

**Trends in Romance Linguistics and Philology**  
**Volume 4**

# Trends in Linguistics

## Studies and Monographs 15

*Editor*

Werner Winter

Mouton Publishers

The Hague · Paris · New York

# Trends in Romance Linguistics and Philology

Volume 4: National and Regional Trends  
in Romance Linguistics and Philology

*edited by*

Rebecca Posner  
John N. Green

Mouton Publishers  
The Hague · Paris · New York

ISBN 90 279 7916 2

© Copyright 1982 by Mouton Publishers, The Hague. All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form — by photoprint, microfilm, or any other means — nor transmitted nor translated into a machine language without written permission from the publisher. Phototypesetting: Western Printing Services Ltd, Bristol. — Printing: Werner Hildebrand, Berlin. — Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer Buchgewerbe GmbH, Berlin.  
Printed in Germany

# Contents

## 4.1 Romance-speaking areas

Rebecca Posner	
Favoured approaches among Romance-speaking nations	3
Robert de Dardel	
Romance studies in Switzerland	9
Willy Bal	
Romance studies in Belgium (1945–1974)	41

## 4.2 English-speaking areas

Noel Corbett	
Romance studies in North America	81
Glanville Price	
Romance studies in Great Britain	127

## 4.3 Germanic-speaking areas

Helmut Lüdtke	
Romance linguistics in Germany and Austria: a paradigmatic survey	173
Willem Noomen	
Romance studies in the Netherlands	223
Ebbe Spang-Hanssen	
Romance studies in Scandinavia	251

#### 4.4 Slavonic-speaking areas

Witold Mańczak

Romance studies in Eastern Europe 275

J. Ian Press

Romance linguistics in the Soviet Union (1945 to the present  
day) 295

Index of Names 317

## Contributors

Prof. Dr. Willy Bal	Catholic University of Louvain
Prof. Noel Corbett	York University, Ontario
Prof. Dr. Robert de Dardel	University of Groningen
Prof. Dr. Helmut Lüdtke	University of Kiel
Prof. Dr. Witold Mańczak	University of Krakow
Prof. Dr. Willem Noomen	University of Groningen
Prof. Rebecca Posner	University of Oxford
Dr. J. Ian Press	University of London
Prof. Glanville Price	University College of Wales
Prof. Dr. Ebbe Spang-Hanssen	University of Copenhagen





## 4.1 Romance-speaking areas



REBECCA POSNER

## Favoured approaches among Romance-speaking nations

The relevance of a section on national preferences in an academic discipline is open to question. Of course, within the Romance field, those nations that make use in everyday life of a Romance language will tend to concentrate on study of that language. We have not included in our volumes specific sections on the major European Romance languages — French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and Rumanian — partly because *Current Trends* 9 (1972), with bibliographies running up to 1968, has already covered much of the material. In the last decade, there has been no deceleration in the production of studies in or on these languages, but bibliographical information is readily available from other sources. In those regions where more than one Romance language is spoken — Sardinian, Catalan, Rhetio-Friulian, or Occitan — special attention is often paid to the 'minor' language and we have judged it opportune to include special sections on these languages. Similarly, where Romance languages are extensively used outside of Europe, particular problems arise, and we have devoted separate sections to these, for *Current Trends* 4 (1968), excellent as it is, is already fifteen years out of date.

But apart from the obvious preference of Romance speakers for study of their own native languages, how far can we really discern national trends in the study of Romance linguistics and philology? In the modern world, it is true, differences are now being ironed out into uniformity: in Italy, for instance, where there are officially no chairs of Romance linguistics (cf. Ruggieri 1969) the discipline has been, in practice, well supported, as part of the study of Latin, with the Romance languages considered as 'neo-Latin' (a term now often used for medieval and Renaissance Latin). Today, with Latin losing its status in the education system — even in Italy — Romance studies are rapidly going into decline. Since 1965 (cf. SLI 1977), Italian linguistics has turned away from

historical studies and 'idealist' conceptions and taken up more and more sociolinguistics, alongside traditional dialectology, as well as synchronic approaches, along generative lines (cf. also Cardona 1976).

Similarly, in Spain, the tradition that owes so much to Menéndez Pidal — of meticulous attention to old texts (cf. Marcos Marín 1975) — is supplemented by sociolinguistic approaches to dialectology (especially in the work of Manuel Alvar) and, rather belatedly, it is true, an adoption of transatlantic ideas (cf. Sánchez de Zavala 1976).

France, on the whole, is more resistant to international impulses — in scholarship as in other fields — and French linguistics retains its distinctive flavour (cf. Martin 1975), with even its transformationalists, like Maurice Gross, retaining a reserve in face of Chomskyan trends. Admittedly, since 1968 there has been provision for incursion into French University life of foreign scholars — but it is really only at Vincennes that any major (though ephemeral) impact was made on linguistic studies.

French remains, for most countries, the most widely taught of the Romance languages: it is different enough from the rest to appear to necessitate separate treatment, and is the language which receives most attention from scholars both inside and outside France.

The continuing attention to dialectology (cf. Tuailon 1976) stems from rather different motives in France than in some other countries — like Italy, Belgium or Portugal: for northern French dialects are virtually extinct, and their study is seen as a last desperate attempt to record for posterity a disappearing aspect of French culture, essentially a rural way of life that is being ousted by modern economic and social developments. In other countries — especially in Italy — dialect study is seen as a branch of sociolinguistics and goes hand in hand with investigations of popular features of language. Indeed, Italian developments have been linked with a swing in opinion among younger academics towards more left-wing views, with less emphasis on élitist language. In France, on the other hand, sociolinguistic investigations of popular language are still less favoured than more pedagogically oriented treatment of the standard. Here, Canada provides something of a contrast — in Montreal, at any rate, popular French receives much attention, though in Quebec, at Laval, language study is particularly linked to French traditions, with Guillaumeau theory particularly promoted (cf. Meney 1978).

That national trends do still exist is amply demonstrated by the articles in this volume. Often the persistence of national traditions is the result of institutionalization of once fashionable approaches: the German pre-eminence in comparative Romance studies is surely related to the con-

tinuing existence of established Chairs in the subject (though, admittedly, in Britain, reputedly conservative enough, similar Chairs have tended to drift in scope towards more currently popular fields).

Influential individuals have swerved whole generations of scholars along set paths: Humboldt in Germany, Croce in Italy, Menéndez Pidal in Spain, and Guillaume in France. Such influence is more evident in those countries in which established University teachers are recruited only from nationals of the country — unlike, for instance, Britain, Holland or North America. Not unrelated to this point is the availability of funding for research: projects with the backing of well-known personalities or related to national prestige are more likely to attract financial support. Naturally, in some countries research is geared to specific problems: it is not surprising that creole studies flourish in ex-colonialist countries like Portugal or Holland (to a lesser degree in France), or that bilingualism is a particular concern of Canada, Belgium or Switzerland. In non-Romance-speaking countries, French — as the educationally most prestigious ‘foreign language’ — usually receives most attention, while Spanish figures large in U.S. linguistic discussions, as the most readily accessible Romance language.

