

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS UPSALIENSIS

Studia Latina Upsaliensia

38:2

Georg Stiernhielm

Linguistic works, volume 2

Etymology, historical and comparative language studies
and programme for the renewal of the Swedish language

Unpublished manuscripts and early prints edited with introduction,
translation of *De linguarum origine praefatio*, and reception studies

by

Josef Eskhult



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

2023

This book has been printed by grants from *Svenska Akademien* (the Swedish Academy), *Olle Engkvists stiftelse* (Olle Engkvist's Fund) and the Editorial Board of *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis*.

Abstract

This is the second of two volumes that provide a textual edition of the linguistic writings of the Swedish polymath Georg Stiernhielm (1598–1672). On the basis of his unpublished manuscripts and early prints, this volume presents a textual edition of his writings on etymology (Chapters 7–9), on historical and comparative linguistics (Chapters 10–13) and on a programme for the renewal of the Swedish language (Chapters 16–17) as preserved in unpublished manuscripts and some prints. Moreover, a record of the public dispute between Stiernhielm and Terserus is edited (Chapter 14), as is also Stiernhielm's autograph catalogue of his holdings of linguistic literature and source texts, viz. dictionaries, textual samples and treatises for research on language origins (Chapter 15). The textual edition is preceded by an introduction to the political and cultural contexts of Stiernhielm's linguistic theories on these topics, as well as to the early development of historical-comparative language studies, to Stiernhielm's achievements of in this field of study, and finally to his unpublished etymological, universal and bilingual lexicography. The textual edition is followed by a reception study on Stiernhielm as a historical linguist and language renewer.

Keywords

etymology, lexicography, language origins, language relationship, linguistic change, Scythian hypothesis, Swedish Gothicism, Swedish language

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND). For more information, please visit creativecommons.org.



Images with other rights-holders than the author are expressly excluded from the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 licence covering the rest of this publication. Permission for reuse of these images should be sought from the rights-holders.

© AUU and the author 2023

Cover image: Vasula Manor, 1783. Watercolour painting by Carl Otto von Gyllenschmidt. Source: Johann Christoph Brotze, *Sammlung verschiedener Liefländischer Monumente, Prospecte, Wapen, dritter Theil*, c. 1782–1792 (unpublished manuscript, Latvian Academy Library). By the courtesy of the Library of the University of Latvia, Riga.

Distributor: Uppsala University Library,
Box 510, SE-751 20 Uppsala, Sweden
www.ub.uu.se, acta@ub.uu.se

ISSN 0562-2859

ISBN 978-91-513-1104-3

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-429245>

Printed in Sweden by By Wind, Ödeshög 2023

Preface with acknowledgements

This study originates in my research project about views on language origins, language relationships and linguistic change, as they are expressed in writings about the history of Semitic and Germanic languages in the early modern Republic of Letters. It was begun 14 years ago (in early 2009) and was initially supported by a grant from the Royal Society of Humanities in Uppsala (*Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala*). The scope was later narrowed to a few linguistic theorists: the Swedish philologists Georg Stiernhielm (1598–1672) and Johan Ihre (1707–1780), and the Dutch Orientalist Albert Schultens (1685–1750). At this stage the project was funded by a research grant from the Fund for Humanities and Social Sciences in Sweden (*Riksbankens Jubileumsfond*).

Research on the full range of Stiernhielm's theoretical linguistic works covering phonology, morphology, semiotics, phonosemantics, etymology and language classification was made possible by an Erik Allardt fellowship at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies in the academic year 2014–2015.

My further research in 2016–2018 with an emphasis on improving the transcription of the texts being edited and broadening the selection of texts across the entire range of Stiernhielm's linguistic thought was supported by a grant from Birgit and Gad Rausing's Fund for the Humanities (*Birgit och Gad Rausing's Stiftelse för humanistisk forskning*). The study on Stiernhielm's lexicography was subsidized by a grant from Olof Gjerdman's Fund at Uppsala University.

Grants for the printing of this volume have been provided by the Swedish Academy, Olle Engkvist's Fond and the Editorial Board of *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis*.

I acknowledge the receipt of these research and printing grants with joy and gratitude.

I express my deep gratitude to Hans Helander, prof. em. of Latin at Uppsala University, for his support and advice. I am particularly indebted to him for his attentive perusal and valuable criticism of my work. He read my book manuscripts at various stages of development

and greatly contributed to improving the form and contents of the final work.

I am indebted to Per Stille Ph.D. for checking my transcriptions of Swedish words in Stiernhielm's list of grammatical and rhetorical terms (Section 17.1.2). I am also grateful to Johan Heldt, BA, for checking the forms and spelling of Greek words.

I have submitted parts of the present textual edition to the Latin seminars at the Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University, and the Department of Romance and Classical languages, Stockholm University. I thank all the participants at these seminar discussions, in Uppsala particularly Chairman professor Gerd Haverling and the professors Hans Helander and the late Monica Hedlund as well as the professors of Scandinavian philology Henrik Williams and Lars Wollin, moreover Toumo Nuorluoto PhD and Charlotta Forss PhD, and in Stockholm, Chairman associate professor Maria Plaza, Göran Bäärnhielm PhD and Susanna Åkerman PhD.

I have also presented drafts of the introduction (Sections 3.2 and Chapter 4) to the seminar of the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies and to the Latin seminar at the Section for Ancient languages and cultures (presently Latin language and Roman literature) at the Department of World Cultures (presently Department of Languages), Helsinki University. I thank all the participants at these seminar presentations, in particular, at HCAS the late professor of philosophy Jaakko Hintikka for requiring an exploration of Leibniz's knowledge of Stiernhielm's linguistic ideas, which I present in Section 19.4, and at the Latin seminar, then Chairman professor Olli Salomies and the associate professors Anneli Luhtala and Raija Sarasti-Wilenius.

Uppsala, March 2023

Josef Eskhult

Table of contents

PART 1. INTRODUCTION

1. General introduction	13
1.1 Purpose	13
1.2 Earlier research on Stiernhielm's language comparison	14
2. Historical background	22
2.1 Political background: the Swedish Empire	22
2.2 Swedish Gothicism and antiquarianism	23
3. Historical linguistic ideas in early modern Europe	27
3.1 Preliminaries: early modern fields of language study	27
3.2 The emergence of a historical linguistic discourse	27
3.3 Renaissance philology: theories of language origins	32
3.4 The Scythian hypothesis: a proto-language theory	39
3.5 Universal history and world chronology	52
4. Stiernhielm's etymology, comparative language studies and renewal of the Swedish language	55
4.1 Etymological theory	55
4.2 Language classification	60
4.3 Programme for Swedish language renewal	69
5. Stiernhielm's lexicography: an exploratory account	73
5.1 Place in the Swedish lexicographical tradition	73
5.2 Kinds of lexicography, and language sources	75
5.3 Swedish lexicography: antiquarian and etymological	76
5.4 General etymological lexicography	79
5.5 Bilingual lexicography	80
5.6 Concluding remarks	84
6. Manuscript sources, prints, and editorial principles	85
6.1 Printed and manuscript sources	85
6.2 Classificatory editorial principles	87
6.3 Editorial principles	87

PART 2. ETYMOLOGY: THEORY AND METHOD

7. Etymological principles	91
7.1 <i>Canones etymologiae</i> : rules for etymology	91
7.2 <i>Ut linguarum studiosos doceam</i> : "to teach the students of languages"	94
7.3 <i>Cognationes literarum</i> : related speech sounds	95
7.4 <i>Observanda</i> : observations	97
7.5 <i>Aphorismi</i> : etymological statements	98

7.6	<i>Probanda et praenosceda</i> : starting points	100
7.7	<i>Radicum indago</i> : analogy and decomposition	102
8.	Etymology as a discipline	105
8.1	<i>Mysterium etymologicum</i> : the etymological mystery	105
8.2	<i>Palmarium artis</i> : the purpose of the art	113
8.3	<i>Verborum scientia</i> : the science of words	113
8.4	<i>Divinae huius scientiae fundamentum</i> : basic assumptions	114
8.5	<i>Radix</i> : the stem's relation to ontological categories.....	115
8.6	<i>Notarum in Ulfilam scopus</i> : lexicographical aims	116
9.	The origin of some Hebrew and Germanic words	117
9.1	On the origin of biblical proper names	117
9.2	On the origin of the tetragrammaton	120
9.3	<i>Nativitatis certamen</i> : the battle of etymological origins	130
9.4	<i>Observatio de etymo vocum Fader, Moder, Broder</i>	131
9.5	On the origin of a couple of Moesogothic words	133
9.6	On the derivatives from the morpholexeme <i>a</i>	135
PART 3. HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE LANGUAGE STUDIES		
10.	<i>Adelruna</i> and <i>Anti-Cluverius</i> (1639–1644): early ideas on ethno-linguistic relationships	139
10.1	<i>Scopus Adelrunae</i> : plans for antiquarian and etymological Swedish lexicography	139
10.2	<i>Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica</i> : twelve theses	141
10.3	<i>Adelrunae conclusiones</i> : the twelve theses explained	143
10.4	<i>Anti-Cluverius</i> : statements of Swedish Gothicism	168
10.5	Digression: <i>De Hyperboreis dissertatio</i>	171
11.	<i>Runa Suethica</i> (1649–1653): the conspectus, the preface, and drafts of chapters, stray notes and diagrams	172
11.1	Conspectus in a draft and two prints (1650–1669)	172
11.2	Title page and preface	183
11.3	Drafts not included in the preface on languages origins	185
11.4	Mesopotamian and biblical chronologies	200
11.5	The antiquity and particular nature of Swedish	203
11.6	The nature of language diversification	209
11.7	Typology of language origins and differentiation	214
12.	<i>De linguarum origine praefatio</i> (1651–1671): a treatise on language origins, language relationships and linguistic change ...	215
12.1	Printed and manuscript sources	215
12.2	Dating and summary	217
12.3	Critical edition of the Latin text	222
12.4	English translation with explanatory notes	258
12.5	Commentary	304

13. Stiernhielm in dialogue with contemporary scholars	312
13.1 Correspondence with David Blondel	312
13.2 Abraham Mylius: commented excerpts	321
13.3 Claudius Salmasius: commented excerpts	322
13.4 Georgius Hornius: a commented excerpt	326
13.5 Hugo Grotius: commented excerpts	328
13.6 Gerard Vossius: a commented excerpt	328
13.7 Christian Ravius: an excerpt	329
14. Stiernhielm vs. Terserus: the public dispute in 1653	330
14.1 Programme of the public dispute	330
14.2 Record of the public dispute on Gen. 11:1	334
15. Stiernhielm's catalogues of linguistic literature	338
15.1 Libri rariores huic instituto inservientes	338
15.2 Libri conducentes ad origines linguarum	340
15.3 List of books sent to Bengt Skytte in 1657	352

PART 4. PROGRAMME FOR LANGUAGE RENEWAL AND PURITY

16. Statements for the renewal of Swedish	357
16.1 <i>Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur</i> : preface	357
16.2 <i>Baculus Carolinus</i> : preface	360
16.3 <i>Wäst-Götha lagbok</i> : preface	364
17. Swedish counterparts of Latin technical terms	366
17.1 List of grammatical and rhetorical terms	366
17.2 List of rhetorical, logical, and linguistic terms	370
17.3 List of philosophical terms and common words	373

PART 5. STUDIES OF THE HISTORICAL AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL RECEPTION

18. Preliminaries	377
18.1 Scope of the studies	377
18.2 Earlier research	378
19. Historical reception in the Republic of Letters	381
19.1 Contemporary reception	381
19.2 Johann Dieckmann	386
19.3 Daniel Georg Morhof	387
19.4 Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz	388
19.5 Jäger and Kirchmaier	398
19.6 Petrus Lagerlöf	407
19.7 Wotton and Suhm	410
19.8 Albert Schultens	414

20. Reception by lexicographers of Germanic languages	415
20.1 Haquin Spegel	415
20.2 Johann Georg Wachter	417
20.3 Johan Ihre	418
21. Historiographical reception by Swedish biographers	421
21.1 Arckenholtz and Franzén	421
21.2 Samuel Gagnerus	423
21.3 Carl Gustaf Nordin	430
21.4 Lorenzo Hammarsköld	432
21.5 Per Daniel Amadeus Atterbom	436
21.6 Eric Gustaf Geijer	438
Appendix: An inventory of Stiernhielm's preparatory works for his Swedish and universal lexicography with other unpublished writings	445
Bibliography	448
Manuscript sources	448
Printed sources	450
Secondary literature	462
Indices	474
Index I: Names	474
Index II: Subject matters, key words, names of languages and peoples, place names, and biblical proper names	487
Index III: Swedish words occurring in the texts edited	505
Index IV: Words in Indo-European languages being referred to or discussed in the texts edited	509
Index V: Words in Semitic languages cited in the texts edited ...	513
Illustrations	515
List of illustrations	515
Samples of manuscripts and early prints	516
Historical map and the painting of Vasula Manor	543

PART 1. INTRODUCTION

1. General introduction

1.1 Purpose

Georg Stiernhielm (1598–1672) is known as a Swedish state official, mathematician, philosopher, philologist and poet. This volume provides a textual edition of his writings on:

- (1) etymology, including principles of derivation;
- (2) language origins, language relationships and linguistic change;
- (3) renewal of the Swedish language, his programmatic statements;
- (4) proposals for Swedish grammatical and rhetorical terms.

In his lifetime Stiernhielm published only one major linguistic work, his treatise on the origin and diversification of languages, which is the preface to the 1671 edition of *Codex Argenteus*, published by the Swedish College of Antiquities. After his death, a few treatises were edited from his manuscripts, viz. the historical work *Anti-Cluverius* (1685), the philological *Anti-Bochartus* (1738–1739) and *Observatio de etymo vocum fader, moder, broder, etc.* (1763). The rest of his theoretical linguistic oeuvre has up to now remained unpublished.

As a poet, Stiernhielm developed Swedish artistic poetry through his adoption of different Greco-Roman metres and his use of classical rhetorical devices. He published his Swedish poems in the collection *Musae Suethizantes* in 1658, which half a century later was regarded as a watershed in the history of Swedish poetry¹ and which gradually earned him a reputation as the father of Swedish artistic poetry.² As a

¹ In the 1720s, Stiernhielm's poetry began to be considered epoch-making. In his review of Possieth's "Sabbatsdagens afton-offer", *Acta literaria Sueciae* in 1721, p. 191, E. Benzeliuss the Younger argues that it inaugurated a new period of Swedish poetry: "ab illo enim foecundissimi ingenii viro nova aetas poetarum patriae nobis constituenda videtur." In his biography of Stiernhielm (ms. X 296, p. 7, UUB) in 1726, Nils Hufwedsson Dal refers to this assessment. "novam poematum patriae aetatem ab illo constituendam censuerunt patres academici". In *Lärde svänske* (1753: 16), Olof Celsius the Younger counts Stiernhielm as marking the beginning of a new era of Swedish poetry: "Man räknar med skäl den svenska poesien rätta och förbättrade tidevarf ifrån Stiernhielm." In his biographical dictionary "Lärde och berömmelige svenske män", ms. X 201, p. 704, UUB, he expresses a similar view: "Stiernhielm var den förste som började inrätta svenska poesien efter latinske reglor. Ifrån Stiernhielm plägar man taga en viss *epoca poeseos Suecanae*."

² After reading the poem *Hercules*, Olof Verelius in a letter of March 1649 referred to Stiernhielm as the Swedish Virgil, *Maro Sueonicus* (Wieselgren, *Brev till Georg*

poet, Stiernhielm endeavoured to renew the Swedish language by means of so-called “Gothic” archaism. In his programme for renewal of the Swedish language, he advocated a moderate form of linguistic purism. To make his vernacular capable of functioning as a national language independently of Latin, he proposed a Swedish linguistic and philosophical terminology.

Both in his own time and subsequently, Stiernhielm also won recognition as a historical linguist. In the 17th and 18th centuries, prominent linguistic researchers in the Republic of Letters were well acquainted with his ideas about language origins and language relationships, and at the end of the 18th century the national discussion on his attainments as a poet of Swedish was extended to include an evaluation of Stiernhielm’s achievements as a historical linguist and language renewer. The last part of this volume therefore explores the international and Swedish reception of Stiernhielm’s efforts as a historical linguist.

1.2 Earlier research on Stiernhielm’s language comparison

1.2.1 Swedish research

Some areas of Stiernhielm’s linguistic theory have been the object of research. There are studies on his phonology and sound symbolism and their interplay in his Swedish poetry (Ståhle 1951 and 1975), his etymological principles and language classification (Swartling 1909: 76–83, and Agrell 1955: 92–101), his morphology (Blume 2000), and his grammatical and rhetorical theory (Olsson 1974).³

Stiernhielm’s historical and comparative linguistic thought has generally fallen into oblivion in Sweden. Despite the fact that the international historiography of linguistic thought has made a positive evaluation of Stiernhielm’s theory on linguistic change and language relationships, Swedish research in general has tended to neglect his achievements in these fields. His efforts are most often derided as a prejudiced component of the national patriotic programme of Gothicism by the leading writers of the history of Swedish literature, antiquities and ideas, such as Henrik Schück (1855–1947) and Sten Lindroth (1914–1980).

Stiernhielm, Lund 1968, p. 155). In the 1680s, the Swedish poet Olof Wexonius wrote an epigram in which he described Stiernhielm as “den svenske poesi-fadren” and as the Swedish Opitz (Hanselli, *Samlade vitterhetsarbeten af svenska författare från Stjernhjelm til Dalin*, vol. 6, Uppsala 1863, p. 371.). This admiration was reinforced by Carl Gustaf Nordin (Section 21.5.1), who regarded Stiernhielm as the progenitor of Swedish poetry, and was confirmed by the literary historians Carl Julius Lénström (1838; Section 18.1) and P.D.A. Atterbom (1843; Section 21.5.1).

³ Swartling and Agrell are surveyed below, Section 1.2.1. As regards Ståhle and Blume, see Vol. 1, Section 1.2.2, and concerning Olsson, see Vol. 1, Section 1.2.3.

In his history of Swedish literature, Schück, together with his co-author Karl Warburg, argues that Stiernhielm applied his historical imagination to comparative linguistics and etymology. Nonetheless, he underlines that Stiernhielm had a wider linguistic horizon than Johannes Bureus regarding languages known. Apart from his knowledge of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, Stiernhielm mastered ancient Germanic languages – not only, like Bureus, Runic Swedish, Old Swedish and Icelandic, but also Old High German, Old English (Anglo-Saxon) and Gothic. Stiernhielm also had a rudimentary understanding of other languages, such as Finnish, Hungarian and Celtic, and Romance languages. Despite his high evaluation of Stiernhielm's linguistic ability, Schück claims that Stiernhielm did not have the qualities of a scholar doing sober research, and that he used his linguistic competence and “lively imagination” to derive all languages from his own national vernacular, just as Goropius Becanus had done for his vernacular.⁴ Nonetheless he admits that Stiernhielm's preface to the edition of *Codex Argenteus* testifies to a good grasp of the diversification of languages by means of dialect splitting and also exhibits one of the earliest insights into the Finno-Ugric linguistic kinship.⁵

Lindroth also typifies Stiernhielm as a man of bold imagination, describes his comparative linguistics as a manifestation of Swedish Gothicism and points out his habitual lack of ability to complete his own undertakings.⁶ He derives Stiernhielm's representational theory of the relationship between reality and language from Platonic phonosemantics and argues that Stiernhielm used this philosophy as a criterion in identifying the primeval language with Swedish.⁷ He dismisses Stiernhielm's textual scholarship in the editions of the Westrogothia law (1663) and *Codex Argenteus* as careless work.⁸

In a digression on Stiernhielm's guiding etymological principles, Birger Swartling reveals their phonosemantic foundations, which he

⁴ Henrik Schück and Karl Warburg, *Illustrerad svensk litteraturhistoria*, vol. 2: (Reformationstiden och stormaktstiden), third completely revised edition 1927, reprinted in Stockholm 1985, pp. 232 f.

⁵ Henrik Schück and Karl Warburg, *ibidem*, pp. 233 f.

⁶ Sten Lindroth, *Svensk lärdomshistoria*, vol. 2: Stormaktstiden, Stockholm 1975, p. 267: “Till våra götiska tänkare hörde också Georg Stiernhielm. Med sin djärva, fantasiburna ande satte han in de fosterländska trossatserna i nya sammanhang, där frågan om det svenska eller götiska språkets enastående ställning blev viktigare än någon annan. Stiernhielm, vilken här liksom annars fullföljde ansatserna av lärofadern Bureus, blev filolog, snart var han ute på den jämförande språkforskningens djupaste vatten. Sin ovana trogen lyckades han aldrig fullborda det stora språkhistoriska verk han drömde om.”

⁷ Lindroth, *ibidem*, pp. 270–271.

⁸ Lindroth, *ibidem*, pp. 272–274.

traces back to Plato's *Cratylus*.⁹ He also clarifies how Stiernhielm posited semantic shifts in the same lexical root in relation to the categories of reality,¹⁰ and argues that he considered the primordial lexical roots of the primeval language to be the common bond linking all languages. Moreover, he accounts for Stiernhielm's views in the chapter drafts 4–5 of *Runa Suethica* on the origin of linguistic diversity from dialect diversification, which Stiernhielm considered to be independent of the Confusion of Languages. He points out that the biblical genealogical table of the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth (Gen. 10) was fundamental to 17th-century diachronic language classification and recognizes the important role attributed to Magog, son of Japheth, as the ancestor of the Scythians, whose original homeland Adam of Bremen had divided into *Scythia minor*, which was identified with Scandinavia, and *Scythia maior*.¹¹

In his history of comparative linguistics in Europe in general and Sweden in particular from the antiquarian Bureus until the Orientalist Matthias Norberg (1747–1826), Jan Agrell maintains that Stiernhielm was a capable etymologist who drew the outlines of a basically correct historical classification of the European languages¹² and who had a sense of phonetic shifts of the same groups of stop consonants (namely the labials b–p–f, dentals d–t–th, and velars g–k–ch).¹³ Consequently, Agrell considers Stiernhielm to be a predecessor of the discovery of Grimm's Law (1822).¹⁴

1.2.2 International research

In the international historiography of linguistic ideas, Stiernhielm is recognized as a precursor of the Scythian hypothesis of historical language relationships.¹⁵ The Scythian hypothesis is a collective term for a variety of pre-modern ideas that regarded the Scythian language

⁹ Swartling, *Georg Stiernhielm. Hans lif och verksamhet*, Uppsala 1909, pp. 76–77.

¹⁰ Swartling, *ibidem*, pp. 79–81.

¹¹ Swartling, *ibidem*, pp. 81–83.

¹² Jan Agrell, *Studier i den äldre språkjämförelsens allmänna och svenska historia fram till 1827*, Uppsala 1955, p. 206: "In seiner Ausgabe des Wulfila von 1671 prägte er den Terminus japhetische Sprachen und gab in der Hauptzügen richtige systematische Aufteilung der europäischen Sprachen." In surveying Stiernhielm's language classification, Agrell (*ibidem*, pp. 95–96), relies on *Runa Suethica*, esp. chapters 3–4 (as summarized by Swartling, *ibidem* pp. 81–82), *De linguis in genere* (according to ms. R. 21 at Uppsala University Library) and the phonological part of chapter 26 of *Runa Suethica* titled *Nomina deorum* (see Vol. 1, Section 7.2.1).

¹³ Agrell, *ibidem*, pp. 97–101.

¹⁴ Agrell, *ibidem*, p. 101. On p. 29 Agrell distinguishes between five stages of insight in the discovery of Grimm's Law. He places Stiernhielm in the third stage.

¹⁵ Metcalf 1974: 233–257, Muller 1986: 9–12, Considine 2008a: 307, cf. Fellman's articles of 1974, 1975 and 1976; Droixhe 1978 and Olender 1996.

as the common historical ancestor of both European languages and Persian. It thus implied that Germanic, Slavonic and Celtic languages along with Latin, Greek and Persian were all historically related and traced their origin from a common historical origin. This complex of linguistic ideas must be regarded as a precursor of the Indo-European hypothesis.

The Scythian hypothesis was the result of a merger between Greco-Roman ethnography and biblical ethnography in Genesis 10. In antiquity, the Scythians were identified with the descendants of Magog, but in the 17th century they were more broadly equated with the Japhethites, that is, all the descendants of Noah's son Japheth. Scythian did not only refer to the historically attested language of the Scythians on the steppes north of the Black Sea in the first millennium BC, but was extended to encompass different "Japhetic" ethnicities of the areas from the Black Sea to the Caspian Sea and the Caucasus region from about 2200 BC to 400 AD.

Vivien Law, a Canadian-English historian of linguistic thought, represents Stiernhielm's ideas as a predecessor of the Indo-European hypothesis:

[...] the Swedish scholar Georg Stiernhielm set out some vitally important principles for the development of historical linguistics in the preface to his edition of the Gothic Bible (1671): he introduced criteria for defining the relatedness of languages, pointed out that linguistic change is inevitable, given either temporal or geographical distance [...] and extended Salmasius's list of languages of Scythian stock to include not only Latin, Greek, German, Gothic and Persian, but also what are now called the Romance, Slavonic and Celtic languages, whilst expressly excluding Hungarian, Finnish, Estonian and Lapp.¹⁶

She repeats the same contention in her history of linguistic thought from antiquity until the Renaissance. In the last chapter (11), she surveys the development of linguistics since 1600. Referring to antiquarians and linguistic researchers of the 17th century, Law states:

As these scholars assembled their collections of data, their grammars and dictionaries and editions of texts in medieval languages, they came up against phenomena which seemed to imply language change. That raised a major conceptual problem: hadn't all present-day languages come into being when the Tower

¹⁶ Vivien Law, "Language and its students: a history of linguistics" in Neville Edgar Collinge (ed.), *An encyclopaedia of language*, London 1990, pp. 816.

of Babel was destroyed? Then how could they be changing, and worse still, how could new languages be appearing? One scholar after another grappled with this issue.

One of the more systematic was the Swedish antiquary Georg Stiernhielm. He published an edition of the Gospels in Gothic, the oldest Germanic language of which substantial records remain.¹⁷ He printed the Gothic text facing the text in Icelandic, Swedish and Latin set out in parallel columns, providing invaluable comparable data for the linguist. As he worked on the text and reflected upon the relationship of Gothic to the many Germanic languages and dialects with which he was acquainted, Stiernhielm began to elaborate many of the principles which are now central to the historical study of language.

For instance, all languages, he said, even Hebrew are subject to change, whether or not catastrophic precipitating events – invasions, deportations, wars and so forth – have taken place. In the course of time a language, particularly if spread over a wide geographical area, will split into dialects, and the dialects will in turn mature into languages. He attempted to distinguish language from dialect partly in terms of mutual intelligibility, partly by arguing that a distinct language will have its own lexical stock shared to a large degree by all its dialects, but the dialects diverge in their inflections, pronunciation and word formation. He concluded his introduction by summarising the conclusions already reached a generation earlier by Claude Saumaise (Salmasius) in his *De Hellenistica* (1643)¹⁸ as to a major language family which had once covered vast tracts of Europe and Asia, the *Scythian* or *Japhetic* family. From the ancient Scythian language are descended, Stiernhielm says, such languages as Persian, Gothic, German, Latin, Greek, Slavonic, Phrygian and Celtic – most of the major members of the family now known as *Indo-European*. On the other hand, he says, Hungarian and Finnish, which show many lexical similarities, and Estonian and Lapp (dialects of Finnish, he thinks), are not connected with Slavonic nor with any other language of his acquaintance. Although he doesn't give this family a name, it is clearly the *Finno-Ugrian* family, well over a century before it was put on a sound philological footing by the Hungarian scholar Gyármathi (1799). Everything was now in place for the development of a thorough-

¹⁷ Georgius Stiernhielm, *D. N. Jesu Christi SS. Evangelia ab Ulfila [...] Gothice translata* (Stockholm: Wankif 1671).

¹⁸ Claudius Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, Leiden: Elsevier 1643.

going historical and comparative linguistics – yet it didn't happen for nearly 150 years. Why not?¹⁹

Moreover, in his survey of early modern scholars who became adherents of the Scythian hypothesis, the American linguist George J. Metcalf (1908–1994) points out that Stiernhielm was a prominent theorist of linguistic change, language kinship, and diversification.²⁰ He takes his point of departure in the Swedish philologist and clergyman Andreas Jäger (1658–1730), who was a proponent of this complex of ideas, as an example of the Scythian strand of historical linguistic thought in early modern Europe. In doing so, he maintains that Stiernhielm is Jäger's particular model.²¹

In his survey *Dictionaries in early modern Europe* (2008), John Considine outlines and evaluates Stiernhielm's historical linguistic theory in the context of his lexicographical undertakings. He refers to the conspectus of *Runa Suethica* in its second proof print (1669), which has the main title *Babel destructa*. Though this print does not diverge much from the first (1651), he argues that it is a development of the linguistic theory that underlay Stiernhielm's dictionary *Magog Armaeo-Gothicus* and then pinpoints the key ideas of *Runa Suethica*:

A late stage of Stiernhielm's thoughts on the historical relationship between Swedish and other languages appears to be represented by a pamphlet of two leaves printed towards the end of his life, called *Babel destructa seu runa Suethica* (the second part of the title harks back to Bureus' *Adulruna*.) The pamphlet offers an outline of a work that was never published, and was presumably circulated in an effort to arouse the interest of potential purchasers. It develops the argument of the *Magog* for the antiquity of Swedish, claiming that modern Swedish is the least altered representative of the ancient Scythian proto-language. Its most important theses are as follows. (1) All the languages of

¹⁹ Vivien Law, *The history of linguistics in Europe from Plato to 1600*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 260–261. Law answers the last question by pointing out the alternation between two opposing orientations in creating linguistic knowledge: a particularist empiricism being “born of a new observational epistemology”, and a universalist rationalism as “a continuation of the old rationally based approach to knowledge.” She argues that the rationalist current soon became mainstream in terms of prestige and choice of research questions and delayed the rise and development of the empiricist approach to comparative linguistics.

²⁰ George Metcalf, “The Indo-European hypothesis in the 16th and 17th centuries” in Dell Hymes (ed.), *Studies in the history of linguistics: tradition and paradigms*, Bloomington & London 1974, pp. 248–249.

