The Interdisciplinary Linguistics Program (ILP) at the University of Winnipeg (UW)

Ancient Grammars: Not For The Faint-Hearted
Karen Malcolm, English

For the last several years, I have been studying yogic philosophy out of personal interest. In preparation for teaching the History of Yogic Philosophy for Religious Studies, I became acquainted with the early scriptural sources of several eastern religions/ philosophies. There are four Vedas: each a compilation of numerous hymns, methods of ritual performances, myths and scriptural teachings. These texts are called *sruti*, which means 'revealed' scriptures (there are the equivalent in many religious traditions: for example, the Psalms in the Christian Bible). Many believe them to include words revealed directly from God to ancient *rsis* or sages during meditation. The earliest, the Rg Veda, is thought to have been compiled approximately 1200 BC. For centuries, the Vedas were performed orally only by Brahman priests. There were no written copies. In fact, people back then thought that *sruti*, words revealed directly from God, carried a particular vibration that was crucial to the harmonious functioning of the body, microscopically, the society, and macrocosmically, the entire cosmos/ universe. Some believed that if the words of God were written down, they would be vibrationally 'dead', and their power to heal or maintain anything would be severely curtailed, if not completed diminished .

The Vedas had to be transmitted/ performed with phonetic precision and perfection in order to maintain a healthy body and universe. In order to do this, priests were trained to memorize the verses/ *sutras* in very rigorous and thorough ways. They memorized individual words, groups of words including some before and others after, complete sentences, sentences spoken backwards. Sometimes they were learned accompanied by particular hand and finger positions. Mispronunciations were not only frowned upon, but punished severely: Brahmans might lose their caste or even their life. The linguistic precision demanded by the oral tradition of the Vedas may well have contributed to the rise of grammars of Sanskrit. Of the six types of supporting knowledge and areas of study pertaining to the Vedas, four related to language (Ray 1). Although these documents were primarily phonologically and morphologically oriented, they also contained grammatical, lexical and etymological information (Ray 50). They defined their terms, and then wrote sequentially specific and cumulative systems of rules that accounted for Sanskrit grammar exhaustively and completely. Although grammars fulfilled a descriptive function, their purpose was prescriptive: to ensure the purity of the oral performance of the Vedas. Scholars say there were over three hundred grammarians and a thousand works on grammar in these early times (Ray 7). The only ancient grammarian I had heard of, while preparing to teach the History of Linguistics, was 5th century BC Panini. Nineteenth and twentieth century linguists like deSaussure, Firth, Jacobson and Bloomfield considered Panini's Sanskrit grammar the model of all subsequent formal grammars (Rath 49). Bloomfield called it "a model of human intelligence"(11). Although Panini mentioned several earlier grammars and grammarians

Interdisciplinary Linguistic Program Faculty:

The ILP is anchored at the Department of Anthropology; the core of the Linguistic Faculty resides at that Department, as well as in English, Modern Languages and Classics:

Ivan Roksandic (Anthropology) teaches *Languages of the World*, *Morphology* and *Indo-European Linguistics*. His main research interests are language typology and indigenous languages of South America. His current project focuses on the indigenous toponymy in the Caribbean.

Jane Cahill resides in the department of Classics. She teaches courses in Latin and Greek, as well as *Greek and Latin in Today's English* and *The Classical Roots of Medical Terminology.*

Amy Desroches (Psychology) uses cognitive and brain imagining methods to examine reading and language development. In particular, her work focuses on the role of phonology in learning to read, and the impact that reading development has on spoken language processing.

Lois Edmund is a Clinical Psychologist who teaches Conflict Resolution Studies. Her interest is in using communication for effective prevention and resolution of conflicts.

George Fulford is an Anthropological linguist, specializing in Cree and Algonquian languages. He is especially interested in problems related to grammaticalization, language origins, and semiotics and structuralism.

Zbigniew Izydorczyk teaches at the Department of English. His areas of special interest include Old and Middle English, history of English, history of Latin, and palaeography.

Kristin Lovrien-Meuwese (Modern Languages) is interested in language learning in general and second language acquisition in particular, but has most recently worked on a sociolinguistic study of German in Manitoba.

Jorge Machín-Lucas (Modern Languages) is a specialist in XXth and XXIst Century Spanish Literature, and teaches courses in Spanish Normative Grammar and History of the Spanish Language.
During her career in linguistics

Karen Malcolm (English) has used Communication Linguistics (a development of Halliday's System Functional Grammar) and its descriptive framework, phasal analysis, to analyze and explore a great variety of texts: spoken and written, literary and non-literary.

Liliane Rodriguez (Modern Languages) teaches Linguistics, Comparative Stylistics and Translation. Her main research is in Lexicometry, Geolinguistics and Bilingualism. She is the author of several books and of

many articles in Linguistics and Translation Studies.

In addition, several courses inluded in the ILP curriculum are taught at other Departments: Classics (**Samantha Booth**); Developmental Studies (**Janet Simpson**); Rhetoric (**Tracy Whalen**).

Other UW faculty members associated with the ILP include **Linda Dietrick** (Modern Languages), **Jeffrey Newmark** (Religion and Culture), as well as no less than two Deans: **Glenn Moulaison**, the Dean of Arts, teaches *History of the French Language*, whereas **James Currie**, the Dean of Science, works on mathematical models of language.

Students

Admissions: Students interested in majoring in Linguistics should contact the Coordinator of the ILP.