Accessibility and the nature of data available to scholars is an important factor in the formation of national trends. Synchronic studies of all kinds — especially dialect investigations — require ease of access to informants and are best done on home ground; foreign scholars will often prefer historico-comparative study and editing of texts. A less obvious example can be drawn from a comparison of French and Italian traditions in textual editing. The French preference for reconstructing an “Ur”-text on the basis of corrupt versions is not simply due to the influence of Joseph Bédier, nor are Italian editors simply following Lachmann in advocating meticulous reproduction of the actual texts. French medievalists have the special problem of not possessing extant autograph versions of their (pre-classical) texts, whereas in Italy, where the medieval and the classical periods more closely coincide, directly transmitted texts are more frequent (cf. Speer 1979).

But if we admit that national traditions do exist, an apparent lacuna in our volumes is the absence of sections on comparative Romance studies in individual Romance-speaking nation states. This brief introduction is meant in some degree to stop this gap. But it has to be said that comparative Romance studies — sometimes categorized as a German invention — are little promoted in most Romance-speaking countries. Yakov Malkiel’s admirable survey of European trends in comparative Romance

linguistics up to 1968 (*Current Trends* 9 (1972): 834–925) devotes little space to Romance-speaking countries as such: indeed, he suggests that too high a specialization in one language may lead to neglect of related languages. Coseriu's well-informed general survey of linguistic trends in Latin America (*Current Trends* 4 (1968): 5–62) also brings out the relative neglect of comparative Romance studies by the Spanish-speaking countries, in contrast to Brazil, which, under the influence of da Silva Neto, does keep comparatism more alive.

It is, in fact, 'peripheral' Romance-speaking nations — like Belgium, Switzerland, Rumania and, possibly, Brazil — that show more interest in comparatism than the European 'hard core'. Belgium and Switzerland are discussed in the following two contributions, by Willy Bal and Robert de Dardel, while Brazilian trends are covered in Naro's article in Volume 3.

Perhaps we can include in our peripheral category the active *Centre du Philologie et de Littératures Romanes* at Strasbourg, under the direction (1960–1979), of Georges Straka (cf. Straka 1979), which, although (just) within the confines of France, may be seen as continuing essentially a German, or at any rate a Middle European, tradition: its policy of inviting visiting professors from other countries has kept alive a non-parochial spirit which is reflected in its publications, periodicals *Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature* (1963—), the *Bulletin des Jeunes Romanistes* (1960—) and the series *Bibliothèque française et romane* (1960—) (cf. also the Centre's annual *Brochure-Programme* which lists publications of staff members and visitors, as well as dissertations presented and in progress).

Whereas the influence of German scholarship may well explain the vitality of Romance studies in Belgium, Switzerland and Alsace, the emergence of Rumania as the most active centre of comparative Romance studies within Romance-speaking nations must surely be due to other factors. One is undoubtedly the comparatively ample supply of funds from the socialist government which is keen to promote national culture and to establish Rumania's position in the Romance world, differentiating it from surrounding nations. Another is probably the personal influence of the veteran Academician Iorgu Iordan (cf. Posner 1970: 406–407). Be that as it may, Rumania has an impressive record, especially since 1956, in all branches of linguistics, but especially in comparative studies and in dialectology: cf. the volume of *RRLing* 23 (1978), devoted to a survey of "Current Trends in Romanian Linguistics".

At the other end of the scale, we might place Portugal, where political instability and economic disarray may account for the relative stagnation of scholarly activity: the most active centres are the *Instituto de estudos românicos* at Coimbra, under Manuel Paiva Boléo (publishing *RPF*), which is concerned mainly with Portuguese dialectology, and the *Centro de estudos filológicos* at Lisbon, under Luis F. Lindley Cintra (publishing *BF*); which since 1970 has had study groups on *Português fundamental*, theoretical linguistics and medieval Portuguese texts as well as preparing an *Atlas linguístico-etnográfico de Portugal e da Galizia*. Insurmountable difficulties retard the regular publication and diffusion of learned periodicals: in any case comparative Romance studies are rare, though there is, not surprisingly, in view of the Portuguese presence in Africa and Asia, much interest in creole languages.

But it is not really fair to take Romance-speaking countries to task for neglect of comparative studies, for they all devote much energy to comparatism within their own national frontiers — in dialectological investigation (cf. John Green's introduction to Volume 2) and to study of 'minor' Romance languages (cf. Volume 3.2). It is only right and proper that they should tackle the problems nearest at hand, while still being ready to learn from others' experience.

A not totally irrelevant factor in the formation of 'national schools' is the language in which research is reported: Soviet research, for instance, is almost totally unknown to most Romanists, who, even if they are ready to tackle Rumanian or German, often balk at Russian. Rumanian scholars are, in fact, usually eager to translate their work into other Romance languages; Dutch and Scandinavian scholars as often as not use French. Portuguese and Catalan-speaking scholars on the whole prefer their native tongues, even though this renders their work less accessible than that of French, Spanish and Italian speakers. But it is fair to say that English began to supplant French or German as the international language of linguistics — even of Romance linguistics — from the time of the second world war. The pre-eminence of the U.S.A., bolstered at first by the influx of distinguished European refugee scholars and then by the more ample provision it provides for research, has had the effect not only of levelling out national differences, but also of making knowledge of English a *sine qua non* of linguistic research. Perhaps the fact that most of the articles in these present volumes are appearing in English, compared with Gröber's (1888) German survey, is symptomatic of the shift. It should be noted in this context that, traditionally, North American Universities owe more to German patterns than to British or Romance.

That one of the most brilliant centres of comparative Romance studies is located in California, at Berkeley, is perhaps significant — in that prosperous, cosmopolitan atmosphere a broad-sweeping, if elitist, discipline survives better than in many European Universities.

It would be a shame though if national quirks were to disappear: International Congresses of Romance Linguistics and Philology are tremendous jamborees of scholars united by their interest in, and use of, Romance languages and literatures, profiting from rubbing shoulders with other scholars of varying traditions. One can only proclaim: "Vive la différence!"

