Maria Selig/Laura Linzmeier (Hg.)

Expert Cultures and Standardization
Romance Languages in the Early Modern Period

Expertenkulturen und Standardisierung
Romanische Sprachen in der Frühen Neuzeit

ESV ERICH SCHMIDT VERLAG

STUDIENREIHE ROMANIA

Expert Cultures and Standardization

Expertenkulturen und Standardisierung

Romance Languages in the Early Modern Period

Romanische Sprachen in der Frühen Neuzeit

Herausgegeben von
Maria Selig und Laura Linzmeier

ERICH SCHMIDT VERLAG

Deutscher
Romanisten
Verband

Contents

Contents

Maria Selig and Laura Linzmeier

'Doing expertise': linguistic standardization in early modern Romance expert cultures

1.   Expert cultures and standardization: some preliminary remarks

For more than thirty years, there has been an increasing interest in "alternative language histories" (Elspaß 2021: 94). Rather than concentrating on literary norms or the norms of higher social classes, scholars have tried to conceive language history from a new perspective and have shifted their interest to varieties hitherto seldom taken into consideration: the language of 'ordinary people', not of privileged classes, and the language of informal use – that is, private letters, account books and trial proceedings instead of literary poetry and prose, sacred texts and courtly conversation (cf. Elspaß 2021: 99–102; cf. also Oesterreicher 1997). This shift to a *language history from below* (Elspaß 2005) is meant not only to highlight domains which until now have been eclipsed by traditional narratives; the classic models of standardization, heavily influenced by concepts of national identity and hegemonial, homogeneous national languages, are also at stake. The aim of these new approaches, then, is to show how historical instances of standardization processes have been influenced by dynamics located 'below' the social classes and/or communicative genres believed to be the driving forces behind the selection, elaboration, codification and implementation of standard varieties.

The title of this volume signals our desire to continue this line of thinking. The expert cultures and literate practices rooted in these circles are not the domains that standardization theories presume to be decisive for establishing supra-regional and codified varieties. But, as we will show in section 1.2, the communicative practices of these experts are not 'below' the literary circles, courtly entourages or princely academies that histories of standardization seem to favor. We deliberately avoid any social or cultural hierarchizations, but think rather of 'parallel' or 'different' communicative dynamics, each of which contributes in a specific way to standardizing processes. Or, in the words of Lorenzo Tomasin: we do not conceive expert cultures as an "anecdotal appendix, or at most occasional participant in the [standard's] path

of diffusion, expansion, and affirmation", but as one of the "numerous and varied currents" that nurture historical standardization processes.[1]

This, in turn, leads us to question some standard ideas about standardization: in section 1.1, we argue for a model that includes not only the classical top-down processes controlled by language authorities and guided by standard language ideologies, but also invisible-hand processes related to functional-pragmatic aspects of literacy and the domain of communicative distance (cf. Koch/Oesterreicher 2011; 2012). We suggest, therefore, taking a close look at the communicative practices rooted in expert cultures (1.2) and seeing to what degree they contributed to linguistic elaboration, centralization and normalization (1.3).

1.1 'Spontaneous' standardization processes

In standardization theory, there has always been a tension between approaches focused on the functional requirements of (Klossian) *Ausbau* and nation-wide communication on one hand and sociolinguistic interpretations criticizing standard language ideology and interpreting it as a means of repressive social control on the other. Functionalist perspectives can be traced back to the Prague School of structuralism and its ideas on functional stylistics and later, in the sixties and seventies, to sociolinguistic research on language planning, especially in the context of nation-development and the standardization of minority languages (cf. Ayres-Bennett 2021: 29–33). Yet with regard to this functional perspective, a non-normative, descriptive approach has also been developed: Peter Koch and Wulf Oesterreicher's model of "conceptional variation" (Koch/Oesterreicher 2011: 3–20; cf. also Koch/ Oesterreicher 2007: 20–42) argues for directly relating the linguistic effects of *Ausbau* and elaboration to the interplay of context and discourse. Their model relies on insights from text/discourse-centered approaches as to the relevance of situational features for the choice of verbalization strategies. It therefore highlights: a) social parameters such as the degree of social and emotional distance between the interlocutors or the variation between more private/more public communication; b) cognitive parameters such as the variation between situationally embedded/non-embedded verbalization; and c) cognitive-interactional parameters such as spontaneous or non-spontaneous turn-taking, the specific possibilities of planning or the varying degrees to

---

[1] Cf. "una sorta di appendice aneddotica, o al più di partecipante occasionale al percorso di diffusione, espansione e affermazione [dello standard]", "sviluppi storici di una lingua che in realtà è stata silenziosamente alimentata da correnti ben più numerose e variegate" (Tomasin, this volume, p. 94–95).

which communication focuses exclusively on one thematic domain (cf. Koch/ Oesterreicher 2011: 6–10; cf. also Selig/Schmidt-Riese 2021: 149–153).