Colloquium: Every year in April, after the exam period, the Annual Student Colloquium is held, offering to students an opportunity to present the results of their research to the audience of their colleagues. In 2013/14, **the XV Annual Student Colloquium in Linguistics will take place on Thursday, April 24th, from 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM, in room 3D01, on main campus.**

Award: The Angela Mattiaci Memorial Scholarship in Interdisciplinary Linguistics is awarded every October to a student majoring in linguistics with a distinguished performance in ILP courses. For more information visit our website at: http://www.uwinnipeg.ca/index/interdisciplinary-linguistics

Spring 2014		
LING 2003 / ANTH 2403 / ENGL 2802 Syntax	Tu-Th 10 AM-02 PM	K. Malcolm
SOC 3214 Mass Communication and Media	Tu-Th 10 AM-12:15 PM	W. Nelson
Fall/Winter 2014/15		
LING 1001 Introduction to Linguistics	MWF 09:30-10:20 AM	TBA
ENGL 3812 History of the English Language	Tu-Th 11:30 AM-12:45 PM	Z. Izydorczyk
Fall 2014		
LING 2002 / ANTH 2402 / ENGL 2805 Morphology	MWF 01:30-02:20 PM	I. Roksandic
CLAS 2850 The Classical Roots of Medical Terminology	Tu-Th 02:30-03:45 PM	TBA
CRS 2252 Conflict and Communication	M 06-09 PM	C. H. Morris
LING 3302 / FREN 3204 French Morphology and Syntax	MW 04-05:15 PM	L. Rodriguez
LING 3104 / 4104 South American Languages	MWF 10:30-11:20 AM	I. Roksandic
LING 3305 / 4305 / FREN 3205 / 4205 Studies in Bilingualism	F 02:30-05:15 PM	L. Rodriguez
ANTH 3113 / 4113 Algonquian Ethnography	W 09:30 AM-12:20 PM	G. Fulford
DEV 3300 Speech and Language Disorders in Children	Th 05:30-08:30 PM	J. Simpson
RHET 3153 Studies in the Rhetorics of Gender	Tu-Th 02:30-03:45 PM	J. Kearns
SPAN 3301 History of the Spanish Language	MW 02:30-03:45 PM	J. Machín-Lucas
ENGL 4823 Old English Language	TBA	Z. Izydorczyk
Winter 2015		
LING 2001 / ANTH 2401 / ENGL 2803 Phonetics and Phonology	Tu-Th 02:30-03:45 PM	TBA
ING 2004 / ANTH 2405 / ENGL 2806 Semantics	MWF 09:30-10:20 AM	TBA
LING 2101 / ANTH 2406 / ENGL 2804 Language and Culture	W 06-09 PM	K. Malcolm
LING 2102 / ANTH 2400 Method and Theory in Linguistic Anthropology	Tu-Th 08:30-09:45 AM	G. Fulford
ING 2103 / ANTH 2404 Languages of the World	MWF 01:30-02:20 PM	I. Roksandic
CRS 2252 Conflict and Communication	MW 04-05:15 PM	L. Edmund
PSYC 2620 Psycholinguistics	Tu-Th 02:30-03 :45 PM	A. Desroches
LING 3001 / ANTH 3405 / ENGL 3800 Textual Analysis	Tu-Th 10-11:15 AM	K. Malcolm
LING 3002 Discourse Analysis	Tu-Th 01-02:15 PM	K. Malcolm
LING 3102 / 4102 / ANTH 3406 / 4406 Indo-European Linguistics and Mythology	MWF 10:30-11:20 AM	I. Roksandic

who had influenced him, subsequent Katyayani (300 BC) and Patanjali (200 BC) considered Panini's perfect, complete, a *sruti* in itself, revealed directly from God. In their work over the next few centuries they did not try and change it, rather they added new sutras to it while they commented on others; all in order to keep Panini's grammar current and complete despite the linguistic changes they recognized in the use of Sanskrit throughout the intervening time and despite regional variations. Despite the normal evolution of language, scholars have been amazed how little this linguistic variation has touched the recitation of the Vedas.

Before my recent foray into the realm of ancient grammarians, I had credited the introduction of core linguistic terms like noun, verb and sentence to Greek scholars Aristotle and Plato some time later; however, I was surprised to discover these terms in earlier Indian grammars. Dr. Izydorczyk tells me the Greeks were also interested in the purity of their language, but for a different reason: to maintain the perfection of Homer's literary classics.

Not surprisingly, given the religious motivational purpose of grammars, many early grammarians were also interested in religious philosophy, and included philosophical discussions of language in their works. They considered words eternal, in the same way that everything that was created by Brahman was considered eternal, without beginning, without end, completely pure and com-

pletely free (Kulkarni 121). They were interested in the relationship between words, thought, creation, reality and consciousness. Bhartrhari (650 CE) introduced the theory of *sphota* which suggested that the meaning of words came from a revelatory intuition that pre-existed before thought and before speech (Rath 46). Bhartrhari talked of three levels of language: ordinary articulated speech/*vaikhari*, the words of mental thinking/*madhyama* and the deepest origins of these ideas in an undifferentiated realm of metaphysical possibility/*pasyanti vac* (ibid).

Tenth and eleventh century Abhinavagupta took this a step farther. In what Padoux calls his phonemic emanation theory, Abhinavagupta maps the creation of everything by mapping a phonemic symbol on each of the thirty-six tattvas or primary principles of the evolution of reality (223). This was a development of a more simplified model of the tattvas by the earlier Sankhya School. Actually, what Abhinavagupta did was even more complex: he mapped symbolic phonemes on to the primary principles of creation, and at the same time his choice of phonemes recreated both the evolution of the sounds which comprise the Sanskrit language and the evolution of consciousness as articulated by Kashmir Shaivism (Singh 132). And by doing so, not only did he superimpose the evolution of the language on the evolution of the universe and the evolution of consciousness itself, but he also mapped the yogi's path of 'involution', or return to source:

from the differentiated, variated universe to the meditative experience of non-differentiated unity.

