Modern Icelandic basic linguistic terminology: A survey from a historico-puristic perspective

Matteo Tarsi
University of Iceland

ABSTRACT

The present article deals with the development of basic linguistic terminology in Icelandic. Such terminology pertains to five categories (general, graphematics, phonology, morphology and lexicon) and has been collected from 19 different sources from the Middle Ages to 1920. After a short introduction (1), the corpus is outlined (2). Subsequently (3), each of the aforementioned categories will be analysed in separate paragraphs. In the last section (4), an evaluation of the development of the Icelandic linguistic terminology is given.
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1. Introduction

Linguistic discourse in Iceland can be traced back to the first half of the 12th century, when an unknown Icelander wrote the so-called First Grammatical Treatise. The author’s aim was to propose a modified version of the Latin alphabet, which would suit writing in Icelandic the best. A history of the Icelandic linguistic terminology might well start from here: sometime in the decade 1130–1140. However, as already pointed out by Raschellà (1998, 2004), there is good evidence which suggests that the very core of the Icelandic linguistic terminology has its roots in writing practices prior to the adoption of the Latin alphabet, viz. in rune carving, whereas on the other hand it chiefly rests upon the Latin grammatical tradition. The aim of this paper, which strongly rests upon earlier scholarship (Tryggvi Gíslason 1968, Svavar Sigmundsson 1981, and Raschellà 2004), is to give a broad overview of the basic linguistic terminology in Modern Icelandic. This will be done from a historico-puristic perspective. The approach is twofold: on the one hand it is onomasiological, i.e. aimed at tracing the different words with which a given concept has been expressed throughout the centuries, while on the other it focuses on the sources of the terms themselves, which are in most cases foreign. As reference terms, I will use the terminology used in Icelandic today. Modern Icelandic spelling is used throughout the article, except when Old Icelandic terms are specifically addressed.
2. The corpus

Although surely objectionable, the rationale for the choice of what I call “basic linguistic terminology” rests upon the fact that the terms chosen constitute the foundations for linguistic discourse for each of the groups in which the corpus has been subdivided, namely GENERAL, GRAPHEMATICS, PHONOLOGY, MORPHOLOGY, and LEXICON. Terminology relative to syntax has not been included as it is very sparsely found in the Icelandic linguistic scholarship prior to the 19th century. The corpus is as follows:

**GENERAL:** orð ‘word’, mál, tunga, tumgangal ‘language’, málfræði ‘grammar, linguistics’.

**GRAPHEMATICS:** (bók)stafur ‘letter’, stafróf ‘alphabet’.


The terms covering the above-listed meanings have been traced in a selection of nineteen Icelandic grammatical writings ranging from the 12th to the early 20th century: from the *First Grammatical Treatise* to Alexander Jóhannesson’s 1920 *Frumnorraen málfræði* (Proto-Norse grammar). The researched texts are as follows:

1. The *First Grammatical Treatise* (FGT, 1130–1140, ed. Hreinn Benediktsson, 1972)
2. The *Second Grammatical Treatise* (SGT, 1270–1300, ed. Raschellà, 1982)
3. The *Third Grammatical Treatise* (ThGT, 1240–1250, ed. Finnur Jónsson, 1927)
4. The *Fourth Grammatical Treatise* (FoGT, 1320–1340, ed. Clunies Ross/Wellendorf, 2014)
5. Ms. AM 921 III 4to (ca. 1400, The Árni Magnússon Institute, Reykjavík)
6. Ms. AM 413 fol. (ca. 1732, Rúnareiðsla/Runologia, Jón Ólafsson from Grunnavík, Arnamagnæan Collection, Copenhagen)
7. Ms. AM 1001 4to (ca. 1732, Jón Ólafsson from Grunnavík, The Árni Magnússon Institute, Reykjavík)
8. Ms. AM 987 4to (1772–1779, Jón Ólafsson from Grunnavík, The Árni Magnússon Institute, Reykjavík)
3. Analysis