### References

- Cardona, Giorgio Raimondo  
 1976 *Standard Italian* (The Hague: Mouton).  
*Current Trends . . .* (in *Linguistics*, edited by Thomas A. Sebeok) (The Hague: Mouton).  
 1968 4. *Ibero-American and Caribbean linguistics*.  
 1972 9. *Linguistics in Western Europe*.  
 Marcos Marín, Francisco  
 1975 *Linguística y lengua española: introducción, historia y métodos* (Madrid: Cincel).  
 Martin, Robert  
 1975 *The French contribution to modern linguistics: theories of language and methods in syntax* (Paris: Klincksieck).  
 Meney, Lionel  
 1978 *Bibliographie de la recherche en psycho-systématique du langage* (1911–1977) (Québec: Laval U.P.).  
 Posner, Rebecca  
 1970 "Thirty years on" supplement to Iorgu Iordan and John Orr, *Introduction to Romance Linguistics* (1937, reprint 1970 Oxford: Blackwell).  
 Ruggieri, Ruggiero M.  
 1969 *La filologia romanza in Italia* (Milan: Marzorati).  
 Sánchez de Zaval, Victor (editor)  
 1976 *Estudios de gramática generativa* (Barcelona: Labor Universitaria).  
 Speer, Mary B.  
 1979 "In defense of philology — two new guides to textual criticism", *RomPh* 32: 335–344.  
 SLI  
 1977 *Dieci anni di linguistica italiana (1965–1975)* edited by Daniele Gambarara and Paolo Ramat (Rome: Bulzoni).  
 Straka, Georges  
 1979 *Les sons et les mots: choix d'études de phonétique et de linguistique* (Paris: Klincksieck).  
 Tuaillon, Gaston  
 1976 *Comportements de recherche en dialectologie française* (Paris: CNRS).



ROBERT DE DARDEL

## Romance studies in Switzerland

1.1 As a great number of writings by Swiss Romanists have appeared in the twentieth century, this survey has for its main topic the studies done in Switzerland after the Second World War (1945), referring only to striking or indispensable pre-war facts in so far as they serve to put in context the most recent trends in the history of Romance linguistics in Switzerland. I do not draw a distinct line between Romance studies in Switzerland and elsewhere, since there are linguists with a Swiss background working outside Switzerland and, on the other hand, non-Swiss linguists from other countries now doing important work in Switzerland itself.

1.2 Rebecca Posner has clearly shown<sup>1</sup> that Romance studies after 1940 have been on the wane, probably owing to a recent development in theoretical linguistics towards abstraction, formalism and synchronism on the one hand, and to the difficulties that Romanists face in keeping in touch with theory and in integrating into their field of research on the other. For those who peruse Helvetic works of the last thirty years, it is obvious that these observations are very much to the point.

This phenomenon may be all the more striking as Switzerland has a fairly fruitful past in this field. Around 1900, roughly, Swiss Romanists such as Gilliéron, Meyer-Lübke, Morf, Salvioni, Tobler greatly contributed to Romance studies. Between the two wars, Romance studies in Switzerland, especially linguistic geography and etymological research, were still of international fame. However, after 1945 this generation began to disappear: Oskar Keller died in 1945, Albert Sechehaye in 1946, Charles Bally in 1947, Jules Jeanjaquet in 1950, Jakob Jud in 1952, Alexis François and Karl Jaberg in 1958, Arnald Steiger in 1963, Johann Ulrich Hubschmied in 1966, Walther von Wartburg in 1971, Silvio Sganzini in 1972, Paul Scheuermeier in 1974 and Paul Aebischer in 1977. The loss of

these masters, some of whom, either by temperament or by necessity, had never abandoned their views or methods, created a kind of vacuum for young Swiss Romanists. The greater part, those formed in the tradition of these masters, had lost touch with certain theories, either older ones, such as comparative Romance linguistics and Saussurean structuralism, or more recent ones, such as the various extensions of structuralism or transformational-generative grammar. Those who made an effort to return to theory, after carefully selecting from various trends (Guillaume? Hjelmslev? Martinet? Chomsky? . . .), have not always been successful in their syntheses of new theories and traditional aims in Romance studies. Consequently, Romance studies in Switzerland after 1945 tend to give the impression of confusion and stagnation, in contrast with the preceding period and in comparison with some other countries.

1.3 These considerations have determined the plan of this survey. First the activities carried on in the Helvetic tradition will be discussed (2), next the traditional aspects tending to disappear or to stay in the background (3) and finally the activities that break away from tradition (4). In two of these sections there will be subdivisions referring to Romance areas (2.1 and 4.1) and to aspects of language with which research is concerned (2.2 and 4.2); in all three sections there will be a subdivision referring to methods applied (2.3, 3 and 4.3). This is, of course, a very subjective classification, not always satisfactory in describing facts, leading besides to duplication of reference.

1.4 Since the many Swiss Romanists are very prolific, the publications discussed — with bibliographic reference at the end of the survey — have had to be severely selective; they have been chosen mainly for their quality, but sometimes also for being characteristic of Swiss scholarship.

1.5 This survey is a condensed version of “*Etudes romanes en Suisse (1945–1976)*” (VR 37:1–104), to which the reader may refer for further details and a more expanded bibliography.

2.1 Among the Romance areas with which Swiss Romanists are traditionally concerned, a distinction will be made between the Romance languages and dialects as spoken in Switzerland (2.1.1) and those spoken elsewhere (2.1.2).

2.1.1 Swiss Romanists have always taken a great interest in the native

Romance dialects, perhaps nowadays even more so than in the past years. This may be due to the fact that these dialects are so close at hand, sometimes spoken by the linguists themselves. It certainly is due also to the fact that these dialects are spoken in mountainous regions, in the fringe area of the large linguistic groups to which they belong (Swiss Romansh — or Rheto-Romance — excepted), politically and culturally isolated from these groups and having resisted unifying tendencies and preserved linguistic elements which have disappeared elsewhere. Especially in the case of dialects liable to disappear sooner or later, the need is felt to record them in every possible way for scientific purposes and for posterity. The very important lexicographical works on French and Franco-provençal in Switzerland, on Italian dialects of Switzerland and on the Romansh of the Grisons, begun in the first half of the twentieth century, should be completed whatever happens; teams of field-workers and editors should go on working, and financial support by State and canton should continue. Swiss Romanists very rightly consider the preservation of this linguistic heritage as one of their first and foremost missions.

In this light, it might be useful to mention two valuable contributions: the publication of gramophone-records of Romance dialects together with explanatory booklets in the series *Schweizer Dialekte in Text und Ton — Dialectes suisses*, and some pages (maps 27 and 28) in the *Atlas de la Suisse* dealing with the linguistic situation in 1960 and showing — by means of maps and commentaries composed by experts — the dialectal areas and the lexical variety of the three Romance groups of Switzerland. Mention must be made of the positive attitude taken by many Swiss people to the problem of linguistic minorities; this attitude is based on a feeling of respect and, at the same time, on the hope that the most threatened dialects can be preserved from becoming extinct. This attitude showed itself before the Second World War, in which period the Swiss people took the Rheto-Romance (or Romansh) of the Grisons as a fourth national language. And it goes on showing itself in every kind of material and moral support given to minorities for their cultural activities, especially in the case of the Grisons. The same attitude appears in creating research centres and University Chairs.