A few years ago, I read a sentence by Padoux on Abhinavagupta that stopped me cold: "Grammar is the gateway to salvation" (xi). I was dumbfounded. However, now that I begin to understand and experience the realm of pasyanti vac, as Abhinavagupta has foretold in his mapping of the process of return to source, I see that grammar is potentially much more than the *sthula*/mundane level of *vaikhari* speech that we explore in linguistics classes. Perhaps, it is a doorway to liberation from all limitations.

Works Cited

Kulkarni, M. 2004. "Contributions of Katyayana to the Paninian Grammar." In Ray, B.'s *Panini to Patanjali.*
Padoux, A. 1990. *Vac*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
Rath, K. 2004. "Genesis of Sanskrit Grammar." In Ray, B.'s *Panini to Patanjali.*
Ray, B. 2004. *Panini to Patanjali a Grammatical March*. New Delhi: DK Printworld Ltd. Singh, J. (trans.) 1988. *Abhinavagupta A Trident of Wisdom*. Ed. B.Baumer. New York: State University Press.

An Ethnographer's Understanding of Algonquian Languages and Linguistics
George Fulford, Anthropology

One of my great joys is teaching a second-year course in linguistic anthropology here at the University of Winnipeg. The course draws on concepts from cultural anthropology, biological anthropology and linguistics. Students acquire a working knowledge of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics in the first half of the course. In the second half they apply their linguistic skills to understand a diverse array of topics including language evolution, the acquisition of speech and signing, the role of language in identity formation, writing systems, and the analysis of cultural performances as varied as rap music and American Sign Language poetry. It is an exciting journey!

It seemed natural to extend the methods of linguistic anthropology from teaching to my research on Swampy Cree derivational morphology. But outside the classroom one encounters an atmosphere of disciplinary divisiveness. At professional conferences linguists and cultural anthropologists exist in two solitudes. This is most evident at the Algonquian Conference, which over the past 45 years has become the pre-eminent gathering place for those doing work on Algonquian languages and cultures[1]. Presenters at the Conference are divided into two separate groups, one pertaining to linguistics and the other to ethnography. There is a certain logic to doing this, as linguists' presentations typically involve highly-technical concepts which go over the head of ethnographers, the majority of whom lack linguistic training. At the same time, linguists seem to find the conceptual tools used by ethnographers in their presentations, drawing as they do on the fuzzy logic of "culture", to be frustratingly vague and imprecise.

In their presentations at the Algonquian conference my linguistic colleagues tend to discuss matters that in one way or another pertain to textual transcription. Details pertaining to grammatical structure and stylistics also figure prominently. But little is said about matters pertaining to culture. My colleagues who are cultural anthropologists tend to present on topics such as ethnohistory, traditional land use, spiritual beliefs and practices, material culture, and education. Little is said in any focused way about language.

The work of both the linguists and cultural anthropologists who present at the Algonquian conference is of great value. But the divide between these two "tribes" is a pernicious obstacle to interdisciplinarity. And the divide shows no sign of diminishing. So why is there is growing interest among students in the crossover discipline of linguistic anthropology, while at the same time such a vast gulf separates linguists and anthropologists at professional venues?

It is my lingering suspicion that the disciplinary divide at the Algonquian Conference finds its way back to controversies going back at least 80 years. My linguistic colleagues' preoccupation with meticulous text transcription and the details of formal language structure finds its way back to Leonard Bloomfield while my ethnographic colleagues preoccupation with the relatively amorphous concept of culture finds it way back to Edward Sapir.

Bloomfield's rigorous approach to phonology and morphology gave his descriptive studies of Menomini, Fox, Ojibwe and Cree a much richer level of detail than the works of previous linguists. His comparative research into the structure of Proto-Algonquian, based as it was on assumptions about historical changes in form irrespective of changes in meaning, may also have influenced his theoretical approach to grammar.

Bloomfield moved from what he described (1933: vii) as a "mentalistic" approach to language to a "behaviouristic" one in order to avoid relying on a theory of mind to supplement "the facts of language". For the sake of expedience Bloomfield reduced the role of meaning from a cornerstone of language to an epiphenomenon of the speech act. This had a tremendous impact on how linguists have subsequently approached the remarkable rich der-

---

[1] The term "Algonquian" is used by linguists and anthropologists to describe the language family that includes Cree, Ojibwe, and nearly 30 other related Indigenous languages spoken across Canada and the United States.

ivational morphology of Algonquian languages. According to Bloomfield, to define the meaning of every morpheme in a language "we should have to have a scientifically accurate knowledge of everything in the speakers' world." Since this is nearly impossible, Bloomfield advised linguists to refrain from speculating about the meaning of morphemes in Algonquian languages (1933: 140).

Edward Sapir countered Bloomfield's assertions by suggesting that linguists must consider matters pertaining both to meaning and form. "Human beings," Sapir (1929: 162) wrote, "do not live in the objective world alone...but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society." "It is quite an illusion," he continued,

to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems or communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality...We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation.

Sapir (1914: 14) described thought as "the highest latent potential content of speech" and language as "the outward facet of thought on the highest, most generalized, level of symbolic expression." Unlike Bloomfield, Sapir saw psychology, linguistics and ethnography as being engaged in a complementary exploration of the relationship of form and meaning in human life.

Sapir embraced the challenges of understanding the derivational morphology of Algonquian languages. He likened words in Cree and other Algonquian languages to "tiny imagist poems" and speculated that this quality is likely related to polysynthesis (1921: 143, 228).