We cannot fully develop the theoretical background and variational aspects of this model.[2] It may suffice here, though, to underline those aspects that are essential for understanding standardization. First, it is important to note that Koch and Oesterreicher's model conceptualizes the varying situational features and corresponding verbalization strategies as a multidimensional continuum, spanning from the pole of "communicative immediacy" (i.e., maximally informal communication) to that of "communicative distance" (i.e., maximally formal communication). The model thus provides a comprehensive vision of the interplay of contextual parameters and verbalization strategies and allows us to grasp linguistic variation along the entire range of communicative practices at a community's disposal (cf. Winter-Froemel 2023). Second, the framework allows for a more analytic approach to functionalist attributes of standard languages, such as *intellectualization* (Garvin 1959), *minimal variation in form* or *maximal variation in function* (Haugen 1966), because it traces them back to the conceptional profile of communicative practices that instantiate conditions of communicative distance. Finally, even if it was originally conceived as independent from media-related aspects, the model allows one to integrate material as well as cognitive and social effects of literacy und to provide an analytic framework able to disentangle the close relationship between literate practices, literate infrastructure and standardization (cf. Grübl et al. 2021; Selig 2017; 2022a). Standardization processes such as linguistic elaboration or normalization can then be rooted anthropologically: They are related to the agency of individual speakers/writers and hearers/readers, interacting in formal contexts of communicative distance and adapting their linguistic choices to the functional – i.e., epistemic and social – needs of these communicative configurations.

From the standpoint of language history, this shift from focusing on explicit, institutionally concentrated top-down-processes to an actor-practice-centered definition is essential. It allows for a better understanding of the impact of major socio-cultural dynamics such as urbanization, the tendency towards juridification and increasing public administration – as well as the rise of vernacular literacy with the dissemination of literate practices in larger social contexts. These changes enlarge the communicative genres at a society's disposal (especially in the domain of communicative distance), while *Ausbau* on the level of text/discourse acts as an incentive towards elaboration processes in the lexical and syntactic domains (cf. Koch/Oester-

---

2   Cf. Grübl et al. (2021); Schmidt-Riese/Selig (2021); Selig (2017; 2022a). Cf. also the contributions in Winter-Froemel/Octavio de Toledo y Huerta (2023).

reicher 2011: 135–142).[3] We may add that urbanization increases the contexts favorable to spontaneous koineizations and that literacy is often related to supra-regional networks which, in turn, favor dialect convergence and the emergence of less local, more "anonymous" (Woolard 2007: 133–135) varieties (cf. Grübl 2014; Selig 2022b). These elaboration dynamics and centralizing tendencies are not planned and their effects may be limited. Nevertheless, from an analytic point of view, these invisible-hand processes are not random but systematic, and they intersect with prototypical instances of standardization processes at more than one point. It seems necessary in standardization theory, then, to focus not only on literary contexts of communicative distance, but also on non-literary ones which are not controlled by rhetorical culture. We therefore suggest taking a closer look at those who, by their expertise, are involved in these non-literary practices of so-called pragmatic literacy.

1.2 Expert groups and expert cultures

In the early modern era, the concepts of 'expertise' and 'expert' are still fuzzy ones. This vagueness stems from the combined interest in both practical and theoretical know-how, that is, in

> a form of knowledge that was not fully rooted in practical, hands-on experience, nor yet in abstract mathematics or a rarified natural philosophy. It was something of a mix, ever in flux, always being negotiated, nameless because the name we now use for it had yet to come into being. (Ash 2019: 74)

Historically speaking, this interest is related to the revaluation of practical fields of action (the *artes mechanicae*) whose practically oriented knowledge initially circulated mainly orally within a small community of skilled workers. After the rise of vernacular literacy and the invention of printing, however, such knowledge could reach wider circles, also thanks to the increasing interest of scholars in experiments and the documentation of technical and practical knowledge. This knowledge includes, among others, the know-how and expertise of craftsmen, those engaged in the healing professions, veterinarians, traders, bankers, etc. (cf. Rankin 2022: 144; Pöckl 1990: 274).

---

[3]   Whereas Haugen's term 'elaboration' (Haugen 1966) concentrated on language-internal aspects, Kloss (1967) was also interested in external, i.e., practice-related aspects of appropriating text genres of communicative distance when using the term *Ausbau*. Cf. also Koch and Oesterreicher's distinction between *intensiver Ausbau* (i.e., linguistic) and *extensiver Ausbau* (i.e., genre-related) (Koch/Oesterreicher 2011: 136).

The word 'expert' was initially used less as a noun and more as an adjective. The underlying Latin expression *expertus sum* can be translated as "I experienced" or also "I know from experience/from trying it out", indicating participation in an act (whether in the form of observing and assisting or actually performing it) (cf. Rankin 2022: 143). This means that one could be an "expert-by-practice" or an "expert-by-knowledge" (Steven Walton quoted in Ash 2019: 77) or even a combination of both: "seeing, touching, observing, experimenting: doing something" (Rankin 2022: 143).

From the sixteenth century onward, the publication of reference books, manuals and specialized dictionaries increased and the term 'expert' started to appear on the titles of monographs (cf. Füssel 2012: 270). Even though the ideas of what an expert or expertise was were still "hotly contested" (Rankin 2022: 144), the notion of what actually defined an expert was slightly refined in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. For example, Füssel (2012: 270, n. 7) points out that Richelet's *Dictionnaire françoise, contenant les mots et les choses* from 1680 contains only a short definition of the term, but that the later edition of 1759 describes much more precisely what characterizes 'experts': "des personnes qui ont acquis par une longue pratique, la connoissance de certaines choses, en sorte que lorsqu'il s'agit de décider des questions de fait, on nomme des Experts pour en dire leur sentiment" (Richelet 1759: 148).