Let us turn now to each of the three Romance groups.

The editorial team of the *GPSR* (chief editor Ernest Schüle) regularly publishes the fascicules of this monumental work, which has got as far as the letter E; a *Rapport annuel* gives a survey of the work done. According to an interuniversity agreement in French Switzerland, Neuchâtel recently became the centre of Francoprovençal research. A newly created chair

of dialectology is held by Schüle. A centre for dialectology and regional French studies was opened in 1973 and the archives of the *GPSR* are now housed here. In 1969 there was a conference on Francoprovençal dialectology here, where Swiss and foreign specialists met.

The youngest of the great Swiss glossaries, the *VSI*, began to appear in 1952, under the direction of Silvio Sganzini; since Sganzini's death, the chief editor is Federico Spiess. This work, first begun by the Tessinian Carlo Salvioni and continued after his death by Clemente Merlo, is the result of an inquiry made in more than 300 villages and hamlets in Ticino (Tessin) and in the Italian speaking valleys of the Grisons.

The Romansh of the Grisons, recognized as a fourth national language in 1938 and presently spoken by about 40,000 people, is threatened on two sides simultaneously, in the North by German, in the South by Italian. The efforts of radio and television, federal financial support for publications, local societies for defending linguistic heritage and the inclusion of Swiss Romansh in the school programmes of the canton and at Swiss universities, are not succeeding in checking the decline of this language. A study by Wunderli (1966), based on successive censuses, confirms this. According to him, Swiss Romansh declines wherever industry and tourism play a part in this canton with its few resources; the natives themselves sometimes do not use it for convenience sake. Other factors operate in the same direction: firstly the fact that Swiss Romansh, unlike the other national languages of Switzerland — German, French and Italian — is not supported by an important European language; next, the dialectal multiplicity inside Swiss Romansh itself, and the absence of a uniform or model Romansh language, even a written one (printed texts are published in five dialectal varieties).

The activity of Romanists in the field of the Grisons dialects is particularly great, for it embraces two fields: linguistic research aiming at recording and describing this extremely interesting Romance language, and the standard work of grammarians and lexicographers aiming at solving the practical problems linked with a group of dialects taught at school and still serving as a written means of communication.

In the field of scientific activities, the *DRG* should be mentioned; it is due to the initiative of Robert von Planta, a well-known Romansh linguist; this work, the counterpart of the two glossaries quoted before — one of the dialects of French Switzerland and the other one of the dialects of Italian Switzerland — is also very important because of its size and scientific level. The letters A to F have been published. Its chief editor is Alexi Decurtins. The *Rätisches Namenbuch*, also started by Robert von

Planta, is a large collection of place names and names of persons past and present, comprising the whole canton of Grisons, including the German and Italian speaking parts. Volume one (Planta-Schorta 1939) contains the toponyms classified according to borough; volume two (Schorta 1964) is an etymological dictionary of materials occurring in volume one; volume three, which is being prepared by Konrad Huber, will be about anthroponymy. The *Annalas da la Società Retorumantscha* frequently publish linguistically interesting documents, particularly old Swiss Romansh texts.

In the field of standard works, activities centre especially round the publication of bilingual dictionaries coupling German and one of the Romansh dialects. The authors of dictionaries have made it their delicate task to find linguistic and orthographic norms suited to satisfy all the present needs of the written Swiss Romansh; moreover they aim to preserve the genius of the language, to see to it that Romansh keeps its character in spite of the influx of foreign words. The cultural history of the Grisons, the main linguistic problems of this canton are clearly outlined in a brief but substantial essay by A. Decurtins (1959), the holder of the new Chair of Rhetor-Romance at Fribourg.

2.1.2 As for Romance languages outside Switzerland, the interest of Swiss Romanists has concentrated, even before the war, especially on the Romance fields shared by Switzerland, that is to say Gallo-Romance, with Albert Secheyaye, Charles Bally, Henri Frei, Walther von Wartburg and his *FEW*, and Italo-Romance, with Karl Jaberg, Jakob Jud, Carlo Salvioni, Paul Scheuermeier and the *AIS*. This trend has not changed with the new generation, if we think of what the names of Kurt Baldinger, Carl Theodor Gossen, Eddy Roulet and Jean Rychner mean to Gallo-Romance studies, and those of Siegfried Heinemann and Gustav Ineichen to Italo-Romance studies. In spite of geographical distance, Ibero-Romance had, between the two wars, attracted the attention of Arnald Steiger; likewise tradition continues here with Kurt Baldinger, Germán Colón, Gerold Hilty and Michael Metzeltin. Sardinian and Rumanian, as exclusive objects for studies, have been and still are rather marginal sections in Swiss research.

On the other hand, Swiss scholars who are, in some sense, Pan-Romanists in so far as they do not basically exclude any Romance language or dialect from their field of observation are more numerous, for example, Johann Ulrich Hubschmied, Karl Jaberg, Jakob Jud and Walther von Wartburg. Some, such as Kurt Baldinger, Siegfried

Heinimann, Gerold Hilty, Konrad Huber and Heinrich Schmid, consider the problems of virtually any Romance language; others, such as Paul Aebischer, view the organic whole of Romania; and there are some scholars, for instance Johannes Hubschmid, who consider any non-Romance language with which Romance languages may have some historical connection.

2.2 Recent Swiss Romanists still stick to tradition — in this case the neogrammarian school — when it comes to the study of phonetic and lexical facts. An important part of the research by Gossen, for instance, is taken up by the study of connections between phonetics and graphic systems in ancient scriptae. Several studies by Pfister (e.g. 1960) are centred around historical phonetics. Wartburg and his team are primarily concerned with the form, the meaning and the history of words. This is also true of numerous dialectological monographs, where this restriction is probably linked up with methods of inquiry, which lend themselves to the study of syntax only at the cost of endless precautions; it is still linked up with material offered by fundamental works such as atlases and glossaries, which present mostly — although not exclusively — lexical elements.

2.3 In the choice of method and approach, Swiss Romanists, even some of the youngest ones, remain very much anchored in Swiss pre-war traditions. This does not necessarily imply immobility, but may imply, as will be seen presently, a certain adaptation, a certain renewal. We can put under this heading onomastics (2.3.1), etymology and lexicology (2.3.2), dialectology and linguistic geography (2.3.3), the study of influences among languages (2.3.4), contrastive linguistics (2.3.5), onomasiology (2.3.6), the study of socio-cultural and historic factors (2.3.7), the edition of medieval texts and medieval philology (2.3.8).

2.3.1 Together with von Planta, J. U. Hubschmied has founded a Swiss toponymy on a scientific basis. His famous research on substrata rests partially on toponyms. Another prominent toponymist at that time was Muret.