To gain a glimpse into how Sapir understood Cree this process lets look at just one of the 474 roots which in Cree which are used to create words. The root I have chosen is *aapii* which denotes the idea of spatial and temporal length and can be translated as 'stringy or string-like'. Consider the following words which incorporate this root: *piishaakanaapii* '(unbraided) rope', *sheshtakweyaapii* 'braided rope', and *oshkooshkwayaanaapii* 'rawhide rope'; *anaapii* 'a net' (literally a "concave string") *aahchaapii* 'a bow' (literally a "moving string"), *mikweyaapii* 'a vein or artery' ("blood string"), *mitisiiyaapii* 'umbilical cord' ("belly-button string"), and *otaapii* 'root' ("sucking string"); *taapiikonew* 's/he strings (beads) or files something animate (the stem means literally "stringing-sewing-hand-movement"), *taapiisikoskochikan* 'a stirrup' (literally a 'stringing-foot-jumping-movement-thing") and *taapitoonepichikan* 'a bridle or bit' (literally a "stringing-mouth-pulling-thing").

It is quite obvious to my students, not to mention most fluent Cree speakers, that the 11 words mentioned in the previous paragraph all share the root *aapii* as well as the associated concept of 'string or string-like'. Yet linguists who have ventured to comment to me about this morpheme are extremely reluctant to admit that this is the case. At best they begrudgingly relegate such semantic domains to the realm of "folk taxonomy", often with the proviso that native speakers (and perhaps ethnographers too) are unable to objectively understand the grammatical structure of the languages they speak and study. This strikes me as a pernicious double bind.

The notions of becoming, fluidity, and creativity are inherent in the derivational morphology of Algonquian languages. Hundreds of different derivational morphemes describe the characteristic shapes, movements and spatial and positional indices characterizing the Algonquian inscape. The appearance of such morphemes is not an isolated or restricted feature; it is the most salient characteristic of derivational morphology in Algonquian languages.

It has fallen largely to scholars outside the field of Algonquian linguistics to explore the semantic structure of Algonquian languages. Since the late 1970s Peter Denny has been a guiding force in this area. Denny's method (1978, 1981, 1989) is to assemble a paradigm of words in a given language (usually Cree or Ojibwe) which share a particular morpheme. By comparing and contrasting the meaning of the words he is then able to sketch the semantic domain of the shared morpheme. This is precisely the method which my students and I

employ when analyzing Cree words such as those sharing the root *aapii* and it has proven to be a powerful method of analysis. It also sheds considerable light on the relationship between language and worldview (a central preoccupation of Sapir).

Moving forward to fuller understanding of the derivational morphology of Algonquian languages requires a synthesis in the paradigms presently used by linguists and ethnographers. This synthesis must draw from the toolkits of both ethnography and linguistics to be compelling and successful. It must, in short, build on the approach of linguistic anthropology. I am confident that this synthesis is underway among students who are studying linguistic anthropology at the University of Winnipeg. Given the number of new textbooks in this field (Ahearn 2011, Duranti 2004 and 2009, Hickerson 1999, Ottenheimer 2013) I am also hopeful that is happening at other universities too. Slowly but surely a new generation of scholars will have an impact on the direction of research in the field. One sure sign that this is happening will be when the disciplinary divide between linguists and ethnographers at the Algonquian conference diminishes.

References Cited

Ahearn, 2011 *Living Language: an Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Bloomfield, Leonard 1933 *Language* . New York: Henry Holt and Company.

---------- 1962 *The Menomini Language*. (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Denny, Peter 1978 Semantics Roles of Medials within Algonquian Verbs. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 44(2): 153-155.

---------- 1981 Algonquian Word Structure from the Viewpoint of Logical Semantics. *Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics* 16: 21-29.

---------- 1984 Semantic Verb Classes and Abstract Finals. Pp. 241-271 in *Papers of the Fifteenth Algonquian Conference*. William Cowan, ed.

Ottawa: Carleton University.

---------- 1989 The Nature of Polysynthesis in Algonquian and Eskimo. Pp. 230-258 in *Theoretical Perspectives on Native American Languages*. Donna B. Gerdts and Karin Michelson, editors. (State University of New York Press).

Duranti, Alessandro 2005 *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

---------- 2009 *Linguistic Anthropology, a reader*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Hickerson, Nancy Parrott 1999 *Linguistic Anthropology*, 2nd edition. Toronto: Thompson Wadsworth.

Ottenheimer, Harriet Joseph 2013 *The Anthropology of Language,* 3rd edition. Toronto: Thompson Wadsworth.

Sapir, Edward 1921 *Language* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich).

---------- 1929 [1949] The Status of Linguistics as a Science. Pp. 160-166 *in Edward Sapir: Selected Writings in Language, Culture and Personality* . David G. Mandelbaum, editor (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Comparing dictionaries: To swear or not to swear…

Carolina Crescenzi and Rachelle Foidart,

Students in the Department of Modern Languages

Prefaces are an indication of the type of dictionary they introduce. We will briefly describe and compare three Canadian "French dictionaries". The following are the dictionaries we will explore: The *Dictionnaire des canadianismes* by Gaston Dulong (1989), the *Dictionnaire de la langue québécoise* by Léandre Bergeron (1980) and the *Dictionnaire nord-américain de la langue française* Louis-Alexandre Bélisle (1989). In conclusion and based on those prefaces, we will present *our* ideal version.

The *Dictionnaire des Canadianismes* stems from information collected through some thirty dialectological surveys. Its author has taken the most interesting linguistic facts according to personal preference. He has also added usages accumulated during his years as a professor at the University of Laval. This is not a dictionary of standard French but of Canadianisms attested in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Ontario. It is both descriptive as well as prescriptive, and contains 8,000 entries which exclude swearwords and phonetic variations. A list of symbols is enclosed in the beginning; some are there to discourage the use of certain words, while others indicate the degree of dispersion of the word within Quebec. The register and age of the words are indicated if needed. Anglicisms and Amerindianisms are also identified. Words are presented with a definition in standard French, a synonym, an example and geolinguistic information.