Nevertheless, it still remains unclear who exactly fell under this category and who did not:[4] With reference to Ash (2019), it must be emphasized that if the term 'expert' can be applied simply to anyone who is particularly competent or experienced at something, then the term has been completely overextended. According to Ash (2019: 80–81), it is therefore advisable for researchers on the early modern era not to use the term descriptively, but rather exclusively as a "meta-category" and to have recourse to the concrete professional designations common to the time, such as *surgeon*, *artisan*, *alchemist* etc. As long as there were no institutions regulating the understanding of who was an expert and who was not, "the negotiation of expertise was much more vague, contingent, and open to differing interpretations and agendas" (Ash 2019: 83).

We therefore define expertise not simply as 'knowledge' or 'skill', since it combines practical know-how with theoretical underpinning:

---

[4] The French adjective *expert/e* has long remained synonymous with the English term 'experienced' and has therefore been used to refer to different professional groups; cf. Richelet (1759): "Un matelot fort expert" (1759: 605), "L'Ingénieur est un Mathématicien habile, expert & hardi, qui fait l'Art de l'Architecture militaire" (1759: 443), "Les Maréchaux de camp doivent être braves, experts & judicieux" (1759: 592).

> It is the nuanced combination(s) of practical ability and a more general, theo-
> retical understanding that makes expertise different from other, related con-
> cepts such as 'experience'. Thus, if the early modern knowledge and skills in
> question were usually encompassed in a straightforward artisanal apprentice-
> ship, they may better be thought of as 'craft knowledge' or 'workshop
> knowledge', but probably not as 'expertise' per se. (Ash 2019: 81)

The same holds for the concept of 'expert' in the early modern period. Re-
lated to the question of standardization, we suggest that this term be re-
stricted to professionals who were equipped with theoretical knowledge
(which they might also have used in the execution of practical actions), had
to pass through examinations or come before specific authorities in order to
qualify as such and had access to literacy (through schooling or other educa-
tional practices). In this sense, early modern experts are not only character-
ized by special knowledge and skills, but are also often associated with
higher social positions, a special use of language, competence in handling
instruments and tools and the mastery of "precise ritual choreographies of
expert action" ("genaue rituelle Choreographien des Expertenhandelns",
Rexroth/Schröder-Stapper 2018: 9; cf. also Füssel et al. 2019: 10). In a nut-
shell: these experts do not necessarily act 'below' – and certainly not apart
from – literary, courtly or public authorities.

1.3 'Polymorphic' standardization

What, then, is the role of expert cultures in standardization? Were expert
cultures involved at all in this development? According to the idea of bottom-
up standardizing processes, related to the specific discourse-pragmatic con-
ditions of communicative distance and to the material and cognitive disposi-
tions of literacy, the answer is clearly yes: Premodern experts, albeit not be-
longing to elitist literary circles, were involved in standardization. The
contributions of Sebastian Lauschus, Guido Mensching, Luca Refrigeri and
Frank Savelsberg, Christiane Paasch-Kaiser and Gabriele Zanello show that
from the beginnings of the written use of vernaculars by expert groups, we
witness the elaboration of technical vocabulary and complex syntax. The
question then arises as to whether the standardization processes initiated by
these experts took place in an independent way, occurring only locally and
at an individual level. Here, the answer is no: These processes, then as now,
are never isolated and completely autonomous, but rather are embedded in
larger communication networks. This means that even if vernacular, non-
literary experts are located outside hegemonial (Latin) literacy and act on a
more regional level, they contribute to "supralocalizations" and "suprare-
gionalizations", terms used by Gijsbert Rutten and Rik Vosters for premod-

ern linguistic accommodation and dialect convergence phenomena (Rutten/ Vosters 2021: 67). The same holds for later developments such as the setting up of large administrative systems in the colonial empires, new forms of schooling or the increasing role of the book market after the invention of printing. Here too, non-literary, vernacular expert groups actively participate in building up these structures, and their literate practices and the communication networks they establish continue to contribute to standardizing processes. It is true, however, that the new experts are not 'absorbed' by traditional, Latin-based rhetoric culture. Esthetic norms may dominate in private or public academies in Renaissance Italy, as has been shown by Martin Sinn, but vernacular expert groups do not follow those tendencies for the most part. The contributions of Lorenzo Tomasin, Tabea Salzmann, Marina Albers, Katharina Fezer and Laura Linzmeier, therefore, advocate for a differentiated approach. Indeed, premodern experts take advantage of (Latin) educational infrastructure, adapt politeness patterns developed by ecclesiastical hierarchies and rely on bureaucratic handwriting traditions. Yet, all in all, they continue to align their textual and linguistic strategies towards the functional needs of pragmatic literacy and to adopt a flexible, inclusive concept of linguistic normativity, which tolerates the use of group- or genre-specific varieties. According to the contributions of Anne Weber, Daniel Moretti, Vahram Atayan and Franz Meier, who analyze premodern translational practices in theoretical-pragmatical literature, we may even witness the first signs of a definite shift away from rhetorical to non-rhetorical, i.e., 'functionally' oriented patterns before the rise of modern standardization 'from above' in the mid-eighteenth century (cf. Rutten/Vosters 2021).