²¹ Metcalf, *ibidem*, pp. 236–237. See further Section 19.4.1.

the known world have arisen from one proto-language and can be traced back to a set of roots which constitute the vocabulary of that protolanguage. (2) This is the Adamic language, for there is nothing in the Bible to prove that new languages were created at Babel, or that any that were created there were anything but temporary; the variety of existing languages is the product of the kind of divergence from an original that can be readily observed, not of the creation of new languages at Babel. (3) All the existing languages in the world, including those of Asia, northern Europe and Western Europe, can be traced back to Scythian. (4) The words spoken by Adam and his family, which are commonly said to have been Hebrew by the proponents of the seniority of that language, can just as well be called Scythian; and in fact they were more like Swedish than Hebrew. (5) The contemporary Persian and Armenian languages (here Stiernhielm was putting his copy of *Dictionarium Armeno-Latinum* into use) conform substantially with the Scythian language. (6) In the Edenic language, the relationship between signifiers and signified was not arbitrary. The pamphlet ends with a reference to a projected 'Lexicon, or universal key to the first languages': this would present the roots of the Edenic vocabulary in so far as they could be at once the ultimate etymological dictionary of Swedish and the ultimate dictionary of a universal language.²²

Considine continues:

By the end of his life, he had gone far beyond Goropius in anticipating the conclusions and the methods of nineteenth-century and subsequent comparative philology. He was not dazzled by the claims of Latin, Greek or Hebrew to primacy among languages, and saw no good evidence for the derivation of Swedish from any non-Germanic language. To make statements about the origins of Swedish, he turned to the runic texts and the Gothic of the *Codex Argenteus*, which he believed to be the most ancient attested languages. The ultimate ancestor of Swedish and Gothic, must, he proposed, be reconstructed rather than being sought among extant languages. That ancestor, finally, was to be sought in western Asia – for he observed that the languages of Europe has affinities with each other and with some of the

²² Considine, *Dictionaries in early modern Europe and the making of heritage*, pp. 308–309.

languages of western Asia, including both Persian and Armenian.²³

In an article on Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeldt published in 1999, Eugene McKendry says:

Stiernhielm's views on languages and their history fall into the pattern of thought and debate of the period, which we might usefully review in summary. [...] Stiernhielm maintained the tradition of Hebrew as the mother language prior to Babel. He also laid a significant emphasis upon the importance of dialects and the diachronic mutability of languages after Babel. Nevertheless, Stiernhielm argued for the supreme antiquity of Swedish, which he identified with Scythian: *Nostra Sveo-Gothica [...] ab externis pura et intaminata nihilque nisi aevo a prima sua origine distans* (Stiernhielm 1671 xxxiv). [...] Stiernhielm is central in his influence upon Sparwenfeldt and upon Andreas Jäger.²⁴

Raf Van Rooy draws attention to Stiernhielm's criteria for the distinction between language and dialect, for which Ravius and Salmasius apparently were the latter's sources of inspiration, and to Stiernhielm's views on the nature and process of dialectal diversification.²⁵ I have dealt with the same topics in an article on the concept of dialect in the linguistic theories of Stiernhielm, Salmasius and Ravius.²⁶

²³ Considine, *ibidem*, pp. 309–310.

²⁴ McKendry, "J.G. Sparwenfeldt and Celtic linguistics in seventeenth-century Sweden" in David Cram, Andrew Linn, Elke Nowak (eds.), *History of linguistic 1996, vol. 1: traditions in linguistics worldwide*, Amsterdam 1999, pp. 180–189.

²⁵ Van Rooy, *Through the vast labyrinth of languages and dialects: the emergence and transformation of a conceptual pair in the early modern period* (ca. 1478–1782), Leuven 2017, pp. 106–109; *idem*, *Greece's labyrinth of language: a study of the early modern discovery of dialect diversity*, Berlin 2020 (Language Science Press), pp. 163–167.

²⁶ Eskhult, "The concept of dialect in the works of three 17th-century linguistic theorists: Georg Stiernhielm, Claudius Salmasius and Christian Ravius. An exploratory survey of their intellectual contexts, defining criteria and classificatory aims" in Raf Van Rooy (ed.), *Essays in the history of dialect studies. From ancient Greece to modern dialectology*, Münster 2020, pp. 85–106.

2. Historical background

2.1 Political background: the Swedish Empire

2.1.1 *Stiernhielm as state official in the Swedish realm*

In the seventeenth century, Sweden emerged as a Great Power in Europe and became more tightly integrated into the political, economic, social, and cultural life of the continent. Earlier Sweden had been in the periphery of Europe with an eastward-facing political orientation. During the reigns of Gustavus Adolphus (1611–1632), Queen Christina (1644–1654) and Charles X Gustav (1654–1660), the Kingdom expanded its territories to the east, west and south. Stiernhielm put his abilities at the service of the state first in Swedish Livonia, serving from 1630 as assessor of the court of appeals and as district judge in Tartu, then in mainland Sweden as a court poet and antiquarian of the realm (1648–1651), a military counsellor (1661), reformer of the system of weights and measures and finally as director of the College of Antiquities (1666–1672).

2.1.2 *Multilingualism in the Swedish realm*

Stiernhielm's polyglottism was promoted by his contacts with the patchwork of different languages and ethnicities within the Swedish Empire. In addition to Swedish, German can be considered a native language in Stockholm due to the continuous migration of merchants and craftsmen from Germany. Approximately a third of the citizens in the Swedish capital were Germans. German was also spoken in other trading cities in Sweden, in Vorpommern, Bremen-Verden and Wismar, which fell to Sweden at the Peace of Westphalia (1648) and in the Baltic provinces where the German nobility held sway. The inhabitants of the eastern part of the Empire spoke Finnish, as did the Finns who at that time were colonizing Ingria.

Moreover, in the Baltic provinces, which were integrated into the Swedish realm by the Peaces of Teusina (1595) and Stolbova (1617) and the Truce of Altmark (1629), Estonian, Ingrian, Latvian and Russian were spoken as native languages. Furthermore, Danish was a vernacular in the provinces (Scania, Blekingia and Hallandia) that were ceded by Denmark by the Peaces of Brömsebro (1645) and Roskilde (1658). Sami was spoken in the north in Lapponia, which

increasingly was the subject of Christian missionary work and ethnography. Latin retained its position as the main language of scholarship and a viable means of literature and diplomacy. In the House of Nobility, Swedish, German, Dutch and French were spoken – French as the language of diplomacy and a cultural language for private communication. The Swedish Empire was accordingly distinguished by linguistic and ethnic diversity.²⁷

2.2 Swedish Gothicism and antiquarianism

2.2.1 Swedish Gothicism as a political ideology and on Stiernhielm's official role as its propagator

Swedish Gothicism – the tradition that Sweden was the homeland of the ancient Goths and the claim that the modern Swedes were their direct descendants – was adopted as a state ideology of the Swedish Empire. The Government endeavoured to prove the country's Gothic national identity with historical evidence and instructed antiquarians and philologists to find proof not only in antiquities such as the Swedish runic inscriptions, medieval Swedish law texts, and the Icelandic sagas, but also in the history of the Swedish or “Sweo-Gothic” language.

Stiernhielm played an important role in implementing this cultural policy. His inquiry into Gothic language history was gradually extended to a general project of language comparison, which was elaborated in *Runa Suethica* (1651), some parts of which were published in his preface to the edition of *Codex Argenteus*, the so-called Silver Bible (1671). The study of Swedish antiquities and lexicography had been initiated by Johannes Bureus, but Stiernhielm took the research a step further. He brought his historical linguistic thinking to maturity mainly during two periods, first as antiquarian of the realm (*Antiquarius Regni*) between 1648 and 1651, and then as director of the College of Antiquities between 1667 and 1671. In the first period, he established friendships with contemporary linguistic theorists, such as Gerard Vossius, Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn, Claudius Salmasius and Christian Ravius (Vol. 1, Sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.3).

The Swedish self-identification with the Goths served the purpose of historically legitimating the political position of the Swedish Great Power. At the tournament held to celebrate his coronation in 1618, Gustavus Adolphus played the part of the ancient Gothic King Berig,

²⁷ See Ulf Teleman, *Ära, rikedom och reda: svensk språkvård och språkpolitik under äldre nyare tid*, København 2002, pp. 24–41. See also Bo Andersson & Raimo Raag (eds.), *Från Nyens skans till Nya Sverige: språken i det Svenska Riket under 1600-talet* (published in the series Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien, konferences, vol. 78), Stockholm 2012.

during whose reign the Goths (*Gothi*) according to ancient mytho-history migrated from Scandinavia (*Scandza*) across the Baltic Sea, first to Gotlandia (*Gothiscanza*) and then further to the coastal regions of northern Poland.²⁸ In his decree for the tournament, Gustavus Adolphus, in the name of Berig, exhorts his knights to display their bravery to prove that the origin of the ancient Goths is Sweden – “att the gamble Göthers rätte ursprung utur Sverige är.”²⁹ In his speech to the Parliament in 1630, Gustavus Adolphus asked the Swedish nobility to revive the famous name of their warlike Gothic ancestors and show themselves to be their descendants by taking part in the wars of the fatherland.³⁰

A Gothicism historiography emerged in Sweden in the 17th century. In general it rested on Johannes Magnus, *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sveonumque regibus* (1554). Stiernhielm fulfilled his duty of history-writing. In his treatise *Anti-Cluverius*³¹ he opposes the claims of the German historian and geographer Philipp Clüver in *Germania Antiqua* (1616), that the homeland of the Goths was east-Prussia, that the Goths and the Getes were mutually different nations, and that Scandinavia is represented in ancient historiography as a part of Germany. Stiernhielm makes the counterclaim that the homeland of the Goths has been associated with Scandinavia and perceived as the Kingdom of Sweden from the earliest accounts until the present time.³²

2.2.2 Swedish antiquarianism

Swedish antiquarianism may be defined as the antiquarian study and interpretation of the ancient remains of the Swedish past, which at that time was broadly defined as encompassing textual remains such as runic inscriptions, medieval Swedish law codes, and Icelandic sagas as well as archaeological remains.³³

²⁸ Jordanes, *De origine actibusque Getarum*, chapter 4.

²⁹ Joh. Ax. Almquist, “Tornér-spelet vid kröningen 1617: ett bidrag till 1600-talets bibliografi” in *Donum Grapeanum: festskrift tillägnad överbibliotekarie Anders Grape*, Uppsala 1945, p. 5.

³⁰ Sven Widmalm, “Tyrann eller kung of Guds nåde?” in Gunnar Broberg (ed.), *Gyllene äpplen: svensk idéhistorisk läsebok*, Stockholm 1991, pp. 215–216.

³¹ This work was begun about 1640, completed in 1645, revised and supplemented in 1669, and published posthumously by Hadorph in 1685.

³² Stiernhielm, *Anti-Cluverius*, Stockholm 1685, p. 1; see the textual edition below, Section 10.4. Compare the treatise *Adelrunae conclusiones*, Section 10.3, remarks on thesis 12 (on fol. 36v).

³³ The nature, methods, and results of Swedish antiquarianism during the period 1600–1720 has been explored by Johanna Widenberg in her thesis *Fäderneslandets antikviteter: etnoterritoriella historiebruk och integrationssträvanden i den svenska statsmaktens antikvariska verksamhet 1600–1720*, Stockholm 2006.

Institutionalized antiquarianism traces back to Johannes Bureus in the early 17th century. He performed official antiquarian duties from the early 1590s onwards and was the first person to hold the office of *Antiquarius Regni*, from 1630 until 1648. As his pupil and successor, Stiernhielm acknowledged Bureus as the instigator of antiquarian and vernacular linguistic studies in Sweden.³⁴ Stiernhielm held the office from September 1648 until February 1652, when he was discharged and replaced by Johan Axehielm. In a letter to Axel Oxenstierna in 1653 or early 1654, Stiernhielm defends his work as chief antiquarian. He regrets that he was dismissed and declares that he willingly and faithfully obeyed the orders of the Queen (“at iag gärna och trooligen effter kommit min Allernådigste Drottningens befallningar”) and that he fulfilled the duties of his office: “to illustrate the antiquities of the nation, the religion, ancient history and the language of the Swedes” (*in antiquitatibus ad illustrationem gentis, cultus, famae pristinae et linguae*).³⁵ He claims that he has achieved this goal, and that his work, if published, would commend its master. Presumably the oral command of the Queen was the study of “Sweo-Gothic antiquities”. Stiernhielm interpreted this instruction as a mandate to conduct linguistic antiquarianism.

Some decades earlier, in the 1620s, King Gustavus Adolphus had commissioned Bureus “to write a Swedish dictionary”.³⁶ Bureus only initiated this enterprise and began collecting material for a Swedish dictionary (*Lexicon Gothicum*, F.a. 13 comprising the entire alphabet, A–Ö, Royal Library, Stockholm). In the provisional instruction to the antiquarians by the Swedish Council in 1630, the antiquarians were

³⁴ Stiernhielm makes the following statement in ms. F.d. 4:4:1, fol. 10v: “Studium antiquitatis et linguarum Septentionalium quod attinet, magnas debemus gratias Iohanni Bureo, qui omnium primus, anno scilicet 1600, edidit literas et lectionem Runarum etc., deinde etiam Olao Wormio, qui anno demum in Dania eandem Runarum doctrinam iusto volumine edidit, licet in eo non paullo videatur iniuriosior et citra ambitionis notam vix possit praeteriri, quod sibi tribuat dudum inventa ab alio suaeque patriae ascribat ut propria, quae sint ascititia vel ad minimum Suethiae cum Dania communia, inscribendo opus suum Runam seu literaturam Danicam.” In English: “As far as the study of antiquities and northern languages is concerned, we owe great thanks to Johannes Bureus, who was the first to publish the letter forms and reading of the runes in 1600 [*Runakenslones lerespan*, Uppsala 1599], and also to Olaus Worm, who published a handbook on the runes in a fair volume in 1636, though he seems somewhat unfair and hardly can avoid being blamed for vainglory, since he ascribes others’ findings to himself and attributes foreign matters, or at least what is common to Sweden and Denmark, to his native country, by giving his work the title ‘Runes or Danish writing’” [*Runir seu Danica literatura antiquissima*, Hafniae/ Copenhagen 1636].

³⁵ Wieselgren, *Samlade skrifter av Georg Stiernhielm*, 3:1 brev och inlagor, p. 166.

³⁶ Henrik Schück, *Kgl. Vitterhets, Historie och Antiquitets Akademien. Dess förhistoria och historia*, vol. 1, Stockholm 1932, p. 80.

instructed to collect proof of the old age of Swedish language and culture in order to confirm the historical legitimacy of the Swedish government's political ambitions. The compilation of a Swedish dictionary would serve this aim, at the same time as it would facilitate the reading and understanding of medieval documents, such as the provincial law codes and the city and country laws. The provisional decree, which mirrors Bureus' cultural linguistic program, reads as follows (in English translation):

The Council of the Realm expects the following from the antiquarians: [...] 3. A dictionary of our language, in which are explained all ancient words that are found in law codes and other documents. [...] 7. Since our kings, highly praised in memory, have by arms expanded our realm and subdued other nations and since book-learning has advanced so greatly that it widely surpasses that of other nations, it is required that we, too, prove that our ancestors were not barbarous people, as foreigners call us without much knowledge of our historical past. For no nation is older and has older literary monuments than we. Such evidence proves that we are the most ancient people, and also that our language is the most ancient. From us the other nations arose, by us other countries have been peopled. Otherwise, we will see that the Danes will appropriate to themselves the glory that belongs to us.³⁷

In the Government instruction for *Collegium antiquitatis* issued on the 20th of November 1667, the first task is the compilation of a antiquarian and etymological dictionary of “our ancient Swedish and Gothic language” (“vårt gamle svenske och götiske språk”). The secretary of this state agency, Johan Hadorph, proposed that this task should be assigned to Stiernhielm.³⁸

³⁷ Schück, *ibidem*, pp. 138–139. The provisional decree is extant in a copy by Johannes Haquini Rhezelius, F.c. 6, Royal Library. The quoted passages read: “Dätta hafwa Rijkens råd af Antiquariis att förvänta: [...] 3. Ett lexicon på vårt mål, therutinnan alla gamla ordh uttydas som i laghböcker och frödor hittas. [...] 7. Effter som våra konungar högloflin i åminnelse, detta Rijket förwidgat hafwa med sköld och andra nationer sig underkufvat; Sådän ock effter boklige konster nu så högt äro stegne, at the widt öfwergå andre nationer, kräfwes at wij och bewijse at våra Förfädher ej hafwa warit *barbari* som oss Uthlänske wäle kalla utan myket mehr af vår häffd: Ty ingen nation äldre och berömligere monumenter hafwa än wij. Sådant bewijsas at wij thet äldste folket äro, så och att vårt tungomål thet äldsta är. Af oss hafwa andra sitt upphof, af oss äro andre land besatte medh folk. Eliest see wij at the danske myken ähra then oss bör sigh tillegna.”

³⁸ Schück, *Kgl. Vitterhets, Historie och Antiquitets Akademien. Dess förhistoria och historia*, vol. 2, Stockholm 1933, p. 17. He also discusses the proposals of Johann Hadorph. See Schück, *ibidem*, p. 9 and p. 13.

3. Historical linguistic ideas in early modern Europe

3.1 Preliminaries: early modern fields of language study

In the Renaissance and early modern period (1400–1800), the study of language was not an autonomous linguistic discipline, but was included in different contexts, in particular the study of grammar, rhetoric, and logic (a continuation of the medieval *trivium*), but also in interdisciplinary activities, such as Latin and vernacular philology, the practice of translation, philosophy of language and its relation to mind, ethnographical history, and historical anthropology.

In the 16th and 17th centuries, the educational programme of Latin Renaissance humanism, which comprised the study of Latin grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history and moral philosophy, was transferred and applied to European vernaculars, first Italian and French and then other languages. Scholars turned their attention to the orthography, phonology, morphology, etymology, syntax and rhetoric of their own national vernaculars. They combined this with a historical enquiry into language origins and relationships. This study gave rise to a historical and comparative discipline of philology.

In relation to the different groups of languages that were explored, differentiated philologies emerged, which in modern terminology can be classified as Classical, Romance, Semitic, Germanic, Slavic, and Finno-Ugric. Historical and comparative study of languages first emerged in Latin and Romance philology (Robins 1997: 118, Gensini 1999: 24) and was extended to other European vernaculars and to the languages of the Near East (namely the Semitic languages plus Persian and Turkish). These philologies arose at different times and developed separately, though in mutual interaction.

The practice of ethnographic historiography also served as a field for diachronic language classification, since linguistic kinship was used as a historical tool in the search for ethnic origins.

3.2 The emergence of a historical linguistic discourse

3.2.1 Preliminaries

The practitioners of philology and ethnographic history developed a linguistic discourse on the history and classification of languages.

This discourse grew from a systematic inquiry into a set of interrelated topics (cf. Simone 1998:165, 212 and Salmon 1996: 5):

(1) the identity and nature of the original and primeval pre-Babelic language of humankind, the search for which brought about important progress, first in defining larger linguistic families, next in forming a meta-linguistic imagery of language relatedness (e.g. the terminology of mother-, daughter- and sister-languages), and finally in developing a tentative comparative method.

(2) the causes of diachronic language change and the process of dialectal diversification.

(3) the language relationships within each family of languages nowadays classified as Indo-European and Semitic, and across the boundaries of these language families (i.e. combined Semitic-European language comparison).

(4) the origin and history of individual languages in Europe and the Orient.

Below, some assumptions are proposed concerning the emergence of a pre-disciplinary, early modern discourse on the history of languages. Socio-political, intellectual, historical and cultural factors contributed to the rise of specialized questions and answers regarding language origins, language relationships, and linguistic change in a particular discourse practised by philologists and historians.

3.2.2 *Socio-cultural contexts*

The fact that languages have a history did not begin to be recognized until the Renaissance. This insight was consolidated during the same period, which marks the beginning of a meta-linguistic reflection on linguistic change and diversification. This was conditioned and prompted by several historical and cultural factors, of which the following appear most important:

(1) the emergence of European vernaculars as written languages in the High Middle Ages (c. 1000–1300), and the increase of this cultivation during the Renaissance, a phenomenon that has been called a process of vernacularization, often conceived of as a process of emancipation from Latin, both in that time and in modern historiography.³⁹

(2) the codification of the European vernaculars in the 16th and 17th centuries, a process that was necessitated by the rise of the vernaculars in domains such as literature, law and administration.

³⁹ See Peter Burke, *Languages and communities in early modern Europe*, Oxford 2004, p. 63; cf. Leezenberg, “How comparative should a comparative history of the humanities be?” in *The making of the Humanities*, edited by Rens Bod, Jaap Mat and Thijs Weststeijn, Amsterdam 2010, p. 24.

The efforts of adapting and transforming these vernaculars into culture-bearing national languages have been described as a process of language standardization.⁴⁰ The codification consisted of three parts: *graphization*, i.e. the choice of graphemes and the normalization of orthography, *lexization*, i.e. the description of the lexis in dictionaries, and *grammatization*, the summarizing of the linguistic usage into certain rules in grammars.⁴¹

(3) the rediscovery in the Renaissance of classical Latin and its textual heritage, and a reorientation towards this linguistic code as a model for imitation. This phenomenon can be described as the core of the language identity of Renaissance Humanism, in so far as the return to classical Latin as a linguistic norm was considered to be the most essential point in the renewal of ancient Roman culture, at the same time as Latin continued to hold its position as the primary medium of scholarly communication and literary composition.⁴² On the Continent, a slow decline of Latin began after 1650, and accelerated after 1750.

(4) the emergence of linguistic national consciousnesses in the Renaissance in opposition to the classical linguistic heritage and in competition both with it and with each other, especially those of neighbouring nations.⁴³ The status of various vernaculars was programmatically vindicated in treatises and speeches on their dignity and excellence.⁴⁴ Thus the rise of nation-states constituted the political basis for discovering and shaping language identities in early modern Europe.⁴⁵ All this entailed a historical search for ethnic origins. In the search for historical ethnic identities and linguistic pre-history, biblical ethnography (primarily the Table of nations descended from Noah in Genesis, chapter 10) and classical ethnography played a decisive role.

(5) the increase in linguistic documentation of the European languages, especially language data testifying to older language stages, e.g. the editions of early Bible translations, such as the edition of the Gothic Gospels by Franciscus Junius in 1665.

⁴⁰ Cf. Burke, *Languages and communities*, pp. 89–91.

⁴¹ In this process of codification, the grammars and dictionaries of the Latin language served as models. For a list of the first grammars of vernaculars and their specific dates, see Law, *History of linguistics in Europe*, 2003: 234–235.

⁴² Ann Moss, *Renaissance truth and the Latin language turn*, Oxford 2003, p. 2.

⁴³ Mirko Tavoni, “Renaissance linguistics” in Giulio Lepschy (editor), *History of linguistics*, vol. III: *Renaissance and early modern linguistics*, London and New York 1998, p. 44; Burke, *Languages and communities*, pp. 61, 65 and 70–71.

⁴⁴ Burke, *ibidem*, p. 65.

⁴⁵ William Jervis Jones, *Images of language: six essays on German attitudes to European languages from 1500 to 1800*, Amsterdam 1999, p. 216.

(6) the re-discovery of classical Latin in its historical specificity and with its textual heritage. This provided (a) a framework for dealing with linguistic change, (b) linguistic data for language comparison and (c) a meta-linguistic terminology for analysing language as such (in its constituents).

(7) the expansion of linguistic awareness of languages outside Europe. This manifested itself in early European grammars of non-European languages and was motivated by European trade and Christian missionary work.

(8) the Christian encounter with Semitic languages in Bible philology (*philologia sacra*) and with the Hebrew grammatical tradition with its meta-linguistic terminology, e.g. the concept of a root morpheme (*shoresh* in Hebrew, then rendered *radix* in Latin, although the ancient terms *positio* and *thema* also were retained) and the Hebrew-Arabic classification of consonants into gutturals, palatals, linguals, dentals, and labials.

(9) the increase of language documentation of the Semitic languages by editions of texts attesting to earlier language stages and the writing of dictionaries and grammars.

3.2.3 *Reflection on the history of languages*

Due to these factors, Renaissance humanist philologists discovered the depth dimension of languages. This discovery may aptly be compared to the invention of perspective in Renaissance painting, as opposed to the flatness of medieval painting in which everything was represented as equally near or distant. Accordingly, the Renaissance raised questions across Europe about the origin and history of particular languages. These factors gave rise to linguistic reflection on languages around the following topics: (1) language origins, (2) language relationships and (3) linguistic change.

This reflection is to be distinguished from the development that took place within the philosophy of language, whose specific background is the ancient and medieval debate on the relationship of language to thought and reality. Likewise, Renaissance translation theory, which to a great extent was based on the classical theory of language, is another field of meta-linguistic theorizing in the Renaissance that must be distinguished from the historical study of languages, despite being an adjacent field.

Why did the linguistic past become an object of historical exploration in early modern Europe? Sonia Brough provides an answer to this question in her survey of Gothicism in Germany from

1500 to 1750.⁴⁶ At the beginning of the second chapter with the heading “The uncouth grandeur of the Gothic language,” Brough says:

The investigation of the origins and history of one’s native language, whether parallel with or to the exclusion of the study of Latin and Greek, was a widespread European pursuit in the sixteenth and subsequent centuries. Language as a *vehiculum scientiarum*, a carrier of knowledge and culture, in the first place constituted the most detailed record of a nation’s past, shedding light on cultural accomplishments and political events which might otherwise have fallen into oblivion. Linked with this, the age of a particular language, as far as it could be determined, was an indication of the antiquity of its speakers and thus a key factor in the establishment of the historical identity of a nation or people.⁴⁷

Brough continues to emphasize the connection between patriotism and studies into the linguistic past of Europe or of one’s own vernacular:

Although the tracing of human achievements to their origins or earliest recorded stages was not pursued exclusively in the interest of proving the superiority of one’s nation and people [...], the motivation behind such pursuits was generally of an overtly patriotic nature, whether on a national or a provincial scale. Thus it was with the philologically-oriented European Humanists who from the fifteenth century onwards were devoting their energies to the illumination of their respective mother tongues with the same intention as many contemporary historians, namely that of demonstrating the early literacy and cultural pre-eminence of their particular homeland.⁴⁸

3.2.4 *A pre-disciplinary historical linguistic discourse*

The reflection on language origins, language relationships, and linguistic change developed and consolidated into a pre-disciplinary discourse, in which answers to the questions raised were provided as a form of specialized knowledge. This discourse took place in

⁴⁶ Sonia Brough, *The Goths and the concept of Gothic in Germany from 1500 to 1750*, Frankfurt am Main 1985. The book was reviewed by Kurt Johannesson in the journal *Arbitrium*, vol. 5, issue 3 (1985), pp. 269–270.

⁴⁷ Brough, *ibidem*, p. 63.

⁴⁸ Brough, *ibidem*, p. 64.

interaction or dialogue with ancient and medieval traditions in the fields of (a) patristic and medieval exegesis of Genesis 10–11: the Table of nations and the Confusion of Languages at Babel, especially the opinion that Hebrew was the primeval language of humankind, (b) classical ethnography, both Latin and Greek, referring to the Scythians, the Goths, the Celts and many other ancient ethnic groups, (c) classical mythology – Latin and Greek – and (d) medieval Jewish conceptions of the history of Hebrew and Aramaic.

The traditional knowledge was contested by a process of renewal motivated by a new observational, empirical epistemology. New knowledge was drawn from a growing body of linguistic documentation, and the interpretation of these new data gave rise to a project of language comparison, which discovered and explained lexical linguistic similarities. Explicit theories of language relationships based on descent from a common origin were formulated. Some coherent research traditions can be distinguished in the emergence and propagation of the Scythian hypothesis and in the formulation of a proto-language for the Semitic languages. As stated above, a meta-linguistic terminology for describing language kinship was also developed.

3.3 Renaissance philology: theories of language origins

The discourse described above was established by a particular group of practitioners, philologists and historians. The practice of specific philologies, namely Romance, Gothic, Oriental, and Greek, and the art of *historia universalis* can be identified as the most relevant historical intellectual contexts. Consequently, the emergent views on language origins will be dealt with under the following headings:

- *Latin and Romance philology*, which mainly comprised the study of Latin, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and French.
- *Germanic or Gothic philology*, which mainly encompassed the study of German, English, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, and Icelandic.
- *Semitic or Oriental philology*, which mainly included the study of Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Arabic.
- *Greek philology*, which comprised the study of ancient Greek.

3.3.1 Latin and Romance philology

Questions of language history were raised in earnest in Romance-speaking countries where the Renaissance initially gained ground, such as the politically divided Italy, the emergent nation-states of Spain and France, and the kingdom of Portugal. Different hypotheses were proposed on how the Italian, Spanish, French and Portuguese vernaculars were related to Latin. In the pursuit of this topic, the

Romance philologists had the advantage of knowing the parent of Romance languages, ancient Latin, and thus they possessed the meta-linguistic concept of a common ancestor. Their search into linguistic origins took the form of a competition to demonstrate the supreme conformity of one's own language to Latin.⁴⁹

In linguistic historiography, scholars agree that the historical study of languages primarily emerged in Renaissance Romance philology. A prominent historian of linguistic thought, Robert Robins states:

The relationship between the Romance languages and Latin provided what the ancient world had always lacked, an explicit theoretical framework for dealing with linguistic change. It might reasonably be argued that it was in these studies that historical linguistics, as we understand it today, finds its real beginning. The rediscovery of classical Antiquity in all its glory as a part of the revival of learning gave Renaissance man a historical perspective such as the Middle Ages had not had.⁵⁰

Another historian of linguistics, Stefano Gensini, similarly traces “the analysis of languages as autonomous historical phenomena” to the Renaissance⁵¹ with its awakening awareness of “the historicity of every language and linguistic phenomenon”. He identifies two main specific factors that contributed to this development: (1) “the recovery of the classical tradition in its historical-linguistic specificity,” which means that “classical Latin was now understood as a historical reality” and (2) “the evaluation of various vernacular traditions”.⁵² He emphasizes the significance of Romance philology in this development, saying:

But the discovery of the historicity of languages was mainly consolidated by the works that studied the evolution of the vernacular dialects of Latin. Latin was at that time beginning to be conceived as the basis of the Romance world. [...] This field of

⁴⁹ Tavoni, “Renaissance linguistics”, pp. 59 and 44.

⁵⁰ Robins, *A short history of linguistics*, London and New York, fourth revised and expanded edition from 1997, p. 118.