The lexicon of the *Dictionnaire de la langue Québécoise* is derived from Quebec French words found in dictionaries, glossaries, and the spoken language. Words that can be easily found in a *Robert*, a *Larousse* or a *Quillet* were systematically removed. This is not a dictionary of standard French and contains only Quebecisms. There are no symbols indicating age, register or dispersion, which is done in order to avoid a biased opinion of certain words; only the part of speech and gender are indicated. The dictionary resembles a glossary, offering a synonym, sometimes a description and an example all in Quebec French. It contains 20,000 words, which include spelling and phonetic variations as well as swearwords. A thematic glossary is also included at the end of the dictionary, which contains most of the words divided into themes.

Lastly, the foundation of the French language entries in the *Dictionnaire nord-américain de la langue française* is taken from the *Littré-Beaujean* (1874). However, Bélisle had to add information in order to complete definitions and bring them up to date. In addition to its standard French content, the dictionary has Canadianisms, which come mainly from the *Glossaire du Parler français au Canada.* To these, he added his own findings, gathered in Quebec where he has lived and worked for more than half a century. Being a descriptive and corrective dictionary, Canadianisms are divided into three categories (each with its own symbol): *de bon aloi* (acceptable form); colloquial and folk; and barbarisms and (American) English words, not gallicized. This is a language dictionary containing 60,000 entries, in which one will find citations and examples. In addition, it has some 100 pages of biographical, geographical and historical information, making it encyclopedic as well.

With the help of such diverse dictionaries as these, we have put together ideas of what our own ideal Canadian "French dictionary" would look like. First of all, our dictionary would be differential and not integrated, only including Canadianisms and giving it a specific purpose. The lexicon would contain Canadianisms from all parts of Canada, unlike the *Dictionnaire de la langue québécoise* which only contains Quebecisms. In addition, the definitions would be in standard French and synonyms would be provided if available. Similar to the *Dictionnaire des canadianismes*, we would integrate a system of symbols. Symbols referring to word dispersion would represent all of Canada. The nomenclature would include all variations of a word: morphological, syntactic, phonetic and orthographic. Each entry would be accompanied by a phonetic transcription and, if possible, geographical information. Our dictionary would not be corrective, but rather descriptive, in order to provide objective information on the usage of words. Its most important aspect would be to ensure the inclusion of words that are found throughout Canada, and not limited to Quebec. Finally, regardless of the register and status of a word, all Canadianisms would be included — even swearwords!

The Influence of Celtic Languages on English
Deirdre Tomkins, A Linguistic Major

Celtic culture flourished from approximately 1200 BC to approximately 400 AD, initially dominating Europe, but ultimately relegated to small pockets within the United Kingdom and Brittany. While the beauty of Celtic art and metallurgy is revealed in its impact on the cultural fabric of Britain, common convention holds that, despite centuries of co-existence, Celtic languages offered very few contributions to the developing English language. Scholars of English acknowledge the contributions of Scandinavian and French languages; why, then, should Celtic influence be considered minimal? The most frequent rationale is that the Celts were "underdogs" in Britain, from any viewpoint. Politically, militarily, culturally, they have been described throughout history as inferior to a succession of intruders: Romans, Anglo-Saxons, Danes, and French. Rarely did Celtic loanwords enter English, as the "conquerors" had no need to adopt the lexicon of the "conquered" (Filppula and Klemola 155).

The few previously acknowledged examples of Celtic influence are lexical, primarily place- and river-names. Kenneth Jackson correlates the incidence of Brittonic river names with successive waves of

Anglo-Saxon invasions. (Brittonic is the Insular Celtic branch from which the Welsh, Cornish and Breton languages developed.) Eastern Britain, home to early English settlements up to the VI century, shows very few Brittonic names. In the later-VI and early-VII centuries, the wave of Anglo-Saxon expansion extends into southern and then northern England. Brittonic names are more common here, and their origins more securely attested. In addition to larger rivers, a number of small rivers have Celtic names. From the mid-VII to early-VIII century, Anglo-Saxon territory extends west and north to the borders of Cornwall and Scotland. Large and small rivers, even streams, have Celtic names here. Modern-day Wales and Cornwall remained Brittonic up to the Norman conquest of 1066; this territory never was Anglo-Saxon (Jackson 220-223). Here, Brittonic names predominate, illustrating the correlation: the longer the territory withstood Anglo-Saxon invasion, the greater the retention of Brittonic river-names. Jackson and others postulated that Britons had survived to varying degrees across the landscape (229). As bilingual speakers, they would have been partially responsible for the transference of Brittonic place- and river-names to Anglo-Saxon. Citing also the transference of personal names (*CadMann (Pr.W) > Caedmon (AS)), Jackson suggests that close relationships and intermarriage between Brittonic and Anglo-Saxon cultures were frequent (243-4).

Historically, few scholars have considered Celtic influence on English. Multiple sources claim that the paucity of Celtic loanwords proves that syntax and phonology would have been similarly non-influential,

ascribing this to the low social status of the Celts (Filppula et al 225). Over the past two decades, however, that convention has been revisited. New archaeological and historical evidence has emerged about early relationships between Celts and Anglo-Saxons. Genetic studies support the theory that, rather than being completely eliminated by the Anglo-Saxons, Celts co-existed during a long period of biculturalism, and were gradually absorbed into the new culture (Filppula and Klemola 156). Advances in the general theory of language contact indicate that intense language shifts of large populations, when coupled with non-formal learning, will produce changes in phonology and grammar rather than in vocabulary (Filppula and Klemola 157). In second-language acquisition, we bring our own sound systems to the new language, and construct phrases based upon knowledge of our native syntax. Parents' accented semi-mastery of the language influences the phonology and sentence structure of the next generation. It is insufficient to consider only vocabulary when determining the extent of contact language influence.