The question, then, is not so much whether non-literary experts partake in standardization, but whether expert cultures are in line with general tendencies or are acting 'against' them. Let us first note that premodern experts may be active in written practices situated nearer to the pole of communicative immediacy, such as contextually embedded lists or private correspondence within immediate professional and/or familiar contexts. However, it would be grossly misleading to compare their (pragmatically, not literarily oriented) skills to those of less experienced occasional writers 'below' the prevailing standards of literacy. Analyzing expert cultures is a highly necessary complement to language histories biased by their exclusive focus on literary traditions, but this must be done without subscribing to the tendency to locate everything non-literary 'below' influential social settings. This, in turn, means that we should not advocate for a narrow definition of standardization which necessarily encompasses metalinguistic activities promoting standard language ideology and exclude – on principle – unplanned, bottom-up and not explicitly thematized invisible-hand processes from such a definition. We must certainly take into account the "fundamental breach"

(Rutten/Vosters 2021: 68) that can be observed in European language history around 1750 on the threshold to the modern era. Standardization, at this point of cultural and social evolution, clearly comes 'from above'. It begins to be based on nationalist ideologies and modern concepts of citizenship, such that codification practices are addressed to entire national language communities, extending the normative claims to linguistic practice as such, regardless of contextually motivated variation. However, on the conceptual level, when analytic tools used to describe the processes involved in standardizing are under discussion, it may be more advisable to signal the historical continuity of elaboration and centralization, and to provide the means to mark clearly that without the results of these processes, modern standardization would not have been possible (cf. Elspaß 2021: 97–98).

Following a proposal by Peter Auer (2005: 22), Gisbert Rutten and Rik Vosters characterize the linguistic situation preceding the nineteenth century's standardization 'from above' as "diaglossia with fairly local writing practices on one side of the sociolinguistic continuum, supralocal writing traditions on the other side and a wide spectrum of variation in-between" (Rutten/Vosters 2021: 65).[5] The contributions gathered in this volume are interested in analyzing how this "wide spectrum of variation" and the flexible understanding of written norms came into being in medieval and early modern Romance-speaking areas and to what extent vernacular expert cultures were involved in this process. We think that as a result of these analyses, the interest of a broader vision of language history including research on expert groups is beyond any doubt. The contributions show that premodern standardization is not exclusively related to literary domains, but rather is anchored in more than one *epistemic culture* (Knorr-Cetina 1999). They show that premodern standardization dynamics are mostly driven by communicative practice and by the agency of historical actors, not by institutionalized language authorities. Moreover, they contribute to a differentiated, more complex view of standardizing dynamics by showing that elaboration and convergence processes are not necessarily interrelated and may in fact

---

[5]   Rutten and Vosters 'enlarge' the notion of diaglossia and apply it regardless of Auer's original orientation towards the modelling of spoken dialect-standard continua (cf. Auer 2005: 22–24) to written language as well (cf. Rutten/Vosters 2021: 65). This implies that configurations of communicative immediacy, the prototypical domain of dialects in premodern Europe, are mingled with those of communicative distance, which is prototypically associated with written use. It would be necessary to differentiate more clearly media-related and discourse-pragmatic phenomena, but we concentrate here on Rutten and Vosters' idea that premodern literacy should be modelled as a continuum, with varying norms according to genres, groups and regions.

be signs of conflicting tendencies, yet are nevertheless rooted in essentially the same anthropological, functional and social dynamics, i.e., the dynamics of literacy and communicative distance.

We have decided not to include the literate practices of experts and their standardizing effects in dichotomous opposition to the traditionally focused literary cultures. In our understanding, expert cultures do not act 'outside' or 'against' these developments, even if they are not always exactly in line with them. By contrast, we propose conceiving of premodern standardization as 'polymorphic', encompassing processes originating in different contexts, but comparable as to their social and communicative conditions. The outcome of these processes – diaglossia – is certainly much less mandatory then modern standard situations, as it offers flexible norms together with genre- and group-specific solutions. Nevertheless, diaglossia is not ephemeral and purely transitional, but rather a standardization context adapted to the needs of premodern literate societies and their multiple epistemic cultures.

2.   The contributions of the present volume

The articles gathered in this volume are clustered into three major thematic areas that focus on the linguistic features (2.1 Specialized/technical languages and terminological elaboration), cultural embeddings (2.2 Expert practices and cultural models) and contact-driven processes (2.3 Knowledge flows, translations and scientific literacy) of premodern expert cultures. The case studies they offer provide insights into historical situations situated not only in Europe, but also in overseas areas of the Romance-speaking world.

2.1 Specialized/technical languages and terminological elaboration

Sebastian Lauschus, Guido Mensching, Luca Refrigeri and **Frank Savelsberg** ("Medizinisch-botanische Synonymenlisten zu den hebräischen Übersetzungen von Avicennas *Qānūn*. Ein Beitrag zur überregionalen Diffusion romanischer Fachterminologien in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit") concentrate on the dissemination of Occitan specialized terminology in Jewish medical texts of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries. They show that this terminology spread to other cultural areas such as the Iberian Peninsula, Northern France and Central Italy, even before the period of premodern globalization. Furthermore, they argue that the Occitan terminology was quasi-standardized either through its use as loan-words or as a kind of model for the creation of local terminologies. The Occitan context and the Jewish community in Southern France can thus be considered as pivotal in the transmis-

sion of Arabic medico-botanical knowledge to other European areas, at least until the rise of the humanistic intellectual movements and their tendency towards basing scientific terminologies on Latin or Greek forms in order to mark the passage to a new scholarly paradigm.