⁵¹ Gensini, “Rhetoric, the philosophy of language and the study of languages in the Humanistic tradition” in (Peter Schmitter, ed.), *Sprachtheorien der Neuzeit: 1 Der epistemologische Kontext neu-zeitlicher Sprach- und Grammatiktheorien*, Tübingen 1999, p. 22: “When today we speak about Renaissance ‘linguistics’ [...] we refer to the phase during which languages started to be considered as such, as specific systems, not only from a lexical, but also from a morphological, syntactical and stylistic point of view.”

⁵² Gensini, “Rhetoric, the philosophy of language”, p. 24

research was destined to develop immensely by the end of the 16th century and give rise to the true ‘protocomparative’ linguistics during the subsequent century.⁵³

3.3.2 Germanic or “Gothic” philology: the Scythian hypothesis

As Renaissance Humanism gradually spread across Europe, other language groups, such as Germanic and Semitic, became objects of exploration with regard to their origins and diachronic differentiation. In Germanic philology, the investigation was initially hampered by the lack of any attestation of a common ancestor comparable to Latin in Romance philology. In the 16th century, this was compensated by the cultivation and comparison of a multiplicity of languages. Thus, there arose a culture of multilingualism whose scope and range surpassed the linguistic horizon in the Romance-speaking countries.⁵⁴ In the 17th century, a theory was developed that aimed at systematizing the historical relationships of the Germanic languages mutually and with other language groups such as Latin, Greek, Celtic, Slavonic, and Persian. According to this theory, the Germanic languages, Latin, Greek, and Persian all shared a common origin in the historical Scythian language, *lingua Scythica*. In modern linguistic historiography, this is referred to as the Scythian hypothesis.

The idea of the antiquity of the Scythian language was enunciated by the Dutch physician and antiquarian Johannes Goropius Becanus in his *Origines Antwerpianae*, 1569.⁵⁵ However, he equated the Scythians with the Cimbrians, whom he in turn identified with the ancestors of the Dutch and whose language he regarded as the same as Old Flemish or Old Dutch (*lingua Cimbrica*). Abraham Mylius⁵⁶ took up the idea of descent from an earlier common parent language and elaborated the hypothesis, as did Adrian van Schrieck,⁵⁷ but it was not brought to maturity until the 1640s. The most explicit formulation of it is encountered in the work of Marcus Zuerius van

⁵³ Gensini, “Rhetoric, the philosophy of language”, p. 24.

⁵⁴ Tavoni, “Renaissance linguistics”, p. 60.

⁵⁵ See further Metcalf, “The Indo-European hypothesis”, p. 239 and pp. 241–244.

⁵⁶ Abraham Mylius, *Lingua Belgica sive de linguae illius communitate cum plerisque aliis, tum praesertim cum Latina, Graeca, Persica deque communitatis illius causis; tum de linguae illius origine et latissime per nationes quamplurimas diffusione, ut et de eius praestantia*, Leiden 1612. It has been investigated by Metcalf, “Abraham Mylius on historical linguistics”, *Modern language Association* 68:3 (1953), pp. 535–554; idem, “The Indo-European hypothesis”, pp. 244–245.

⁵⁷ van Schrieck’s linguistic ideas are the subject of a study by Pierre Swiggers, “Adrianus Schrieckius: De la langue des Scythes a l’Europe linguistique”, *Histoire, Épistémologie, langage*, vol. 6, issue 2 (1984), pp. 17–34.

Boxhorn (1612–1653), professor of rhetoric and history at the University of Leiden. He proposed it in his *De Graecorum, Romanorum et Germanorum linguis earumque symphonia*, Leiden 1650, and the ninth chapter of *Originum Gallicarum liber primus*, Amsterdam 1654, to which his colleague, the Dutch historian Georg Horn, wrote a preface in which he accounts for how Boxhorn arrived at his hypothesis and its reception by contemporaries.

Despite its potential to explain linguistic relationships, the Scythian theory was not universally accepted and only survived as one of several competing theories. When the historians of the late 18th century redefined the Scythian ethnicity, so that one restricted the term Scythian to the nomad Scythians who lived on the steppes from the Carpathians to the Don, the idea in question fell into oblivion. Nevertheless, a number of philologists worked according to this model, among whom Stiernhielm holds a prominent place.

3.3.3 Semitic or Oriental philology

From the beginning of the 16th century, when Christian humanists learnt Hebrew, reflection on language history also took place within the field of Semitic philology or, to employ the term of the early modern period, Oriental philology. The same century also witnessed an intense study of other Semitic or Oriental languages in Western Europe, such as Syriac, Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic, which primarily were used for elucidating words and phrases in the Old Testament, but also for the study of history. European universities began to offer courses in most Oriental languages in the first decades of the 17th century. The thus extended and gained knowledge entailed the rise of a comparative method, but the concept of a common Semitic parent language was overshadowed by the conception of Hebrew as the original and primeval language of humankind. This idea was persistent due to its support in ancient and medieval tradition, both Christian and Jewish, but the comparative approach made a decisive breakthrough in the decades around 1750. Previous linguistic historiography placed the crisis a century earlier (circa 1650) pointing to the rationalist critical opinions of the Dutch polymath, lawyer, jurist and biblical commentator Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) who challenged the Hebrew monogenesis hypothesis, but in the normal science⁵⁸ of Oriental philology, the established

⁵⁸ Normal science is here used about the set of scholarly practices and assumptions that make up a research paradigm, for instance in the practice of handling empirical data, of matching them with theory and of adapting existing theories; see Thomas Kuhn's *The structure of scientific revolutions*, 3rd ed. Chicago and London 1997 (1st ed. 1962), pp. 23–34 (chapter 3).

hypothesis prevailed much longer. The Dutch Orientalist Albert Schultens (1686–1750) developed the concept of a Semitic proto-language as a theoretical framework and justification of his etymological Hebrew lexicography, in which he turned out to be both an innovator and a fulfiller.⁵⁹

About one hundred years before Schultens, the German Orientalist Christian Ravius (1613–1677) advanced the ground-breaking theory that most languages until then designated as Oriental (more exactly those that today are referred to as Semitic, namely Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syriac, Samaritan, Arabic, and Ethiopic) were actually one and the same language with equal claims to a primordial historical status and holiness.⁶⁰ After a career at the universities of Wittenberg, Utrecht, Amsterdam, London, Oxford and a two-year journey to the Ottoman Empire, he entered the Swedish history of learning as professor of Oriental languages at Uppsala University, a position he held for nearly two decades (1650–1656 and 1659–1669).⁶¹ Ravius attended the court academy of Queen Christina of Sweden, where Stiernhielm had the opportunity to meet him.

In interpreting and conceptualizing language change and linguistic variation, Ravius adopted, like Stiernhielm after him, the Aristotelian categories of substance and accident as conceptual tools. He based his concept of dialect on this conceptual dichotomy. Ravius draws up this language-dialect distinction in the introductory remarks to the morphological part of his Hebrew grammar in Latin (1646: 42). The passage reads:

⁵⁹ See my forthcoming monographs *Albert Schultens as the innovator of Hebrew etymology and lexicography* and *Albert Schultens as the innovator of Hebrew Biblical philology* (in the series *Studia Semitica Upsaliensia*). See also my accompanying textbook *Albert Schultens. Unpublished manuscripts on comparative Hebrew philology edited with a biographical introduction* (*Studia Latina Upsaliensia*).

⁶⁰ Ravius presented his methodology of comparative Semitic language studies in his Hebrew grammar in Latin, viz. *Orthographiae et analogiae (vulgo etymologiae) Ebraicae delineatio*, Amsterdam 1646, in his Hebrew grammar in English, viz. *A generall grammer for the ready attaining of Ebrew, Samaritan, Calde, Syriac, Arabic and the Ethiopic languages*, London 1648, and finally in a treatise entitled *A discourse concerning the easterne tongues, to wit, Ebrew, Calde, Samaritane, Syriac, Arabic and Ethiopic*, London 1649.

⁶¹ Due to his novel method of teaching his subject, Ravius came into conflict with his colleagues at Uppsala University, and this was to the detriment of his memory in the university historiography, where he has been depreciated, for instance by Claes Annerstedt. See my article “Christian Ravius’ Turkish and Semitic studies and his work as an Orientalist in the Swedish state service” in Éva Á. Csató, Gunilla Gren-Eklund, Lars Johanson, Birsel Karakoç (eds.), *Turcologica Upsaliensia: an illustrated collection of essays*, Leiden: Brill 2021, pp. 47–71.

Languages – generally considered diverse, but in all essentials connected, even if seemingly very distinct in some and certainly many, numerous and countless accidents – are nonetheless dialects in relation to each other and constitute an entire language and a perfect body.⁶²

Ravius shows himself to be a rationalist in his view of the nature of languages. They are all, he states, based the faculty of reason that is common to all humankind. This explains in his view why the same principles of semantic development by metaphors, metonymies, synecdoches and other tropes are found in such a diversity of languages.⁶³ This linguistic rationalism is the same as that which underlies the Port-Royal grammar and logic. This fact has generally not been noticed, except in a paper by Judith Olszowy-Schlanger.⁶⁴

3.3.4 *The emergence of proto-language theories*

The hypothesis of a proto-language⁶⁵ emerged in each one of the four philologies referred to above. In Romance philology, the Italian Renaissance humanists ultimately rejected the medieval theory of bilingualism between Latin and Italian,⁶⁶ and recognized that Italian derives its origin from Latin, but this insight was greatly obscured by the theory of linguistic decay.⁶⁷ A clear proto-language theory was

⁶² Ravius, *Orthographiae et analogiae Hebraicae delineatio*, Amsterdam 1646, p. 42: “Linguae vulgo aestimatae diversae, per omnia tamen essentialia iunctae, licet aliquibus et quidem multis variisque et innumeris accidentalibus apparenter distinctissimae, sibi invicem tamen dialecti sunt, et linguam aliquam constituunt integram corpusque perfectum.”

⁶³ Ravius, *A discourse concerning the easterne tongues*, London 1649, pp. 15–17.

⁶⁴ Judith Olszowy-Schlanger, “The ‘generall grammar of oriental tongues’: and universal language schemes in the 17th century: the contribution of Christian Ravius” in *History of linguistics 1996, vol. II: from classical to contemporary linguistics*, Amsterdam 1999, pp. 131–141. I will discuss Ravius’ linguistic rationalism in a forthcoming article: “The linguistic theory of Christian Ravius on the unity and diversity of the Semitic languages: a study on a prestructuralist approach to comparative Semitics.”

⁶⁵ A proto-language is a hypothetical and unattested language from which historically attested languages are assumed to be derived as from a common source through a process of dialect diversification.

⁶⁶ That is, that Italian and Latin co-existed since antiquity, with Latin as the written variant. This idea was embraced by Dante Alighieri (1265–1321), *De vulgari eloquentia* (c. 1304, printed in 1529) and still defended by Leonardo Bruni (1374–1444).

⁶⁷ That is, that the Romance languages deteriorated by the admixture of foreign linguistic elements due to the barbaric invasions, a theory that was proposed by Flavio Biondo in 1435 and held sway until the middle of the 18th century, when Pierre-Nicolas Bonamy again proposed the descent of Romance languages from

proposed in 1601 by Celso Cittadini (*Trattado della vera origine della nostra lingua*), who derives Italian and other Romance languages from the common origin of Vulgar Latin in the different provinces of the Roman Empire in late antiquity.⁶⁸

In Germanic philology a proto-language theory was proposed by Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn in 1650 (*De Graecorum, Romanorum et Germanorum linguis earumque symphonia*) and 1654 (*Originum Gallicarum liber primus*). Boxhorn derives German, Latin, Greek and Persian from the common source of the lost Scythian language. In modern linguistic historiography this has been termed the Scythian hypothesis.⁶⁹ As intimated above, it served as a classificatory model and qualifies to be seen as the predecessor of the modern Indo-European hypothesis.⁷⁰

According to George Metcalf (1974: 257), the Scythian hypothesis comprised the following patterns of thought that prepared the way for the comparative method of 19th-century linguistics:

- (1) “the concept of a no-longer-spoken parent language which in turn produced the major linguistic groups of Asia and Europe,”
- (2) “a concept of the development of languages into dialects and of dialects into new independent languages that could help to explain the historical situation”,
- (3) “certain minimum standards for determining what words are borrowed and what words are ancestral in a language”, and
- (4) “an insistence that not a few random items but a large number of words from the basic vocabulary should form the basis of comparisons.”

Metcalf underlines that the major difference to 19th-century views is the recognition that phonetic change is the basic pattern of linguistic change. Early modern linguistic generally had an a-historical view of phonetic change.

Vulgar Latin. However, the term Romance (*Romansae, Romanenses*) had earlier at times been used as a superordinate term for the group of languages descended from Latin, for instance in Joseph Justus Scaliger’s treatise on the European languages “*Diatriba de Europaeorum linguis*”, published in *Opuscula varia antehac non edita*, Parisii/ Paris 1610, pp. 119–122.

⁶⁸ See further my article “Vulgar Latin as an emergent concept in the Italian Renaissance (1435–1601): its ancient and medieval prehistory and its Renaissance emergence and development”, *Journal of Latin linguistics* vol. 17:2, pp. 1–39.

⁶⁹ See for instance Metcalf 1974: 233–257, Droixhe 1978, and 1980: 123–137, Swiggers 1984: 17–35, Muller 1986: 9–12, Law 2003: 261, Villani 2003: 443–491)

⁷⁰ In the historiography of linguistic ideas, the Scythian hypothesis was rediscovered in the 1970s by George J. Metcalf, “The Indo-European hypothesis in the 16th and 17th centuries” in *Studies in the history of linguistics: tradition and paradigms*, edited by Dell Hymes, Bloomington & London 1974, pp. 233–257.

In Oriental philology proto-language theories were introduced by Christian Ravius in his *A discourse concerning the easterne tongues* in 1648, by Jean Leclerc in his *De lingua hebraica* in 1693 (in the prolegomena to his commentary on Genesis), and in a more complete way by Albert Schultens in his published and unpublished writings between 1738 and 1748.⁷¹ Schultens conceives of Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic as figuratively speaking branches of a primeval tree trunk and dialects derived from the common source of the primeval language.

In Classical philology, Claudius Salmasius in his *De Hellenistica commentarius* in 1643 proposed the origin of the Ionic, Attic, Doric and Aeolic dialects from an earlier linguistic stage of Greek and derived Greek, Persian and Germanic from a common source, which he equated with the Scythian language.

3.4 The Scythian hypothesis: a proto-language theory

3.4.1 Early modern conceptions of Scythian ethnicity and language

The views on Scythian ethnicity before 1750 differ from the modern concept of Scythian. In modern times, Scythians are defined as a nomadic people of an Iranian origin who inhabited ancient Scythia – the land between the Danube to the West and the Don to the east, roughly corresponding to present-day central and southern Ukraine –⁷² and whose culture flourished between 800 and 200 BC.⁷³ This definition differs from early modern views on Scythian ethnicity and chronology, but agrees with the Scythians' geographical location. From the late sixteenth century until the middle of the eighteenth century, the Scythians were regarded as identical with the proto-Europeans. They were supposed to have settled the Pontic-Caspian steppe in the early second millennium B.C. by means of gradual migration from the Caucasus region, and from there to have

⁷¹ Schultens, *Origines Hebraeae*, vol. 2, Leiden 1738, p. 11, *Vetus et regia via Hebraizandi*, Leiden 1738, p. 53, *Proverbia Salomonis*, Leiden 1748, preface, pp. lxxviii, lxxxviii and xcii, and his unpublished *Theses de lingua primaeva*, §§ 83–91 (Or. 1460, Leiden University Library) in my forthcoming study *Albert Schultens. Unpublished manuscripts on comparative Hebrew philology*, Section 6.1.5. See also my forthcoming monograph *Albert Schultens as the innovator of Hebrew etymology and lexicography*, Section 11.1.

⁷² For the exact location of ancient Scythia, see Renate Rolle, *The World of the Scythians*, Berkeley 1989, pp. 11–12 (German original titled *Die Welt der Skythen*, Luzern 1980). However, some scholars extend the eastern borders to the Ural river, so that Ancient Scythia may be equated with the Pontic-Caspian steppe.

⁷³ For modern research on Scythian culture, see Rolle, *ibidem*, E. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, Cambridge 1913, H. Parzinger, *Die Skythen*, München 2004, and B. Cunliffe, *The Scythians: nomad warriors of the steppe*, Oxford 2019.

gradually spread to all the corners of Europe by means of migration and colonization. Through the combination of biblical ethnography (of the nations descended from Noah) with Greco-Roman ethnography and geography, the Scythians were identified with the Japhethites, the peoples mentioned in Genesis 10:2–5 as descending from Japheth, Noah’s son. These views partly trace back to those held by Flavius Josephus, who located the settlement area of the Japhethites from the Don to Cádiz in south-western Spain. He identifies Japheth’s son Magog as the ancestor of the Scythians.⁷⁴

This view of Scythian ethnicity was the historical basis for the theory of linguistic kinship between most of the European languages and Persian (but still not Sanskrit which remained largely unknown to Europeans)⁷⁵. When Dutch philologists in the early to middle 17th century discovered the lexical and morphological points of similarity between German and Persian, and in turn the agreement of these languages with Latin and Greek, they posited Scythian more clearly than before as the common historical source of Persian and most European languages, the exceptions being Finnish and Hungarian. In the middle of the 17th century, important advocates of this hypothesis were Claudius Salmasius, Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn, and Georg Stiernhielm. In the 18th century, the lexicographers Johann Georg Wachter and Johan Ihre advocated the Scythian hypothesis, although they adopted the Germanized version of this kinship theory, where in practice Scythian was identified with proto-German (then designated as old Celtic) more than with proto-Indo-European, to use modern terminology. Since the 1970s (after Metcalf 1974: 233–257) historiographers of linguistic thought has called attention to the fact that the Scythian hypothesis in many ways is the precursor of the Indo-European hypothesis. It is thus a misunderstanding introduced by 19th-century linguistic historiography that Gottfried Wilhelm

⁷⁴ Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 1, 6: “Japheth, the son of Noah, had seven sons. They colonized their countries beginning at the mountains Taurus and Amanus they proceeded along Asia, as far as the river Tanais, and along Europe to Cádiz, and settling themselves on the lands they lighted upon, which none had inhabited before, they called the nations by their own names. For Gomer founded those whom the Greeks now call Galatians, but were then called Gomerites. Magog founded those that from him were named Magogites; but who are by the Greeks called Scythians.”

⁷⁵ Rosane Rocher, “Discovery of Sanskrit by Europeans” in E.F.K. Koerner and R.E. Asher (eds.), *Concise history of the language sciences: from the Sumerians to the cognitivists*, New York 1995, pp. 188–191; idem, “The knowledge of Sanskrit in Europe until 1800” in S. Auroux, E.F.K. Koerner and H.-J. Niederehe (eds.) *History of the language sciences: an international handbook on the evolution of the study of language* [...], vol. 2, Berlin, 2001, pp. 1156–1163.

Leibniz (1646–1716) should have been the first or main precursor of the Indo-European hypothesis.

A change in the definition of Scythian ethnicity occurred in the second half of the 18th century, when German historians expressly redefined the concept of Scythian ethnicity, making Scythians only a particular historical nation located north of the Black Sea from the 9th to the 3rd century BC. For this reason, the Scythian hypothesis could no longer be sustained.

As the geographical method of language classification became predominant in Europe in the late 18th century, the Scythian hypothesis – which was a historical and genealogical method of classification – was easily forgotten.⁷⁶

3.4.2 *Pioneers and early proponents of a Persian-German linguistic kinship*⁷⁷

While Goropius Becanus (*Hermathena*, 1580) presumed an ethno-linguistic relationship between Persians and Germans on the basis of a single passage in the Greek historian Herodotus (*Historiae* 1, 125), where a Persian tribe is called *Germanioi*,⁷⁸ other Flemish or Dutch philologists were the first to propose the theory of a Persian-German linguistic kinship relying on empirical evidence. A collaborator of the Antwerp Polyglot Bible, Franciscus Raphelengius (1539–1597) came across the Persian translation of the Pentateuch published in Hebrew characters in Istanbul in 1546 and drew up a list of Persian words, of which his colleague and friend Bonaventura Vulcanius (1538–1614) published a part in his sample of the Persian language in his treatise on the writing and language of the Getes or the Goths in 1597.⁷⁹ He acknowledges a letter from Raphelengius to him on this topic as his

⁷⁶ The clash between the old and new concepts of Scythian ethnicity is observable in the German 18th-century historian Johann Christoph Gatterer's review of a contemporary dictionary in which the old concept of Scythian plays a key role, namely the *Glossarium Suiogothicum* (1769) by Johan Ihre. Gatterer published his review in his journal *Allgemeine historische Bibliothek*, vol. 13, Halle 1770 (pp. 131–179).

⁷⁷ See Bernhard Dorn, *Über die Verwandtschaft des Persischen, Germanischen und Griechisch-lateinischen Sprachstammes*, Hamburg 1827, pp. 91–135 (divided into one sub-section on the supporters and another on the opponents or sceptics of the hypothesis). See also Toon Van Hal, "The earliest stages of Persian-German language comparison" in *History of linguistics 2008: selected papers from the eleventh international conference on the history of the language sciences (ICHoLS XI)*, edited by Gerda Hassler with the assistance of Gesina Volkmann, pp. 147–165.

⁷⁸ See Van Haal, "The earliest stages", pp. 148–150.

⁷⁹ In *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum*, Lugduni Batavorum 1597, pp. 87–88, Vulcanius provides a list of 22 Persian words with Latin translation and the Persian translation of Genesis 1:1–8 with an interlinear Latin translation.

source. From the common words, he concluded that there is some kinship (*aliquam affinitatem*) between Persian and German. Moreover, in a letter to Henric Schotti at the end of the following year, Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) supplied a list of 46 Persian words with phonetic and semantic counterparts in German and with Latin translation.⁸⁰ This list partly coincides with that of Vulcanius.

In the 17th century, many Dutch philologists continued to claim the Persian-German linguistic relationship, whether they attributed it to a common origin, language contact through colonisation, trade and war.⁸¹ Regardless of their explanation, we encounter such ideas in the works of Hugo Grotius,⁸² Abraham van der Myl,⁸³ Salmasius and Boxhorn in a letter to Nicolas Blankaart and in his treatise on the Gaulish language.⁸⁴ Johannes Elichmann was an important advocate of this theory, but did not accomplish his planned work *De affinitate linguae Persicae et Germanicae*, also titled *Archaeologia harmonica*.

From the latter half on the 17th century until the late 18th century several German philologists advocated the hypothesis in question, for instance, the Orientalists Matthias Wasmuth and August Pfeiffer, the polymath Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, the grammarians and linguistic theorists Johann Georg Schottelius and Johann Christoph Adelung and the etymologist Johann Georg Wachter. In Sweden, Stiernhielm, Olof Celsius the Elder, and Johan Ihre supported the same idea.⁸⁵

3.4.3 The views of Goropius Becanus, Schrieckius, Salmasius and Boxhorn on the Scythian language and ethnicity

One of the first important theorists of the role of the Scythians as proto-Europeans was the Dutch physician, humanist and linguist Jan Gerartsen van Gorp (a native of the city of Gorp), better known under

⁸⁰ Lipsius, *Epistolarum selectarum centuria tertia ad Belgas*, Antverpiae 1614, letter no. 44, pp. 56–57. This letter is edited, translated and commented upon by Tom Deneire and Toon van Hal, *Lipsius tegen Becanus*, Amersfoort 2006.

⁸¹ Van Haal, “Persian-German language comparison”, pp. 157 f., directs attention to the fact that the causes for linguistic similarities between Persian and German were explained differently by the proponents of the hypothesis in question.

⁸² Grotius, *Parellelon rerum publicarum liber tertius de moribus ingenioque populorum*, 1602, published 1803, p. 62 f.; idem, *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum et Langobardorum*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam 1655, p. 8.

⁸³ Mylius, *De lingua Belgica*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1611, pp. 51 and 101.

⁸⁴ The letter to N. Blankaart (Blanckardus) on 1 Dec. 1648 is attached to Boxhorn’s edition of Cornelius Tacitus’ works (*Cornelii Taciti quae extant*, Amstelodami) in 1653, pp. 58–66. In *Originum Gallicarum liber primus* (1654) Boxhorn discusses the topic at issue on pp. 87 ff.

⁸⁵ See Celsius (pres.) / Olaus Odhelius Andersson (resp.), *Dissertatio philologico-historica de convenientia linguae Persicae cum Gothica*, Upsaliae/ Uppsala 1723; Johan Ihre, *Glossarium Suiogothicum*, Upsaliae 1769, “Prooemium”, pp. XIII–XV.

his Latin name Johannes Goropius Becanus (1519–1572). In 1563 he proposed to the city council the idea to write a history of Antwerp and in the year after the outbreak of the Dutch War of Liberation he published *Origines Antwerpianae* (1569) in nine volumes, in which he aimed to show that Antwerp was founded by the Cimmerian or Cimbrian descendants of Gomer, son of Noah.⁸⁶ In the fifth book, subtitled *Indoscythica*, he claims that Old Dutch (*Cimbrica*) is the primeval language. In doing so, he equates Old Dutch with Scythian and with Scythian Aramaic, which he opposed to the term Aramaean of Semitic ethno-linguistic origin.⁸⁷ He argues that Dutch with its Scythian dialectal variants fulfils the main criterion of identification with humankind's original language, as he can explain the pre-historical biblical proper names (Adam, Eve, Cain, Set, etc.) by Dutch etymologies.⁸⁸ He also contends that Dutch fulfils the criterion of the functionally most perfect language, as the Dutch words well correspond to the nature of things and thus have excellent transparency between form and meaning.⁸⁹ From a historical point of view he argues that the Scythian nations, including the Cimbrians, who remained at the Caucasus regions after the Flood of Noah – to cultivate the ground – and did not participate in the building of the Tower of Babel, retained the original language. Therefore, Dutch, or Scythian, is the primeval language.⁹⁰ Goropius only applied the Scythian hypothesis to the Dutch language. It did not yet function as

⁸⁶ An analysis of Johannes Goropius' linguistic ideas is provided by Toon van Hal, *'Moedertalen en taalmoeders'. Het vroegmoderne taalvergelijkende onderzoek in de Lage Landen*, Brussels 2010, pp. 81–127, with an English summary, pp. 584–585.

⁸⁷ Goropius, *Origines Antwerpianae sive Cimmeriorum becceselana*, Antverpiae/Antwerp 1569, book 5 titled “Indoscythica”, pp. 530–531 and 554. Goropius does not confuse the Aramaeans with the Armenians. He concludes, p. 531: “Quo tamen utrique parti sit satisfactum, concedamus Aramaeos alios esse ab Aramaeis et eos quidem, quod Graeci Syros vocant, Hebraeorum lingua Aramaeos ab Aramo dici; illos autem, quos Scythas nominamus, antiquitus dictos et illos quidem Aramaeos esse, verum non Hebraica, sed sua, id est, Scythica lingua.”

⁸⁸ Goropius, *ibidem*, pp. 539–550.

⁸⁹ Goropius, *ibidem*, p. 551: “Credendum autem, quae excellentissimas habet significandi rationes eam quoque antiquissimam esse, si Adamo illud non denegemus, quod Mosis testimonio est tributum, eum nimirum nomenclaturas dedisse de rerum natura ita petitas, ut cum rebus natae viderentur. At talem nostram esse clarissime demonstrabo.” Cf. Goropius, *ibidem*, p. 538, on the phonosemantic nature of the Adamic language.

⁹⁰ Goropius, *ibidem*, pp. 532–534. On p. 534 Goropius concludes: “Quamobrem minime suspicandum Cimmerios confusio[n]i Babylonicae interfuisse; atque adeo ne causa quidem ulla est ob quam cogitari queat aliam eorum linguam a prima fuisse.” On p. 551 he regards Scythian as the primordial language, equating it with Dutch, Saxon, and Phrygian: “Prima ergo erit lingua Scythica sive Cimbrica sive Ascania sive Togormana, quia Phryges locuti sunt.”

a clearly posited proto-language theory. He thinks that the Cimmerians colonized and peopled the region extending from the Caucasus Mountains to the Volga River and the Sea of Marmara.⁹¹

In the Netherlands, Becanus stimulated further discussion of language relationships.⁹² In discovering the Persian-German kinship, Franciscus Raphelengius was aided by Goropius Becanus' historical model of linguistic kinship.⁹³ The Dutch etymologist Cornelius Kilianus (c. 1529–1607) reveals himself to be an epigone of Becanus in his *Etymologicum Teutonicae linguae* (1599), in which the etymologies serve as a frame of reference of his master, though often not without criticism.⁹⁴ The Dutch clergyman Abraham Mylius (1563–1637) followed in the footsteps of Becanus in his treatise *Lingua Belgica* (1612). After a systematic discussion of the topics of language diversity and linguistic similarity, he deals with the Dutch language in its prehistoric relations to Latin, Greek and Persian.⁹⁵ Opposing the criticism voiced by Joseph Justus Scaliger and Justus Lipsius,⁹⁶ Mylius defends Becanus' assumption that Dutch traces back to the primordial language of humankind. He argues that historically Dutch is identical with languages of the same alleged Cimmerian stock, viz. Scythian, Phrygian, Trojan, Sarmatian, Celtic, Gothic, and Gaulish. He locates the original speaking area to the

⁹¹ Goropius, *ibidem*, p. 556: "Scimus enim Gomerum hinc ad Iaxartum et ultra hinc ad Ascanium usque lacum posteritatis suae colonias habuisse atque toto hac terrarum tractu Cimmeriorum linguae vestigia extare, clarissima tamen ad Caucasios montes, ad quos Arcam docuimus quievisse." River Jaxartus is today known as Syr Darya in Central Asia. Ascanius lacus refers to the Lake Iznik, situated east of the Sea of Marmara in the province of Bursa, Turkey (in ancient times in the province of Bithynia, Asia Minor).

⁹² Van Hal, *Moedertalen en taalmoeders*, p. 585. Van Hal argues that although Goropius' methods as a historian and linguist can be criticized, he actually "pointed to a number of relevant sound correspondences between Dutch, Greek and Latin."

⁹³ Van Hal, *ibidem*, p. 130.

⁹⁴ Van Hal, *ibidem*, pp. 131–132.

⁹⁵ See further Metcalf, "Abraham Mylius on historical linguistics" in *Publications of the modern language association of America* 68 (1953), pp. 535–554; Van Hal, *Moedertalen en taalmoeders*, pp. 213–232; *idem*, "Reviving the old Teutonic language. An unpublished preface by Abraham Mylius", *Lias* 38:1, pp. 129–147.