Not all scholars ignored Celtic influence, however. Keller was first to highlight syntactic influence in 1925, while J.R.R. Tolkien in 1963 explored Welsh influence on English at the phonological, lexical and syntactical levels (Filppula et al 226). Several scholars marked the dismissal of Celtic influence as "Anglo-Saxonism", a biased relic from the 19th century. (Conversely, proponents of the Celtic hypothesis have been labeled "Substrato-maniacs" or "Celto-maniacs" for their enthusiasm (Filppula and Klemola 157)).

Peter Schrijver posits two varie-

ties of British Celtic during, and following, the Roman occupation. In the Romanized Lowland Zone, Latin was the dominant or only language: Lowland British Celts became bilingual, if not primary, Latin speakers. The Highland Zone in western and northern Britain adopted many Latin words, indicative of the low prestige of existing British Celtic. In the post-Roman era, however, significant changes occurred in phonology and grammar which were similar to changes in Late Latin (Schrijver 194). This suggests that the incoming Anglo-Saxon invaders pushed wealthier Lowland Latin speakers towards the west and north, carrying upper-class Late Latin accents into existing Highland British Celtic. This influence subsequently passed to Brittonic descendents Welsh, Cornish and Breton. Meanwhile, the rural poor stayed in the Lowland Zone, and imported their lower-class Celtic-Latin accents into then-developing Old English (195).

John McWhorter examines the emergence of periphrastic *do* in English, stating, "English is the only Germanic language with a semantically empty syntactic place-filling *do*." (168). This innovation first was attested in the 1400s; its usage increased rapidly into the 1700s. Periphrastic *do* is seen in both Breton and Cornish, thus must have originated in Old Cornish before migration to Breton. *Do* subsequently passed to English through Middle Cornish (167-8).

Markku Filppula notes the *it*-cleft construction shows close syntactic parallels between English and Celtic. ("It is money that I love" versus "I love money".) Chronologically, this construction first appeared both in Brittonic and Goidelic Insular branches, and may

even date back to Continental Celtic (Filppula 284). Filppula notes that *it*-clefting seems to occur in conjunction with less flexible word order (279-282). The occurrence of this innovation in English, Celtic, French and Portuguese suggests an areal consideration. *It*-clefting is not commonly used in Germanic languages, which utilize other constructions to create emphasis (Filppula 288).

Theo Vennemann investigates Yes/No questions, illustrating the disparity between answer patterns in English and German via the marriage vow – a fixed ritual with a prescribed manner of response. In English, "Will you have/take X to be your lawful wedded partner?", or "Do you take...?" is answered via a short sentence, with "I will" or "I do". In German, "Do you want to love and honour X...?" is answered, unfailingly, with "*Ja!*" (311-3). Irish English also exhibits an extreme avoidance of Yes/No answers. "Do/make" are used often as auxiliaries: "Did you drink the tea?" "I did"; or the verb of the question is repeated in the answer: "Will you come?" "I will come" (321-2). This is a Late Middle, Early Modern English attested innovation (330-1), with close parallels in both Irish and Welsh. Carried from Brittonic to Anglo-Saxon, the innovation slowly worked its way up from the vernacular in Old English towards emergence in educated discourse by the Middle English period (326). As Tolkien noted regarding the attestation of Celtic influence, "The records of Old English are mainly learned or aristocratic; we have no transcripts of village-talk. For any glimpse of what was going on beneath the cultivated surface we must wait until

the Old English period of letters is over." (qtd in Laker 21).

David White also examines an areal Celtic influence. His research lists nearly one hundred possible "Brittonicisms", studied by a variety of scholars, sorts them within an areal framework, and explains why they cannot be due to Norse or French influence, but must rather be ascribed to the influence of a Celtic substratum (306-324). White concludes:

...the traditional denial of Brittonic influence fails not only to explain *why* the major innovations of the Middle English period originate in the South West and North, but also to recognize *that* these innovations are for the most part resemblances to Brittonic. Likewise, the conventional wisdom fails not only to explain *why* English diverges from other Germanic, but also to recognize *that* in so doing English converges toward Brittonic (324).

From this brief exploration we may understand that the Celtic languages *did* contribute to the development of English phonology and syntax in significant and enduring manners. In conclusion, not only were Celtic peoples *not* extirpated by Anglo-Saxons, rather they left a distinct trace to their identities in their unique stamp on the English language.

Works Cited

Filppula, Markku. "The rise of *it*-clefting in English: areal-typological and contact-linguistic considerations." *English Language and Linguistics* 13.2 (2009): 267–293. Cambridge University Press.

Filppula, Markku and Juhani Klemola, eds. "Special issue on Re-evaluating the Celtic hypothesis." *English Language and Linguistics* 13.2 (2009): 155–161. Cambridge University Press.

Filppula, Markku; Paulasto, Heli; Klemola, Juhani. *English and Celtic in Contact. Routledge Studies in Germanic Linguistics, Volume 13.* Taylor & Francis, 2008. 9 November 2012 <http://lib.myilibrary.com?ID=139520>

Jackson, Kenneth. *Language and History in Early Britain*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1953. Print.

Laker, Stephen. "The English Negative Comparative Particle." *Transactions Of The Philological Society* 106.1 (2008): 1-28. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 2 Nov. 2012.

McWhorter, J. H.. "What else happened to English? A brief for the Celtic hypothesis." *English Language and Linguistics* 13.2 (2009): 163–191. Cambridge University Press.