Christine Paasch-Kaiser's paper ("Conventionalization of verb-noun constructions in legal discourse") deals with the occurrence, distribution and diachronic development of verb-noun collocations in legal textbooks originating from Normandy in the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries. The study is concerned with examining five verb-noun collocations containing the legal terminological unit *plet*. The author raises the question as to whether these constructions can be characterized as conventionalized patterns that are part of the customary law of Normandy and whether they shape the understanding of an implicit legal norm that was not exclusively tied to that region. The study allows for three of the verb-noun collocations to be identified as conventionalized constructions, whose use was not limited to Normandy. Furthermore, the author highlights the effects of the law reforms in the sixteenth century, which caused the collocations considered here to lose their status as conventionalized forms. There seems, then, to be a clear parallel to the transition to a new knowledge paradigm observed by Sebastian Lauschus and his colleagues in the domain of medico-botanical practices.

Gabriele Zanello's paper ("I linguaggi tecnici nelle carte friulane del tardo Medioevo") offers insights into another important context of vernacular pragmatic literacy, namely that of charters and other administrative texts that closely mirror situations, actions and objects of everyday life. The author analyzes the technical vocabulary of agriculture, craftsmanship and administration in a corpus of Friulian texts from Cividale, Udine and Gemona, covering the period between ca. 1300 and 1400. He shows how these terms reflect the multilingual situation created, for instance, by the presence of groups of Tuscan merchants in the Friulian towns: On the one hand, the technical terms are predominantly of local origin, yet on the other, their morphology is adapted to central varieties and Tuscan features, by adding final vowels or final consonants; Friu. *savolon*, 'sand' (It. *sabbia*), for instance, figures in the texts as *savolone*. Interestingly, the comparison with modern dialect data shows that in the medieval texts, there are many abstract nouns ending in *-ura*, *-arìa* and *-son*, which do not have modern dialect correspondences. This leads to the question as to what extent medieval scribes used word formation techniques to create the complex vocabulary they needed in a more or less *ad hoc* fashion.

2.2 Expert practices and cultural models

Lorenzo Tomasin's article ("Più *trasmigratori* che *poeti*. Percorsi non letterari nella storia e nella lessicografia dell'italiano") underlines the necessity of alternative approaches to standardization history, especially in the case of Italian. He shows how traditional historiography has narrowed its focus on the evolution of literary language and/or Tuscan varieties to the point that *storia della lingua* and *storia della letteratura* seem to be identical. This might be related to the particular historical background of Italian standard language ideology, which, due to secular trends towards regional fragmentation, emerged in Renaissance Italy without any relation to political and/or economic centralization. But as Tomasin convincingly argues, discussions on literary norms must have been paralleled by other non-literary practices to explain the formation of common linguistic and metalinguistic traditions. He therefore proposes analyzing the impact of professional migration contexts and of pragmatically oriented bilingual and multilingual lexicography on premodern standardization processes.

Tabea Salzmann's article ("Standardisierungsprozesse in der administrativen Schriftlichkeit des *Estado da Índia* im 16. Jahrhundert") focuses on the effects of language contact on the pragmatic writing of Portuguese administrators in the sixteenth-century *Estado da Índia*. She shows that the documents display a relatively homogeneous form, even though they originate from numerous different writers. The author therefore suggests an underlying professional practice of writing in addition to a well-organized and stable network between the Portuguese colonies and the European motherland, institutions and individuals and other factors that encouraged the spread and use of standardized forms.

Marina Albers focuses on the epistolary writing practice of Jesuits in the historical province of Paraguay ("Knowledge and Writing in the Spanish Colony. The Promotion of Education and Literacy by the Jesuits and internal epistolary communication in the eighteenth-century Province of Paraguay"). Drawing on the evidence that the Jesuits contributed significantly to the establishment of educational structures and the dissemination of knowledge in the colony, the author uses a discourse-traditional and pragmatic analysis of a corpus of eighteenth-century letters to examine the extent to which Jesuit epistolary culture parallels the European epistolary discourse tradition. The study shows that the writers not only respect traditional strategies of communicative distance of the European epistolary tradition (e.g., structure, address forms and formulaic patterns), but at the same time are open to expanding the understanding of the discourse tradition and to linguistic innovations

that emerged during the *primer español moderno* (1675–1825) (e.g., inclusion of short messages, telegram-like style with condensed and elliptical expressions).

Katharina Fezer's contribution ("'Le parfait négociant' als vollendeter Sprecher? Wirtschaftsfachsprache und Sprachnormierungsdebatte im Frankreich des 17. Jahrhunderts") deals with French language of trade in the context of the seventeenth-century language standardization debate in France. After an overview of the different positions on this linguistic variety in metalinguistic treatises – which simultaneously reveal an attitude of rejection as well as toleration towards language of trade – a linguistic-structural analysis of a sample of commercial letters included in manuals for merchants and in letter-writing manuals shows that this form of pragmatic-functional writing uses its own standard forms (e.g., structures of efficiency and condensation such as elliptical constructions) that clearly deviate from codified norms of literary use of the day.

Laura Linzmeier's article ("'Navigating' the visual surface – the writing strategies of French navigational experts in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries") focuses on the maritime writing practice of French navigators based on an exemplary analysis of a navigational journal from the mid-eighteenth century. The study shows that the writing culture of navigational experts is a clearly individual undertaking when it comes to documenting personal observations, discoveries etc. Navigators of the eighteenth century are aware of their expert role and therefore allow themselves to disregard official guidelines, such as pre-structured tables, by which the authorities intended to force the writers to record navigation-specific information in ever more detail and mathematical form. Maritime writers prefer instead narrative structures with coherence-creating linking strategies and are less interested in the purely numerical documentation of individual nautical details.