⁹⁶ Scaliger states that he had never read greater nonsense nor seen or read a more conspicuous example of temerity than deriving all languages from one's own vernacular; see *Castigationes* (1576), p. XVI: "Nunquam legi majores nugaces, nunquam insigniorem temeritatem vidi neque audiui, ut qui omnes linguas a sua barbara deducere velit" [...]. See further Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger, II Historical Chronology*, Oxford 1993, p. 88. In his above-mentioned letter to Henric Schotti of 19 December 1598, Lipsius states that Goropius deserves derision rather than opposition, and referring to the history of Latin he argues that it is unreasonable to suppose that languages are unchangeable throughout time.

region between the Caspian Sea and the Vistula (Wisła) River and specifies the core homeland as stretching from the Crimea to the Vistula River.⁹⁷

In the early 17th century, the Scythian hypothesis was reinterpreted by the Flemish scholar Adrian van Schieck (1559–1621), counsellor in Ypres, in his trilogy on the linguistic prehistory and history of Europe.⁹⁸ He equated Scythian with Japhetic, posited it as the general origin of the languages of Europe, and derived from it Germanic languages (specifically German, Dutch, Danish and other Scandinavian varieties), Celtic languages, Slavonic, Latin, Greek and Persian. He argued that the Oriental tongue (i.e. the Semitic family) and Scythian or Japhetic originally were related dialects and equal in terms of antiquity.⁹⁹ Van Schrieck supplied Dutch etymologies for a large number of biblical proper names and classical Greco-Roman names of places, persons and ethnic groups. In his correspondence with Sparwenfeldt (see Section 19.3.3) Leibniz expressed the opinion that Stiernhielm's linguistic ideas came close to those of van Schrieck.

In *De Hellenistica commentarius* (1643), Claudius Salmasius combined the Dutch research into the Persian-German kinship with views on Scythian language and ethnicity into a theory of a common origin of German, Greek, Persian, and Indian, but this was not a self-contained goal. In his controversy with Daniel Heinsius, he needed a historical model for the history of Ancient Greek to justify his ethno-regional conception of dialect and to reject Heinsius' social-literary definition. This model was intended to demonstrate the continuity of the Greek language and the nature of its history as an ethno-linguistic progression in time and space in terms of regional dialects and local subdialects, from the rise of the first Hellenes in Thessalia in northern Greece until late antiquity. Salmasius derives the Greek language and people from the Scythians.¹⁰⁰ He considers *Scythia* to be the cradle

⁹⁷ Mylius, *Lingua Belgica*, pp. 127–128.

⁹⁸ Adrianus Schrieckius, *Van t'beghin der eerster volcken van European, in-sonderheyt van den oorsponck en de saecken der Neder-landren XXII boecken*, in Latin entitled *Originum rerumque Celticarum et Belgicarum libri XXII*, Ypres 1614, *Monitorum secundorum libri V*, Ypres 1615 and *A consiliis adversariorum libri IIII*, Ypres 1620.

⁹⁹ For an analysis of van Schrieck's linguistic ideas and arguments, see Toon Van Hal, *Modertalen en taalmoeders*, pp. 254–276 with a diagram on Van Schrieck's views on language relationships on p. 259 and with an English summary on p. 588.

¹⁰⁰ Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 384: "Idque certius statui potest ex iis, quae supra docuimus, homines primos, qui Graeciam populis repleverunt et Graecae linguae auctores fuerunt, e septentionali plaga et Scythica advenisse."

from which Europe and Asia have been filled with peoples. Defining *Scythia* as a vast northern region, he states:

There is scarcely a single people in Europe or Asia which has not sprung from the North. Thence, the peoples have originated and spread, by whom Europe and Asia and most (other) regions are peopled. Scythia, therefore, which was the land to the north, poured forth almost all the peoples who have overflowed Europe and Asia with their languages. Since the country of the Scythians was extremely vast and extended far to the east and west, it produced various languages here in Europe and in Asia by disgoring towards the south.¹⁰¹

Salmasius argues that the German, Persian, Indian, or Indo-Scythian, languages and peoples were of Scythian descent.¹⁰² In accordance with Greco-Roman geography, he distinguishes between Asiatic and European *Scythia*. He argues that Scythian was heterogeneous. At the outset, Greek (*Hellenica*), Slavic (*Illyrica* as the superordinate term) and Germanic languages (*Getica* as the superordinate term) differed

¹⁰¹ Salmasius, *ibidem*, p. 366: “Nulla est Europae fere gens nec Asiae, quin a Septentrione promanaverit. Inde propagines profectae populorum, quibus Europae Asiaeque partes consitae fuerunt. Scythia igitur quae ad septentrionem, omnes fere gentes evomuit suis cum linguis, quae Europam et Asiam inundarunt. Ut autem vetustissima illa Scythiarum regio fuit et late porrecta ad Orientem et Occidentem, versus meridiem eructando varias hinc in Europa inde in Asia produxit gentes.” I have slightly revised the English translation by John Considine, “Why was Claude de Saumaise interested in the Scythian hypothesis?”, *Language and history* 53:2 (2010), p. 83.

¹⁰² See Salmasius, *ibidem*, p. 373, where he finds support for the Scythian origin of Germanic in the Flemish diplomat Augier Ghiselin de Busbecq’s (1520–1592) account of Crimean Gothic: “Originem quippe linguae Teutonicae seu Teotiscaae ab illa Ponti ora et Taurica Cherroneso, quam et Σκυθικὴν vocarunt, descendisse fidem facit quod scribit Busbequius in Epistola quadam [...]. Eos lingua Germanica usos esse tradit paucis verbis exceptis.” Busbecq served as Imperial Austrian ambassador in Istanbul. He published a short Crimean Gothic word list in the letters of his Ottoman Turkish embassy: *Legationis Turcicae epistolae quatuor*, Francofurti/ Frankfurt (am Main) 1595; see the fourth letter, pp. 144–145. It was republished by Bonaventura Vulcanius, *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1597, pp. 49–53, a work that Stiernhielm possessed. Salmasius claims a Scythian origin of Persian and Indian on p. 366: “Ab Asiae parte usque in Indiam penetravit et Indoscythas fecit. Parthos Persasque profudit” (‘On the Asian side it reached as far as India and produced the Indo-Scythians. It brought forth the Parthians and the Persians’) and on p. 379: “Praeterea Indi sive Indoscythae eadem dialecto utebantur, qua hodierni Persae. [...] Inde apparet [...] Persicam proinde linguam, quae hodie viget, ab illis Indoscythis manasse vel ab iisdem Scythis, qui in Indiam descenderunt, cum in Parthiam quoque eiusdem gentis homines migrassent, originem traxisse.”

greatly, though their agreement would be more clear, if we had known their earliest stages.¹⁰³ Including Chinese and Turkish in his concept of Scythian languages, he argues that the former is much diversified in the dialects of the Chinese Empire, while the latter differs from other Scythian languages, such as Persian and German.¹⁰⁴

As far as the Scythian theory of kinship between Persian, German and Greek is concerned, Salmasius received a decisive impetus from the Leiden physician and Arabist Johannes Elichmann (1602–1639), whose findings Salmasius accounts for in the preface to Elichmann’s edition of the Table of Cebes.¹⁰⁵

The Dutch historian and etymologist Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn proposed the Scythian hypothesis more clearly in a double-treatise on the goddess Nehalennia on the occasion of the discovery of her temple in Zeeland in the Netherlands in 1645.¹⁰⁶ Two treatises, *Bediedinge* and *Antwoord op de vrage*,¹⁰⁷ were published in 1647, the latter of which as an extensive and systematic response to a writing in which the anonymous author raised four questions: Are the Scythians more ancient than the Greeks and the Romans? What language did the Scythians speak? Was it the same as Dutch? How is it proved that the languages of the Greek, Dutch and Romans derive from that of the Scythians? How can the great diversity between the languages of the Romans, Greeks and Dutch be explained, when all of them use the same language?¹⁰⁸ In the following years Boxhorn went on to elaborate his hypothesis. In 1650, he published a treatise on the lexical agreement between Greek, Latin and German, where he draws

¹⁰³ Salmasius, *ibidem*, p. 380, referring to Persian, German and Greek: “Nec dubito, quin longe maior ea harum linguarum convenientia apparere posset, si lingua antiqua Graeca, qualis erat Deucalionis aut Hellenis aeate, ad nos usque perlata esset, aut antiqua Germanica.” [...] “Tres multum differentes linguae, ut fontes diversorum fluminum in propinquis locis, enatae sunt, Hellenica sive Macedonica, quae Graecas produxit dialectos; Illyrica, quae Sclavoniam genuit, qua hodie Poloni utuntur, Bohemi, Lituani et alii; et Getica [...], ex qua Germanica propagata est cum omnibus suis dialectis.”

¹⁰⁴ Salmasius, *ibidem*, pp. 393–394.

¹⁰⁵ J. Elichmann, *Tabula Cebitis Graece, Arabice, Latine, Lugduni Batavorum/Leiden* 1640, preface, p. 3. Van Hal, “On ‘the Scythian theory’: reconstructing the outlines of Elichmann’s *Archaeologia Harmonica*”, *Language and History* 53: 2 (2010), pp. 74–75, quotes and translates the passage in question, as he does in *Moedertalen en taalmoeders*, p. 344. The first part of the passage on the Persian-German kinship is quoted by Stiernhielm, *De linguarum origine praefatio*, p. 34.

¹⁰⁶ Kees Dekker, *The origin of old Germanic studies in the low countries*, Leiden 1999, pp. 209–211.

¹⁰⁷ For their full titles, see the bibliography under Boxhornius 1647a and 1647b.

¹⁰⁸ *Vraag en voorgesteldt [...] over de Bediedinge van de tot noch toe onbekende afgodinne Nehalennia*, 1647. Cf. Van Hal, *Moedertalen en taalmoeders*, p. 368.

up an alphabetic list of etymological counterparts of Dutch words in Greek and Latin. After that, he concludes:

If you ask what the basis is for this relation of agreement, there will be people who answer that the Germans received such words from the Romans. I do not at all approve of this. Rather the matter itself, and reason, show that this is a false assumption. Why? Because then we would have to postulate that our forefathers once were so dumb and speechless and lacking every faculty of speech by which people name familiar things and matters at home, that they were not able to call father (this example now serves as an instance of all) or mother by their own words, but only after having borrowed them from the Greeks and Romans. Consequently, it remains for us to infer that the languages of these nations are of the same common origin, that is are of Scythian origin.¹⁰⁹

In a poem in elegiac distiches addressed to the dedicatees, Boxhorn says shrewdly: “Why do others call German barbarous? when the Greeks and Romans are recognized as speaking this language.”¹¹⁰

Boxhorn also advocates the Scythian hypothesis in his first book on the origins of Gaulish, which was published posthumously, *Originum Gallicarum liber primus*. In chapter 6 he argues that the ample lexical similarities between Brittonic and Latin depend on a common origin rather than on borrowing. He justifies his assertion by reason of the lexical similarities between Greek, Latin and German:

From this you do not, however, conclude rightly that the language of the Germans is indebted to Greek and Latin. From this

¹⁰⁹ Boxhorn, *De Graecorum, Romanorum et Germanorum linguis earumque symphonia*, Leiden 1650, p. 90: “Hujus συμφωνίας quae caussa sit, si quaeras, erunt qui respondebunt Germanos e Graecis et Romanis eiusmodi vocabula accepisse. Quod mihi neutiquam probatur. Imo falsum esse res ipsa et ratio arguunt. Quid enim? Mutos ac elingues et ab omni sermonis, quo suae cuique domi res significantur, usu destitutos aliquando fuisse majores nostros statuendum est, si patrem (hoc enim exemplum ad instar omnium nunc erit) aut matrem nullo suo, sed tantum accepto a Graecis et Romanis nomine potuerint appellare. Restat ergo, ut dicamus eiusdem et communis, hoc est Scythicae, originis harum nationum linguas esse.” The treatise is attached to a Latin grammar dedicated to Queen Christina of Sweden: *Grammatica regia sive nova et facillima ratio discendi linguae Latinae praecepta*, (a reprint of the 1635 edition in Stockholm), Leiden 1650.

¹¹⁰ Boxhorn, *ibidem*, p. 52: “Barbara cur aliis Germania dicitur? Isto / Graecia cum Latio noscitur ore loqui.” The dedicatees were the book collector and dean of Münster Cathedral Bernhard von Mallinckrodt (1591–1664) and the German poets, philologists and literary critics Georg Philipp Harsdörffer (1607–1658) and August Buchner (1591–1661).

agreement of language it rather follows that these nations have descended from the same mother, that is, Scythian, and from this they learned the same language, only slightly different in terms of dialectal variety.¹¹¹

Boxhorn's historical and linguistic reasoning was more clearly put forward by the historian Georg Hornius (1620–1670),¹¹² who was well informed about Boxhorn's ideas from his scholarly collaboration and talks with him. In the preface to Boxhorn's treatise on the origins of Gaulish (dated 1 June, 1654), Hornius tells the background and outcome of Boxhorn's position that Scythian is the European proto-language. To begin with, he states:

He [i.e. Boxhorn] began to explore the origin of Dutch words. He saw that there were countless words common to the Germans, Romans, Greeks and other nations across Europe. From this he conjectured that this similarity resulted from a common source, i.e. from the same origin of all these peoples. The attempts made by Goropius Becanus and Schrieckius displeased him. The new devices by the most famous Bochart in favour of the Phoenicians did not satisfy him either.¹¹³ Approaching the factual matter in a different way, he posited a common language, which he called Scythian, to be the mother-language of Greek, Latin, German and Persian, from which these arose as dialects. Accordingly, the Romans did not draw from the Greeks, nor both of them from the Germans, what they all have in common, but rather from a common, i.e. Scythian, origin.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ Boxhorn, *Originum Gallicarum liber primus*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam 1654, p. 86: "Interim ex iis recte non colligas Germanorum linguam Graecae aut Romanae deberi. Id potius ex illo sermonis consensu sequitur ex eadem gente, tanquam matre, id est Scythica, prodiisse has nationes, et ab eadem eundem sermonem, sed dialecto fere tantum distantem didicisse." In his own copy of Boxhorn's work on Gaulish (at UUB), Stiernhielm wrote "Recte" in the margin of this passage. For a photograph of this page, see Figure 19. Another passage on the Scythian origins (*Scythicae origines*) of Brittonic, Gaulish, and German is found at the end of chapter 6, p. 89, where Stiernhielm annotated "Vere" in his copy.

¹¹² After having served as professor of history, politics and geography in Harderwijk since 1648, Hornius succeeded Boxhorn in the chair of history in Leiden in 1653.

¹¹³ In his *Geographia sacra*, vol. 2 subtitled *Chanaan seu de coloniis et sermone Phoenicum* (Caen 1646) Bochart proposed a Phoenician origin of Celtic words.

¹¹⁴ Boxhorn, *Originum Gallicarum liber primus*, Amsterdam 1654, Horn's preface: "Origines vocabulorum Belgicorum examinare coepit. Vidit innumera vocabula Germanis, Latinis, Graecis et aliis per Europam nationibus communia. Inde conjiciebat a communi fonte eam similitudinem profectam, id est eadem omnium

In his private copy of Boxhorn's treatise, Stiernhielm has written "intentio Boxhornii"¹¹⁵ as Boxhorn's assumption of a common origin of the Germans, Latins and Greeks. More importantly, he has underlined the final passage of the quotation above, from "Scythicam vocabat matrem" to "Scythica origine". In the margin he has with a pencil noted "rectissime" (i.e. very rightly).

Hornius goes on to account for the reaction of the scholarly community to these new findings:

When these attempts of his were spreading to the public, many people found them strange on account of their novelty. Some people were too hasty to condemn all his efforts, because there had never, as they said, been any common Scythian language or, at least, it had been forgotten and was unknown to us. They said that he was inventing a new language at his own whim. Other people acknowledged that once there had been such a language, but they denied that the Greeks and the Romans had got their words from it. As regards the Germans, they admitted that possibility, regardless of how it would have occurred. These prejudices did not deter this most famous scholar from persisting in his opinion once conceived or from continuing his initiated work. Rather, he was incited all the more to accurately and eagerly investigate all (kindred) languages and their vocabulary, and thus he collected an infinite number of words, from which he thought he could corroborate his opinion about the Scythian language. He was encouraged in his purpose because he found that the great Salmasius, who had recently been carried off, to the enormous detriment of the Republic of Letters, was of almost the same opinion in his commentary on the Hellenistic language.¹¹⁶

illarum gentium origine. Displicuerunt Goropii et Schrieckii conatus neque satisfaciebant novae clarissimi Bochari pro Phoenicibus machinationes. Quare alia via rem aggressus communem quandam linguam, quam Scythicam vocabat, matrem Graecae, Latinae, Germanicae et Persicae statuit, ex qua illae velut dialecti profiscantur. Non ergo vel Latinos a Graecis vel hos a Germanis, quae communia inter se habeant, hausisse, sed ab eadem, id est Scythica origine."

¹¹⁵ For a photograph of this annotated page, see Figure 18.

¹¹⁶ Horn(ius), *ibidem*: "Hi ipsius conatus cum in publicum emanassent, multis ipsa novitate mirabiles videbantur. Quidam praecipiti iudicio labores eius in universum damnabant, quod vel nulla lingua Scythica communis fuisset vel saltem oblitterata nobisque incognita esset. Hi dicebant eum novam linguam suo arbitratu cudere. Alii fatebatur quidem eiusmodi olim lingua fuisse, caeterum negabant inde Graecos vel Latinos sua vocabula accepisse; nam de Germanis, utcumque id fieri potuisse, fatebantur. Quae quidem praeiudicia non absterruerunt clarissimum virum ut vel ab opinione sua semel concepta desisteret vel coeptum opus abrumperet: quin magis

He also reveals that Boxhorn planned to write a work with the title *De Scythicis originibus gentium ac linguarum Europae*, that is, “On the Scythian origins of the nations and languages of Europe”, a work to which Boxhorn refers in a letter to Pibo a Doma in 1647.¹¹⁷

Both Boxhorn, in his capacity as a linguist and a historian, and Hornius, in his role as historian, attempted to place Scythian at the heart of Europe’s linguistic, ethnic and political past. These attempts failed however. Only a few comparative linguists and etymologists followed Boxhorn.

In his preface to Boxhorn’s *Origines Gallicae*, Hornius himself defends the Scythian hypothesis. He argues that the Scythian people in the Greco-Roman ethnography and geography was well-known as a superordinate term for the peoples of Asia and Europe. Scythian is accordingly a convenient term for the most ancient origin of Western languages.¹¹⁸ In *De originibus Americanis* (1652) Hornius used the concept of Scythians in the same way as Boxhorn. He argues that Persian, Greek and German are related, and proposes the idea that North America was peopled by the Scythians.¹¹⁹ Regardless of his considerable achievements in universal history, where *Arca Noae* (1666) is his main work, Hornius did not have any greater impact on the further development of this early modern genre, and he did not have any followers in his use of Scythian as a classificatory historical political term.¹²⁰

inflammatus fuit, ut cunctas linguas earumque lexica cum cura et studio excuteret, unde silvam infinitarum vocum congeffit, ex quarum collatione suam de lingua Scythica opinionem sibi stabilire posse videbatur. Et animum in proposito ipsius obfirmavit, quod magnum illum Salmasium nuper ingenti damno reipublicae literariae ereptum in eadem fere sententia versari in *Commentario de lingua Hellenistica* deprehendisset.” The full title of Salmasius’ treatise is *De Hellenistica commentarius controversiam de Lingua Hellenistica decidens et plenissime pertractans originem et dialectos Graecae linguae*, ‘A commentary on the term Hellenistic to concluding the controversy on the Hellenistic language and to fully discussing the origin and dialects of Greek’, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1643.

¹¹⁷ Van Hal, *Moedertalen en taalmoeiders*, p. 369.

¹¹⁸ Boxhorn, *Originum Gallicarum liber primus* (1654), Horn’s preface, p. 2: “Lingua igitur Scythica apud antiquos notissima fuit, ut et ipsa gens Scytharum, quae Septentrionales Asiae et Europae populos complectebatur. Antiquissima enim orbis divisio in tres partes fuit, quarum media Graeciam, Italiam, Asiam complectebatur; Septentrionalis Scythia, Australis Aethiopia dicebatur Strabone teste.” [...] p. 3: “Ita antiquissima linguarum Occidentis matrix est Scythica illa.”

¹¹⁹ Van Hal, *Moedertalen en taalmoeiders*, p. 399.

¹²⁰ In Hornius’ *Brevis et perspicua introductio in historiam universalem* (1655) the historical political concept of Scythian plays an important part in his classification of ancient Asiatic political history, where Scythian is used as a superordinate term along with Babylonian, Persian and Indian. After dividing modern Eurasian

3.5 Universal history and world chronology

3.5.1 Historical periodization of world history

Renaissance theories on language origins and language kinship must be evaluated within the context of general history-writing of world history. This kind of history belonged to the genre of universal history, *historia universalis*. Universal history employed a set periodization of history that was inherited from antiquity. The biblical narrative of pre-history was accepted as a trustworthy source and was often combined with ancient Greco-Roman historiography. From a chronological point of view, universal history presumed world history to encompass a period of 6000 years, with landmarks in the biblical narrative of the Creation around 4000 BC, the Flood 1656 years later, and the Tower of Babel 101 years still later (1757 years after the creation of the world, “Anno Mundi”) and the Babylonian Captivity 587/ 586 BC, and in the Greco-Roman chronology: the Fall of Troy c. 1194–1184 BC, the first Olympiad in 776 BC and the foundation of Rome in 753 BC.

3.5.2 Use of biblical genealogies

The philologists of the 17th and 18th centuries used both linguistic and historical evidence to establish language relationships. The biblical narrative of pre-history provided a framework for the history of languages. The book of Genesis first tells that the whole earth was populated by the descendants of Noah, Shem, Ham and Japheth, and that they were divided on the earth according to their nations and their languages; see Gen. 9,18; 10, 32, and 10, 5 (Japheth), 18 (Ham) and 31 (Shem). Moreover, the pre-historical linguistic unity between the Flood and the Tower of Babel was split up when the single unified and unifying language of mankind was confused at Babel (Gen. 11: 1–9), which led to linguistic diversity, either immediately at Babel or later.

To map out peoples and nations and their languages, the self-evident starting point was the biblical genealogies in *Genesis* 10. A common method was to identify or associate a certain people with an assumed ancestor in the biblical genealogies. When the biblical pieces of information ran short, the scholars resorted to classical ethnography, especially Herodotus, Strabo and Pliny the Elder.

According to ancient biblical interpretation, the descendants of Shem settled in Asia, the descendants of Ham colonized Africa and the descendants of Japheth peopled Europe through colonization.

political history into *Scythica*, *Aethiopica* and *Cataica*, he subordinates the history of the Germans, Huns and Slaves (*Germanica*, *Hunnica* and *Slavonica*) to that of the Scythians.

This exegetical tradition was retained until the end of the 18th century and played an important role in language classification,¹²¹ including the one proposed by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz in 1710¹²² and those drawn up by the historians of the school of Göttingen in the second half of the 18th century, foremost August Ludwig von Schlözer who divided the world into Semitic and Japhetic ethno-linguistic areas (using the terms of “Hauptsprachen” and “Hauptvölker”, that is, main languages and main peoples). His collaborator Johann Christoph Gatterer presumed that the language of Noah was diversified into dialects and then into new languages, and viewed the table of nations in Genesis 10 as historically reliable.¹²³ As a matter of fact even the one made by Sir William Jones in his famous annual discourses on the Hindus (1784–1792) depends on Mosaic ethnography.¹²⁴

¹²¹ Robert Robins, “The history of language classification” in *Current trends in linguistics*, vol. 11 edited by Thomas A. Sebeok, the Hague 1973, pp. 3–15.

¹²² G.W. Leibniz, “Brevis designatio meditationum de originibus gentium ductis potissimum ex indicio linguarum”, *Miscellanea Berolinensia ad incrementum scientiarum ex scriptis Societati Regiae Scientiarum exhibitis edita*, vol. 1, Berolini/ Berlin 1710, p. 4: “Linguas ex antiqua illa latissime fusa derivatas in binas species non male dividimus: Japeticas, ut ita loquor, et Aramaeas. Japeticae septentrionalem implevere, Aramaeae meridiem; totam vero Europam nostram Septentrioni computo. Quod si septentrionalem Japhetum referas, meridionales ad fratrum Semi Chamique propaginibus non inepte tribuentur. Iapetum ejusque filium Promethea hominum fabricatorem etiam mythologi ad Caucasum collocarunt, Aramaei (vel Arimi) pro Syris iam Homero innouere.” In English translation: “I rightly divide the languages that derive from the ancient and most widely spread one in two kinds: Japhetic, so to speak, and Aramaic. The Japhetic ones have occupied the north and the Aramaic ones the south. I count the whole of Europe to the north. If you refer the north to Japheth, the southern regions are not vainly attributed to Shem and Ham. Even the writers of mythology have located Iapetum and his son Prometheus as creator of human beings to Caucasus. The Aramaeans, or Arimi, were known as Syrians already to Homer.”

¹²³ Schlözer, “Von den Chaldäern”, *Repertorium für Biblische und Morgonländische Litteratur*, Achter Theil, Leipzig 1781, p. 161; Gatterer, *Einleitung in die synchronistische Universalhistorie zur Erklärung seiner synchronistische Tabellen*, Göttingen 1771, pp. 104–106.

¹²⁴ In his anniversary “Discourse the ninth on the original families of nations, delivered 23 February 1792”, Sir William Jones used “the Mosaic history” for describing and assessing the “early dispersal of mankind” into the branches of Shem, Ham and Japheth and takes for granted that the whole earth was peopled from them. He argues these ethnic branches correspond to a tripartite linguistic division, followed by a dialect diversification of each branch. He states: “The only human family after the Flood [...] was divided into three distinct branches each retaining little at first and loosing the whole by degrees of their common primary language, but agreeing severally on new expressions for new ideas.” He continues: “The branch of Yafet was enlarged in many shoots over the north of Europe and Asia diffusing themselves as far as the Western and Eastern Seas and [...] formed a variety of dialects, as their tribes were variously ramified.” See *The works of Sir*

In tracing the origins of peoples, the historians realized the value of linguistic evidence and tried to find out the causes of linguistic change. In the mid-sixteenth century, the French jurist, historian and statesman Jean Bodin (1530–1596) proposed three different causes, namely (1) the flowing or running of time (*decursus temporum*), (2) the confusion of various peoples with each other by colonization, migration and invasion (*coloniarum ac populorum inter ipsos confusio*), and (3) the impact of climate on pronunciation (*ipsa regionis natura*).¹²⁵ Shortly before, the Swiss Reformed theologian, Hebraist and Classical philologist Theodore Bibliander (1504–1564) had identified two external causes of linguistic diversity and change: (1) the mixing of peoples and languages and (2) political change and language policy of multilingual empires.¹²⁶

William Jones, vol. 1, London 1799, p. 135 and 140. In his tenth anniversary discourse (delivered on 28 February 1793), *ibidem*, p. 145, Jones states: [...] “our historical researches have confirmed the Mosaic accounts of the primitive world”.

¹²⁵ Bodin, *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*, Paris 1566, pp. 414–415.

¹²⁶ Bibliander, *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum*, pp. 58–59.

4. Stiernhielm's etymology, comparative language studies and renewal of the Swedish language

4.1 Etymological theory

4.1.1 Etymological principles

Two assumptions served as the basis of Stiernhielm's etymological lexicography, namely that the lexis of a language can be reduced to a number of basic semantic morphemes (*radices* or *primitiva*) and that they have a natural correspondence to reality.¹²⁷ His aim was (1) to identify the primitive and simple word-roots of the Swedish language, (2) to provide knowledge of the nature of the primeval language of humankind, (3) to enrich and ennoble the Swedish language with ancient words drawn from its primitive roots, and (4) to ensure the continued lexical purity of the Swedish language. Stiernhielm's lexicography was thus not only motivated by language-theoretical and antiquarian interest, but also by a programme for Swedish language purism.

Stiernhielm envisaged "a new etymological science" (*scientia nova etymologica*), for which he developed a theory and a methodology. He defined the object of the etymological discipline (*Miscellanea etymologica*, F.d. 7:3) as follows:

(1) to explore word-roots common to all languages, *indagare radices omnibus linguis communes*,

(2) to explore word-roots particular to every individual language, *indagare radices singulis linguis peculiares et proprias*.

Accordingly, Stiernhielm proposed the practice of a universalistic and a particularistic etymology. In the explanation of the origin of words he aimed to derive words from their etymons (*ex stipite*) rather than from their cognates (*collaterales*), as the etymologists of his time did, for instance when deriving German *Wind* from Latin *ventus*. According to Stiernhielm they are rather "two sister words, both from the stem *wehen*, a secondary root from the pure root $\alpha\omega$, $\alpha\epsilon\upsilon$."¹²⁸

¹²⁷ See further Vol. 1, Section 4.2.1.

¹²⁸ "quae sunt voces sorores, utraque ex stirpe seu motu *wehen*, radix affecta, a pura $\alpha\omega$, $\alpha\epsilon\upsilon$ ", F.d. 6, fol. 7v; see textual edition in Vol. 1, Section 7.3.3.1.

4.1.2 Etymological rules

Stiernhielm put forward the following set of nine etymological rules, *canones etymologiae* (*Virgula Divina*, F.d. 6c fol. 3v and 4r):

(1) a word should be analysed apart from any formative letters which mark grammatical case, tense, person and mood,

(2) we should consider whether any word is a compound, a derivative or a primary word,

(3) we should pay attention to the fact that letters might have been altered or added for the sake of euphony,

(4) we should consider both the interlingual kinship of speech sounds (*cognatio literarum*) and frequent intralingual interchange of speech sounds (*transitio literarum*, also known as *permutatio* or *commutatio literarum*),

(5) to the principles of interlingual sound correspondences and intralingual sound similarities, the principle of semantic similarity (*significatus*) should be added,

(6) the etymological meaning of words in two languages may sometimes be the same, but in most cases the proper and general sense is preserved in one language, at the same time as they are used in a transferred sense in other related languages,

(7) the primary and proper meaning of the word is often hidden in great obscurity,

(8) we should accustom ourselves to the inner nature of each letter and the combination and mixture of primary lexical elements (*primorum elementorum combinatio et commixtio*)

(9) we should think that the primary words, invented by the primordial name-givers, agree with nature in everything and are appropriate symbols of nature.