This tradition continues after the war, although there is not much research done. Let us first mention Bruckner (1945), whose work covers all parts of Switzerland, and maps 29 and 30 of the *Atlas de la Suisse*, devoted to the main toponymic layers. Toponymics are made use of in the



German part of Switzerland in order to distinguish, in time and space, Germanic settlements from Romance ones. On the side of the Romance languages, linguists resort to toponymics for the study of interlinguistic relations (with Wartburg (1950) who supports his belief in a prolonged bilingualism in northern Gaul by reference to duplication of toponyms) and for the study of linguistic systems (with Schmid (1951–1952), according to which the contrast between Germanic place-names in *-s*, e.g. *Truns*, and Romansh place-names without *-s*, e.g. *Trun*, reveals a trace of nominal declension in Retho-Romance).

While Planta-Schorta 1939 is nearing completion, a *Dictionnaire toponymique de la Suisse romande* is being launched; it consists partly of the materials which E. Muret collected for the *GPSR*. Ticino is starting a similar work, the *Rilievo toponomastico ticinese*.

2.3.2 As shown very clearly by Baldinger (1959), etymology which is essentially based on the laws of phonetic evolution and secondarily on the meaning of words is definitely dated. It has been replaced by a more demanding etymology, which — although respecting phonetic laws — traces back the history (some will even speak of it as a biography) of words, from their origin up to their most recent appearance, at the same time submitting their semantic development to a critical examination. Moreover, this kind of etymological approach tends to determine the cause of certain changes, causes which can lie in the linguistic system itself or in factors outside the system: influences of other languages and of non-linguistic factors.

One of the most important works written according to the principles of this etymological approach is the *FEW*, to which W. von Wartburg (1922–1968) has given the best of his abilities, even in his declining years. The theoretical aspects of the evolution of words, in particular the causes to be found in the linguistic system, such as homonymic collisions, associative etymology, etc., are elaborately discussed in Wartburg 1943. No doubt the *FEW* is open to criticism, as is to be expected of a work whose publication extends over more than forty years; it is to be regretted, for instance, that the historical aspect so clearly predominates over the geographical one.

A reflection of the *FEW* and at the same time a continual up-dating of Gallo-Romance etymology can be found in the successive editions of Oscar Bloch and Wartburg 1932.

Baldinger has started on an etymological dictionary of Old French (1971–), in which, in accordance with modern trends in etymology, he

gives a biography of a particular word from within the etymological family to which it belongs.

Besides the three great Swiss glossaries, the *GPSR*, the *VSI* and the *DRG*, all of which partly deal with etymology, Jaberg–Jud 1960 is considered, as suggested by the subtitle, *Ein propädeutisches etymologisches Wörterbuch der italienischen Mundarten*, to be a basis for etymological research; indeed, the dialectal forms in the *Atlas*, accompanied by semantic indications, are all classified according to their etymological relations.

Swiss etymological research, with a long past as we have seen, remains singularly alive these days, with Baldinger, Colón, Gossen, Hilty, Hub-schmid, Jänicke, Keller, Lurati, Metzeltin and Pfister. This is no doubt partially due to the intellectual brilliance of Wartburg and to the influence which he exercised on his disciples, many of whom seem to have found their vocation as etymologists in their work at the bureau of the *FEW* in Basle. Let us just mention one etymological essay: Jänicke (1971); the author, inquiring into French *bécane* ‘bicycle’, proposes to combine a former meaning of this word, ‘old-fashioned engine that is no longer used except for shunting’, with the elements *bé-*, depreciatory prefix (also occurring in *bévue* ‘blunder’) and *cane* ‘female duck’, on account of her walk; his hypothesis is supported by analogous developments in German, *lahme Ente* ‘slow vehicle’ (literally ‘lame duck’), and in English, *lame duck*.

2.3.3 Romance dialectology in Switzerland in the first half of this century clearly bears the mark of the teaching of Jules Gilliéron; still, his direct or indirect disciples have tried to improve his methods. Jaberg and Jud, the most prominent among them during the period between the two wars, published the second great Romance atlas, the *AIS* (1928–1940). So much for the output of materials and their presentation.

With regard to the actual scientific interpretation, the Swiss dialectologists of the first half of the century have adopted the method based on areal norms either from Jules Gilliéron or later from Matteo Bartoli; by means of this method, they can draw their inferences about the succession and expansion of forms from their spatial distribution. For instance, when a Romance word has disappeared in a part of the Romance area, proof of its former existence may eventually be furnished by its occurrence in the peripheral Romance languages and dialects or the nearby non-Romance languages and dialects. This method has been illustrated in a number of articles of that era, for instance by Jud (e.g. 1908–1910) and



Jaberg (1908). The dialectologists of that period have also adopted from Gilliéron the notions of pathology and therapeutics of language, which explain certain linguistic changes by inherent tendencies of the system and which have been illustrated by the well-known example of the homonymic collision of *gallus* and *gattus* in Gasconian. An application of this is to be found in Jud 1925 on *éteindre* in the Romance languages. Certain dialectologists, who both adopt and apply these views, are strongly opposed to the neogrammarians. Among Jud's (1908–1910) reproaches of Meyer-Lübke's work is that he analyses the geographical position of present forms only and neglects those of deeper-lying layers, their stratigraphy and the spatial transfers which have produced them; he sets *Wortgeologie* against Meyer-Lübke's *Wortgeographie*. Jud (1914–1917: 71–74) reproaches Carlo Salvioni with having relied exclusively on phonetic laws and asserts, with the aid of examples, that the spatial distribution of forms may complete, or furthermore correct, a hypothesis based solely on phonetic laws. The methods of linguistic geography handed down by Gilliéron and Bartoli have been perfected. In particular Jaberg, who had at his disposal more abundant and, above all, more sensitive material, has carefully differentiated the method. Another improvement (according to its authors at any rate) is the addition, intended to differentiate and correct the theory of areal norms, of a historic or cultural dimension to the usual method, which is essentially based on linguistic data and criteria. It is significant that Jaberg (1940), in his interpretation of Rumanian linguistic maps, relates the synchronic data of the atlas to diachronic facts that are mainly extra-linguistic and historic. It is significant too that Jud (1934) considers the word *basilica*, preserved in Retho-Romance and indicating the building destined to worship, to be more recent than *ecclesia*, descendants of which are found in Northern and Central Italy; the peripheral position of *basilica* should, according to the areal norms, indicate on the contrary that it is older than the more centrally situated *ecclesia*; however, history intervenes here: according to Jud, as Italy was christianised earlier than the distant and savage Raetia and preserved the word *ecclesia* and as Raetia was christianised later and preserved the word *basilica*, the latter term is younger than the former and replaced it in Christian Latin at a given moment.