3.1. General and graphematic terminology

Under the category GENERAL fall terms meaning ‘word’, ‘language’, and ‘grammar’. Understandably, these terms are quite stable during the centuries. The lexeme for ‘word’, i.e. orð, is the most stable, as a variant sögn (calqued on Lat. dictio) is only attested in the ThGT. Two are the main terms for ‘language’, namely mál and tunga, which are both endogenous and attested as early as in the FGT. In addition, there appears another term, tungumál, which is however not attested before the 16th century (cf. RitOH, s.v. tungumál). The terms for ‘grammar’ show a significant bit of variation. They are at least four (in brackets the text in which they appear): bókstafamennt (7), málmmyndalýsing (13, 15), mállýsing (16), and the currently used term málfraði (10, 11, 16, 17, 19). In addition, it is known that more terms have been coined, e.g. málslist and tungnafræði (Svavar Sigmundsson, 1981: 288). Whereas orð, mál, and tunga (together with the compound tungumál) are native terms, there appears to be no endogenous term for ‘grammar’, viz. all the Icelandic terms coined so far prove to be calques: bókstafamennt (calqued on Lat. ars grammatica, viz. AGr. γραμματική τέχνη lit. ‘the science of the letters’), málmmyndalýsing (probably with Ger. Formenlehre or Dan. formlære as model), mállýsing (probably with Ger. deskriptive grammatik or Dan. deskriptiv grammatik as model), málfraði (calqued on Dan. sprogvidenskab or Ger. Sprachwissenschaft). Modern Icelandic also uses the word málvisindi to convey the meaning ‘linguistics’ but not ‘grammar book’.

Among graphematic terms, I have chosen just two, namely bókstafur ‘letter’ and stafróf ‘alphabet’. These are both very early attested terms, as they are found from the FGT on. Apart from some variance in the FGT regarding the term for ‘letter’, where four different words are attested (stafr, rún, málstafur, bókstafur, cf. Raschellà, 2004: 9–10), bókstafur (with the
shortened variant *stafr* and *stafróf* have early become canonic terms for their respective technical meanings. Except for *rún* ‘rune’, all the Icelandic terms for ‘letter’ contain the word *stafr* ‘stick’. Moreover, as duly noted by Raschellà (2004: 9), in the Germanic languages, with the remarkable exception of Modern English (but cf. OE *bōcstæf* and *stæf* ‘letter’), the terms for ‘letter’ are often to be linked to PGmc. *staƀ-,* thing which strongly points to a writing tradition preceding the advent of book writing in the Germanic world (see also the discussion in Green, 1998: 255–256). This is indeed confirmed by runic evidence, f.ex. by the Gummarp runic inscription from the 7th century. The Icelandic word for ‘alphabet’, *stafróf*, appears instead to be a loanword, namely from OE *stafrāw* (ÍOb, s.v. *stafróf*).

### 3.2. Phonological terminology

Under the label **PHONOLOGY** I have comprised a few terms relating to sounds (*hljóð*), namely *sérhljóð* ‘vowel’, *samhljóð* ‘consonant’, and *tvíhljóð* ‘diphthong’, together with the term for ‘syllable’, *atkveði*. The terms for ‘vowel’ are: *raddarstafur* (1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13, 17) and its variants *rǫdd* (1) and *raddstafur* (17, 18), *hljóðstafur* (1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17), and the currently used term *sérhljóð* (20). *Raddarstafur*, from which both *rǫdd* and *raddstafur* derive, is with all probability a calque of Lat. *littera vocalis* (cf. Raschellà, 2004: 16–17). As suggested by Raschellà (2004: 17), *hljóðstafur* appears instead to be an indigenous term tracing its roots back to the pre-literary, viz. runic, era. *Sérhljóð* is again an indigenous formation coined with the term for ‘consonant’ as model according to the following line of reasoning: since *samhljóð* (calqued on Lat. *consonans*, cf. below) “sounds with” something, the vowel is that element necessary to the consonant to sound and which has *ipso facto* “sound” as an intrinsic quality. Therefore the term designating it is *sérhljóð*, which in fact can roughly be translated as ‘sound on its own’.

The terms for ‘consonant’ show very little variation. These are: *samhljóðandi* (1, 3, 7, 9, 11–16, 18) and its related terms *samhljóður* (17), *samhljóði* (1), and *samhljóð* (19); and *málstafur* (2, 18). *Samhljóðandi* and related terms are to be analysed as structural calques of Lat. *consonans*, being *samhljóðandi* a perfect calque. *Málstafur* is found in the SGT (see the discussion in Raschellà, 2004: 18) and Litla móðurmálsbókin (18), being the use in the latter work most likely an archaism as the author himself glosses the term with *samhljóðandi*. In the SGT, *málstafur* is the only term used to convey the meaning ‘consonant’. This has has lead Raschellà to suggest that it was the term used by rune carvers to designate the consonant runes. In fact, as *hljóðstafur* can be translated as ‘sound stave’, *málstafur* corresponds to ‘language (or discourse) stave’. The idea behind this, if I am not mistaken, is that the consonants are those “staves”, viz.
letters, which shape a discourse (or denote a language), whereas the vowels are instead those letters whose intrinsic quality is that of giving sound to a language.