4.1.3 Analytical tools: four categories of phonetic change

Etymology as a branch of learning is the study of the origin of words and the development of their form and meaning. Until the 19th century, the methods of the discipline of etymology were characterized by the principle of sound similarity and by the four categories of phonetic change in ancient etymology: (1) addition, (2) removal, (3) substitution (exchange) and (4) transposition. The Roman polymath Marcus Terentius Varro (*De lingua Latina*, v, 6) designates them as *additio*, *demptio*, *commutatio*, and *traiectio*, all of which he applies to etymology and recommends as tools that facilitate etymological research: “The one who observes in how many ways phonological change occurs, will more easily be able to

investigate the origin of words.”¹²⁹ Quintilian applied these tools to orthography mainly using them to classify forms of linguistic barbarism.¹³⁰ In the category of substitution, ancient grammarians, such as Quintus Terentius Scaurus (2nd cent. AD) and Gaius Marius Victorinus (4th-cent. AD, rhetorician and Neoplatonist), observed that cognate speech sounds alternate in Latin, because they are produced with the same place of articulation (“with a similar pattern of the mouth”), such as those of the lips (b, f, m, p) and the palate (g, c and x).¹³¹

The fourfold set of conceptual tools was used in the theory and practice of both Latin and Hebrew etymology in the early modern period. Since the 16th century the doctrine of substitution or exchange of speech sounds, *commutatio literarum*, was more commonly known under the term *permutatio literarum*.

4.1.4 Stiernhielm’s place in the history of the premodern enquiry into sound correspondences between German, Latin and Greek

From antiquity until the early 19th century, etymologists of European languages had not yet attained an exact knowledge of regular sound correspondences between related languages, but during the 17th and 18th centuries they began to make observations on this phenomenon. Jan Agrell has identified five stages in the progressive discovery of the regularity of the Germanic sound shift, and refers to Stiernhielm as belonging to the third stage. These stages are as follows:

- (1) The collection of coincidental and stray examples of permutations of cognate consonants in word comparisons and word lists between related languages without any given method or knowledge of sound correspondences.
- (2) Intentional lexicographical research on separate permutations of consonants in more large-scale word-comparisons between related languages, including cases of conditional permutations that do not pertain to the ordinary Germanic sound shift according to Grimm’s Law.

¹²⁹ Varro, *De lingua Latina*, v, 6: “quot modis commutatio sit facta qui animadverterit, facilius scrutari origines patietur verborum.” Varro here apparently employs the term *commutatio* in a broader sense than an exchange of individual speech sound or syllables.

¹³⁰ Quintilian uses the terms *adiectio*, *detractio*, *immutatio* and *transmutatio* (*Institutio oratoria*, I, 5, 6).

¹³¹ Paul Diderichsen “The Foundations of comparative linguistics: revolution or continuation” in Dell Hymes (ed.), *Studies in the history of linguistics. Traditions and paradigms*, Bloomington & London 1974, pp. 280–281. For the grammatical works referred to, see Keil (ed.), *Grammatici Latini*, 6, pp. 3–184 (Victorinus) and 7, pp. 11–33 (Terence Scarus).

(3) Intentional phonetic and phonological research on similarities between certain groups of consonants and an emphasis on the interchangeability of these consonants according to the principle *permutatio literarum* or *commutatio literarum*.

(4) A synthesis between extensive lexicographical comparisons and phonological observations of the interchangeability of specific groups of consonants, that is, the combination of stages 2 and 3.

(5) The discovery and formulation of the regularity of the Germanic sound shifts or sound correspondences.¹³²

Focusing on their relation to Grimm's Law, Agrell surveys the observations of sound correspondences made by continental and Swedish scholars between the mid-16th century and the early 19th century.¹³³ He consequently regards Grimm's Law as the result of a cumulative process and argues that the final discovery was made by several scholars independently of one another.¹³⁴

Agrell begins with the Hebrew and Classical philologist Theodore Bibliander (1509–1564), who was the first to systematically classify the Latin and Greek stop consonants and fricatives in a set of series that corresponds to Jacob Grimm's three groups: (1) b, p, f, ph, ps – β, π, φ, ψ; (2) g, c / k, ch, x – γ, κ, χ, ξ; (3) d, t, th, z – δ, τ, θ, ζ).¹³⁵ Stiernhielm considered the speech sounds of each group to be cognate (*literae cognatae*).¹³⁶ He possessed a copy of the treatise in

¹³² Jan Agrell, *Studier i den äldre språkjämförelsens allmänna och svenska historia*, Uppsala 1955, p. 29.

¹³³ Agrell, *ibidem*, p. 41

¹³⁴ Agrell, *ibidem*, pp. 30–40, explores works by Theodore Bibliander (1548), Conrad Gesner, *Mithridates: de differentiis linguarum*, 1555; Gerard Vossius, *Etymologicum linguae Latinae*, 1662; Franciscus Junius, *Etymologicum anglicanum* written in the 1660s, published by Edward Lye in 1743; Lambert ten Kate, *Aenleiding tot de kennisse van het verhevene deel der nederduitsche sprake* 1723; Johann Schilters, *Thesaurus antiquitatum Teutonicarum*, vol. 3 "Glossarium ad scriptores linguae Franciae et Alemanicae", 1727; Johann Georg Wachter, *Glossarium Germanicum*, 1737; James Burnet Lord Monboddo, *Of the origin and progress of languages*, 1773; James Beattie, *The theory of language*, 1788; Rasmus Rask, *Undersøgelse om det gamle nordiske eller islandske sprogs oprindelse*, 1818; and Jakob Hornemann Bredsdorff, *Om aarsagerne til sprogenes forandringer*, 1821. Agrell, *ibidem*, pp. 139–141, pp. 150–161, also explores the observations of sound shifts by the Swedish 18th-century scholars Eric Benzelius the Younger (a draft on the topic of sound shifts between Latin and Swedish, ms. Ihre 48, UUB, c. 1722–1728) and Johan Ihre, *Glossarium Suiogothicum*, 1769, and a couple of manuscript sources from 1753 and 1760.

¹³⁵ Bibliander, *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum*, 'On the common principle of all languages and letters', Tiguri/ Zürich 1548, p. 153 and 170 f. See Agrell, *Studier* (1955), p. 30.

¹³⁶ Bibliander, *De ratione communi*, p. 152 and p. 170.

which this classification is made and lists this work as a book that contributes to his exploration of language origins (Section 15.2.4). His annotated copy is available at Uppsala University Library. On the inside back cover, he has dated his reading of it to 10–12 March 1652. Agrell argues that Bibliander's classification introduced Stiernhielm to the topic of sound correspondences. On the opposite page of Bibliander's phonological classification, Stiernhielm gives his own classification of stop consonants in a marginal annotation (Vol. 1, Section 7.2.4.4). Agrell argues that this gives evidence of Stiernhielm's reliance on Bibliander, because it diverges slightly from the classification in a chapter draft of *Runa Suethica* titled *Nomina deorum* (Vol. 1, Section 7.2.1).¹³⁷ However, this conclusion may be questioned. Rather, Stiernhielm relied on the Western phonological tradition in which the classification of Latin consonants was influenced by a Hebrew grammatical tradition. This is clear from the introduction to his dictionary *Virgula divina* ('The divine staff'), in which he takes a stand on the grammatical tradition of classifying Hebrew speech sounds.¹³⁸ He used it to reach a new classification of Latin letters with a view to their kinship (Vol. 1, Section 7.1.1). Stiernhielm had already been elaborating on his own classification for a decade when he read Bibliander's work in 1652. In his drafts of *Runa Suethica*, he provides a number of slightly different classifications on the kinship of speech sounds (Vol. 1, Chap. 7–8).

4.1.5 Stiernhielm's observations of sound correspondences

Stiernhielm argued that the consonants of certain groups – (1) v, b, p, f; (2) c, h, ch, q; and (3) d, t, th, s, z are cognate and interchangeable. In the introduction to *Virgula divina* (1641), he underlines the genetic relationship of the consonants of each group: "It is necessary that the cognate consonants of each class (*utrinque*) agree in a certain root, from which they derive their origin and thus make a family."¹³⁹ By the term root (*radix*), he here means the original speech sound.

Stiernhielm applies his historical phonology and the doctrine of *permutatio literarum* to his etymological lexicography. As we have seen above, he was an advocate of the Scythian hypothesis, i.e. that all main groups of European languages (except Finnish and

¹³⁷ Agrell, *Studier*, p. 99.

¹³⁸ See further my forthcoming monograph *Albert Schultens as the innovator of etymological Hebrew lexicography* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia), section 11.1.1 and on the topic of sound correspondences in Semitic languages as observed by early modern Western Semitists, see, *ibidem*; section 11.1.3.

¹³⁹ F.d. 6c. fol. 50v: "Eae enim quae inter se sunt cognatae, necessum est ut in uno aliquo quasi stipite concurrant ex quo utrinque ortum suum trahunt et deinde familiam ducunt."

Hungarian) plus Persian are dialects of a once-spoken Scythian language, which in the theory qualified as a proto-language. In a passage of *Runa Suethica*, he combines his phonological findings with the Scythian hypothesis as follows (F.d. 5, fol. 38v):

Now, it is certain that all cognate letters are interchangeable and almost without difference in the Scythian languages. Experience has brought me to the conclusion that I take all (specific) letters [i.e. speech sounds] of one and the same kind and class for one, and one (common and original) letter for all. Thus, for *f*, *v*, *p*, *b* I only take V, for *h*, *cg*, *g*, *c* I take H, for *s*, *t*, *d* and the mixed *th*, *sh*, *st* (ʒ) I take Z, which appears either to be intermediate or to comprise all. The remaining L R N M are neither cognate with themselves nor with others, but each of them is independent.¹⁴⁰

In *Adelrunae conclusiones* (Section 10.3), Stiernhielm drew up a list of the permutations of cognate letters between Swedish and Latin. He notes some shifts of the first Germanic sound change: **shift 1 p–f**: *pes* – *foot*, “foot”, **shift 2 b–p**: *labium* – *läpp*, “lip”, **shift 5 d–t**: *dens* – *tand* (“tooth”), **shift 7 c–h**: *caput* – *huvud*, “head”; *crinis* – *hår*, “hair”; *collum* – *hals*, “neck”; *calx* – *häl*, “heel”; *cutis* – *hud*, “skin”; *cor* – *hierta*, “heart”; *cerebrum* – *hiärna*, “brain”; **shift 9 g–k**: *oculus* – *öga*, “eye”; *genu* – *knä*, “knee”; and *gena* (*genae* in plural) – *kind*¹⁴¹ “cheek”. Stiernhielm also observed shifts in the High German sound change: “the High Germans use S or Z, where the Saxons use T, and they use T, where the Saxons use D.”¹⁴²

4.2 Language classification

4.2.1 Background: linguistic theories in the 17th-century

The concept of historical linguistics refers to the theory and practice of a systematic study of language change and language kinship. In the 17th century this kind of language study was in its pre-disciplinary stage. Scholars began to describe and explain language change on the

¹⁴⁰ “Iam certum est litteras cognatas tam in pronuntiatione, quam in scriptione inter se esse commutabiles et in linguis Scythicis pene indifferentes. Eo itaque me adduxit experientia, ut omnes eiusdem generis et classis pro una et unam pro omnibus caperem. Sic pro *f*, *v*, *p*, *b* capio solam V, pro *h*, *ch*, *g*, *c* capio H aut CH, pro *s*, *t*, *d* et mixtis *th*, *z*, *sh*, *st* (ʒ) capio Z, quae videtur aut media esse aut omnes complecti. Reliquae L R N M nec sibi nec aliis sunt cognatae. Sed quaelibet sua est.” See Vol. 1, Section 7.2.3, paragraph 5.

¹⁴¹ Stiernhielm actually used a dialectal form: *kind* in the plural, *kinner*.

¹⁴² The original reads: “Alemanni utuntur S et Z, ubi Saxones T; T ubi Saxones D. *thor* – *door*. See Autografsamlingen (i.e. the Collection of autograph letters), first envelope, 1r, Royal Library, Stockholm.

different levels of language (phonemes, morphemes, words, phrases, syntax) and to determine the degree of relationship of languages in their descent from a common ancestor, according to the criteria of diachronic and genealogical kinship.

In his views on the linguistic past of Europe, Stiernhielm rejected the common opinion about the high antiquity of Hebrew as the primeval language and the positions of Greek and Latin as main languages from which Germanic words had originated. This opinion was related to the Western tradition of Hebrew, Greek and Latin as the three learned and holy tongues. Since antiquity, the languages used for the inscription on the cross of Jesus had been viewed as the world-dominating languages. Augustine stated that Hebrew, Greek and Latin are languages that are especially prominent in the world: *quae linguae toto orbe maxime excellunt* (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*, psalm 58, § 1). This statement came to be repeated so many times that until the sixteenth century scholars in the West believed that the entire world was dominated by Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, including languages related with each of them.¹⁴³ In his preface to his overview of the languages of the world, *Mithridates: de differentiis linguarum* (1555), the Swiss polymath Conrad Gesner referred to this opinion.

On the other hand, Stiernhielm did not accept the fragmentization of historical language relationships. Joseph Justus Scaliger proposed a classification of European languages into eleven mutually unrelated families four of which were major ones (*quatuor maiores*): Latin, Greek, Germanic, and Slavic, and seven of which were minor languages (*septem minores*): (1) Albanian, (2) Cossackian with Crimean Tataric, (3) Hungarian, (4) Finnish (including the dialects of Sami), (5) Scottish Gaelic, (6) Brittonic (Welsh and Breton), and finally (7) Basque. He argued that these mother languages (*linguae matrices*), were unrelated both in lexis (*in verbis*) and in morphological system (*in analogia*).¹⁴⁴ He assumed a diversification of each mother language into new dialects (*dialecti*) as daughter languages (*tanquam propagines*). Scaliger's view of language kinship exerted great influence. Petrus Lagerlöf, in his lectures on political geography (1688), referred to it as authoritative (see Section 19.5.1). It is possible that the spread of this classification is one of the

¹⁴³ Metcalf, "The Indo-European hypothesis in the 16th and 17th centuries" in Dell Hyme (ed.), *Studies in the history of linguistics: traditions and paradigms*, p. 238, where Bede the Venerable, Bibliander and Gesner are adduced as examples.

¹⁴⁴ Joseph Justus Scaliger, "Diatriba de Europaeorum linguis" in *Opuscula varia antehac non edita*, Parisiis/ Paris, pp. 119–122. See further Metcalf, "The Indo-European hypothesis", pp. 238–239; Toon Van Hal, "'Quam enim periculosa sit ea via'. Josephus Justus Scaliger's views on linguistic kinship", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 20, pp. 111–140.

reasons why Stiernhielm looked upon Scaliger as a tyrant in the Republic of Letters.¹⁴⁵

4.2.2 Stiernhielm's views on the concept of language

In his historical-comparative language studies, Stiernhielm accepted the early modern tripartite categorization of languages from a historical point of view, viz. (1) *the concept of a primeval language*, (2) *the concept of main languages*, and (3) *the concept of derived languages*.¹⁴⁶ This categorization was the basis of historical language classification in early modern Europe. The search for the identity of the original and primeval language of mankind and its relation to main and derived languages constituted the basis for developing hypotheses of linguistic descent (for instance the Scythian hypothesis) and for identifying language families, developing meta-linguistic models of linguistic descent and kinship (e.g. the metaphors of mother–daughter and source–river), and drawing up a rudimentary comparative method (cf. Simone 1998: 165).

In early modern European thought, the biblical narrative of human prehistory (Gen. 1–11) served as guideline for conceptualizing the linguistic past of humankind in pre-historic times. It provided two bases:

- (1) at the Creation, God endowed man with the ability to speak,
- (2) at the building of the Tower of Babel, God confused and divided the originally single language of all mankind (Gen. 11:1–9).

The primeval language was defined as the one that was spoken from the Creation to the Tower of Babel. This concept is consistent with the periodization of world history in early modern chronology and historiography. The Creation was dated to around 3950–4000 BC.¹⁴⁷

World history was divided into a sequence of well-defined epochs, the first of which extended from the Creation to the Flood Anno Mundi 1656 or to the Confusion of Languages AM 1757, both of these dates according to the commonly accepted chronology. The search for the identity and nature of the primeval language increased all the more in importance, as the original linguistic unity of humankind was believed to belong to the not-too-distant past.

¹⁴⁵ Stiernhielm, *De linguarum origine praefatio*, p. 2 (see Section 12.3 below).

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Saara Haapamäki *Studier i svensk grammatikhistoria*, Åbo 2002, pp. 43–44; and Andreas Gardt, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland: vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1999, p. 112.

¹⁴⁷ According to Martin Luther 3960 BC, in *Supputatio annorum mundi* (WA 53: 171) counting the year 1540 as 5500 Anno Mundi, Kepler 3992 BC, Scaliger 3949 BC, Ussher 4004 BC (*Annales Veteris Testamenti a prima mundi origine deducti*, London 1650, p. 1), and Newton 3988 BC (extrapolated from a *Short chronicle*, i.e. Newton's preface to *Chronology of ancient kingdoms amended*, London 1728).

The concept of main languages referred to the languages emerging at the Tower of Babel. In the early modern period, this was common opinion. Finally, the concept of derived languages referred to the languages deriving from any main language, either by the process of language or dialect diversification or the process of language mixing.

Stiernhielm contributed to the theorizing on the identity and nature of the primeval language with his universalistic phonology and morphology, and introduced new views on the origin of the main and derived languages with his language–dialect distinction and his theory of dialectal diversification through temporal and geographical separation. He disapproved of the identification of Hebrew as the primeval language, and also rejected the narrative of the Confusion of Tongues (Gen. 11: 1–9) as an explanation of linguistic diversity.

Stiernhielm uses the following terminology in his classification of languages from a historical perspective:

- (1) the primordial language as common ancestor of all languages: *lingua primigenia*, *lingua primaeva*, *lingua prima et generalis*, *communis stirps*, *stemma commune*, *unitas primigenia*.
- (2) main languages (mother-languages): *linguae matrices*, *linguae cardinales* or *linguae primariae*.
- (3) derived languages and derived dialects
 - (a) derived by language or dialect diversification: *linguae ortae*, *dialecti ortae*,
 - (b) derived by language or dialect mixing: *linguae ortae*, *dialecti ortae*.

4.2.3 Stiernhielm's main conceptual tools

(1) The language-dialect distinction

In explaining language diversity and linguistic change, Stiernhielm created a dialect concept that underlines geographical and historical dimensions of variation and is aimed at a genealogical language classification. In distinguishing language from dialect, Stiernhielm used several criteria, the first being the Aristotelian categorization of reality into substance and accidents. Language is defined by the emergence of a new lexical stock as substance, while a dialect is defined as an accidental change caused by differentiation in pronunciation, inflections, the formation of derivatives and the regular shift of given speech sounds between related dialects. Stiernhielm also makes use of the criteria of mutual intelligibility, geographical distribution (national–regional) and temporal position (prior–posterior).¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁸ For an analysis of these criteria in Stiernhielm's works, see further Eskhult 2020, "The concept of dialect in the works of three 17th-century linguistic theorists:

(2) The life-cycle of languages

The leading philologists of the vernacular Italian Renaissance in the 16th century (Tolomei, Muzio, Cittolini and Varchi) applied one of Aristotle's categories of change in nature, namely generation,¹⁴⁹ to their explanation of the historical relation between Ancient Latin and Italian.¹⁵⁰ This created the new concept of a "generated language", from which a set of related conceptions about language emerged:¹⁵¹

(a) the conception of the life and death of languages, especially in the metaphor of living, half-dead and dead (or extinct) languages;

(b) the vegetation metaphor where languages undergo a process of birth, growth and death in successive stages. This led to the life-cycle periodization of Latin.

(c) the kinship metaphor of mother- and daughter languages, a metaphor intended to explain both the continuity and change of any language.

In his main treatise on the origin and diversification of languages (*De linguarum origine praefatio*, see Section 12.3 or 12.4), Stiernhielm uses the two latter metaphors.

4.2.4 Stiernhielm's proposal of the Scythian hypothesis

Stiernhielm elaborated and formulated an explicit theory of language origins and kinship that is based on the principle of language diversification with the passage of time and separation in space.

The biblical history of the repopulation of the world after the Flood served as the historical basis of Stiernhielm's classification of language families, namely those of the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth. Stiernhielm argues that the Japhethites peopled Europe and most of Asia and that they were called Scythians in classical ethnography as a general name for peoples inhabiting the northern hemisphere, as Salmasius had maintained on the basis of Strabo's *Geographia*.¹⁵²

Georg Stiernhielm, Claudius Salmasius and Christian Ravius, *Approaches to dialectal variation from antiquity up to modern times*, workshop papers presented at ICHoLS XIV, edited by Raf Van Rooy, Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

¹⁴⁹ Aristotle classifies the first kind of essential movement as that from non-being (ἐκ μὴ ὄντος) to being (εἰς ὄν), *Physics* 224b 8–10, *De generatione et corruptione* 319a 26–29, or from non-subject to subject (οὐκ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς ὑποκείμενον), *Physics* 225 a 1–12. This change is called γένεσις in Greek, that is, 'coming-to-be' or (usually) 'generation'.

¹⁵⁰ See my article "Vulgar Latin as an emergent concept in the Italian Renaissance (1435–1601)" in *Journal of Latin linguistics* 17:2 (2018), p. 215.

¹⁵¹ R. G. Faithfull, "The concept of 'living language' in cinquecento vernacular philology", *The modern language review*, vol. 48 (1953), pp. 290–291.

¹⁵² Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, pp. 374–375.

Stiernhielm relied on all the Dutch linguistic theorists who had proposed the Scythian hypothesis. He borrowed the term Scythian or Gothic Aramaean (as distinct from Semitic Aramaic) from Becanus. In his theory of both the Scythian and Semitic branches of languages, he was apparently inspired by Schrieckius. He took the inclusion of Indo-Scythian and Phrygian among the Scythian languages from Salmasius, on whom he also relied for his views on dialects and linguistic change and he was guided by Boxhorn in his treatment of Scythian as a proto-language.

4.2.5 Stiernhielm's classification of the Japhetic Scythian

In one of his drafts of *Runa Suethica*, titled *De linguis in genere*, Stiernhielm offers a language classification. He divides the primeval language into an Oriental branch spoken by the Semites and Hamites and an Occidental branch spoken by the Japhethites.¹⁵³ The Japhetic branch is equated with Scythian, and is divided into three branches: (1) Tataric or old Sarmatian, (2) Gothic or Getic (according to one manuscript version 'Scythian proper'), of which Celtic languages have descended, and (3) Greek. He continues by explaining a number of languages as being a result of the mixture of different main or derived languages. Thus, Turkish, Persian and Armenian are explained as mixtures of languages of the Semito-Hamitic branch with those of the Scythian branch. Slavic languages originate from a merger of Gothic and Greek, while Latin derives from a combination of Celtic and Greek.

In the preface to the Swedish edition of *Codex Argenteus* in 1671, Stiernhielm discusses all branches of languages descended from the primeval language. At first, he presents the languages of the Hamito-Semitic branch as dialects of one and the same stock:

Hebrew, no less than Phoenician, Chaldaic, Syriac, Arabic, Egyptian and Ethiopic, is a dialect of one and the same language.¹⁵⁴

Stiernhielm continues with a classification of the Japhetic Scythian branch of peoples and languages. He included the languages

¹⁵³ Stiernhielm, *De linguis in genere*, F.d. 6, fol. 54r "Primam divisionem fuisse in Orientalem et Occidentalem: illam, quae Asiam Australem et Affricam invasit, hanc, quae Europam occupavit et septentrionalem Asiam. Illam duos fratres Sem et Cham, hanc tertium Iaphetum aut ipsum Noham propagasse credimus."

¹⁵⁴ Stiernhielm, *De linguarum origine praefatio*, p. 22: "Hebraeam, non minus quam Phoeniciam, Chaldaeam, Syram, Arabicam, Aegyptiam, Aethiopicam etc. unius linguae esse dialectum."

listed below in the category of Japhetic Scythian. Regarding the ethnicities originating from Japheth in Asia and Europe, Stiernhielm says: “All these were by descent Scythians and used the Scythian language, each with its individual dialects.”¹⁵⁵ His discussion in *De linguarum origine praefatio* can be systematized as follows:¹⁵⁶

1. Asiatic Scythian (*Scythica Asiatica*)
 - 1.1 Indo-Scythian (*Indo-Scythica*)
 - 1.2 Persian (*Persica*)
 - 1.3 Armenian (*Armenica*)
 - 1.4 Phrygian (*Phrygia* or *Phrygica*)
2. European Scythian (*Scythica Europaea*)
 - 2.1 Italic: Umbrian (*Umbria*), Oscan (*Osca*). Sabinian (*Sabina*)
 - 2.2 Latin (defined as the result of a convergence of Italic languages, Phrygian, Celtic, and Greek)
 - 2.2.1 Italian (*Italica*)
 - 2.2.2 Spanish (*Hispanica*)
 - 2.2.3 French (*Gallica*)
 - 2.2.4 Rhaeto-Romance (*Rhaetica*)
 - 2.2.5 Sardinian (*Sardica*)
 - 2.2.6 Romanian (*Walachica*)
 - 2.3 Greek (*Graeca*)
 - 2.4 Celtic: Gaulish (*Gallica vetus*) and Welsh/ Cymraeg (*Cambrica*)
 - 2.5 Thracian (*Thracica*)
 - 2.6 Gothic (*Gothica*) or Scytho-Gothic
 - 2.6.1 Western Germanic (*Germanica*):
 - English (*Anglica*)
 - Dutch (*Belgica*) and old Dutch (*Cimbrica*)
 - Flemish (*Flandrica*),
 - Frisian (*Frisica*)
 - Brabantian (*Brabantica*)
 - Pomeranian (*Pomeranica*)
 - Saxon (*Saxonica*)
 - Misnian (*Misnica*)¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, p. 33: “Hi omnes propagine Scythae, Scythica usi sunt lingua, singuli singulis dialectis.”

¹⁵⁶ For the general classification and specific grouping, see Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, p. 31 (German dialects), pp. 33–34 (Scythian languages in Asia and Europe), p. 37 (Slavonic and Italic), pp. 42–44 (the Romance languages). For a grouping of German dialects and Germanic languages, see Stiernhielm’s genealogical diagrams in F.d. 6, fol. 10v (Royal Library, Stockholm), edited in Section 11.6.3.

¹⁵⁷ Misnian here refers to the dialect in Meissen in Upper Saxony; see Helander, *Neo-Latin literature in Sweden in the period 1620–1720*, Uppsala 2004, p. 264.

- Swabian (*Svevica*)
- Swiss (*Helvetica*)
- Austrian (*Austriaca*)
- 2.6.2 Scandinavian (*Scandica*)
 - Swedish (*Suedica*)
 - Danish (*Danica*)
 - Norwegian (*Norvegica*)
 - Icelandic (*Islandica*)
- 2.7 Slavonic (*Sclavonica*)
 - 2.7.1 Russian (*Moschovitica*)
 - 2.7.2 Czech (*Bohemica*)
 - 2.7.3 Polish (*Polonica*)

4.2.6 *The position of Swedish in the Scythian language family*

Stiernhielm is commonly regarded to have claimed that Swedish is the most ancient language of the world. This criticism is partly true, but there is a difference and contradiction between Stiernhielm's politically motivated statements and his scholarly theory regarding the process of language diversification.

In his treatise *Mysterium etymologicum*, Stiernhielm ventures to claim: "The Swedish language is, according to its origin, much more ancient than Latin and Greek, contemporary with Hebrew and its sister, even more ancient than Hebrew; it is indeed the Japhetic language itself." Stiernhielm's explicit theory of a Scythian proto-language and his emphasis on its historical diversification calls, however, for a contextual reading of this patriotic exaggeration.

Stiernhielm did apparently not posit an absolute, but only a relative primordality of ancient Swedish in comparison with a number of early West Germanic languages, such as Old English, Old Frisian, Old Dutch, Old Saxon and Old High German (though using different terminology). He says: "our Sweo-Gothic is closer to the primordial language (*primigeniae propriorem*) and has remained more pure, more simple and more intact (*puriolem, simpliciolem et integriorem*) than the other languages" (here referring to the old West Germanic languages and Latin and Greek).¹⁵⁸ Accordingly he claims that the Swedish language possesses the qualities of purity, *puritas*, and simplicity, *simplicitas*. Purity is the quality of being free from foreign lexical elements, while simplicity is the quality of being free from artificiality and complexity in word formations.

In a brief draft dealing with the antiquity of the Swedish language, the patriotic assertion recurs when Stiernhielm states: "I argue that

¹⁵⁸ *Lexicon etymologicum Ulphilianum, rectius notae in Novum Testamentum Ulphilae*, F.d. 12, fol. 1v.

our Swedish, which is the same as Gothic, remains the most pure and the simplest of all those languages.”¹⁵⁹ He specifies the languages in comparison with several Old Germanic and Old Celtic languages. in the same draft he defines the concept of Swedish widely, adding: “within the term Swedish I include all Scandinavian dialects and Icelandic.”¹⁶⁰ In his preface he repeats his claim as follows:

It is superfluous to deal much with our Sweo-Gothic, since everyone acknowledges that it remains genuine and uncorrupted right from its primordial beginning and pure from and uncontaminated by foreign elements, and it does not distance itself from its first origin except for through the passage of time.¹⁶¹

In his small treatise *De antiquitate linguae Suedicae* (Section 11.5.2), Stiernhielm puts forward the following reasons for this patriotic claim: (1) the ethnical homogeneity of the Swedes within Sweden’s territorial boundaries since the most ancient times: their realm has founded colonies, but never admitted colonies, (2) the ancient use of an indigenous script: the runes, and the fact that the use of letters helps preserve the language, (3) the geographical, ethno-linguistic isolation of Scandinavia, and (4) the formation of simple roots and words in Swedish.

The Swedish linguist and poet Carl August Hagberg (1810–1864) argued in his biography of Stiernhielm that there is an incompatibility between the scholarly and patriotic aspects of Stiernhielm’s views on Swedish, because the patriotic assumption that a certain language of the past is the primeval one disagrees with the scholarly assumptions in *De linguarum origine praefatio* that a language was infused in the mind at the Creation and that no language always retains the same form. Hagberg argues that this contradiction was an expression of the need for a functional national language in the 17th century.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁹ Stiernhielm, *De antiquitate linguae Suedicae*, F.d. 6, fol. 58r (Section 11.5.1): “ajo nostram linguam Svethicam eandemque Goticam omnium istarum manere etiam hodie purissimam et simplicissimam.”