2.3 Knowledge flows, translations and scientific literacy

The contribution of **Anne Weber**, **Daniele Moretti** and **Vahram Atayan** ("Ways of wisdom: the transfer of knowledge into German-speaking countries discussed on the basis of the *Heidelberg Bibliography of Translations of Nonfictional Texts*") presents an ongoing bibliographical database project on translations of nonfictional texts from Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, English and Dutch into German from the invention of printing up to 1850. Linguistic historiography has concentrated for a long time on literary genres, and approaches to premodern translations have mostly ignored the large

amount of nonfictional texts as source texts. The Heidelberg database (https://hueb.iued.uni-heidelberg.de/de/) is meant to fill this gap and provide a solid basis for research on the dynamics of premodern cultural transfer. The article presents some of the results of quantitative analyses of the metadata that have been collated in the database. By comparing the distribution of subject matters across time periods, languages and/or cultural areas, clear correlations between subjects and languages and/or cultural areas can be seen. Whereas Latin dominates the religious domains till the nineteenth century, French source texts mostly come from the fields of history and geography, while English texts hail from the sciences. Interestingly, the bibliography reveals a large number of translations into German based on already translated versions of the originals. Dutch thus often functions as an intermediary language in the case of English texts, and French seems to be another prestigious intermediary language, due to its supposed *clarté*.

Martin Sinn confronts two important figures in Italian linguistic history, Dante Alighieri and Benedetto Varchi, and analyzes their contribution to the elaboration of the vernacular in the domain of scientific language ("Sprachliche Vielfalt und disziplinäre Ausdifferenzierung: Dante in den Akademievorträgen Benedetto Varchis (1543–1547)"). The author shows that both intellectuals commit themselves explicitly to linguistic elaboration: Dante in the *Convivio* and the *Divina Commedia*; Varchi in his *Lezioni su Dante*, delivered to the *Accademia Fiorentina* between 1543 and 1547. But whereas Dante acts in the framework of medieval *theologia*, where literary and scientific discourse are not yet separated, Varchi distinguishes clearly between Dante the poet and Dante the *philosophus*, ready to differentiate his aesthetic judgement according to the topics Dante discusses. In doing so, Varchi does not adopt Bembo's harsh judgement on Dante's 'mixed' and 'impure' style and accepts the specific cognitive and terminological needs of specialized language. But, with regard to his stylistic ambitions, Varchi prefers the idea of *bello scrivere* even in scientific prose. This clearly indicates that he shares the hierarchical understanding of linguistic and stylistic variation, common in then-contemporary literary circles, and extends the scope of rhetoric and literary esthetics to include technical and scientific discourse as well.

Franz Meier discusses the phenomenon of cross-linguistic influence via translations of scholarly literature in eighteenth-century Italy ("Les phrases pseudo-clivées inversées dans la traduction scientifique dans l'Italie de la fin du 18ᵉ siècle"). He analyses the distribution of French and Italian reversed pseudo-cleft sentences in a corpus of 30 non-translated and 60 translated articles, published between 1770 and 1795 in Italian scientific reviews. Whereas in the French source texts, there is not a single attestation of the

construction, he observes in the Italian texts (whether translated or not) a regular, though not frequent, use. While this distribution excludes direct code copying, a thorough analysis of the pragmatic and textual features of the Italian examples shows that the reversed pseudo-cleft constructions mostly combine complex noun phrases, resuming anaphoric information on topic subjects, with relative clauses adding new information with a defining or specifying function ("Questa luce, infiammazione, o fuoco, che scappa […], è ciò che si appella Fuoco Elettrico", this volume, p. 228). The construction, then, appears to be related to the functional needs of scientific texts, with its use being not the result of mechanical copying, but rather a sign of the active appropriation of the verbalization strategies of communicative distance.

References

Ash, E. H. 2019. What is an Early Modern Expert? And why does it matter? In Füssel, M. / Rexroth, F. / Schürmann, I. Eds. *Praktiken und Räume des Wissens: Expertenkulturen in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 69–88.

Auer, P. 2005. Europe's sociolinguistic unity, or: a typology of European dialect/ standard constellations. In Delbecque, N. / Van der Auwera, J. / Geeraerts, D. Eds. *Perspectives on Variation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 7–42.

Ayres-Bennett, W. 2021. Modelling Language Standardization. In Ayres-Bennett, W. / Bellamy, J. Eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 27–64.

Elspaß, S. 2005. *Sprachgeschichte von unten. Untersuchungen zum geschriebenen Alltagsdeutsch im 19. Jahrhundert*. Zugl.: Universität Münster [Habilitationsschrift, 2003]. Berlin: De Gruyter (= Reihe Germanistische Linguistik, 263).

Elspaß, S. 2021. Language Standardization in a View 'from Below'. In Ayres-Bennett, W. / Bellamy, J. Eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 93–114.

Füssel, M. 2012. Die Experten, die Verkehrten? Gelehrtensatire als Expertenkritik in der Frühen Neuzeit. In Reich, B. / Rexroth, F. / Roick, M. Eds. *Wissen, maßgeschneidert. Experten und Expertenkulturen im Europa der Vormoderne*. München: Oldenburg, 269–288.

Füssel, M. / Rexroth, F. / Schürmann, I. 2019. Experten in vormodernen und modernen Kulturen. Zur Einführung. In Füssel, M. / Rexroth, F. / Schürmann, I. Eds. *Praktiken und Räume des Wissens: Expertenkulturen in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 7–16.

Garvin, P. 1959. The Standard Language Problem: Concepts and Methods. *Anthropological Linguistics* 1/3, 28–31.