Anyone who deals with the post-war period cannot doubt that, after the death of Jud and Jaberg, ground was lost for the interpretation and the theory, which filled an important place in their writings and reflections, as well as for the spirit which animated that team. However, collection of materials with a less ambitious way of interpreting them, and

analysis of geographically more restricted subjects dealing with fewer languages or dialects, such as already existed before the war, still flourish.

Let us first look at the works of ampler scope. The tradition of Jud and Jaberg, with their wide horizon and their search after general principles, may be found among linguists such as Schmid, Aebischer and Hubschmid. Schmid (1958) points out for instance that, generally speaking, the Lower Engadine constitutes a peripheral archaizing zone of Swiss Romansh, but that, in the case of the word indicating 'yellow', one finds the opposite: the Lower Engadine opposes a more recent form, *ġelk* or *yelk*, to the archaic Romansh *mélan*. The former type, which accidentally resembles the Lombardic *ġalt*, from *galbinus*, is a loanword from the Germanic Tyrolese dialects — a frequent occurrence in that area. In a book devoted to the whole of the Romance area, Schmid (1949) discovers archaic areas, in the sense of Bartoli. In another publication (1956), he encompasses not only the Romance languages but also the neighbouring non-Romance languages and touches, among other problems, upon the loss of declension in central and western Romance as well as in the Germanic dialects of Central and Northern Europe, in contrast to the conservation of a declension, in the extreme east part of the Romance area, in Rumanian, as well as in adjacent non-Romance languages on one hand and, on the other, in the West, in the Western part of the British Isles, forming thus two compact marginal conservative areas over and above the frontiers between Romance and non-Romance languages, at least in the East. Schmid points out that this case illustrates a thesis of Jaberg, according to which the marginal archaic areas tend to reinforce or to exaggerate their archaic features; Rumanian reinforces indeed its flexional system by introducing a vocative which has not been handed down by Latin. Aebischer (1963) takes up once more the problem of the chronology of *basilica* and *ecclesia*, touched upon by Jud (1934); he applies the areal norms but, contrary to Jud, without according a prominent part to cultural history and, after having considered the whole of Romania, Aebischer concludes — rightly, I should say — that the word *basilica* is earlier than *ecclesia*. Hubschmid (1958) mentions the case of a pre-Romance word meaning at first 'cow' or 'pig', afterwards, probably, owing to its use in children's games, 'fir-cone', 'ear of corn'; the first meaning occurs peripherally and the second centrally, in conformity with areal norms.

With respect to research on a smaller scale, it seems sensible to give a brief summary for each Romance area, adopting the same plan as before (2.1).

Improved techniques coupled with the research-worker's intimate knowledge of the dialect to be studied have made it possible to collect valuable materials. For Francoprovençal, Müller (1961) and Schüle (1961–1962) should be mentioned; their lexical and phraseological material has been ordered in accordance with the conceptual system of Hallig–Wartburg. The synchronic study of the pronoun of Central Valais by Olszyna-Marzys (1964) is remarkable in that it makes a start in the almost untouched field of Francoprovençal syntax. The problem of the frontiers of Francoprovençal and of appropriate criteria to distinguish it from neighbouring Romance dialects has been tackled more than once, first by Lobeck (1945), next by Hafner (1955) and finally by Burger (1971).

With regard to the Italian-speaking part of Switzerland, Spiess (1965–1968) describes the phonetic alternants in the morphology of a Ticino dialect, his mother tongue, and Zeli (1968) examines the principal negative constructions (*non*, *mica*, *non-mica*, etc.) on the basis of the material of the *VSI* and characterises various dialects from that point of view.

In the field of Retho-Romance, historical phonetics has been dealt with mainly by Caduff (1952) and Widmer (1962–1974) and historical morphology by Decurtins (1958); in historical syntax two books, by Liver (1969) and Ebnetter (1973), have recently been published.

The Swiss dialectologists, occupied with indigenous dialects, have contributed proportionately little to the progress of Gallo-Romance dialectology; the main names to be mentioned here are those of Baldinger, Gossen, Keller, Pfister and Wüest. The most original contribution of Swiss Romanists to the Gallo-Romance dialectology is certainly found in the many publications which Gossen devoted to ancient Picard (above all 1942, 1970) as well as his systematic research on the scriptae, i.e. the written medieval languages, of Picardy and other provinces of the Langue d'oïl (1967). These are investigations on the extra-linguistic circumstances under which the charters were written (transition from Latin to Romance texts, scribes, notaries, aldermen, etc.), and further into the linguistic features of the scriptae, especially their phonetic aspect. Gossen seems to have been led to this research-work by the following considerations: the localisation of an ancient text by the pseudo-equation "ancient grapheme ~ modern phoneme" does not offer sufficient guarantees; it is therefore preferable to start from extra-linguistic criteria, such as texts dated and located at the time they were written; consequently, he examines non-literary texts, in particular charters, which often contain an indication of place and date; starting from such

documents, it is possible to establish the equivalence between graphemes and the phonetic elements of a region at a given period. Gossen is of the opinion that historical phonetics has often attributed too much value to the grapheme of the scriptae; as regards the relation between the grapheme of a scripta and the sound of the corresponding modern dialect, it can only be of value if this sound has not evolved in the meantime. Relying on these considerations and after patient research in archives where there are gaps, taking into account rigid formulae, conventional spellings, alterations due to copyists, the complex, hybrid, artificial character of the scriptae, and sometimes resorting to statistics, Gossen succeeds in isolating various scriptae according to the region and the period and in determining their influences on each other. Bearing in mind that, to some extent, the scriptae reflect dialectal features, Gossen is able to correct some notions about historical phonetics. He is quite aware of the fact that he has not yet perfected his method nor solved all the problems posed by the scriptae; his research-work is continued and his methods are improved by younger scholars, in particular by his former pupil Hans Goebel, who intends to make use of modern means such as mecanography and arithmetic interpretation.<sup>2</sup>

Italo-Romance dialectology, partly stimulated by the treasures amassed in the *A/S*, regularly attracts attention, though much less than Gallo-Romance dialectology.

2.3.4 The influence exerted by languages on each other plays an important part in the research-work of the pre-war Swiss Romanists. Because of the conservative character of the Alpine dialects, Switzerland was excellently suited for field-research on the pre-Romance and even pre-Indo-European substrata of the Romance dialects, as well as, incidentally, on the Germanic superstrata. The contacts of Romance and Germanic on Helvetic soil, both the assimilation of Burgundian by Romance in present French Switzerland and the decline of Romance with respect to Alemannic and the formation of a Romance substratum in German Switzerland, offered another favourable field of investigation on the strata. These studies, related to analogous phenomena outside Switzerland, naturally had to take other Romance languages and dialects into consideration and sometimes, especially with respect to the substrata, to envisage linguistic fields beyond the Romance area.