¹⁶⁰ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, fol. 58r: “Suethicae autem includo omnes dialectos Scandicas et Islandicam.”

¹⁶¹ Stiernhielm, *De linguarum origine praefatio*, p. 34: “De nostra SVEO-GOTHICA multa dicere supervacaneum est, cum a primordio suo eam nemo neget manere sinceram et incorruptam, ab externis puram et intaminatam nihilque, nisi aevo, a prima sua origine distantem.”

¹⁶² Hagberg, “Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhjelm”, p. 22, *Svenska akademies archive*, vol. 49: “Det är till och med efter skaldens egen åsigt, att ett språk blifvit människan i och med själen ingjutit och att detta ej dröjer i någon form evärdeligt, stridande emot all vetenskap att antaga något visst historiskt språk såsom [urspråk] det första av alla. Men äfven i denna motsägelse se vi en ädel grund framlysa, i det

4.2.7 Stiernhielm's book resources for language comparison

Stiernhielm drew up a list of sources for his exploration of language origins with the heading: *Libri conducentes ad Origines linguarum Georgii Stiernhielmi* (F.d. 5, fol. 33v and fol. 34r. See Section 15.2). Stiernhielm possessed several aids for his historical and etymological linguistic research. These can be classified into the following categories: (1) dictionaries and polyglot dictionaries, (2) language samples, textbooks, and Bible translations into different languages, (3) treatises on the history of languages, and (4) grammars.

Stiernhielm's private library has not been preserved, nor has any catalogue of his book collection. The list of his linguistic resources (edited in Section 15.2) may therefore be a valuable resource for reconstructing Stiernhielm's library.¹⁶³

4.3 Programme for Swedish language renewal

4.3.1 The concept of language purism

Stiernhielm's strived to purify the Swedish language from foreign elements. As we have seen above, he took for granted that Swedish was close to the original language and wanted to revive the oldest words in order to preserve the purity of Swedish.¹⁶⁴ Language purism in general is related to the phenomena of *language legitimization* and *language patriotism*. The former refers to efforts to demonstrate that a certain language is capable of serving as a language of literature and science to the same extent as the established cultural languages, in Stiernhielm's case Latin and French. The latter refers to claims about the superiority of one's own language to other tongues in terms of originality, antiquity, purity, and semiotic transparency when it comes to the correspondences between words and the nature of reality. Stiernhielm claimed both these qualities for Swedish.

In the middle of the 17th century, Swedish was exposed to influence from German, French and Latin.¹⁶⁵ In the decades around

den var en yttring av språkvetenskapens sträfvande att frambringa ett fosterländskt språk och en fosterländsk vitterhet, ett sträfvande som äfven gjorde sig gällande i främmande länder" [...].

¹⁶³ In his survey of Stiernhielm's library "Om Georg Stiernhielms bibliotek: några anteckningar", *Donum Grapeanum: festskrift tillägnad överbibliotekarie Anders Grape* (1945), pp. 107–141, Otto Walde retraced books possessed by Stiernhielm in different libraries, but did obviously not call attention to the list here mentioned.

¹⁶⁴ Eeva Melkas, *Studier i de arkaiska och dialektala orden i 1600-talets diktning*, "laudatursavhandling", University of Helsinki 1970 (unpublished thesis available at Helsinki University Library), p. 2. Melkas accounts for archaic, archaizing, and dialectal nouns, adjectives and verbs in Stiernhielm's poem *Hercules* and Haquin Spegel's poem *Gudz Werk och Hwila* ("God's work and rest").

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Ulf Teleman, *Åra, rikedom och reda. Svensk språkpolitik och språkvård under äldre nyare tid*, København 2002, pp. 42–43.

1650, the official aristocratic and bureaucratic Swedish usage had integrated a large number of loanwords from these languages. Stiernhielm's programme for language renewal was a reaction against this impact on the purity of the Swedish language.

4.3.2 *Stiernhielm's programme: constitutive elements*

Stiernhielm's programme for language renewal had several purposes:

- to enrich the Swedish lexicon, that is, to increase the richness or copiousness of words (*copia verborum*) of the Swedish language and to broaden the stock of literary means of expression,
- to revive and re-activate archaic "Gothic" words by using Old Icelandic and Old Swedish words, a programme which is known as Gothic archaism,
- to cleanse Swedish from non-naturalized foreign loanwords,
- to replace Latin and Greek terms in grammar, rhetoric and natural science with Swedish neologisms formed by derivation from Swedish morphemes.

4.3.3 *Antiquarianism: "the Gothic archaism"*

The fact that Stiernhielm's antiquarianism was closely related to his language purism is evident from his preface to the 1663 edition of the older law of Westrogothia (*äldre Västgötalagen*). The Old Swedish and Old German writings, Stiernhielm argues, play an important part in learning and reviving the ancient Swedish language ("til språksens gamble kundskap och förnyande").

Stiernhielm created the idea of Gothic archaism, which can be divided into several categories:

1. West Nordic archaism, that is, old Icelandic words,¹⁶⁶
2. East Nordic archaism, that is, medieval Swedish words,¹⁶⁷
3. The use of archaizing words derived from Old Swedish or Icelandic morphemes or formed from Old Swedish suffixes,¹⁶⁸
4. The use of dialectal or common inherited Swedish words.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ Melkas, *Studier*, pp. 7–25. In this category Stiernhielm used words such as *frode*, "knowledge, wisdom", from Icelandic *fraeði*, in the saga of Barlaam and Josaphat in the forms *froðr* and *froþi*; moreover *lynde*, "nature, character, form, shape", from Old Swedish *lynde* or Icelandic *lyndi*; *ädli*, "nature, actual quality" from Old West Scandinavian *eðli* (found in the sagas of Barlaam and Josaphat, Diderick and Orm Snorrasson) or Old Swedish *aedhli*, and *arla*, "early", which he met in the Swedish translation of the Wisdom of Jesu Syrach and in the saga of Barlaam and Josaphat.

¹⁶⁷ Melkas, *ibidem*, pp. 26–45. For instance, *hövd*, "head".

¹⁶⁸ Melkas, *ibidem*, pp. 46–62. For instance, *dat*, "praiseworthy action, great deed, exploit"; *hlioma*, "a dull sound, a dull ring", and *hug*, "soul, mind".

Stiernhielm recorded the sources for his knowledge of Old Swedish and Old Scandinavian words in the preliminaries to his antiquarian dictionary of Old Swedish, *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur* (1643). These are:

1. Icelandic sources, the sagas: Barlaam's and Josaphat's Saga,¹⁷⁰ Diderich's Saga,¹⁷¹ Saint Olaf's Saga¹⁷² and the Trojumanna Saga.¹⁷³ These sagas were considered as common "Gothic" property, that is, sagas in the "Gothic" language, which was thought to represent an earlier stage of Swedish. In addition, the events in the sagas were interpreted by Swedish antiquarians as referring to locations in the Swedish realm.¹⁷⁴

2. Old Swedish sources; medieval laws, *Äldre Västgötalagen* in an old manuscript, which Stiernhielm published in 1663,¹⁷⁵ the Westmannia law in ms. or in Åkermann's 1666 edition, and prints of the law codes of Upplandia, Ostrogothia, Helsingia, Gothlandia and Scania (*Upplandslagen*, *Östgötalagen*, *Helsingelagen*, *Jutalag*, *Skånelagen*), the prints of Kristoffer's country law (*landslag*),

¹⁶⁹ Melkas, *ibidem*, pp. 63–76. For instance, *nord-blys*, "northern lights, aurora borealis" and *snöd*, both in the sense of "mere, bare, only" and "mean, worthless".

¹⁷⁰ Stiernhielm sometimes refers to this saga as *Historia Damasceni*. It survives as ms. Isl. perg. Fol. 6, Royal Library, Stockholm. See Ståhle, "Språkteori och ordval i Stiernhielms författarskap", *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, vol 66 (1951), p. 68.

¹⁷¹ Stiernhielm calls this saga "Vilkina Konunga Saga". It survives as Isl. perg. Fol. 4, Royal Library, Stockholm). See Ståhle, *ibidem*, p. 68.

¹⁷² Stiernhielm refers to this saga of king Olaf Haraldsson as *Chronicon Sancti Olavi*. It is preserved as ms. Isl. perg. 2, 4:o, Royal Library, Stockholm. See Ståhle, "Språkteori och ordval i Stiernhielms författarskap", p. 68.

¹⁷³ This saga is the first one in the book of Ormr Snorrason, which does not survive. The National Library of Sweden holds a complete copy of the Trojumanna Saga in the collection of Icelandic manuscripts, a paper foliant no. 58, and an incomplete copy, paper 4:o no. 29. See Anders Grape, *Ihreska handskriftssamlingen i Uppsala universitetsbibliotek*, Uppsala 1949, p. 73. There are also incomplete copies at Uppsala University Library (mss. Ihre 76 and R. 706, 1²) Stiernhielm made excerpts, which in his autograph are found in ms. F.d. 7:1 (loose leaves between p. 12 and 13) and ms. F.d. 11 (*Index vocum antiquarum*). According to Stiernhielm, Bureus possessed a manuscript of the Trojumanna Saga.

¹⁷⁴ This was a Swedish appropriation of Icelandic cultural heritage apart from the fact that the saga of Barlaam and Josaphat traces back to India, from where it reached Europe through Arabic translation. In the same way, *Codex Argenteus* was appropriated from the Goths, in so far as it was regarded as the oldest and the most noble monument of the Swedish nation (*antiquissimum et nobilissimum gentis nostrae monumentum*). See the dedicatory letter of *Evangelia ab Ulfila [...]* ex *Graeco Gothice translata*, Stockholm 1671.

¹⁷⁵ Stiernhielm used ms. B. 59 (*Västgötalagen* 4:o, Royal Library) for his edition.

Magnus Eriksson's city law (*stadslag*) and the instruction guide or moral handbook for government (*Konungastyrelsen*)¹⁷⁶.

Stiernhielm studied these sources for his etymological lexicography and on this basis pursued his antiquarian purist programme. In his Swedish poetry,¹⁷⁷ in particular in the epic poem *Hercules*, which was finished in 1649, and published in 1658, he employed Gothic archaism as a stylistic device. The intellectual historian Sten Lindroth has called *Hercules* "a piece of propaganda in Gothic archaism."

Stiernhielm also used Swedish to write expository scientific prose, e.g. in his geometrical treatises *Archimedes reformatus*, published in 1644, and *Baculus Carolinus*, published in 1689 by Rolf Ohlson, *Från Stiernhielms Carl-Staf till metern*, according to the transcription of Torgny Bondestam (see pages 41–76).

¹⁷⁶ *Konunga och höfdinga styrelse* was probably written for King Magnus Eriksson around 1330 and comprises four books. It was published by Johannes Bureus in 1634 (*En nyttigh bok om Konnunga styrilse och höfdinga*) and was translated into Latin by Johannes Schefferus in 1669 (*Konunga ok höfdinga styrilse, hoc est regum principumque institutio ab incerto auctore gentis Sueticae ante saecula nonnulla patrio sermone conscripta*, Holmiae/ Stockholm). Stiernhielm's copy of Bureus' edition with his own underlinings and annotations is extant at Uppsala University Library (under shelfmark "Sv. Rar. 10: 264").

¹⁷⁷ Stiernhielm's excerpts from the medieval Swedish law codes survives in F.d. 2:3, F.d. 10 and F.d. 11. See further Carl Ivar Ståhle, "Språkteori och ordval i Stiernhielms författarskap", *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, vol. 66 (1951), pp. 67–84.

5. Stiernhielm's lexicography: an exploratory account

5.1 Place in the Swedish lexicographical tradition

The history of Swedish dictionaries has been examined within the recently emerged discipline of the history of lexicography.¹⁷⁸ The history of Swedish lexicographical practice can be classified into four successive stages from the Middle Ages to the 20th century.¹⁷⁹

1. The stage of the Latin tradition: 13th century to 1640;¹⁸⁰
2. The stage of the Swedish Gothicist tradition: 1640 to 1712;¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁸ There are several contributions, e.g. Johansson 1997: 70–79, Ralph 2000 and 2001, Holm 2009, Hannesdottir 1998, Jacoby 1990, and Haugen 1986.

¹⁷⁹ In earlier periodizations, only three periods have generally been identified: (1) the time before 1700, (2) the period 1700 to 1850, and (3) the time after 1850. In earlier periodizations, the Gothicist lexicography is not recognized as a separate stage and period, though Ralph (2001) actually seems to be prepared to do so.

¹⁸⁰ The following dictionaries are representative examples of this stage: *Swedish-Latin alphabetical glossar from the 14th cent.* (ms. Codex Ups. 20), ed. by Erik Neuman 1918–20, considered to be based on the first Latin dictionary *Catholicon* by Giovanni de Balbi 1286; *Variarum rerum vocabula cum Sueca interpretatione*, Stockholm 1538, a thematic word list, the oldest printed Swedish dictionary, which in modern time has been attributed to Olaus Petri; Elaus Petri Helsingius, *Synonymorum libellus*, Stockholm 1587; Jonas Petri Gothus, *Dictionarium Latino-Sveco-Germanicum*, with a Swedish-Latin index, *Index Sueco-Latinus*, Linköping 1640. This Swedish-Latin word list was used as the basis of a several successors of Swedish-Latin dictionaries, such as Johannes Wolimhaus, *Enchiridion Dictionarii Latini-Svecici, in quo Romanae linguae vocabula ad ordinem alphabeticum digesta Svecice explicantur* with *Index Svecico-Latinus*, Stockholm 1652 (see Johansson 1997: 365–383) and Erik Johannes Schroderus, *Lexicon Latino-Scondicum, in quo quatuor celebriores totius Europaei orbis linguae atque idiomata, scilicet Latinum, Svecicum, Germanicum et Venedicum sive Fennonicum parvulis Musarum alumnis methodice inculcantur*, Stockholm 1637, which Stiernhielm possessed. Schroderus compiled *Dictionarium quadrilingue: Suedicum, Germanicum, Latinum, Graecum* in the 1630s, but it remained in manuscript until it was edited by Bengt Hesselman in 1929.

¹⁸¹ Other representatives than Stiernhielm of this Gothicist lexicographical tradition are Johannes Bureus, his drafts of dictionaries in the collection F.a., Royal Library, Stockholm, notably F.a. 13 *Lexicon Gothicum*, and Olof Verelius, *Index linguae veteris Scytho-Scandicae sive Gothicae ex vetusti aevi monumentis collectus*, Uppsala 1691, which is a dictionary on ancient Norwegian.

3. The stage of an independent tradition of bilingual dictionaries with contemporary Swedish as source language: 1712 to 1850;¹⁸²
4. The stage of monolingual contemporary and/ or etymological Swedish lexicography: 1850 to the present, mainly Anders Fredrik Dalin 1850–55, Fredrik Tamm 1980–1905, Elof Hellquist, *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*, 1920–22 (2nd revised ed. 1939, 3rd ed. 1948), Elias Wessén, *Våra ord*, 1961, *Nationalencyklopedins ordbok* 1995–96, B. Ernby 2008, SAOB 1893–2023, SAOL 1873–2015.

Swedish lexicography accordingly developed under the influence of the continental tradition of Latin lexicography (Johansson 1997: 70–79). A Swedish Gothicist lexicography independent of the Latin tradition subsequently emerged, but it mainly had an etymological goal. Nevertheless, it laid the foundation for a lexicography of contemporary Swedish, which was then manifested in Haquin Spegel's *Glossarium Sveo-Gothicum* (1713) and continued in bilingual dictionaries. Stiernhielm's Swedish lexicography belongs to the second stage. The aims and premises of Stiernhielm's few printed dictionaries are surveyed by Ralph,¹⁸³ with special regard for the underlying ideas of sound symbolism and the Gothicist claim that Swedish is closest to the first and original language of humankind.

¹⁸² Haquin Spegel, *Glossarium Sveo-Gothicum eller swensk ordabook*, Lund 1712, the full title of which reads: *Glossarium Sweo-Gothicum eller Swensk Ordabook inrättat them til en wällmeent anledning som om thet härliga språket willia begynna någon kunskap inhämta* (that is: Swedo-Gothic glossary or Swedish dictionary written as a well-intentioned opportunity for the benefit of those who wish to begin to acquire some knowledge of the noble language). Jesper Swedberg, *Swensk Ordabok*, a complete manuscript from 1720–22, copied in the 1720s and 1730s (used by P. Schenberg and by the Swedish Academy in SAOB) ed. by Lars Holm 2009). Olof Lind, *Teutsch-Schwedisches und Schwedisch-Teutsches Lexicon oder Wörter-Buch*, Stockholm 1738, revised edition 1749. Petrus Schenberg, *Lexicon Latino-Svecanum*, with a Swedish-Latin part as well, based on a selection of entries in Swedberg's *Swensk Ordabok*, Norrköping & Linköping 1739. Jacob Serenius, *Dictionarium Suethico-Anglo-Latinum*, Stockholm 1741.¹⁸² Levin Möller, *Nouveau dictionnaire François-Suedois et Svedois-François*, Stockholm & Uppsala 1745. Samuel Schultze, *Swensk Orda-bok*, 1755, never printed, out of six original volumes, three lost. Abraham Sahlstedt, *Swensk Ordbok med latinsk uttolkning / Dictionarium Svecicum cum interpretatione Latina*, Stockholm 1773. Erik Wilhelm Weste, *Swenskt och fransyskt lexikon*, Stockholm 1807 (*Parallèle des langues Françoise et Suédoise*, vols. 3 and 4, Stockholm 1795). Anders Otto Lindfors, *Fullständigt swenskt och latinskt lexikon*, 1815–1824. Anders Fredrik Dalin, *Nytt fransyskt och svenskt lexikon*, 1842, och *Nytt svenskt och fransyskt handlexikon*, 1845.

¹⁸³ Bo Ralph, "Vanans makt i svensk språkhistoriebeskrivning", *Studier i svensk språkhistoria* 5, Umeå 2000, pp. 360–379; "Orden i ordning: den historiska framväxten av en lexikografisk tradition i Sverige", *Nordiska studier i lexikografi* 5, Göteborg 2001.

John Considine relates Stiernhielm's comparative lexicography to the Scythian hypothesis, then analyses its scope and finally argues that it is part and parcel of the making of a cultural heritage. He says:

The supposed Scythian origins of the extant languages were discussed by a number of seventeenth-century scholars, for instance Boxhorn, Franciscus Junius and Salmasius. One of the most striking of these discussions was that in Georg Stiernhielm's *Magog Aramaeo-Gothicus*, a pamphlet that took its title from the story of Noachian descent of the Goths through Magog.¹⁸⁴ [...]

Perhaps no-one has ever seen dictionaries as a more powerful means for the reconstruction of heritage than Stiernhielm. The antiquity of Swedish was to be set out in the *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*; its affinity with Hebrew and other languages was sketched in the *Magog aramaeo-gothicus* [...]. The wonderful dictionary *Babel destructa* would have reached back to the origins of humankind, making the language of Adam himself a heritage for all people, especially speakers of Swedish.¹⁸⁵

5.2 Kinds of lexicography, and language sources

Stiernhielm founded his linguistic theory on his lexicography, which can be classified into three different, but interrelated, kinds: (1) Swedish lexicography, (2) etymological universalist or multilingual lexicography, and (3) bilingual lexicography of ancient languages.

Stiernhielm based his etymological lexicography on his study of texts in older or contemporary stages of the following languages:¹⁸⁶

A. Germanic languages, which are termed "Gothic"

1. Ancient Swedish, *Sveo-Gothica antiqua*
2. Old Icelandic, *Islandica*
3. Old English, *Anglosaxonica*
4. Old High German, *Alemannica*
5. Old Dutch, *Cimbrica*
6. Old Franconian, *Franconica*

B. Hebrew

C. Latin

D. Greek

¹⁸⁴ Considine, *Dictionaries in early modern Europe*, Cambridge 2008, p. 307.

¹⁸⁵ Considine, *ibidem*, p. 309.

¹⁸⁶ In *Personalia* on Stiernhielm (*Svenska Akademiens samlingar*, vol. 291, fol. 5r, edited by Wieselgren 1937: 82) it is claimed that Stiernhielm "was a very good linguist who well understood the foremost Oriental and European languages". In a draft of *Personalia*, these languages are specified as follows: "Hebrew, Chaldaic and Syriac as well as Greek, Latin, Italian, French ("Fransyske"), Spanish, English ("ängelske"), Icelandic, Dutch ("Hållenske"), Finnish and German.

- E. Slavonic
- F. Finnish
- G. Persian
- H. Armenian
- I. Welsh (*Cambrica*)

Stiernhielm developed his linguistic theory in a number of introductory texts to his planned etymological and universalistic dictionaries, for instance *Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica*, “The noble rune or the Sueo-Gothic Sibyll” (1639), *Virgula divina* “The divine staff” (1641) and *Runa Suethica*, “The Swedish rune” in its second constituent part with the subtitle *Lexicon seu clavis linguarum primarum universalis* (1649–1652). Drafts of these dictionaries are extant. He planned a dictionary with the title *Saga Aramaeo-Gothica* “The Aramaic-Gothic saga” (1642), which does not, however, survive and which was distinct from the dictionary entitled *Magog Aramaeo-Gothicus*, “The Aramaic-Gothic Magog, of which a selection on the letter A was published in Uppsala in 1643.

5.3 Swedish lexicography: antiquarian and etymological

5.3.1 *An inventory of surviving drafts of dictionaries*

As Stähle (1951: 53) notes, it was Stiernhielm’s interest in etymology that led him to commence his work on Swedish lexicography in the 1620s. He has left behind several manuscript drafts of Swedish-Latin dictionaries or word lists in manuscript in more or less finished (as in nr. 1, 4, 5 and 7) or unfinished states (the rest). The main ones of these are as follows:

1. *Lexicon Gothicum philologicum*,¹⁸⁷ which according to the title page (F.d. 10, 2r) was begun on 12 June 1626 and completed in 1639, in two autograph parts: an etymological part (letters from A, including Ä and Å, to W, fols. 1r–90v) and an antiquarian part with the specific title *Vocabula prisca et obsoleta Legum Sveorum Gothorumque explicata a Georgio Lilia*, dated 1631, F.d. 10, fols. 103r–162r, which explains old and obsolete words in the medieval Swedish provincial laws.¹⁸⁸ In the lower part of

¹⁸⁷ The entire title reads: *Lexicon Gothicum philologicum a G. Lilia Sueo-Montano coeptum anno 1626, 12 Julii. Q. F. F. S. Detegens fontes linguae Gothicae atque itidem ex eadem in alias flumina*, see F.d. 10, fol. 2r, the upper part of the folio.

¹⁸⁸ According to Stiernhielm’s letter to the Regency in 1639, *Adelruna* is divided into two parts, 1. *Lexicon antiquarium*, and 2. *Lexicon primitivorum*. The first part corresponds to the autograph dictionary *Vocabula prisca et obsoleta*, F.d. 10, fols. 103r–162r, and to other drafts in manuscript volumes: *Index vocum obscuriorum*, F.d. 2:6 (non-autograph, see below, 5.3.1, no. 11) and *Index vocum antiquarum cum explicatione*, F.d. 11.

the front page, the dictionary was later, retitled *Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica*, evidently in 1639.¹⁸⁹

2. *Virgula divina*,¹⁹⁰ (F.d. 6c, 61 leaves), an incomplete autograph etymological dictionary on words on the letter A, from 1641.
3. *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, Stockholm 1643 (Peter von Selaw), comprises words beginning with the letter A (A–Aruldigra, 44 pages in quarto). On the verso-page of the Swedish title page, this dictionary is given a Latin title: *Antiquarius linguae Scandia-Gothicae*.¹⁹¹ In *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum*, 1671 (e.g. p. 79, col. 1), Stiernhielm refers to this dictionary as *Inventarium linguae veteris Sveo-Gothicae*.
4. *Utkast till Swea och Göta måles fatebur*, i.e. Outline for a Swedish and Gothic dictionary, F.d. 6a, 239 leaves comprising the entire alphabet, from A to Ö.¹⁹² The dictionary is referred to

¹⁸⁹ *Georgii Stiernhielm Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica*; see F.d. 10, fol. 2r, the lower part of the folio. Below, there is an annotation: “Praesentatum illustrissimo Domino Cancellario Regni Orebrogiae die 5. Martii Anno 1639 et retentum usque ad meridiem diei 7 anno 1639.” This title is repeated in a set of introductory theses in F.d. 13:1: *Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica priscam gentis et linguae Sueo-Gothicae eminentiam et maiestatem a temporum labe et invidiae nube in lucem vindicans*, F.d. 13, fol. 1r. Beside the title, in the upper corner, the annotation in F.d. 10, fol. 2r, is partly repeated: “Praesentatum illustrissimo Domino Cancellario Regni Orebrogiae die 5. Martii Anno 1639.”

¹⁹⁰ The entire title reads: *Virgula divina, cuius ope lingua vetus Gothica ex orco in lucem renovatur. Antiquitas, maiestas et ex ipsa rerum natura prompta indoles et proprietates mundo hactenus abscondita demonstratur. Linguae in orbe terrarum praecipuae inter se conferuntur et errores originationum pro veritate vulgo recepti deteguntur. Serenissimae Reginae Sueciae inscriptum anno Christi 1641.* For the title page, see F.d. 6c, fol. 1r.

¹⁹¹ The Latin title is followed by a detailed subtitle, which reads: *quo Gothicae priscae reliquiae et fragmenta recolliguntur, antiquae leges et legum termini iam desiti vocesque et phrases pene innumerae, alta temporum caligine sepultae, luci et vitae restituuntur, detergentur, illustrantur. Serenissimae Sueonum Gothorum Wandalorumque Reginae d. d.*

¹⁹² According to Swartling, *Georg Stiernhielm*, p. xv, the manuscript is mainly written in Samuel Columbus’ handwriting, occasionally in the styles of others, including Stiernhielm. The entries are distributed as follows according to the letters of the alphabet: A (1r) abreidu – avox, avext ‘fructus’; B (1v–12r): backa, *strand*, Germ. *Ufer* – byss; C (12v): canunca – cumblada, ‘laedere’; D (13r–19r): da, i.e. den – dyn, *biolla*, *biälra*; E (19v–23r): eda, id est *eller*, – eyturlag tunga, ‘virulenta lingua’; F (23v–37v): faa, id est *fä*, ‘accipere’ – fyst; G (38r–47v): gabb, ‘ludibrium’ – gysting, *maat*, ‘cibus’; H (48r–68r): haa, ‘terra’ – hyggen, *wiis*, *försichtigh*; J (68v–75v): ja, ‘adverbium affirmandi’ – juurkherra; K (76r–84r): kaf, *djup*, ‘profunditas’ – kyn, ‘gena, mala’; L (84v–99v): laf, ‘ora vestis’ – lynkind, ‘iustitia, aequalitas, meditatio’; M (100r–111r): maal, ‘sermo’ – myterij, ‘murmuratio, defectio occulta’; N (111v–117r): na, ‘capere’, and nana, interiectio gaudentis’ – nyans, *nyfijkenheet*; O (117v–126v): O, ‘interiectio admirantis’ – örla, id est ‘cursitare’, P (127r–128r): päll, ‘paulus’ – purtera, ‘polire lignum’; Q (128v–

as *Inventarium linguae veteris Sveo-Gothicae* in *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum* (1671). On fol. 209r there is a dating: “end of September, 1663” (JeHoVaH. MDCLXIII, ult. Sept.).

5. *Utkast till ett svenskt lexikon*, i.e. Outline for a Swedish dictionary, F.d. 10a, 76 leaves. It comprises the complete alphabet, from A (*allwatt*, heelwått) to Ö (*överhuvud*) mostly in another hand than Stiernhielm’s, whose autograph notes occur sparsely.¹⁹³ It is followed by an explanation of antiquated Swedish words and phrases in the medieval provincial law of Ostrogothia (twelve leaves).¹⁹⁴
6. *Lexicon Suecanum etymologicum*, F.d. 8, a projected Swedish dictionary comprising a selection of words from A to Y with about 3,000 recorded entries,¹⁹⁵ most of which are blank, however, or only have sparse lexicographical information.
7. *Index vocum antiquarum cum explicatione*, F.d. 11, fols. 1r–11v, a list of old words in the medieval Swedish law codes with Stiernhielm’s explanation. The title is written on the inside of the front cover.
8. *G. Stiernhielmii Fatebuur*, F.d. 11, fols. 12r–68v. This draft comprises the entire alphabet, A–Å. In most of the entries, Stiernhielm refers to passages where the entry word occurs in medieval Swedish literature. The last part of the volume, folios

129r): quabb, ‘assidua imploratio’ – quittur, ‘avium garritus’; R: (129v–140r): Ra, *wrå*, ‘angulus’ – rytsia; S (140v–176r): Sa och see ‘vidit et invenit’ – syt, *suckan*, ‘gemitus’), T (176v–192v): taa, ‘digitus pedis’ – thiut, ‘ululatus’; U/ V (193r–209r): va, ‘damnum, periculum’ – vyngl, ‘verigo’ and vingi, *beskiärm*; W (209r–222v): wa – wunnin, Y (223r–224r): ycher, *eder*, ‘vobis’ – ystu, *yttersta*; Z (224v), Å (225r–227r): å, semper – åverkan, *vålsverkan*, ‘molestatio, violenta usurpatio’, Ä (227v–233v): å, ‘semper’ – äwa, *tidh*, ‘tempus’ Ö (234r–237r) ödhe, *gods*, ‘possessio’ – öyttersta, ‘extremus’.

¹⁹³ The entries are distributed according to combinations of the two initial letters of words, under which the entries often not are listed alphabetically, for instance AX (1v): *axel*, ‘humerus’, *axelbladet*, *axlafläder*, *axel* ‘axis’, *ax* ‘spica’; BA (2r): *bada*, ‘lavare’, *baka* ‘pinsere’, *basse*, ‘aures’, *basunera*, ‘tubicare’, *bötligh* ‘flexibilis’, and DA (7v): *daler* ‘thalerus’, *dagh* ‘dies’, *Dalakarl*, *dagg* ‘ros’, *Danmark* ‘Dania vel Danmarkia, *danaarf*’.

¹⁹⁴ This portion is titled: “Annotatio et explicatio vocabulorum usu moderno non usitatorum, phrasium et modorum loquendi ex iure Sueogothico *Östgöta laghen*.”