The term for ‘diphthong’ is relatively stable during the centuries. *Tvíhljóður* (3, 11, 13, 17) and related terms (*tvíhljóðandi* (6, 7), *tvíhljóði* (16, 18), *tvíhljóð* (19)) are the most widespread, being calques of Lat. *diphthongus* < AGr. δίφθογγος ‘having two sounds’. Other terms encountered in this survey are as follows: *limingarstafur* (3), *tvöfalldur hljóðstafur* (9), *limingur* and *lausaklofi* (15). *Limingarstafur* and *limingur* are graphematic terms which actually mean ‘ligature’. So is *lausaklofi* ‘digraph’. In *Íslensk mályndalýsing* in fact, the graphematic plane overlaps the phonological plane as the author divides linguistic sound units according to graphematic distinctions, hence the terms *limingur* and *lausaklofi* under which fall the Icelandic diphthongs. For what concerns *tvöfalldur hljóðstafur* it is a mere descriptive term meaning ‘double vowel’.

The term for ‘syllable’ is quite stable during the Middle Ages but changes during the early modern period. The two terms are *samstafa* (1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 13, 15, 18, 19) (and its variant *samstöfun* (1, 17)), and *atkvæði* (7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16), which is the currently used term. *Samstafa* and *samstöfun* are both to be linked to the verb að stafa saman ‘to write together’ and have no connection with Lat. *syllaba* < AGr. συλλαβή (Raschellà 2004: 26). Whereas in the Middle Ages *atkvæði* denoted “sound as a basic linguistic entity, endowed with a linguistic function” (Hreinn Benediktsson, 1972: 58), viz. Lat. *potestas*, the word starts to mean ‘syllable’ only in the 18th century, and it was apparently a term used in vernacular, viz. not learned, speech as Jón Ólafsson from Grunnavík in AM 1001 4to glosses the term as used by the *vulgus* beside the “official” Icelandic term, i.e. *samstafa*.

3.3. Morphological terminology

Due to space limitations, it is not possible to provide a thorough analysis of every morphological category listed in Section 2. As a consequence, I will focus here on what I recall to be the most interesting among them: the case system.

Icelandic has a system of four cases: nominative, accusative, dative, and genitive. Moreover, I have comprised under the same category the terms for ‘declension’ and ‘conjugation’. The terminology related to this subfield of morphology shows a remarkable degree of variation, and the name of the single cases, with the exception of the genitive case, appear first in the *ThGT* and *FoGT* (3, 4).

accusative | rögiligt fall [3, 4] | klögunarniðurlag/-ending [6], klögunarbylting [7] | áverkafall | þolandi | þolandi | þolfall


genitive | getnaðarniðurlag/-bylting [6], getnaðarbylting eignar [7] | eigandaafall, getfall | eigandi | eigandi | eigandi | eignarfall

declension


Table 1: Some basic terms in inflectional morphology

Firstly, it should be noted that the word for ‘case’ is relatively stable in that fall is widely used from the Middle Ages on and it is moreover a calque of Lat. casus. However, in the analysed texts there appear three more terms, niðurlag, ending, and bylting, all of which are in the writings of Jón Ólafsson from Grunnavík, scholar and last assistant to Árni Magnússon, the renowned manuscript collector. Niðurlag and ending are calques of Lat. terminatio. For what concerns the term bylting, it seems likely for it to be Jón Ólafsson’s own linguistic term, as it is not attested in other linguistic writings. Moreover, in his Icelandic dictionary (Ms AM 433 fol.), Jón Ólafsson defines bylting as “lapsus cum volutatione quadam”. Lat. casus is given instead as a definition of bylta, a synonym of bylting. Thus, this term is a semantic calque of Lat. casus.

The nominative case is expressed in six ways: nefniligt fall, nefningarniðurlag/-ending, nafnfall, nefnandi, gjörandi, and nefnifall, which is the term used nowadays. Whereas the majority of the terms for ‘nominative’ is inspired by Latin terminology, i.e. casus nominativus, and thus calque it more or less precisely, gjörandi constitutes an exception in that it describes the nominative case by means of the semantic, viz. thematic, function it has, namely that of the agent.

The accusative case is expressed with five different terms: rögiligt fall, klögunarniðurlag/-ending/-bylting, áverkafall, þolandi, and þolfall, which is the current term. The most ancient term, rögiligt fall, appears to calque Lat. casus accusativus, which in turn is a notoriously mistaken structural calque from AGr. αἰτιατικῆς πτῶμας. The same holds true for the terms composed with klögun ‘accusation, charge’. Áverkafall describes instead the case from the point of view of its relationship with the verb, and it is possibly a loan translation closer to the
original Ancient Greek term. Þolandi and þolfall describe the thematic function of the case in question, i.e. that of the patient. The dative case is expressed in seven different ways: gǽfiligt fall, gáfubylting, þiggjandafall, viðtakandafall, fáandi, þiggjandi, and þágufall, which is the term used nowadays. The most ancient term, gǽfiligt fall, calques Lat. *casus dativus*, as also does gáfubylting, albeit more freely. The rest of the terms variously describe the dative case from the point of view of its thematic role, that of the recipient: viðtakandi ‘recipient’, að fá ‘to receive’, að þiggja ‘to accept [to receive]’, þága ‘(one’s) interest, benefit’.