Schrijver, Peter. "Celtic influence on Old English: phonological and phonetic evidence." *English Language and Linguistics* 13.2 (2009): 193-211. Cambridge University Press.

Vennemann, Theo. "Celtic influence in English? Yes and No." *English Language and Linguistics* 13.2 (2009): 309-334. Cambridge University Press.

White, David. "On the Areal Pattern of 'Brittonicity' in English and Its Implications." Pp 306-335 in *The Celtic Englishes IV: the Interface between English and the Celtic Languages; Proceedings of the Fourth International Colloquium on the 'Celtic Englishes'Held at the University of Potsdam in Golm (Germany) from 22 - 26 September 2004,* Hildegard L. C. Tristram, ed. Universitat Potsdam, 2006. Print.

The Slayer and the Slain: a Formula in Indo-European Poetics

Stephen Kesselman, Major in Linguistics

Consider the language of poetry in Indo-European poetics as a sort of a grammar. Beyond the prescriptions of the language itself there is a grammar of poetics composed of the phonetic features, rhythmic figures, diction and devices used to convey extralinguistic meaning in a piece. One of these grammatical figures is the poetic formula – a particular linguistic construction of vocabulary and syntax that acts as a vehicle for semantic themes (Watkins 1995: 28). In other words, it is a grouping of words employed under common metrical conditions to express a given idea (Lord 1960: 4). In traditional oral poetry, perfection of the poet's craft lay in applying formulas and formulaic expressions to a tale – acting as building blocks of meaning on a rough story outline. These formulas are a "verbal expression of the traditional culture" (Watkins 1987: 207) and the poets the custodians of this tradition. In investigating the presence and commonality of formulae through testimony from the myths of daughter languages one can really only hope to scratch the surface of what they can tell us. However, their study offers a rich opportunity for insight into and interpretation of early Indo-European culture.

A central characteristic of the poetic formula is its rigidity in form and perseverance over time. This rigidity makes them easily replicable over various tales so that, tweaking only for particular characters and circumstances, the poet can apply them to numerous storylines and engage an audience in recognizing formulas and anticipating outcomes. Considering these functions – building blocks and audience engagement – formulas have a tendency to encode culturally significant features and phenomena (793). If a researcher can identify poetic formulas from testimonial cross-linguistic and cross-cultural, then a researcher has identified an aspect of the story that has persevered when other features, even those as seemingly important as characters, setting and events, have not. Recurrent formulas indicate an archaic preservation of enduring cultural themes and so offer a glimpse into the perspective and preoccupations of the proto-culture.

The theme dealt with here is that of Order over Chaos – a Hero triumphing over an Adversary – represented most commonly in Indo-European poetics by a Hero Slaying a Serpent. Cross-culturally this chaos is defined in a variety of ways; in Indo-Iranian it is often the blockage of life giving forces (water, sunlight) as with the Indian dragon *Vrtra* or the Zoroastrian evil spirit *Angra Mainiiu*; in Irish, Anatolian, Ancient Greek and Germanic mythology it is generally whatever threatens the institution of reciprocity and hospitality, a role taken up by the stereotypical Germanic dragon, protector of great treasure, who keeps wealth from circulating and threatens gift exchange (Watkins 1995: 300). However, a particular "Indo-European touch" (Watkins 1995: 322) sets this formula apart from those of similar cultural mythologies. Watkins defines this particular touch as an asymmetry in the formula, represented here:

Hero [Slays Serpent]
Hero [*g^when *og^whis]
(Watkins 1995: 322)
* *indicates reconstructed Proto-Indo-European lexis*

The portion in square brackets indicates the formula while the entire idea represents the theme. The "Indo-European touch" is the uneven correspondence of formula to theme. This results from a lack of overt reference to the subject (*hero*) in the clause of action (*slaying*). The formula defines the hero without explicitly mentioning who they are, while the slain is always named. In place of clear reference to the hero, several variants may appear: an epithet, such as 'Slayer', may be used for the hero's name, the weapon used may be promoted to grammatical subject of the phrase such as in the Vedic: *varahan ayoagraya han* – "iron-tipped arrow slew the boar" (RV 10.99.6), or the Hero and Adversary may switch grammatical roles entirely (Watkins 1995: 302) – this phenomenon will be dealt with shortly.

Within these myths, however, there is always a clear danger that the hero will be killed, or instances where the hero figure is unclear. This is particularly evident when the serpent is instead a heroic human adversary. Consider the Iliad and the hostilities between Hector

and Patroklos and between Achilles and Hector. Here vengeance is the motive and the two sides of the formula, Hero and Villain, are subjectively defined. Therefore we re-write the formula as such:

$$\text{-------------------------} \rightarrow$$
$$[\text{Hero}_1\ [\text{Slays}\ *g^when]\ \text{Hero}_2]\ (326)$$
$$\leftarrow \text{-------------------------}$$

This modified formula reflects the "bidirectional, reversible character of any hostile action between adversaries" (329). It allows for the hero to possess characteristics of the adversary, making for an ambiguous or antithetical hero. For illustration of this phenomenon we look to the stories of Indo-European mythology.

The RigVeda tells of the story of a Trita Aptya who, with the help of Indra, slays a three-headed dragon: *trisirsanam saptarasmim jaghan-van* (RV 2.11.19) - "having slain the three-headed, seven-bridled (Visvarupa)". There is also the Avestan story of Thraetona who, with the help of VoreVrayna, slays a three-headed demon: *yo janat azim dahakem vrizafanem vri-kameresam xsuuas.asim* (YT 14.38.40): "slew the dragon Azi Dahaka, the three-jawed, three-headed, six-eyed…". Set overtop one another, we begin immediately to notice some commonalities in formula and diction. Compare these two stories to the myth of Traitana, found in the Brhaddevata, called the "Saga of Dirghatamas". The story tells of an old man, Dirgh, who is bound and thrown into a river by his slaves. His prayer saves him from the waters but one of his slaves, Traitana, tries to behead him with a sword, ultimately slaying himself instead: *siro yad asya traitano vitaksat svayam dasa*

uro amsav api gdha (Brh. Dev. 4.21) - "…when Traitana tries to hew off his head, the Dasa eats up his own breast and two shoulders" (Watkins 1995: 317).