Before the war, the substrata and superstrata have been explored fairly systematically by J. U. Hubschmied (1938, where he assumes that Gallic was still spoken on the Swiss Plateau at the time the Alemanni arrived

there, in the fifth century) and by Jud (1908–1910, 1908, supporting the thesis of the Germanic origin of respectively French *aune* and Italian *barba* 'uncle').

The most important and virtually the only Swiss Romanist who ought to be mentioned for the period we are dealing with is J. Hubschmid (cf. among many other titles 1951 and 1960), who took up and considerably enlarged and differentiated the investigations of his father, J. U. Hubschmid; his investigations follow the same directions as those made by Alessio, Wagner, Rohlf and Wartburg. His method, inspired by linguistic geography, consists in tracing forms in the Romance area which are explained neither by the Romance dialects themselves nor by the superstrata and which, therefore, may be pre-Romance. The pre-Romance forms may be Indo-European, if the corresponding form has been found in other Indo-European languages. The forms that cannot thus be classified as Indo-European may be pre-Indo-European. One of the important criteria is a geographical one: Hubschmid finds the greater part of pre-Romance elements in the most archaic zones of Romania, such as the Pyrenees and the Alps; from that point of view, Sardinian, which had not been Indo-Europeanised before the Roman conquest, is particularly instructive. Hubschmid draws his evidence from the toponyms, from ancient Latin and Romance forms and from modern Romance languages and dialects. The toponyms have the advantage of being well located and often archaic witnesses; the advantage of the appellatives over toponyms is that they have a meaning; so Hubschmid refers to them more and more. The 'thing meant' is of importance for this research, since there may be a link between a language and a civilisation, i.e. the category of objects whose names have come down to us; besides, certain objects travel and facilitate loans. Hubschmid also studies the phonetic facts of Romance dialects; some phonetic clusters seem to have been borrowed by the Romance languages from pre-Romance languages. The Romance dialects and languages are particularly suited for this research-work, because in this field abundant material is available, owing to numerous preparatory works. The principal conclusion drawn by Hubschmid is the hypothesis of various pre-Indo-European layers in Romania, one of which may be the Eurafian substratum and the other more recent one, partly covering the former, may be the Hispano-Caucasian substratum; paleo-Sardinian and Basque, it seems, are related to each other. Hubschmid is not without opponents; in a review Alessio<sup>3</sup> points out errors and reproaches Hubschmid with drawing over-bold conclusions and of a certain monogenetic tendency; however he is not sparing of

encouragement and acknowledges Hubschmid as an authority in this matter.

The Romance substrata in the non-Romance areas have been touched upon by Jud (1914–1917), to whom the *Reliktwörter*, or vestiges, have given the opportunity of locating the original extension of Romanisation and of supplementing the material of use for linguistic geography. Schüle (1963) pursues similar study for the Upper Valais.

Substrata and superstrata may be said to be cornerstones of Wartburg's hypotheses as formulated in Wartburg 1936, 1939, and, for Gallo-Romance, in Wartburg 1934. He especially explains by means of the Celtic substratum the palatalisation of Latin *ū* in Gallo-Romance and, convinced of the long-term existence of a Romance-Germanic bilingualism in the north of Gaul, he links up the Germanic superstratum there with certain phenomena which, like the diphthongisation of close Romance *e* and *o*, oppose the *Langue d'oïl* to the *Langue d'oc*. He perceives a relation between the frontier dividing those two groups and an ancient Frankish political boundary. He also perceives a linguistic and historical relation between the first Burgundian kingdom and the Franco-provençal dialect group. The part he attributes to Germanic superstrata in the partition of Romania and in the evolution of Romance languages or dialects have given rise to animated reactions from Romanists, such as Vidos or Malkiel,<sup>4</sup> and up to now the discussion has not subsided. The problem of Germanic influence in Gaul has cautiously been discussed by Hilty (1968), with regard to some syntactic facts, and by Pfister (1973), who asserts that the linguistic frontier of Frankish origin, extending from the Loire to the Plateau de Langres, is an illusion, because the Frankish words which are used to support that hypotheses actually have different geographical locations; the thesis of Jud (1908–1910) according to which French *aune* is originally a Germanic word is also considered wrong, for it is really a Latin word, and consequently the frontier between *aune* and *verne*, which has been considered as representative of the extension of Frankish influence, is unreliable. Wartburg's thesis, according to which Francoprovençal has geographically and linguistically been conditioned by the first Burgundian kingdom, is questioned again. In the Symposium of Francoprovençal dialectology, in 1969, Schüle (1971) took it upon himself to refute Wartburg's principal arguments. Wartburg's methodological view, which, in spite of criticism, contains valuable elements, has been taken up by K. Baldinger (1958) for the study of Ibero-Romance.

The Germanic superstrata often pose the ticklish problem of the relation of a Germanism to such and such a Germanic dialect. Schmid



(1958) observes a double Germanic influence in the Grisons, namely that of the Alemanni in the valley of the Rhine and that of the Tyrolese in the valley of the Inn (cf. e.g. the two Rheto-Romance forms *pur* and *paur* 'peasant'), and he postulates the prolongation of the frontier between those two Germanic dialects on Romance soil under this form.

Suggestive is the view adopted (in the wake of for instance Jaberg, 1939) by Schmid, defining convergence areas, i.e. converging dialects related by some linguistic form, irrespective of their belonging to a Romance or to a non-Romance family; above (2.3.3), we mentioned an example in connection with the conservation or the loss of the declension (1956); Schmid (1951–1952) gives another one concerning the declension of the Swiss-Romansh article: the opposition of a nominative-accusative and a dative, from Latin *illi* and *illis* respectively (thus two formal cases), but in a combination which seems to be unique in Romance, exactly corresponding however to the situation found in the nearby Germanic dialects.

2.3.5 Bally (1932) has given us a model of the contrastive comparison of languages, particularly by his contrasting of French and German; Wartburg clings to similar views, for instance in the final chapter of Wartburg 1934. Since 1945, favoured by bilingualism, several books have been published, based on the structural contrasts among systems, which are mostly explored by taking good translations of literary texts.

2.3.6 Onomasiology, as a semantic study starting from the structure of the thing meant, is not of recent date, at least in Switzerland (cf. Quadri 1952); there are numerous publications, in the first half of the century, devoted to the linguistic expression of such and such a thing; not the least among them is Wartburg's dissertation. This approach has not come to an end in the period we are dealing with; the most diverse fields of extra-linguistic experience are touched upon, from the agricultural terminology to the linguistic expression of the concepts 'to say' and 'to speak' and the religious terminology, from the onomasiological description of natural facts, such as diseases, to that of manufactured objects, such as the compass. It is to be regretted that Wartburg, who incidentally used in his *FEW* work not an alphabetical classification, but a conceptual one, was not able, for lack of time, to realise the onomasiological essays which, in his view, were to complete and crown the *FEW* and of which he gives a specimen in "Los nombres de los días de la semana" (1949). Onomasiology goes hand in hand with the idea of establishing a system of concepts,

taken as extra-linguistic entities, thus independent of any particular language except for their formulation. Charles Bally (1909: 2, 223–264) already made such an attempt; we ought also to mention here Hallig-Wartburg 1952, which has served as a framework for several onomasiological investigations in Switzerland and for two onomasiological dictionaries (Baldinger 1975a, 1975b).