Grübl, K. 2014. *Varietätenkontakt und Standardisierung im mittelalterlichen Französischen. Theorie, Forschungsgeschichte und Untersuchung eines Urkundenkorpus aus Beauvais (1241–1455)*. Tübingen: Narr.

Grübl, K. / Gruber, T. / Scharinger, T. 2021. Was bleibt von kommunikativer Nähe und Distanz? Revisionen eines linguistischen Paradigmas. In Gruber, T. / Grübl, K. / Scharinger, T. Eds. *Was bleibt von kommunikativer Nähe und Distanz? Mediale und konzeptionelle Aspekte sprachlicher Variation*. Tübingen: Narr, 9–56.

Haugen, E. 1966. Dialect, language and nation. *American Anthropologist* 68/4, 922–935.

Kloss, H. 1967. 'Abstandlanguages' and 'Ausbaulanguages'. *Anthropological Linguistics* 9/7, 29–41.

Knorr-Cetina, K. 1999. *Epistemic cultures. How the sciences make knowledge*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Koch, P. / Oesterreicher, W. 2007. *Lengua hablada en la Romania: español, francés, italiano*. Madrid: Gredos (= span. translation of Koch/Oesterreicher 1990).

Koch, P. / Oesterreicher, W. 2011 [1990]. *Gesprochene Sprache in der Romania: Französisch – Italienisch – Spanisch*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.

Koch, P. / Oesterreicher, W. 2012. Language of immediacy – language of distance. Orality and literacy from the perspective of language theory and linguistic history. In Lange, C. / Weber, B. / Wolf, G. Eds. *Communicative Spaces. Variation, Contact and Change. Papers in Honour of Ursula Schaefer*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 441–473.

Oesterreicher, W. 1997. Types of orality in text. In Bakker, E. / Kahane, A. Eds. *Written voices, spoken signs*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 190–214.

Pöckl, W. 1990. Französisch: Fachsprachen. Langues de spécialité. In Holtus, G. / Metzeltin, M. / Schmitt, C. Eds. *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik.* Band 5/1. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 267–282.

Rankin, A. 2022. How to "Be Expert" in Early Modern Europe. *Historical Studies in the Natural Sciences* 52/1, 143–146.

Rexroth, F. / Schröder-Stapper, T. 2018. Woran man Experten erkennt. Einführende Überlegungen zur performativen Dimension von Sonderwissen während der Vormoderne. In Rexroth, F. / Schröder-Stapper, T. Eds. *Experten, Wissen, Symbole. Performanz und Medialität vormoderner Wissenskulturen*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter, 7–26.

Richelet, P. 1680. *Dictionnaire françoise, contenant les mots et les choses, ...* Genève: J.H. Widerhold. https://archive.org/details/dictionnairefra00rich/page/n335/mode/2up?q=expert&view=theater (2023-03-30).

Richelet, P. 1759. *Dictionnaire de la langue Françoise, ancienne et moderne*. vol. 2. Lyon: Pierre Bruyset-Ponthus. https://archive.org/details/dictionnairedela259rich/mode/2up?q=expert (2023-03-30).

Rutten, G. / Vosters, R. 2021. Language Standardization "from Above". In Ayres-Bennett, W. / Bellamy, J. Eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 65–92.

Selig, M. 2017. Plädoyer für einen einheitlichen, aber nicht einförmigen Sprachbegriff: Zur aktuellen Rezeption des Nähe-Distanz-Modells. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 68, 114–145.

Selig, M. 2022a. Diamesic Variation. In Ledgeway, A. / Maiden, M. Eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of Romance Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 870–897.

Selig, M. 2022b. Standardisierung aus der Akteursperspektive. Überlegungen zu den Ausbau- und Überdachungsprozessen im mittelalterlichen Französischen. In Böhmer, H. / Schmidt-Riese, R. Eds. *Kommunikation, Text und Sprachwandel im romanischen Mittelalter*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 25–89.

Selig, M. / Schmidt-Riese, R. 2021. Noticias sobre inmediatez y distancia: Esbozo de situación, dispositivos mediales y variación concepcional. In Gruber, T. / Grübl, K. / Scharinger, T. Eds. *Was bleibt von kommunikativer Nähe und Distanz? Mediale und konzeptionelle Aspekte sprachlicher Variation*. Tübingen: Narr, 145–169.

Winter-Froemel, E. 2023. Discourse traditions research: foundations, theoretical issues and implications. In Winter-Froemel, E. / Octavio Toledo y Huerta, A. Eds. *Manual of Discourse Traditions in Romance*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 25–58.

Winter-Froemel, E. / Octavio Toledo y Huerta, A. Eds. 2023. *Manual of Discourse Traditions in Romance*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.

Woolard, K. 2007. La autoridad lingüística del español y las ideologías de la autenticidad y el anonimato. In Del Valle, J. Ed. *La lengua, ¿patria común?: ideas e ideologías del español*. Madrid / Frankfurt: Iberoamericana / Vervuert, 129–142.