In cutting off his own breast and two shoulders Traitana becomes Trita Aptya's three-headed dragon and Thraetona's three-headed demon (Watkins 1995: 317). These stories share a common formulaic diction that suggests they are simply different versions of the same Indo-Iranian myth. All involve heroes setting out to slay an adversary, alongside some enlisted help – Trita and Indra, Thraetona and VoreVrayna, Traitana and his fellow slaves – and all involve the slaying of a three-headed beast. The only difference lays in the fact that Traitana, called *dasa* meaning both 'slave' as well as 'demon', becomes the three-headed beast of the previous myths. This illustrates the aforementioned phenomenon of the Hero and Adversary switching grammatical roles – a continuation of the formula whereby the Hero indeed becomes the Monster.

Ambiguity, bidirectionality and omission of overt subject reference in the serpent slaying formula allow for another phenomenon in Indo-Iranian poetics – the antithetical hero. A common monstrous adversary in this cultural mythology is the boar (Vedic: *varaha*, Avestan: *varaza*). This animal, representing a beastliness and evil character, is often used in place of explicit reference to the hero (325). For example, the hymn to Mithra describes "Ahura-created VoreVrayna in the shape of a wild boar; a frequent image of the heroic deity, which emphasizes his fearsome monstrous qualities" (320). This assimilation

of the hero to a boar seems to compromise the notion of heroic purity and renders the hero-monster dichotomy imperfect, non-absolute. This sentiment is reflected too in descriptions of the Vedic deity Indra, who is described to the Panis by the divine bitch Sarama as "not one to be deceived, he deceives" - *dabhyam dabhat sa* (RV 4.23.7a). Indra's characterization as deceitful is in spite of the fact that Truth triumphing over Deceit is a pervasive theme across Vedic mythology (Watkins 1995: 328). Consider such phrases in the Vedas as *rtasya dhitir vrjinani hanti* – "devotion to truth smites the wicked" (RV 4.23.8b), *druham jighamsan* "seeking to smite falsehood" (RV 4.23.7a), or recall how it was prayer – true words – that saved old man Dirgh on the river. Such antithetical characters as this rely on the reversible nature of hostile action between adversaries and the formula that supports it (Watkins 1995: 329).

So what does this formula suggest as far as insight into a culture and proto-culture? Perhaps Proto-Indo Europeans saw hero figures as imperfect and not absolute. Perhaps they perceived conflict as impossible to objectively split into a simple binary of right and wrong, good and bad. Perhaps their view toward hostile relations reflected their pervasive institution of reciprocity, whereby the relationship between hero and adversary is indeed a reciprocal one; each possesses characteristics of the other and are, or should to a certain degree, be sympathetic to one another's aims.

In any event, evidence for the perseverance of this poetic formula through great periods of time, even

up to the modern age, is fodder for further study. One could examine how this reciprocal formula may have influenced such iconic grammatical figures as the Old Irish *gonas gentar* – "he who kills will be killed" – or the Early Welsh *ef wanei wanwyd* – "he who would slay was slain" (326). Or one could even investigate such modern English words as 'to slay', which arguably entails, or retains, some level of fantastical meaning. As Watkins maintains, a proper linguistic theory must account for the creativity of human language, but it must also account for the preservation of formulaic linguistic behaviour over millennia (793). Identification and reconstruction of surface formulae in poetry and mythology stand as flags for the historical linguist to investigate further – beacons indicating some cultural insight is to be revealed.

References

Livanos, C. (2011). A Case Study in Byzantine Dragon-Slaying: Digenes and the Serpent. *Oral Tradition,* 26(1), Center for Studies in Oral Tradition. Retrieved November 11, 2012, from Project MUSE database.

Lord, Albert B. (1960). *The Singer of Tales*. S. Mitchell & G. Nagy (Eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Slade, Benjamin. (2009). Split Serpents and Bitter Blades: Reconstructing Details of the PIE Dragon-Combat. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences: Illinois Working Papers,* 1-57.

Watkins, Calvert. 1987. How to kill a dragon in Indo-European. In C. Watkins (ed.), Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985), 270–299. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Watkins, Calvert. (1989). New Parameters in Historical Linguistics, Philology and Culture History. *Language,* 65(4), 783-799.

Watkins, Calvert. (1995). *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

St George slaying a dragon: The Church of the Holly Week, 16th century, Brnjača near Orahovac, Kosovo and Metohia, Serbia. Reproduced with permission of the Gallery of Frescoes, Belgrade, Serbia

The Interdisciplinary Linguistic Program (ILP) at the University of Winnipeg (UW)

The ILP at UW provides a vibrant environment for teaching, study and research, offering a 3-year BA, a 4-year BA, and an Honours BA degrees in Interdisciplinary Linguistcis, through a variety of courses ofered at several different departments. Linguistics is defined as the branch of knowledge whose subject-matter includes both language as a general property of human species, and particular languages. Since human language is both a biological phenomenon (language faculty is innate), and a socio-cultural one (language is the main carrier of all human culture), linguistics is necessarily an interdisciplinary field covering the academic divisions of Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. We invite you to join us in this magic adventure that is the study of human language in all its protean forms, from conventional to quirky.