Hebraea commemorata sunt, incerti suis ipsis iudiciis ediderunt. (Ed. Doignon 1997: 38)

[So the oldest translators of these books [= the inspired translators of the Septuagint] had a spiritual knowledge of hidden meanings that conformed to the tradition of Moses. They translated the ambiguous sayings of the Hebrew language involving different meanings, in accordance with the truth and by means of words that had a precise and appropriate meaning. They mastered the manifold signification of the texts by means of their knowledge of the teaching [of the Mosaic tradition]. Hence it is that those who made translations after them [viz. after the inspired translators of the Septuagint: Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus], in interpreting the text in different ways, brought serious error to the nations. As they were unaware of the hidden tradition going back to Moses, they set forth without any certainty and following their own opinion those things that are ambiguously recorded in the Hebrew language.]

In order to illustrate the ambiguity of the Hebrew language, Hilary cites the example of Hebrew בראשית [bʾrāšît], the very first word or phrase of the book of *Genesis* in the Hebrew text. Among the various translations he quotes, ‘*in principio*’ (“at the beginning”) and ‘*in capite*’ (“at the head”) were standard, whereas the translation ‘*in filio*’ (“in the son”) was quite unusual (cf. Clines 2010 VII, 365–376).¹⁰ The broader context of this passage in Hilary’s work makes it clear that in his view a correct translation of the Hebrew had been given by the

¹⁰ According to Descourtieux (in Descourtieux & Doignon eds. 2008: 218n.1), this translation is also found in Irenaeus and in Ariston of Pella, the latter of whom is quoted by Jerome. Hilary is the first to mention all three options: “Ambiguitatis autem linguae Hebraicae unum adferemus exemplum [...]. *Bresith* uerbum Hebraicum est. Id tres significantias in se habet, id est et *in principio* et *in capite* et *in filio*. Sed translatore septuaginta in principio ediderunt, ceteris diuerse transferentibus; et secundum hanc ambiguitatem haec ab illis in omni translatione est facta confusio” (ed. Doignon 1997: 38). “Now, we will adduce one example of the ambiguity of the Hebrew language [...]. *Bresith* is a Hebrew word. It has in itself three significations, viz. “in the beginning” as well as “at the head”, and even “in the son”. But the seventy translators [viz. the translators of the Septuagint] edited “in the beginning”, whereas others have [later] translated it [erroneously] in a different way; and consistent with this ambiguity, this confusion is made by them in all translations.”

Septuagint translators, who were still participants in the Mosaic tradition, whereas later translators were not, and thus committed inaccuracies and errors in their translations.

3.3 *Saint Isidore of Seville on the ‘primeval language’*

In his *Origines* or *Etymologiae*, Isidore (c.560–636), archbishop of Seville, epitomized the state of knowledge then attained in the various fields of learning. The ninth book of his *Origines*, entitled ‘*De linguis gentium*’ (“On the languages of the nations”), is entirely devoted to language-related issues, but it should be noted that Isidore offers comments on language throughout the work. In *Orig.*, 1, 3, 4, he discusses the origin of the Greek and Latin writing systems. The genealogy of the writing systems is implicitly taken as a guideline in defining the genealogical relationship between Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; no neat distinction is made between letter and sound. The Latin term *littera* denotes the name of the letter, the grapheme, as well as the phoneme (cf. Law 2003: 61):

Litterae Latinae et Graecae ab Hebraeis videntur exortae. Apud illos enim prius dictum est aleph, deinde ex simili enuntiatione apud Graecos tractum est alpha, inde apud Latinos A. Translator enim ex simili sono alterius linguae litteram condidit, ut nosse possimus linguam Hebraicam omnium linguarum et litterarum esse matrem. (Ed. Lindsay 1911, without page number)

[The Latin and Greek letters seem to be derived from the Hebrew, for among the Hebrews the first letter is called *aleph* [<א>], and then *alpha* [<α>] was derived from it by the Greeks due to its similar pronunciation [the Hebrew aleph does not in fact stand for a vowel], whence A among Latin speakers. A transliterator fashioned the letter of one language from the similar sound of another language; hence we can know that the Hebrew language is the mother of all languages and letters.] (Transl. in Barney et al. 2006: 39)