¹⁹⁵ The entries are distributed as follows according to the letters of the alphabet: A: 17r–29v, B: 30r–60v, D: 61r–72v, E: 72v–75r, F: 76r–97r, G: 98r–114v, H: 115r–138v, I: 139r–143v, K: 144r–171r, L: 172r–188r, M: 189r–200v, N: 201r–213v, P: 214r–223r, Q: 224r–226r, R: 227r–240v, S: 241r–305v, T: 306r–320r, U: 320v–321v, W: 322r–332v, and Y: 333r–334r. Folios 336v–410v are blank. On fol. 336r some omitted entries have been added and others have been further explained. There are typically five entries per page (that is, ten entries per folio). The list of entries is non-autograph, while the etymological explanations are autograph.

85r–127v, comprises supplements to some letters (B, D, E, K, L, M, O and S), but has many blank pages and only a couple of sporadic quotations from medieval Swedish.

9. *Collectanea in Lexicon Sueo-Gothicum*, F.d. 2:7:2:1, a minor list of Swedish words, 12 leaves, from A (here including Ä and Å) to W, in different handwritings, sparsely that of Stiernhielm.
10. Fragments of *Virgula divina* in another version than that above (5.2.3, point 2), seven leaves on the letter A, from *A* to *Anlete*, F.d. 9:15, with a dedication to Queen Christina on the front page after the title and subtitle (fol. 7v).¹⁹⁶
11. *Index vocum obscuriorum quae occurrunt in Legibus Sueogothicis*, see F.d. 2:6: two series: 1. A–Y in Samuel Columbus' handwriting, and 2: A–W in a foreign handwriting.
12. "Ordelist uppå the ord förnemligast som särskilt finnas i Wäst-Götha Lagen, här i kortheet uthtydde, efftersom the i then stoore Ordboken, som i Wårcket är, widlyffteligare blifwa uthförde", *Wäst-Götha Laghbook*, Stockholm 1663, pp. 110–112, where c. 500 legal words are explained in the older Westrogothia Law.

5.4 General etymological lexicography

Items comprising general etymological lexicography are as follows:

1. *Lexicon seu clavis linguarum primarum universalis, cui titulus BABEL DESTRUCTA*, a universal etymological dictionary projected as the lexical part of *Runa Suethica* (the second part of the conspectus, paragraph 4), which was realized in two manuscript volumes and in a few samples. The main manuscripts are the following ones:

1. *Runa Suethica*, F.d. 5, fols. 47v–143v with many blank leaves.
2. *Miscellanera etymologica*, F.d. 7, specific pages, mainly 2v–3r, 9r–9v, 19r–40r, 41v, 42v–61v, 67r, 69r–69v, 70r–81v, 83v, 93v–95v, 97v, 105r–111v, and 113r–113v.

The main samples are as follows:

3. *Cubus radicum omnium positivarum filarium unius matris*, F.d. 9:6, 22 leaves. This text contains a theoretical part (edited in Vol. 1, 8.2.2) and a lexicographical part, which explores fifty-six lexical roots assumed to be universal to all languages.
4. *Radix Ma sive specimen etymologicum unius istius vocis*, F.d. 2:2, dated 1649.

¹⁹⁶ The main title is not extant on the damaged title page, but the subtitle reads "cuius ope LINGUA SCANDICA, vulgo GOTHICA sive SUETHICA, partim recensetur, partim ex oblivionis orco resuscitatur, excutitur, repurgatur et primaevo suo nitore et origini, quantum fieri potuit, restituitur, SERENISSIMAE SUEONUM GOTHORUM-QUE REGINAE consecrata". *Virgula divina* (Section 5.3, nr. 2) has a similar subtitle.

5. *Radix Ma, Scha, Tha ... Agg*, F.d. 9:7, about twelve leaves containing etymological stray notes on certain roots, such as *ma, mon, scha, sche, ska, ske, pa, tha* and *agg*. The notes on *agg* are dated 6 January 1667 (fol. 16r). A leaf on etymologies of Latin words from Germanic languages (instead of Greek) is dated 29 November 1664 (fol. 12r).
6. *Analogia rerum et verborum*, eight leaves, the last of which is blank, F.d. 9:3. This text consists of etymological and phonosemantic notes on Greek and Hebrew roots or groups of consonants (*cr, kr, gr, hr, scr*), which are compared with words in other languages, such as Swedish, Latin, English, German, Polish, Arabic, and Aramaic.

5.5 Bilingual lexicography

Bilingual lexicography is represented by numerous items as follows:

5.5.1 A Hebrew dictionary

1. *Magog Gothus demonstrans radices Hebraearum vocum convenire et easdem esse cum radicibus linguae Suethicae*, ms. XXXII 1715, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, fols. 8–29 and fols. 52–61, comprising the entire alphabet from *Aleph* (א) to *Taw* (ת). Hebrew words are compared with Swedish. The dictionary can be dated to around 1640–1642.¹⁹⁷
2. *Magog Gothus*, F.d. 17: a fair copy of the autograph above, written by Claudius Arrhenius, ennobled Örnghjälms, and supplemented with autograph additions by Stiernhielm. On the first page (fol. 1r), Stiernhielm states that this is only a preliminary collection.
3. *Magog Aramaeo-Gothicus*, Upsaliae/ Uppsala, undated, but published around 1643 (printer: Eschillus Matthiae). It comprises a selection of words beginning with the letter A (אֵיל – אֵבֶה, 18 pages) with purported Swedish counterparts.

5.5.2 Dictionaries of Mesogothic

1. *Lexicon etymologicum Ulphilianum, rectius notae in Novum Testamentum Ulphilae*, F.d. 12, notes on Gothic words in some chapters of Matthew (5–11, 26 and 27) and Mark (2 and 3) with parallels in Germanic languages and Latin (27 leaves excluding

¹⁹⁷ Ms. XXXII. 1715, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, is called on the inside of the front cover *Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielm*, while the outside of the front cover has the title *Adversaria prima*. The dictionary *Magog Gothus* is contained in two locations: from fol. 8r (אֵבֶה *voluit, affectum propensioem erga aliquem habuit; hinc Lat. aveo*) to fol. 29v (נִגַּע *pertingere, pervenire*) and from fol. 52r (נִטַּוִּית *nutavit*) to fol. 60v (תִּרְחַח *iaculum, omne missile*). Fol. 27v contains supplements on words from *aleph* (א) to *šin* (ש). Fol. 33r contains a list of words related to *Magog Gothus*.

- front cover and back cover). The front cover and back cover and fols. 1r–21r and 27v contain text, while fols. 21v–27r are blank.
2. *Lexicon etymologicum Ulphila-Gothicum*, F.d. 2:1, comprising the entire alphabet A–Z (from *Abin* to *Zlep*), 91 leaves. This is mainly the original of Stiernhielm's printed Gothic dictionary (see no. 3 below). The body of entries with basic information on grammar and an inventory of biblical occurrences is written in the hand of a research assistant, perhaps Abraham Tornaeus, on the basis of Fr. Junius' Gothic dictionary (1665). This framework is supplemented by Stiernhielm's autograph etymologies, independently of Junius.
 3. *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum*,¹⁹⁸ Holmiae/ Stockholm 1670 (printer: Nicolas Wankijf), comprising the entire alphabet, A–U (*Abin–Ustauh*, 152 pages, 1–151 in two columns). This is a complete revision of the Gothic-Latin dictionary published by Franciscus Junius, *Glossarium Gothicum*, Dordrecht 1665. The work of revision is evident on the macro- and micro-levels of the dictionary. The general innovative features are as follows: (1) Latin characters are consistently used instead of Gothic characters, (2) words are sometimes arranged in another order according to the different order of some Gothic consonants, (3) many words lexicalized by Junius as derivatives under the main word of a certain entry are lexicalized as independent entries by Stiernhielm. In the explanation of the entries the differences are everywhere obvious. First, Stiernhielm accounts for all inflectional forms of nouns and verbs rather than quoting the source passages, in which the Gothic word in question occurs, as Junius did. Secondly, the selection of references to biblical occurrences of Gothic words often diverges from Junius' inventory and is mostly given in another order. Thirdly, except for increasing the number of compared languages with Swedish, Stiernhielm gives the same cognates as Junius, but often dismisses the latter's etymological explanations, and in so doing, he bases his arguments on his own theory and practice of Swedish etymological lexicography.

¹⁹⁸ Variant copies have different titles. The dictionary was printed in 1670 (together with the new edition of *Codex Argenteus*) and then had the following title: *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum, linguis affinibus per Fr. Junium, nunc etiam Sveo-Gothica auctum et illustratum per Georgium Stiernhielm*, Holmiae/ Stockholm 1670. When the introduction *De linguarum origine praefatio* was added to the edition of *Codex Argenteus* in 1671, a new title page was printed for the dictionary as follows: *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum, linguis aliquot affinibus per Fr. Junium, nunc etiam Sveo-Gothica moderna et antiqua, cui innumerae accesserunt etymologiae et voces ex affinibus Orientalibus Graeca et Slavonicis, locupletatum et illustratum per Georgium Stiernhielm Sacrae Regiae Maiestatis Consiliarium Militarem et Collegii Antiquitatum praesidem*, Holmiae/ Stockholm 1671.

5.5.3 Word lists of Continental Celtic and Insular Celtic (Welsh)

1. *Vocabula Gallo-Gothica*, ms. XXXII 1715, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, fol. 27r.
2. *Index vocum Suethicarum cum lingua Cambrica et aliis convenientiam habentium*, F.d. 9:4, 22 leaves (1r–22v, of which 16r, 16v, 18r, 22v are blank), a non-autograph copy supplemented with autograph notes by Stiernhielm.
3. A Welsh-Latin-Swedish word list, F.d. 6, fols. 88r–91v, 94r–104v.
4. A Welsh-Latin word list, F.d. 7, on the page numbered as 186.
5. A Welsh-Latin word list, F.d. 9:8, fols. 7r–12v (oblong 4:o): words on M (*mab*, *filius*, *puer*–*mynegy*, *index*, *narrator*), and F.d. 9:9.

5.5.4 Draft of a Latin-Swedish etymological dictionary

1. *Latinarum et Gothicarum vocum communes origines*, in *Miscellanea etymologica* F.d. 9:1 (37 fols.), an incomplete non-autograph draft of a Latin-Swedish dictionary, mainly consisting of a list of Latin words serving as entries. Explanations are given for a selection of words that begin with the letters A, B, C, F and G, while the remaining parts (words on D, E, H and the rest, I–Z) only comprise occasional remarks on the listed words. Only the explanations are written in Stiernhielm's handwriting. Latin words are compared with Swedish, German, and Greek, and sometimes with Old English, Italian, Finnish and Hebrew.

5.5.5 Germanic lexicography

1. *Nomenclatura quorundam propriorum Germanorum nominum*, F.d. 2:3, an onomasticon of old Germanic names divided into two sections: 1. *A. not.* comprising A–Z (18 leaves) and 2. *B. not.* comprising A–W (40 leaves, of which many are blank).
2. A Frisian word list, *Frisica*, F.d. 7:1, inside of the first loose folio.

5.5.6 Finnish and Hungarian lexicography and philology

1. Hungarian-Latin wordlist with Finnish and Estonian cognates and purported Swedish cognates (with Latin explanations): *Ungarica convenientia cum Finnonica et Suethica*, F.d. 7:1, fol. 1r–4v.
2. A Finnish-Latin word list with many purported Greek and Hebrew cognates, F.d. 7:1, fol. 89r (in the ms. paginated as p. 138).
3. A Hungarian-Latin list of words beginning with M, F.d. 9:8, 2r.
4. *Specimen linguae et philologiae Finnonicae. Gen. cap. 1. v. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.* This “sample of Finnish language and philology” is extant in two copies: IV 574, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, and F.d. 13 wrapper 2, fols. 11r–14r, Royal Library,

Stockholm, a photocopy of which is extant at the National Library of Finland (shelfmark 1983:5).

In this treatise, Stiernhielm explains Finnish words in Genesis 1:1–5 in the first complete Finnish translation of the Bible from 1642.¹⁹⁹ He compares Finnish words with Estonian and Hungarian cognates and with purportedly related words in Swedish, German, Greek, Slavic languages (mainly Polish), and Latvian and sometimes also Armenian.

Ms. IV 574 is an accurate fair copy of a lost first version,²⁰⁰ which can be dated to Stiernhielm's stay in Stockholm between November 1649 and August 1651, after he had returned from his travels in the Netherlands and had been appointed archivist of the realm.²⁰¹ Ms. IV 574 contains an introductory text (1.5 pages), in which it is posited that the historical origin of the Finns was a colony that in ancient times bordered on Greek-speaking areas, and for this reason it is claimed that there are phonetic and lexical similarities between Greek and Finnish.

Ms. F.d. 13 (wrapper 2, fols. 11r–14r) is the fair copy of a later version, which seems to have been written around 1655, since Stiernhielm to some extent integrates his language philosophy into the explanation of a word, *loi*, in Finnish “created” (the root *la* is regarded as an expression of the ideas of light and goodness, F.d. 13, wrapper 2, fol. 11r–11v). Stiernhielm supplied this copy with his autograph additions in the margin, which he must have done after the repurchase of *Codex Argenteus* in 1662, or more likely after the *editio princeps* of it by Junius in 1665, since he refers to a

¹⁹⁹ The title is: *Biblia, se on: coco Pyhä Ramattu suomexi. Pääramattu in Hebrean ja Grecan jälken*, Stockholm/ Stockholm 1642. This Bible translation was made by a committee led by the bishop of Turku, Isaac Bigersson Rothovius (d. 1652). It is dedicated to Queen Christina.

²⁰⁰ Ms. IV 574 consists of two parts, first a title page followed by a dedication of the copy of the treatise to the historian and Germanic etymologist Johann Georg von Eccard (1674–1730) and an introduction on the origin of the Finnish people and language; and secondly the treatise itself, which etymologically explains words occurring in Gen. 1:1–5 in the numbered folios 1r–10r. According to the dedicatory page it was acquired by Johann Heinrich Heubel (1694–1758) during his journey to the north (“ex itinere septentrionali”), from which he returned in January 1722 (redux ... Io. Henricus Heubel, A. C. MDCCXXII. M. Jan.).

²⁰¹ This dating is possible to establish by the fact that he refers to the chronicle of St. Olof. King of Norway (995–1030), in Icelandic as “preserved here in the archive of the realm” (hic in Archivo Regni asservato, see ms. IV 574, fol. 3r; F.d. 13, wrapper 2, p. 23) and by the fact that he refers to an etymological argument of “his friend Boxhornius” (amicus meus clarissimus Boxhornius), the Dutch scholar Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn, viz. the comparison between the name of the old German goddess Taifana, the Queen of heaven, and the Finnish word *taivaan*, “heaven”, see ms. IV 574, fol. 4v; F.d. 13, wrapper 2, p. 24).

Gothic word, *laikan*, “to rejoice” in the explanation of a Finnish word, *liikui*, that is, “moved itself” and quotes a biblical verse where the Gothic word occurs (Luke 6: 23). This copy lacks the introductory pages on the historical origin of the Finns and the Finnish language.

5.5.7 Greek word lists

1. A Greek word list, F.d. 9:8, fol. 1r (ἄγω–χέω).
2. A Greek word list, F.d. 9:9, fol. 1r (on words beginning with μ).

5.5.8 Oscan word list

Oscan word list A–Z, F.d. 7:5b, “Ex carmine Osco Jacobi Balde”: five leaves of alleged Oscan words in alphabetical order (A–Z) from a Latin poem filled with many supposed Oscan words by the German Jesuit Jacob Balde (1604–1668).

5.5.9 Marginal annotations to various dictionaries

Stiernhielm possessed manuscript dictionaries of Old English, Old German and Armenian.²⁰² In his private copies he occasionally added marginal annotations.

5.6 Concluding remarks

Stiernhielm’s drafts of bilingual and multilingual wordlists were not self-contained goals; rather they served the purpose of collecting material for a universal etymological lexicon. Similarly, his various drafts of a Swedish dictionary on historical and contemporary usage were supposed to serve the overall purpose of universal lexicography. His lists of words in Swedish and Icelandic laws and in Icelandic sagas and Bible translations, and his lists of proper names were in turn subordinated to the Swedish lexicography. This is made clear in an inventory dating from 1669 of Stiernhielm’s unpublished writings, mainly his lexicographical drafts, where the different manuscripts are classified under the heading of Swedish and universal lexicography. In all probability, this inventory was made by Samuel Columbus. I have edited it in the appendix. The catalogue also comprises a list of mathematical writings and a couple of main works on other topics.

²⁰² *Lexicon Anglo-Saxonico-Latinum cum observationibus G. Stiernhielmii*, F.d. 1.; *Glossarium vetus Latino-Teutonicum*, F.d. 7:2; and *Dictionary Armeno-Latinum*, F.d. 22.

6. Manuscript sources, prints, and editorial principles

6.1 Printed and manuscript sources

6.1.1 Manuscripts

As stated in the first volume (6.1.1), Stiernhielm's linguistic writings survive in his own autographs and in copies by his amanuenses and other people. These are found at the National Libraries of Sweden, Finland and Denmark, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, (Hannover) and Uppsala University Library.

The Royal Library (The National Library of Sweden, Stockholm) holds the collection of Stiernhielm's autograph manuscripts, non-autograph copies of his linguistic and lexicographical writings and manuscript dictionaries of others with his annotations (F.d. 1–23, cf. Vol. 1, Section 3.1.2). The autograph manuscripts used in the editing of this volume are the following: F.d. 2:2:1, F.d. 2:7, F.d. 4:4:1, F.d. 5, F.d. 6, F.d. 6b, F.d. 6c, F.d. 7:1, F.d. 9, F.d. 9**, F.d. 10, F.d. 13, and F.d. 19:d, while the non-autograph copies are F.d. 2:2:2, F.d. 3 and F.d. 14a, the last of which collects Stiernhielm's minor linguistic drafts under the title *Discursus philologicus de omnibus linguis in genere et in specie de Suethica et affinibus*. Drawn up by Claudius Örnhielm, when he was Stiernhielm's copyist in the early 1660s,²⁰³ it was later supplied with autograph additions by Stiernhielm.

Furthermore, two other national libraries in Scandinavia hold non-autograph volumes containing approximately the same texts as those in F.d. 14a with the title *De linguis in genere ad diligentiores investigationem annotata*: ms. D. II. 37 at the National Library of Finland, Helsinki,²⁰⁴ and ms. NKS 150: 4^o, at the National Library of

²⁰³ In 1668, Örnhielm (1627–1695) became a professor of history at Uppsala University. Apart from his well-known work on Church history, *Historia Sveonum Gothorumque ecclesiastica* (Stockholm 1689), he wrote a treatise titled *Descriptio regni Sveciae* on the origin and antiquity of the Swedish realm with a focus on linguistic matters, ethnic customs and religion. This manuscript remained unpublished until 1765, when it was edited in the journal *Greinir or Peim Gaumlu Saugum, Laugum og Iprotter*, Stockholm 1765, pp. 173–296.

²⁰⁴ The provenance of D. II. 37 is interesting. It belongs to the collection (24,000 volumes) donated to Imperial Alexander University of Finland, Helsinki, in 1832 by Paul Alexandrov, from the Gatchina Palace Library, which he inherited in 1831 from his father Grand Duke Konstantin Pavlovich, a son of Tsar Paul I and a

Denmark, Copenhagen. The main differences are that the former also contains a draft of the first five chapters of *Runa Suethica* (ms. D. II. 37, fols. 25r–55v). The latter copy lacks this, but divides several texts into numbered paragraphs, thereby giving a better overview of the structure.²⁰⁵ Uppsala University Library also holds a manuscript with a similar set of texts as in NKS 150, see shelfmark ms. R. 21, hastily copied by Arvid Moller from Örnhjälms transcript (F.d. 14a).

Two texts in this volume are edited from Stiernhielm's autograph notebook, *Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielm*, shelfmark ms. XXXII: 1715, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, of which the Royal Library possesses a photostat, shelfmark N. 24. These texts are the following: *Mysterium etymologicum* (Section 8.1.1) and *Adelrunae conclusiones* (Section 10.3).

6.1.2 Prints

Several larger or shorter texts by Stiernhielm were edited during and after his lifetime. These prints are as follows:

- *De linguarum origine praefatio*, Stiernhielm's preface to the edition of *Codex Argenteus* (the Silver Bible) in 1671.²⁰⁶
- the conspectus of *Runa Suethica*, in two versions without date and place of publications, one from 1651 and another from 1669.
- *Observatio de etymo vocum fader, moder, broder, syster, amma, barn, dotter, son*, published in the journal *Greinir or þeim gaumlu saugum, laugum og íþrotter*, Stockholm 1763, pp. 217–219.
- *Anti-Bochartus*, first published in *Acta literaria et scientiarum Sveciae*, in Uppsala in 1738, pp. 363–389, and 1739, pp. 454–477.
- Preface to the dictionary *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, Stockholm 1643.
- Preface to *Wäst-Götha laghbok*, Stockholm 1663.

grandson of Catherine the Great, who had founded Gatchina Palace Library largely through the acquisition of the private library of Johann Albrecht von Korff (1697–1766), a Russian diplomat and president of the Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg (1736–). During his time as an ambassador in Denmark and Sweden in the 1740s (in Copenhagen from 1740, in Stockholm from 1745 until May 1748 and in Copenhagen again from 1748), Korff purchased large quantities of books and manuscripts at public auctions of private libraries (36,000 volumes). For a inventory of Alexandrov's donation, see Arne Jørgensen, *Universitetsbiblioteket i Helsingfors 1827–1848*, Helsinki 1930, pp. 81–87; about Korff, *ibidem*, pp. 76–77.

²⁰⁵ NKS. 150 (quarto) contains following items: *De linguis in genere*, fols. 2r–14r, with numbered paragraphs; *De Thor*, fols. 14r–16v, with 18 numbered paragraphs; *De convenientia linguae Suethicae cum lingua Phrygica*, fols. 17r–20r, with six numbered paragraphs; *De vocum Ebraearum Adam, Eva, Seth, Cain etc.*, fols. 21r–22r and *Nomina deorum pleraque omnium gentium esse Scythica*, fols. 22v–25r.

²⁰⁶ *Evangelia ab Ulfila Gothorum in Moesia episcopo [...] ex Graeco Gothice translata* [...], Stockholm 1671, printer Nicolas Wankijf.

6.2 Classificatory editorial principles

The various texts presented in this volume date from a period of more than thirty years, from the linguistic theory in *Adelruna* 1639, to the high point of his theorizing around 1650 and until the publication of *De linguarum origine praefatio* in 1671. Most of the edited texts are related to the planned work *Runa Suethica*, the conspectus of which was printed twice, the first time probably in June 1651, the second time in September 1669. The preface to the Swedish edition of *Codex Argenteus* (1671) on the origin of languages, language relationships and linguistic change is to a great extent a revision of drafts of the first five chapters of the first theoretical part of *Runa Suethica* (c. 1651–1653).

The editorial work has involved the collection and organization of scattered texts into a new order, corresponding to the branches of modern theoretical linguistics: phonology, morphology, semiotics, transformational grammar and semantics, etymology, and historical linguistics. The first volume comprises the former fields, while this volume deals with the two latter ones.

In Stiernhielm's works, some of these areas overlap, since one and the same text can encompass two or more fields, but most of the edited texts belong more or less to a specific branch of theoretical linguistics, because Stiernhielm had a well-structured, synthesizing and systematic approach to language studies. He set out from the smallest phonological units and proceeded to successively larger ones, first to the phonetic morpheme, then to the lexical morphemes (i.e. words), and finally, as far as his theory of transformational grammar is concerned, to the clause, phrase and sentence. He concluded his theory with etymological principles and the topics of language origins, language relationships and linguistic change and importantly proposed criteria for distinguishing between language and dialect.

6.3 Editorial principles

The general principle is to facilitate the reading of the Latin texts. This implies that it is necessary to amend punctuation according to modern principles, but also that it is sometimes acceptable to retain the original punctuation if this contributes to an easier understanding of the original text. It further means that the use of lower- and upper-case letters must be normalized according to modern principles. These measures depend on the editor's interpretation of the structure of the text, and are unavoidable, unless the basic work of manuscript interpretation is to be turned over to the reader.

In particular, and to sum up, I have applied following principles:

- (1) The orthography of the manuscript or print is always retained (even if inconsistent and deviating from the standards of Classical Latin).
- (2) Textual changes in the manuscript, e.g. corrections, deletions, additions above the line or in the margin, are to a large extent accounted for in a critical apparatus;
- (3) The line and page breaks of the manuscripts are not retained, but the page breaks are marked by indication of the folio or page number within brackets in extra bold type.
- (4) The edited texts have been divided into appropriate sections and paragraphs, sometimes by the introduction of numbering, which has been indicated within angle brackets.
- (5) Unreadable words or letters are omitted and indicated by three dots within square brackets.
- (6) The punctuation has been modernized, which for instance means that commas are removed before accusative with infinitive, before present participles and before absolute ablatives, except in cases where the original punctuation apparently facilitates, or is necessary for, a correct understanding of the syntax.
- (7) The capitalization has been modernized, which means that lower-case letters are replaced with capitals at the beginning of new sentences and that capitalized first-letters of single words within a sentence have been replaced by lower-case letters, unless they are not proper nouns.
- (8) The abbreviations and contractions of words have usually, but not always, been expanded. In so far as abbreviated or contracted letters are supplied, square brackets are used to indicate the letters that are added, with the exception of frequent and common abbreviations.
- (9) Words being supplied by myself as editor have been indicated by pointed brackets, while words that are to be removed have been marked by square brackets in extra bold types.
- (10) The use of diacritic marks in Latin has been removed, and in Greek it has been normalized according to modern standards, e.g. Stiernhielm's use of the grave accent in the last syllable of separate words, where modern principles require the acute accent.
- (11) Textual interference under points 5–10 are in general not accounted for in any critical note.
- (12) When single words are written in capitals, this use is retained, or represented by small capitals, as a typographical marker.
- (13) The Hebrew letter װ (*šin*) is for typographical reasons represented by the undotted form װ (that is, without a dot over its right branch), but the use of the grapheme װ (*šin*) is retained.

PART 2. ETYMOLOGY: THEORY AND METHOD

7. Etymological principles

7.1 *Canones etymologiae*: rules for etymology

Source: Preface of the incomplete dictionary *Virgula divina*, F.d. 6c, fols. 3v–4v and isolated passages on fols. 5v and 6r. Size: 172 x 235 mm.

Dating: This dictionary is dedicated to Queen Christina in 1641, a date which is found at the end of the title: *opus serenissimae Reginae Sueciae inscriptum anno Christi 1641*; see fol. 1r.

(3v) Verum ut omnia fiunt illustriora, nonnullos canones in originum eruendarum studio presse sequendos addere libet.

1. Cuiusque linguae nudum vocabulum inspiciendum abiectis omnibus literis formativis casuum, temporum, personarum, modorum etc.
2. Diligenter erit pensiculandum an sit vox composita, derivata vel prima. Ad prima autem ultimo erit deveniendum.
3. Literae euphoniae causa aut mutatae aut ex abundanti adhibitae, erunt aut reponendae aut abjiciendae.
4. In cognationem et consuetum literarum inter se transitum oculi erunt infigendi acutoque intuitu disquirendum numquid vox ac deinceps etymon emergat voci notae vere congruens. Idem sonus fere, non eadem literae semper requirendae in originationibus.
5. Congruentia, quam requirimus, non consistit in sola alliteratione vel literarum cognatione, nisi etiam significatus²⁰⁷ accedat, ut si velim deducere nostram *rijk* ab Hebraea רִיק, vacuus,²⁰⁸ et veterem *affat*, i.e. egens, a Latino *affatim*.
6. Significatus in nonnullis, sed paucis, est utrinque idem et adaequatus, in pluribus latior est vel strictior in lingua alterutra, ita, ut quod in una generalius, ita in altera specialius et vice versa. Nec raro accidit, ut quae in una proprietatem possidet, in altera tropice usurpetur. Verum hic, nisi qui summum et acre adhibet iudicium, vanus erit. Cuivis non est datum.

²⁰⁷ idem] *idem* has been crossed out after *significatus* (i.e. “the same meaning”).

²⁰⁸ רִיק, vacuus] The Hebrew adjective רִיק (*rīq*), more commonly spelled רִיק or רִק (*rēq*), “empty, vain”, is in the manuscript wrongly vocalized as רִיק.

7. Proprietas genuina et vera alta plerumque caligine obruta latet et nonnullis²⁰⁹ est inexplorabilis; in multis non nisi operose²¹⁰ eruitur vel per analogiam vel aliis mediis, sed inprimis per exquisitam naturae rei cum elementis vocis collationem²¹¹.

8. Ad quod²¹² requiritur, ut literarum sive primorum ut vocant elementorum eorundemque inter se combinationum et commixtionum naturam et potestatem internam frequenti et sagaci²¹³ indagine notam nobis reddamus.

9. Nec enim vanum est, si voces quas primas credimus et a primo sermonis architecto profectas dicamus, naturae in omnibus apte convenire eiusdemque nativa²¹⁴ et adaequata esse symbola.

10. Modus eruendi etymologias est:

1. Cum literae radicales in utraque lingua ordine immoto manent eadem.

2. Assumendo pro radicibus cognatas.

3. Est metathesis vel inversio radicis.²¹⁵

4. Et aphaeresis,²¹⁶ quando caput demitur.

5. Apocope²¹⁷ vero, cum cauda curtatur.

6. Syncopen ut minus dubiam et licentiosam ego non facile admisero, nisi ubi alias manifesta vocis nativitas vel analogia suaserit.

Antiphrasin ut vanam et rejiculam in plerisque²¹⁸ damno. Nec enim derivatur lucus ab eo quod minime lucet nec bellum ab eo quod minime bellum nec foedus ab eo quod res foeda non sit, ut inopes etymologistae sibi persuadere volunt.²¹⁹ Alia est ratio Scaligeri, *Poetica*, lib. 3, cap. 90: Etymologia est vocis

²⁰⁹ nonnullis] *multis* has been crossed out and replaced by *nonnullis* above the line.

²¹⁰ operose] *difficulter* has been crossed out and replaced by *operose* above the line.

²¹¹ collationem] After this word, *instituta* has been crossed out.

²¹² quod] *hoc* has been crossed out and replaced by *quod* above the line.

²¹³ sagaci] *iudiciosa* has been crossed out on the line and replaced by *sagaci*.

²¹⁴ nativa] *vera* has been crossed out and replaced by *nativa*.

²¹⁵ Est ... radicis] The original wording *Per metathesis vel inversionem radicis* has been crossed out.

²¹⁶ et aphaeresis] The original wording was *Et nonnumquam per apharesin*.