The name for the genitive case does not appear in Old Icelandic sources. Five different names are found in the corpus: getnaðarniðurlag/-bylting (eignar), eigandafall, getfall, eigandi, and eignarfall, which is the term used nowadays. Here, again, the terms may be divided into two groups: those that calque Lat. *casus genetivus*, i.e. getnaðarniðurlag/-bylting and getfall (að geta ‘to get, beget, engender’), and those that describe the thematic role of the case, that of the possessor (eigandi ‘possessor’, eign ‘property’), namely eigandafall, eigandi, and eignarfall.

The term that nowadays describes both declension and conjugation is beyging. Svavar Sigmundsson (1981: 292) claims that in Old Icelandic the concept of ‘declension’ was expressed by hneiging, whereas that of ‘conjugation’ by samokan. I was not able to find any instance of hneiging in Old Icelandic with the meaning ‘declension’. On the other hand, samokan ‘conjugation’ is attested in the ThGT and is a structural calque of Lat. *conjugatio*. In the other surveyed texts, the two concepts are always expressed with one main term (which is eventually further specified as referring to verb conjugation or noun declension): hneiging (7, 10, 11, 12), breyting (13), beyging (14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19).

Whereas the source for breyting lit. ‘change’ is unknown, although it may be said that it is highly probable that it is an endogenous creation, hneiging and beyging both derive from movement verbs which recall the idea of inflection. However, while hneiging is a calque of Lat. *declinatio*, beyging was most probably inspired by Dan. *bøjning*.

### 3.4. Lexical terminology

The lexical category comprises terms for the parts of speech. These are first encountered in the ThGT where the Icelandic names are exact renderings of their Latin equivalents, e.g. *nomen substantivum* = undirstóstöðiligt nafn [undir-stóði-lig-t = sub-stant-iv-um, nafn = nomen]. The most terminologically stable parts of speech, according to my survey, are the noun (chiefly referred to as nafn or nafnorð), the verb (previously often referred to as tímaord, from 1815 (11) on as sögn or sagnord), and the pronoun (chiefly referred to as fornafn, calqued on Lat. *pronomen*).
Space limitations prevent me from going into any further detail here. However, it might be said that, as a general trend, the terms encountered in this survey either tend to variously render their Latin equivalents or are native creations.

4. Conclusions

Some discussion about Modern Icelandic basic linguistic terminology has been offered above. To sum up, it may be said that the very core of such terminology has its roots in scribal practices prior to the advent of parchment writing, viz. rune carving. Among these terms are e.g. málstafur and hljóðstafur. On the other hand, the Latin grammatical tradition has played a very important role in shaping the Icelandic linguistic terminology, as many of the terms encountered in this survey are renderings of the Latin terms. This does not apply only to medieval terminology, but also to early modern and modern terms. The pre-literary layer in the Icelandic linguistic terminology has nowadays almost disappeared completely, whereas influence from the terminology used by Latin grammarians is still quite appreciable, e.g. samhljóð ‘consonant’, fornafn ‘pronoun’, samtenging ‘conjunction’, etc. Other terms appear to be coined as a native response to foreign influences, viz. they are terms whose structure, either entirely or partially, does not calque a foreign term. Examples of such terms are framsöguháttur ‘indicative mood’ (11–19, cf. ávisunarháttur ‘s.m.’ (7), a calque of modus indicativus), and lýsingarorð (12, 14, 16, 17, 19, cf. tillagsord ‘s.m.’ (7), a calque of Dan. tillægsord, and viðrliggjanligt nafn (3), a calque of Lat. nomen adjectivum).
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Notes

1. Notably, only a work by Jón Ólafsson from Grunnavík is known to me in this respect (cf. Jón Helgason 1926: 319).

2. Gothic uses the word boka to denote ‘letter’. Got. *stafs is also attested, but whether it could also mean ‘letter’ is disputed (see the discussion in Lehmann, 1986, s.v. boka, and moreover Green, 1998: 256–257).

3. (h)AþuwolAfA sAtA (s)A(b)AtA þr(i)A fff ‘Haþuwulf(R)ððulf) placed three staves fff’ (source: http://runer.ku.dk, retrieved 2 August 2017; cf. also Moltke, 1985: 78–79 and 103).

4. The term hneiging is not mentioned by Tryggvi Gíslason (1968: 113) as a technical linguistic term in Old Icelandic.