2.3.7 Social, cultural and historical facts play a not to be neglected part in pre-war Swiss Romance linguistics. We can distinguish two opposing aspects: (I) Extra-linguistic facts allow for a description or an explanation of linguistic facts, and (II) Extra-linguistic facts are conceived of as facts which the linguistic facts can determine or account for. The first is the case with Jud (1934), when the relative chronology of *basilica* and *ecclesia* has to be determined; and he has recourse again to that criterion (1946–1947), when, in deriving the Romansh *stuver* from *est opus*, he explains the extension of the originally impersonal verb to all persons as due to Christian influence; according to him, Christianity preached the idea of personal duty, thus expressed in all persons, and so went beyond the idea of an impersonal duty, expressed in the third person only. The second happens with Huber (1944: 27–48); in his study above the open air threshing-floor, the names of the *area*-type in the archives and the toponyms enable one to assume the occurrence of that type of object in regions where nowadays it is no longer found; here linguistics is subservient to ethnography.

These tendencies lived on after the war, although Swiss scholars nowadays do not go to extremes, as did Jud in one of the examples mentioned above. As regards aspect I, we must mention Egloff (1950), who shows, by examining the technical terminology of crafts, how society is reflected in language. He shows among other things: (1) the influence of the origin of the craftsmen on the vocabulary (in the Valais, where the greater part of the bricklayers are of Italian origin); (2) that the craftsman who works by himself (e.g. the man from Gruyère who carves wooden spoons) has no special terms for his tools, because he is the only one to use them, whereas the boatmen of the lake of Geneva, who work in teams, have at their disposal a complete technical vocabulary; (3) that a tool used by different guilds has generally the same name but with a different complement (*marteau de maçon*, *marteau de cordonnier*, etc.), whereas, if a guild uses variations on the same tool, it is given different names (*tranche*, *étampe*, *chasse*, etc.). Egloff notes a uniform, sometimes international, terminology in crafts in those cases where the apprenticeship involves a sojourn of several years in France.



As regards aspect II, we confine ourselves to pointing out an attractive article where the ethnographer Weiss (1963) tests, by means of Swiss data, the assumption that the territory of a language covers that of a civilisation; he states that this occurs very rarely or perhaps owing to non-linguistic factors; yet it does occur in a few cases, which are not fortuitous; there is for instance a linguistic basis in the superstition attached to the names of the days of the week: in French Switzerland, Friday is the day which brings misfortune; in German Switzerland, it is Wednesday; the frontier of the two forms of superstition covers the linguistic one. This phenomenon is accounted for by the fact that Wednesday, German *Mittwoch*, gives the impression of being a day by itself, because its name is the only one without the element *-tag*.

2.3.8 The publication of texts of literary or linguistic value, already important in Switzerland long before the war, with Aebischer, Cornu, Decurtins, Piaget, Steiger and Ulrich, is still going on. It is mainly occupied with medieval Gallo-Romance texts (Aebischer 1965; Mandach 1970; Rychner 1966; Wunderli 1968), less so with Italo-Romance (Ineichen 1962–1966) and Ibero-Romance (Hilty 1954) ones. For Franco-provençal, Burger (1952) published a new edition of the *Chanson de l'Escalade* and Aebischer (1950) an anthology. With regard to the Rheto-Romance of the Grisons, all kinds of texts (literary texts, charters, etc.) have been published, in particular in the *Annalas de la Società Retoromantscha*. Bezzola (1971) published an anthology of texts in an English translation.

Few alphabetical lexicons have been published — among the most important is A. Burger 1957.

Various texts have been explored from a linguistic point of view, often with the purpose of better locating and dating them, of identifying the author, of exploring the transmission of the manuscripts and of elucidating the interpretation of certain passages, like the studies devoted to the *Girart de Roussillon* (Pfister 1970), to the *Lois de Guillaume* (Wüest 1969) and to the *Livre de l'Eschiele Mahomet* (Wunderli 1965).

The thorny problem of verse in the Romance languages, to which Spoerri had devoted himself before the war, has been taken up again by M. Burger (1957); he gives a novel version of the birth of the Romance verse, based especially on the assumption that Romance verse has come from the classic Latin verse in connection with the linguistic evolution of the quantitative into a qualitative vocalic system.

We ought to mention the names of three scholars who have more

especially concentrated on philology, on the literary aspects of texts and the history thereof: Aebischer for his research on the origin, the historical background and the Scandinavian equivalents of the *Chanson de Roland* (e.g. 1954–1972), Mandach (1961—) for his study of the numerous documents belonging to the Turpinian and Tuoldian traditions in Europe and of the connection between the *Chanson de Roland* and historic reality, and Rychner for his inquiry into the *chanson de geste* (1955) and into the *fabliaux* (1960).

3 We should now glance at those methods which either have kept in the background or have declined since the war — at genetic comparative linguistics (3.1), at the method called *Wörter und Sachen* (3.2) and at the so-called idealistic tendency (3.3).

3.1 More than once, already, we have considered research-work as dealing with several Romance languages or with all Romance languages, which are looked upon as forming one organic whole from a historic point of view. Such is the dialectological research based on the theory of areal norms (2.3.3) and the approach consisting of partitioning the Romance area according to external criteria (2.3.4), which establish chronological and spatial relations between the parts of that whole. These investigations, using the traditional methodology, have in common that they pay attention rarely, or only incidentally, to reconstructing the departing-point of Romance languages, in other words to raising the issue of Common Romance (also called Proto-Romance). Many Romanists, victims of an illusion, believe indeed that the departing-point for the Romance languages is to be found in Latin texts. A. Burger (1943, 1951) has shown that the Latin of the texts is not sufficient to account for Romance languages and that Romance linguistics cannot avoid methodically reconstructing a Common Romance, taking as the starting-point the Romance languages, in the same way as Indo-European has been reconstructed from comparison of the Indo-European languages.

Reconstruction of Common Romance assumes the application of the comparative method to the Romance languages, as Meillet did with the Indo-European languages and Meyer-Lübke with the Romance languages, though the latter's comparative method is not always consistent and consequently leaves certain problems unsolved. That tradition however has been almost completely lost in Switzerland since the war or, to be more precise, since the death of its main representative, Meyer-Lübke, in 1936.