This is an interesting statement: the mere circumstance that the Latin and Greek alphabets — strictly speaking only their initial letters — derive from the Hebrew alphabet, is used as an argument to demonstrate that the Hebrew language is the primeval language of mankind. The smooth transition from writing system to language may have been enhanced by the fact that the primacy of Hebrew was an unproblematic issue to Isidore, as is clear from *Orig.*, 9, 1, 1:

Nam priusquam superbia turris illius in diuersos signorum sonos humanam diuideret societatem, una omnium nationum lingua fuit quae Hebraea uocatur [...] (Ed. Reydellet 1984: 31)

[For before the pride of that Tower divided human society, so that there arose a diversity of meaningful sounds, there was one language for all nations, which is called Hebrew [...]] (Transl. in Barney et al. 2006: 191)

4. *Conclusion and prospects*

The short case-studies presented here may serve to illustrate the relevance of a systematic study of the views held by early Christian Latin authors on language origins, language diversity, and language classification. In addition, since these authors attempted a

Christian(ized) synthesis of the body of knowledge constituted by ancient Greek and Latin authors (cf. Chin 2008), we will also examine, within the scope of the project, (1) whether and to what extent these authors' opinions can be regarded as mediating between the views held by non-Christian authors of Antiquity and those held by late medieval and Renaissance scholars, and (2) whether and to what extent language-theoretical material from non-Christian sources was adapted and converted by these early Christian Latin authors in order to lend support to points of Christian doctrine. In this way, the project can contribute to the study of the long-term transmission of language-related conceptions.

REFERENCES

- Amacker, René & Éric Junod, eds. 2002. Pamphile et Eusèbe de Césarée, *Apologie pour Origène*. Suivi de Rufin d'Aquilée, *Sur la falsification des livres d'Origène*. Tome I. (= *Sources chrétiennes*, 464.) Paris: Cerf.
- Amsler, Mark. 1989. *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. (= *Studies in the History of the Language Sciences*, 44.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Barney, Stephen A., W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach & Oliver Berghof (with the collaboration of Muriel Hall). 2006. *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borst, Arno. 1957–1963. *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*. 4 vols. in 5. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.
- Chin, Catherine M. 2008. *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. 1992. *The Origenist Controversy: The cultural construction of an early Christian debate*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. 2010. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Vol. VII. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Darrell Jackson, B. 1969. "The Theory of Signs in St Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*". *Revue des études augustiniennes* 15.9–49. (Repr. in *Augustine: A collection of critical essays* ed. by R. A. Markus, 92–147. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday. 1972.)
- Descourtioux, Patrick & Jean Doignon, eds. 2008. *Hilaire de Poitiers, Commentaires sur les Psaumes*. Tome I: *Psaumes 1–14*. (= *Sources chrétiennes*, 515.) Paris: Cerf.
- Doignon, Jean, ed. 1997. *Sancti Hilarii Pictaviensis episcopi Tractatus super Psalmos. Instructio Psalmorum*. In *Psalmos I–XCI* (= *Corpus Christianorum; Series Latina*, 61.) Turnhout: Brepols.
- Döpp, Siegmund & Wilhelm Geerlings (with the collaboration of Peter Brungs, Georg Röwekamp & Matthias Skeb OSB). 1999. *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur*. Freiburg, Basel & Wien: Herder.
- Edelstein, Jouri M. 1985. "Problemy jazyka v pamjatnikach patristiki [Language problems in the Patristic writings]". *Istorija lingvističeskich učenij: Srednevekovaja Evropa* [History of linguistic research: Western Europe] ed. by A[gnija] V[asil'eva] Desnickaja & S[olomon] D[avidovič] Kacnel'son, 157–207. Leningrad: "Nauka".
- Fürst, Alfons. 2004, 2006. "Hieronymus". *Augustinus-Lexikon*, vol. III, ed. by Cornelius Petrus Mayer et al., fasc. 1/2 (2004), cols. 317–320; fasc. 3/4 (2006), cols. 321–336.