Sebastian Lauschus, Guido Mensching, Luca Refrigeri und Frank Savelsberg

Medizinisch-botanische Synonymenlisten zu den hebräischen Übersetzungen von Avicennas *Qānūn*

Ein Beitrag zur überregionalen Diffusion romanischer Fachterminologien in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit

Abstract. This contribution uses an example from the field of Jewish medicine to sketch some tendencies in how Romance specialized terminology spread and became quasi-standardized across regional borders even before the trends of humanistic re-Latinization and early modern globalization. The article focuses on three lists of medico-botanical word correspondences (Arabic–Latin/Romance) in Hebrew characters. These alphabetically ordered lists are based on an index or table of contents originally belonging to a Hebrew version of Avicenna's *Canon of Medicine*, apparently originating from Southern France. In the oldest line of transmission for these lists, the Romance component is written in Old Occitan. We retrace how this Old Occitan terminology in Hebrew garb spread to central Italy, where it was enriched through a multitude of Italo-Romance lexical items. In this process, some Old Occitan terms persisted in the texts, figuring alongside a great number of Italo-Romance forms. In this context, the Occitan linguistic and cultural area can be considered as a kind of center of irradiation, from which medico-botanical knowledge and linguistic forms spread to other geographic and cultural areas, such as the Iberian Peninsula, northern France, and Italy, functioning as a kind of model for the creation of local terminologies. Thus, the synonym lists under consideration elucidate some aspects of transregional diffusion of knowledge in the pre-modern era. In addition, they enhance the documentary basis of Old Italo-Romance, for which the scientific terminology is underrepresented in texts in Latin script (due to the long predominance of Latin in scientific writing), in contrast to the Jewish scientific literature of the same period.

Abstract. Anhand eines Beispiels aus der jüdischen Medizingeschichte werden einige Tendenzen der Diffusion und Quasi-Standardisierung von romanischer Fachterminologie skizziert, die bereits vor dem Einsetzen der humanistischen Relatinisierung und der frühneuzeitlichen Globalisierung über regionale Grenzen hinaus wirkten. Zentraler Untersuchungsgegenstand sind dabei drei in hebräischer Schrift vorliegende alphabetisch geordnete Listen mit medizinisch-botanischen Synonymen (Arabisch–Latein/Romanisch). Diese basieren auf einem Index oder Inhaltsverzeichnis, der bzw. das ursprünglich zu einer wohl in Südfrankreich entstandenen hebräischen Version von Avicennas *Kanon der Medizin* gehörte. In dem Beitrag wird nachgezeichnet, wie die altokzitanische Terminologie, die die volkssprachliche Synonymenschicht des ältesten Überlieferungs-

zweigs dieser Texttradition bildet, in hebräischem Gewand ihren Weg nach Mittelitalien fand und dort mit einer Vielzahl italoromanischer Formen angereichert wurde. Bei diesem Prozess blieb das ursprüngliche altokzitanische Wortgut neben dem neu hinzugefügten italoromanischen teilweise erhalten. Der okzitanische Sprach- und Kulturraum kann in diesem Zusammenhang als ein Zentrum gesehen werden, von dem aus medizinisch-botanisches Wissen sowie die entsprechende altokzitanische Terminologie in andere Areale wie die Iberische Halbinsel, Nordfrankreich und hier Italien ausstrahlte und die Folie zum Ausbau entsprechender lokaler Fachsprachen bildete. Die untersuchten drei Textzeugen geben aber nicht nur Aufschluss über einige Aspekte der vormodernen transregionalen Wissensverbreitung, sondern tragen auch dazu bei, die Dokumentationsbasis der altitaloromanischen Fachsprachlichkeit zu erweitern. Aufgrund der langen Dominanz des Lateinischen ist diese im Vergleich zur jüdischen wissenschaftlichen Literatur im lateinischen Schrifttum zur gleichen Zeit eher spärlich überliefert.

1. Einleitung

Ziel des vorliegenden Artikels ist es, Tendenzen überregionaler Verbreitung und Vereinheitlichung romanischer Fachterminologie in der Phase vor der humanistischen Relatinisierung und vor den frühneuzeitlichen Globalisierungstendenzen anhand eines konkreten Beispiels aus der in romanischsprachigen Ländern praktizierten jüdischen Medizin vorzustellen. Dies erscheint uns deshalb interessant, weil die jüdischen Wissens-, Schreib- und Diskurstraditionen größtenteils unabhängig vom lateinischen Schrifttum waren. Somit muss der volkssprachliche Anteil nicht zwangsläufig auf der Folie lateinischer und romanischer Vorbilder gesehen werden. Der Beitrag verarbeitet erste Ergebnisse aus unserem DFG-Projekt „Eine medizinisch-botanische Synonymenliste in hebräischer Schrift aus Mittelitalien".[1]

Zentraler Forschungsgegenstand des Projekts sind sogenannte Synonymenlisten, eine Weiterentwicklung von Glossen und Glossaren. Nach MacKinney (1938) handelt es sich dabei in der griechisch-lateinischen Tradition um eine aus *glossaria* und *hermeneumata* hervorgegangene Art mehrsprachiger Lexika:

> These appear under the titles *glossaria*, *hermeneumata*, *synonyma*, *vocabularia*, *index*, *expositio nominum*, etc., and are usually characterized by the *id est* formula; that is, each entry is followed by *id est* (or a variation thereof) and the explanatory material. Such works are clearly distinguishable from concordances and pharmaceutical handbooks in that their chief purpose was phi-

---

[1] Das Projekt wird von einer Göttinger Arbeitsgruppe, die aus den Autoren dieses Beitrags besteht, in Kooperation mit einer Kölner Arbeitsgruppe um den Judaisten Gerrit Bos durchgeführt. Eine ausführlichere Beschreibung des Projekts ist unter https://gepris.dfg.de/gepris/projekt/430923012 (30.03.2022) zu finden.