- Herbermann, Clemens-Peter. 1981. "Moderne und antike Etymologie". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 95.22–48.
- Joseph, John E. 2000. *Limiting the Arbitrary: Linguistic naturalism and its opposites in Plato's Cratylus and modern theories of language*. (= *Studies in the History of the Language Sciences*, 96.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kirwan, Christopher. 1994. "Augustine on the Nature of Speech". *Language* ed. by Stephen Everson, 188–211. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lardet, Pierre, ed. 1982. *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera. Pars III, I: Contra Rufinum*. (= *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina*, 79.) Turnhout: Brepols.
- Law, Vivien. 2003. *The History of Linguistics in Europe from Plato to 1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lindsay, Wallace Martin, ed. 1911. *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum libri XX. Tomus I libros I-X continens*. Oxford: Clarendon. (Repr., 1966.)
- Markus, Robert A. 1957. "St Augustine on Signs". *Phronesis* 2.69–83. (Repr. in *Augustine: A collection of critical essays* ed. by R. A. Markus, 61–91. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1972.)
- Rebenich, Stefan. 1993. "Jerome: the 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas'". *Vigiliae christianae* 47:1.50–77.
- Resnick, Irven M. 1990. "Lingua Dei, lingua hominis: Sacred Language and Medieval Texts". *Viator* 21.51–74.
- Reydellet, Marc, ed. 1984. Isidore de Séville, *Étymologies*. Livre IX: *Les langues et les groupes sociaux*. Paris: Éditions "Les Belles Lettres".
- Rochette, Bruno. 2009. "Les noms de la langue en latin". *Histoire – Épistémologie – Langage* 31:2.29–48.
- Ruef, Hans. 1981. *Augustin über Semiotik und Sprache: Sprachtheoretische Analysen zu Augustins Schrift 'De Dialectica'*. Bern: Wyss Erben.
- Sanders, Willy. 1967. "Grundzüge und Wandlungen der Etymologie". *Wirkendes Wort* 17.361–384. (Repr. in: *Etymologie* ed. by Rüdiger Schmitt, 7–49. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977.)
- Simone, Raffaele. 1972. "Sémiologie augustinienne". *Semiotica* 6:1.1–31.
- Swiggers, Pierre. 1989. "Les pères de l'Église". *Histoire des idées linguistiques*, vol. II: *Le développement de la grammaire occidentale* ed. by Sylvain Auroux, 76–82. Liège: Pierre Mardaga.
- Swiggers, Pierre. 1996. "L'étymologie: Les transformations de l'étude historique du vocabulaire aux Temps Modernes". *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie*, Bd. 5: *Sprachtheorien der Neuzeit II: Von der Grammaire de Port-Royal (1660) zur Konstitution moderner linguistischer Disziplinen* ed. by Peter Schmitter, 352–385. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Trabant, Jürgen. 2003. *Mithridates im Paradies: Kleine Geschichte des Sprachdenkens*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Van Hal, Toon. 2010. "Moedertalen en taalmoeders": *Het vroegmoderne taalvergelijkende onderzoek in de Lage Landen*. Brussel: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten.
- Vecchio, Sebastiano. 1994. *Le parole come segni: Introduzione alla linguistica agostiniana*. Palermo: Novecento.
- Werner, Jürgen. 1992. "Zur Fremdsprachenproblematik in der griechisch-römischen Antike". *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike* ed. by Carl Werner Müller, Kurt Sier & Jürgen Werner, 1–20. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Authors' address:

Tim Denecker, Gert Partoens, Pierre Swiggers & Toon Van Hal

Centre for the Historiography of Linguistics
Faculty of Arts, University of Leuven
Blijde Inkomststraat 21- pb 3308
B-3000 Leuven
B e l g i u m

e-mail: tim.denecker@arts.kuleuven.be
gert.partoens@arts.kuleuven.be
pierre.swiggers@arts.kuleuven.be
toon.vanhal@arts.kuleuven.be