²¹⁷ Apocope] The original wording was *Per apocopen*.

²¹⁸ in plerisque] Stiernhielm first wrote *penitus*, “completely”, and then changed it to *in plerisque*, “in most cases”.

²¹⁹ Nec enim derivatur ... non sit] The examples of antiphrasis (that is, the use of an opposite word) is drawn from the tradition of Greco-Roman Stoic tradition, which is accounted for by Augustine in *De dialectica*, chapter 6, § 10, where the principle of contrariety is explained as follows:

From these we move on to contrariety. ‘Lucus’ (sacred grove) is thought to take its name from the fact that there is little light there (*minime luceat*), and ‘bellum’ (war), because it is not ‘bella’ (pretty) and the word ‘foedus’ (treaty), because it is not ‘foeda’ (dishonourable, ugly).

ratio, id est vis qua vox a voce generatur, etc. Vide quod ibidem sentiat de antiphrasi.²²⁰

(4r) 7. Nonnunquam et iam nova assumitur litera, quae vel praemittitur vel inseritur.

Exempla omnium affatim²²¹ habet lector non fastidiosus in *Adelruna Gothica Hebraizante*.

8. Frustra est, ut expectes omnes radicales Hebraeas reddi in nostra, nisi duae immediate se consequantur absque interposita vocali. Neque enim fert hoc indoles nostri idiomatis, cum omnes voces primitivae sunt monosyllabae. Quod etiam manifestum est in omnibus nostris infinitivis, si characteristic a vel diphtongum ia in fine abscindas ut:

אם. *amma*. צידה. *sidha*.

סידן. *sijden*. רדה. *rådha*.

מלט, פלט. *flyttia*. נפל.²²² *falla*.

(4v) Voces Gothicae vix admittunt duas sibi immediate adhaerentes vocales. Quin ad vitandum hiatum interponunt vel D. vel F. vel G. Non itaque facile harum una pro radicali habenda erit. Nonnunquam inter duas vocales media est, nisi forte in compositione.

Radix cuiusvis rei est instar puncti, ex quo diffunduntur surculi et deinceps rami varii. Est ergo in vocibus monosyllaba etc., imo monogramma sive unilitera. [...]

(5r) C. et H. commutantur.

L. splendet σέλας, fulgor, lumen. על, על; *gla, glas, glijsa, hla, hlas, häll*; σελήνη, ut luna a lucendo. B. et G. praeponuntur L. *blija, glijda, lijda, labi, gladh, blanck*. Interdum et S. *slia, slinta, slippa, slipa*.

W, Wh, hw, qw Graeca non habet. Nuda itaque reliquitur vocalis; in quibusdam vero aspirationem assumit, ut in αἶδω, αἰδω, cano, et ᾀδω, id. *quāda*.

(5v) Accentus apud Graecos in plurimis mutat significationem. In Arabica غ²²³ mutat significationem vocabulorum quae alias per ع²²⁴ scribitur.

Quod radices non respondent indoli naturae characteri una ratio est, quod ille radix possit non esse vera, sed sit per metathesis inversa. Quaerenda igitur per variarum literarum mutationem radix

²²⁰ Aniphrasin ... de antiphrasi] The former part is found in the margin of fol. 4r, while the latter part occurs at the top of fol. 3v. Scaliger explained etymology as implying "relationship to the true meaning" rather than as "speaking the true."

²²¹ affatim] *copiosa* has been crossed out and replaced by *affatim*.

²²² נפל] The manuscript has נבל, which is a mistake for נפל, "to fall".

²²³ غ] Stiernhielm writes this Arabic grapheme (*gayin*) in Hebrew script with a dot above it according to the common method of translitteration of that time.

²²⁴ ع] Stiernhielm writes the Hebrew counterpart ע (*ayin*) for the Arabic grapheme.

vera. H[ebraica] באר, abiecit. Syr[iaca] באר, abiecit. Radix habet *raka bort*, *wräka*.

(6r) De scriptione Germanica, vide apud Vulcanium post praefationem ad Willeram, item Praefationem ad Otfridum, si memini.

Aio linguarum principium esse unum et omnibus radices communes. Quare? Quia experientia docet omnium in omnibus reperiri confusionem, ita tamen, ut quae omnibus aut pluribus sunt communia non videantur uni aut alteriperegrina et adscita, sed genuia et propria, e.g. חנן et *anna* et *γένω, Latine *geno*, i.e. gigno, Suethice *köna* etc. Haec nulli linguae adscita et ex Hebraea introducta puto ego, sed singulis nativa et propria ex uno fonte, uno traduce communi, qui in aliqua harum reperiatur adhuc superstes, qualis hic est *an*, *en*, i.e. unus. Unde verbum *anna*, cupire, unire, i.e. amare et inde generare. Sed etiam *an* est ab *a*, unus (hic, hoc, ens) et verbaliter esse. Unde etiam <Gothice> *atta*, pater, et Fin[nonice] *äiti*, mater, ut a priori, sive hac ipsa, Turc[ice] *ana*, mater.

7.2 *Ut linguarum studiosos doceam: “to teach the students of languages”*

Source: Stiernhielm’s printed Hebrew-Swedish dictionary on words beginning with *alef*, dedicated to Queen Christina: *Magog Aramaeo-Gothicus, serenissimae Reginae Svecorum Gothorumque Christinae Gustavi Magni ffiliae] dedicatus*, Upsaliae/ Uppsala without date, but probably published in 1643. The excerpt below is drawn from the entry אדב, *’ādab*, “to be sick”, to which the Hebrew cognate דאב, *dā’ab*, “to languish”, Aramaic *dā’eb* (participle of the root דב, *d-w-b*) and Arabic *dhāba* are compared. Stiernhielm then concludes:

(p. 4) Haec coacervavi, ut discant linguarum studiosi rerum causarum easdemque significantium vocum atque has constituentium elementorum cognationem, mutationem, transitionem, additionem, reiectionem et quo facilius assuescant veras eruere etymologias ipsi rei eiusdemque causis et vocis naturae congruentes. Nunc, quas ex variis linguis obiter observavi voces hisce aut sorores esse aut filias sine ambitu indigitebo. [...] ²²⁵

(p. 7) Isthac congressi, ut exemplo linguarum studiosos doceam:

1. Inquirere in naturam, propriam indolem et causam rei, cuius nomen et etymon scire desiderant.

²²⁵ In the omitted text, Stiernhielm gives examples of Latin, Greek, German, and Hebrew cognates of the Swedish words *däf*, *def*, *däfen* or *däven*, all of which mean ‘humid’ and ‘vapour’.

2. Multas res easdem diversas cohaerere et dependere quasi catenatim ex una causa generali easque singulas ad communem stipitem posse reduci.
3. Ut rerum, ita vocabulorum affinium unam dari generalem radicem. Reliquas radices, quas vocant, revera non esse radices, sed surculos ex una radice propagatos.
4. Eandemque radicem primam esse monosyllabam nec regulariter apud Hebraeos pluribus quam duabus literis constare.
5. Literam tertiam nihil agere aliud quam ut significationem generalem modifcet, limitet, ampliet, restringat, augeat, minuat, convertat in aliud, in se reflectat, active, passive, transitive modis variis, hinc tropos pro rerum varietate exsurgere varios.
6. Eodem, quo res discrimine, literas quoque inter se distare.
7. Literas non (p. 8) minus ac res ipsas sibi invicem cognatas esse.
8. Omnino necessarium esse, ut cognationes istae rite addiscantur etc. Tales sunt in praemissis:

ד · ט · ת · ז · צ · ס · ש
d. t. th. z. ts. s. sh.
item: ב · פ
b.v. f. p. ph.
item: ו · ו · י
o. u.v. i. j.

Radix mater est דב, *däf*. Id quod cunctis supra recensitis rebus generaliter inest est humor eiusdemque solutio.

7.3 Cognationes literarum: related speech sounds

Source: *Virgula divina*, F.d. 6c, fols. 47v (from line 8)–48r.

(47v) Tradunt grammatici cognationes literarum, quas in certas classes gutturalium, labialium, dentalium etc. dispescunt easque, quae unius sunt instrumenti, aiunt inter se esse commutabiles, ut revera sunt. Verum in quem usum nescio, nisi et hoc doceant, quod voces unius sensus²²⁶ aliis et aliis, sed unius instrumenti literis notulae in uno aliquo tertio, quod naturam utriusque notationis et significatum utriusque vocis generalem comprehendat, etiam conveniant.

Omnes quippe voces cognatae non differunt nisi modificato sensu generali, in qua utraeque consentiunt.²²⁷ Ea enim quae inter se sunt

²²⁶ unius sensus] This expression has been added above the line.

²²⁷ Omnes quippe ... consentiunt] This sentence has been added in the margin.

cognatae, necessum est ut in uno aliquo quasi stipite concurrant, ex quo²²⁸ utrinque ortum suum trahant et deinde familiam ducant.

Haec, inquam, si animadvertissent et docuissent, qui aetatem in haec studia impenderunt, non dubito, quin viam aperuissent qua longe mitiori laboris et temporis dispendio linguae istae addicerentur. Paucissima enim in omni lingua sunt primitiva proprie ita dicta, paucissimae matres, quae quidem multas filias diversarum formarum pariunt, verumtamen non adeo diversae, **(48r)** ut non ex communi aliquo lineamento dignoscantur esse sorores ex una matre genitae.

Hoc si illi factu impossibile arbitrantur, liceat mihi saltem bona illorum pace cognationum illos gradus, quos in lexicis illorum deprehendo per occasionem, ubi quid occurrit, pro captu et ingenio meo²²⁹ in tabulas redigere atque disquirere ecqua in aliquibus vera radix, ex qua tota consanguinitatis arbor erigatur, inveniri et constitui possit. In omnibus non posse haut diffiteor.

Nec enim tota Hebraea lingua in paucis illis codicibus, qui in Bibliis leguntur, comprehenditur. Multas ergo credo reperiri radices in Celtica et forte aliis, quae non heri aut nudiustertius natae sunt,²³⁰ quorum in Hebraeorum libris qui extant²³¹ vel nullum vestigium vel tantum²³² derivata supersunt. Non quod existimem Hebraeam ab hisce ortam, sed quod multa, quae in primordio gentium aut ex primaeva ut matre accepimus aut cum Hebraea ut sorore communia habuimus,²³³ in nostra, ut quae nunquam usu esse desiit, adhuc integra propemodum et in vigente usu reperiuntur, quod in paucis illis tabellis, quae ex naufragio Hebraeae linguae etiamnum collectae supersunt, aut nullum aut leve indicium appareat.

Non est igitur quod fremat Aristarchus. Si quando contigerit, ut vox aliqua Celtica statuatur mater vel matertera²³⁴ Hebraeae, quam orphanam offendimus et²³⁵ cuius matrem in Hebraea nusquam invenire liceat.²³⁶ Quod tamen temere statuendum non duco, nisi ubi certus se prodit character et generationum ordo manifestus suadet.

²²⁸ ex quo] *unde* has been crossed out and relaced by *ex quo*.

²²⁹ per occasionem ... ingenio meo] This has been supplemented in the margin.

²³⁰ quae non ... natae sunt] This has been added in the margin.

²³¹ in Hebraeorum libris qui extant] Stiernhielm first wrote *in Hebraea quam habemus*, then changed *Hebraea* to *Hebraeorum* and crossed out *quam habemus*.

²³² vel nullum vestigium vel tantum] This has been added in the margin.

²³³ quae in primordio ... habuimus] This clause has been written in the margin and replaces a different wording in the main text: *vigeant in florenti usu et vireant*.

²³⁴ vel matertera] This has been added in the margin.

²³⁵ quam orphanam offendimus et] This clause has been added in the margin.

²³⁶ invenire liceat] *Apparet* has been crossed out on the line and replaced by *invenire licet*.

Non enim credendum est, ut quae relictæ sunt in Hebraea omnes sint matres, ut nec in Celtica omnes esse orbas et steriles.

7.4 *Observanda: observations*

Sources: Stiernhielm's autograph draft *Specimen etymologicum unius radices MA*. 82, F.d. 2:2:1, fol. 2r, and Örnhielm's extended version *Radix Ma sive specimen etymologicum unius istius vocis*, F.d. 2:2:2 fol. 2r. In the preface of *Radix Ma* (Section 8.4), the autograph and the copy more or less agree with one another. In the lexicographical part (fols. 3r–12v), “the copy” represents a later and more complete stage than the autograph. In the present text, the original draft and the elaborate version generally coincide, except for some passages, which are accounted for in the critical apparatus.

Dating: 1649. At the top of ms. F.d. 2:2:1, fol. 2r, Stiernhielm has written “Anno 1649 conceptum a G. Stiernhielm” that is, “Drafted by Stiernhielm during the year 1649.”

(fol. 2r) OBSERVANDA in hac etymologizandi ratione

I. Omnes vocales et diphthongos reduci ad *a* sive *æ* purum, quippe omnium mater est et origo et omnes reliquas in se comprehendit.

II. Litera S in principio vocis ante consonantem, nisi ubi elisa est vocalis, nunquam est radicalis, sed proxima consonans, ut hic in vocibus bene multis, M e.g. in *smälta*, Ital. *smaltire*; *smorzare*, *Smör*, *smudd* et in ipsa radice (*ma*): *små*, *småt*, *smutt*. In Polon. *Szmer*, *smejati*.²³⁷

III. Vocem quamque priorem ordine, posteriori dare lucem et interpretationem. Quo enim quaeque priori, eo origini et radici suae proprior.

Hac scientia penetravimus in adyta naturae, e.g. *mori*, quid in se habet? Quid significat proprie?²³⁸

PRAXIS. Sit vox Latina *mendax*. Quaero etymon. Inveniam in verbis defectus n°. XI. Vox proxime superior in Latinis est *menda*. Haec aliquo modo explicat, quid sit mendax, scil. in cuius fide et sermone insunt mendae. Menda quid sit, docet vox prior et simplicior Suedica *meen*, i.e. defectus. Quam etiam olim Latinam fuisse *mene* patet ex vetusto lexico, quod in voce *mensa* allegat Martinius.²³⁹

²³⁷ M ... *smejari*], In F.d. 2:2:2, this passage reads: “M e.g. *smälta*, Ital. *smaltire*; *mälta*, Angl. *to melt*. *Smolare*, aliter *ammorlare*, i.e. mortificare, extinguere. *Smör* a Gr. *μυρον*, ‘unguentum’. *Smuld* a *mudd*, ‘limus, coenum’. Et in ipsa radice (*ma*) *små*, *småt*, *smutt*. In Pol. *Szmer*, *smejati* etc.”

²³⁸ Hac scientia ... significat proprie] In F.d. 2:2:1, this has been added in the margin. In F.d. 2:2:2, the same has been omitted.

²³⁹ Martinius] Matthias Martini, *Lexicon philologicum*, Bremen 1623.

Alias convenit haec vox *meen* cum *min*, Lat. *minor*. Cuius radix tandem prima est *mi*, hoc *ma*, i.e. parum, aliquid. Quae vocula per comparisonem abit in utramque partem scil. in *maius* et *minus*. Hinc patet quid sit mendax ex causa sua et indole interna.

Item sit vox Gallica *moudre* aut *mouldre*, i.e. molere. Si quaeram etymon, dices eam depravatam a Latino *molere* et hanc profectam a Graeca μύλη. Hic subsistis, incuriosus quid et unde dicta sit μύλη. Ego vero video, quod *mudd*, *modd*, item *muld*, *mold* significet pulverem, unde verba *muddra* et *mola*, *mala*, *muldra*, i.e. comminuere, in pulverem redigere. *Mudd* autem et *muld* a *mo*, i.e. terra; *mo* a *ma*, i.e. aliquid minimum, atomus, pulvisculus. Inde patet quid sit ipsum Latinum *molere* et Graecum μύλη et quod quaerebam Gallicum *moudre*.

7.5 Aphorismi: etymological statements

7.5.1 Text 1

Source, contents and dating: *Collectanea etymologica* F.d. 9:7, fol. 8v (the last page of the fourth loose quire). Size: 163 x 210 mm. The text consists of two sets of etymological theses, probably written around 1640, because the text is in the handwriting before July 1641 and Stiernhielm refers to etymological dictionary as *Virgula divina*.

(8v, col. 1) Aphorismi

1. Europam Iapheto et eius posteris in prima terrarum sortitione divinitus contigisse.
2. Ideoque linguam Iapheticam omnibus Europae nationibus in principio esse communem.
3. Iapheticam et Hebraeam quatenus in una Noachi lingua conveniunt unam esse eandemque.
4. Iapheticam ad posteros Iapheti integram transmissam, in Europa etiam post Confusionem Babyloniam usurpatam fuisse. Iaphet et eius posteris non recensentur in iis qui Constructioni interfuerunt.
5. Eandem quoad fundamenta et radices adhuc in Septentrionalibus Europae terris integram vigere.
6. Hinc consequitur radices linguae nostrae communes esse cum radicibus Hebraeae et Orientalium omnium Hebraeae cognatarum.
7. Et Europaeas omnes inter se cognatas esse et communes habere radices.
8. Atque adeo non absurdum, sed necessarium esse, singulis consignantium vocum classibus in dictis et aliis diversis linguis singulam et unam radicem communem constituere.

(8v, col. 2) 9. Radices omnes monosyllabicas esse.

10. Paucas in aliis veras et puras; in Suedica vero quamplurimas reperiri.

Hosque aphorismos veros esse ad oculum demonstrabit mea *Virgula Divina*, etc.

Aphorismi etymologici

1. Infinitivi in lingua Suet[h]ica sunt aut unilateri aut biliteri,²⁴⁰ ubi ultima litera aut syllaba est infinitiva characteristicam nihil faciens ad substantiam vocis. Prioris generis sunt *see*, *gå*, *stå*, *slå*, *trå*, *få*; posterioris *taga*, *gånga*, *fånga*, *stånda*, *släggia*, *läggia*, *liggia*. In hisce est litera *a* et dipht[h]ongus *ia* characteristicam.

2. Vocales omnes censentur pro una litera. *A* pura est, declinabilis in omnes sonos.

7.5.2 Text 2

Source: *Collectanea philosophica*, F.d. 4:4:1, fol. 51r. Size: 208 x 319 mm.

Dating: This text can be dated to the period between April and October 1652. Stiernhielm dated a draft of philosophy, *Definitiones brevissimae*, on a preceding page (F.d. 4:4:1, fol. 41v) “in Nyhusen 17 October 1652” (“die 17 Octobr. Nyhusen anno 1652”),²⁴¹ but some subsequent pages (F.d. 4:4:1, fols. 52r–v) have an earlier date, 1–17 april 1652..²⁴²

Aphorismi

1. Nullam linguam praeditam esse mente et intellectu proprio citra Scythicam. Non anima est et ratio omnium reliquarum.

2. Linguam Sueticam et Germanicam, si dialectos noris veteres et modernas, continere radicaliter in se omnium reliquarum linguarum, etiam Hebraeae, Graecae et Latinae vocabula et origines.

3. Eas licet impossibile videatur unum hominem posse invenire aut meminisse aut saltem observare, nec tamen ob stare, quominus vera sit thesis praemissa.

²⁴⁰ unilateri aut biliteri] *monosyllabici* and *bisyllabici* have been crossed out.

²⁴¹ Nyhusen refers to the fortress Neuhausen, in Estonian Vastseliina, close to the Russian border in the south-east of present-day Estonia.

²⁴² Stiernhielm's quotations from Jakob Werenberg's *Metaphysicae disputationes* (Wittenberg 1608–09) are dated “Stiernlund 17 April 1652”. His thoughts on the relationship between the principles of mind, light and matter are dated 4 April 1652: “on the day or rather in the night before the 4th of April 1652” (“Meditata die seu potius nocte ante diem 4 April. 1652”). On the next page (F.d. 4:4:1, 53r) there is a draft on the relationship between unity, truth and goodness: “unitas, veritas, bonitas”. It is dated 1 April 1652. See Vol. 1, Section 9.1.5.

4. Quae in Hebraea, Graeca, Latina, Finnonica, Sclavonica etc. hodie reperiuntur, illa procul dubio olim in ipsa Scythica et Svedica fuisse et ex illa orta.

5. Multa derivata in quavis lingua reperiri, quorum radices habentur in alia. Nec hoc propter putandum vocem peregrinam et ex alia lingua adscititiam esse.

6. Voces adhuc multas reperiri in Italica, quae ex antiqua Thusca latuerunt in infima plebe et in rusticis; in Gallica <voces>, quae ex Celtica et Cambrica sunt residuae; in Hispanica <voces>, quae ex Iberica aut Celtiberica superstites manent.

7.6 *Probanda et praenoscenda*: starting points

Source: *Miscellanea etymologica*, F.d. 9:11, fols. 3v–4v. Size: 212 x 325 mm. Dating: c. 1656.

Contents: Stiernhielm lays down his etymological principles under the headings of “that which is to be proved” (*probanda*) and “that which is to be known beforehand” (*praenoscenda*).

(3v) Specimen rei alicuius daturus modicum quidpiam speciem probandam²⁴³ exhibet, rei summam sibi servans. Idipsum in praesenti mihi ut faciam imperavi. Pauca igitur dabo et breviter, ponendo:

I. Probanda

1. Linguas omnes ex una ortas ad unam posse reduci, qua²⁴⁴ materiam scilicet radicalem et mentem intrinsecam, non qua formam exteriorum et habitum adscitum, qui consistit in varia literarum enunciatione, sono et accentu, tum declinationum vocum et coniugationum formulis, casibus, modis, terminationibus et similibus accentibus, quibus una eademque mens et²⁴⁵ materia vestita et variata varias et innumeras pro intervallis locorum et temporum gignit et repraesentat linguarum species. Quae rursus veste et ornatu adempta²⁴⁶ nudae restitui possunt in unam radicalem ceu in elementa prima communia, unde ortum hauserunt.

2. Vocabula linguarum Europaearum Ibericae, Thuscae, Gallicae, Cambricae, Britannicae, Germanicae, Teuthonicae, Saxonicae, Suethicae, Gothicae, Scandicae, etc., antiqua, quae cum Hebraeis, Graecis et Latinis convenientiam habent, non esse orta ex linguis Hebraea, Graeca et Latina, sed ex una communi omnium matre

²⁴³ speciem probandam] The order of these words has been indicated by numbers.

²⁴⁴ qua] In Neo-Latin prose, the form *qua* can be a preposition with the meaning “as regards, concerning”. See further the remark on it in Section 12.5 below.

²⁴⁵ mens et] This has been supplied in the margin.

²⁴⁶ adempta] Stiernhielm first wrote *detractis*, which he then crossed out.

Nohaea, quam ex prima Nohae mansione Scythicam appello, per Iapheti progeniem in universam Europam,²⁴⁷ non minus quam Orientales per Sem et Cham in reliquas terrarum plagas propagatam.

3. Linguae Hebraeae radices trilateras (praeterquam quibus א ה ו י א ע insunt) non esse simplices et puras radices, sed voces aut compositas aut derivatas aut ad certum et limitatum significatum formatas et posse reduci ad simplices et puras.

(4r)

II. Praenoscentia

1. Fatuum esse sperare verum vocum etymon elici aut dari posse sine praevia eaque²⁴⁸ exactissima rerum cognitione. Ideoque non mirum etymologiarum rationem²⁴⁹ hucusque dubiam, vanam et ridiculam evasisse, dum quilibet indoctus, imo etiam qui doctissimi et propter perpetuas divinationes divini habiti et nuncupati sunt,²⁵⁰ sed revera principia et catenam rerum²⁵¹ non intellexerunt, hanc sibi scientiam arrogarunt. Magnam rem se praestitisse arbitrati, si vocabuli alicuius Gallici, Germanici aut cuiusvis linguae similiter sonans aut affine in lingua Latina et hinc in Graeca, utraque in Hebraea (quod miraculosum) invenire²⁵² aut²⁵³ laboriosa literarum commutatione, ablatione, additione et transpositione in capite, in medio, in fine, et ultimo, si hoc non succedit per antiphrasin aut nugaces, sed imperitorum vulgo speciosas et plausibiles ratiocinationes quocunque modo conciliare et concordare²⁵⁴ valeant. Quo impetrato aequae gnari evadunt notionis originalis vocabuli atque ante fuerunt. E.g. Germ[anicum] *hund* aiunt ex Lat[ino] *canis* profectum. Hic multa inductione docent quomodo literae C. et H. invicem in se transeant. D. in *hund* esse superfluum, ut et *is* in *canis* esse terminationem nihil facientem ad substantiam vocis. Omnia vere. Sed vocem *canis* iterum ducunt ex Graeco κυνός²⁵⁵ mutando *υ* in *a* et *ος* in *is*, idque recte, et hic subsistunt putantes se iam etymon reddidisse et demonstrasse

²⁴⁷ universam Europam] The order of these words has been indicated by numbers.

²⁴⁸ eaque] Stiernhielm first wrote *et* and then changed it to *eaque*.

²⁴⁹ rationem] *scientiam* has been crossed out on the line and replaced by *rationem*.

²⁵⁰ et propter ... habiti et nuncupati sunt] This has been added in the margin.

²⁵¹ principia et catena rerum] This means literally: “the principles and chain of things”, that is: “the principles of the universe and coherent tie of being”.

²⁵² si vocabuli alicuius ... utraque in Hebraea invenire] In the margin, Stiernhielm wrote an alternative wording of this conditional clause: *si unquam alicui vocabulo in Germanica, Latina, Graeca, Hebraea etc. similia invenia[n]t*.

²⁵³ aut] After *aut*, the phrase *obtorto collo* has been crossed out in the manuscript.

²⁵⁴ et concordare] This has been added in the margin to replace *ad concordiam obtorto collo*, which has been crossed out on the previous line.

²⁵⁵ κυνός] The genitive singular of κύων, “dog”.

vocabulum Germanicum *hund* ex Latino *canis* et hoc ex Graeco κυνός derivatum esse. Et hoc ita esse, fac credam.

Sed iam nihilo scientior sum quid sit Graec[um] κυνός, quam Lat[inum] *canis* et Germ[anicum] *hund*. Quaero igitur unde κυνός? At²⁵⁶ altum silentium. Hic nobis aqua haeret.²⁵⁷ Clamant non ulterius progrediendum nec deberi quaeri etymon in infinitum, etc.

Brevius: 1. Vocum etymon seu mentem veram elici aut dari haudquaquam possibile esse sine plena et exacta cognitione rerum. Principia enim et catena rerum insinuant principia et catenam notionum et intellectus verborum, quae nihil aliud sunt quam rerum veri et perceptibiles imagines et characteres²⁵⁸ et per sonum in aures, per scripturam in oculos incurrentes.²⁵⁹

2. Principia et catenam rerum vice versa emicare ex genuino etymo verborum.

(4v) 3. Haec igitur, quae ex abstrusissima vocum natura et genealogia longo multoque labore erui, principia rerum erudito lectori pandere non detractabo, cui bono et capienti mysteria, pravo et indocili non intelligenti deliria.²⁶⁰

7.7 *Radicum indago: analogy and decomposition*

Source: F.d. 6, fol. 24v, which is Stiernhielm's autograph with the size 212 x 325 mm. There is a copy of this text in *Observationes de permutatione literarum inter etymologizandum*, F.d. 7:3, 3v–4r. In establishing the text, I have used the autograph under comparison with the autograph additions in the copy. Dating: c. 1650–1651.

Contents: Stiernhielm demonstrates the principle of morphological analogy (that is, regularity) in word formation and its use for internal reconstruction of obsolete or non-attested words in earlier language stages. He also shows the etymological principles of decomposition in a number of composite Latin adjectives, verbs and adverbs, for some of which he proposes etymological Swedish counterparts.

²⁵⁶ at] *sed* has been crossed out before *at*.

²⁵⁷ aqua haeret] A proverbial phrase, figuratively meaning “the matter is difficult”, (literally, “the water is stagnant”).

²⁵⁸ imagines et characteres] The order of these words are indicated by numbers (1–2). The original order was *characteres et imagines*.

²⁵⁹ et per sonum ... incurrentes] This has been added in the margin.

²⁶⁰ Haec igitur ... deliria] On the preceding page (fol. 4r), Stiernhielm crossed out an alternative wording, which reads: “Haec quae mihi ex intima vocum proprietate et indole incredibili labore eruta diu multumque examinata auxit excussa, ventilata, ponderata, proba, certa, vera, manifesta et demonstrabilia [esse] comperta sunt, lectori pandere non gravabor, licet praescium etiam Muscis me expositurus. Verum eas non moror. Capientibus erunt haec mysteria, pientibus deliria.”

(F.d. 6, 24v, F.d. 7:3, 3v)

Radicum indago

+ est nota vocis obsoletae aut demortuae, quam ex analogia patet in vivis fuisse.

* nota est vocis existentis antiquae.

Ex notis pervenimus ad ignota per analogiam formationum, ut radicem *ma* invenio vocem positivam esse, cuius comparativa sit *meer* et superlativa *mäst*. Quo medio? Ex analogia: *na*, *när*, *näst*; et **ha*, *härre*, *häst*. Ex quibus iam aperitur via ad plura, scilicet ad superlativam *fäst* ex *få*, *färre*, *+fäst*. Sic etiam ad positivam *+fla* ex *flere*, *fläst* (Latine plerus, plus, plures). Sic *+wa*, *wärre*, *wärst*. Sic elucebit nominis *ars* primitivam esse *+aro*, i.e. facio, quod reperitur apud nos in **ara* (*ara-meder*), *arna* etc.

An eodem modo *pars* a *paro*? Cuius propria significatio est *compono per partes* aut *dispono*, et hoc a *par*. Omnis enim partitio prima naturalis it in duo paria. Natura aequitatem intendit. Medium inter duo est non-ens, et nihil nisi terminus aut nota. [...] ²⁶¹

(F.d. 6, 24v, F.d. 7:3, 4r) Sic ex compositis eruimus simplicia. Sic in Latino:

de–prae–hendo, etsi sint qui velint *prendo*.

ex–cello, **cello*, id est *cedo*.

ob–scurus.

of–fendo, in–fensus. (*fehd*.)

in–festus, mani–festus, con–festim.

in–gens.

im–manis.

in–anis.

in–signis, a signo; a *sij*, signo, ut a *tee tekna*.

abs–temius, temetum.

con–festim, festino, *hasta*, *fast*.

mani–festus, *gå fast*.

tago, tango, *taga*, *tagga*.

pago, pango, *foga*.

paucus, *föga*.

aggo, angio, *agga*.

pugo, pungo, *pigga*.

tundo, tutudi, *stöta*, *stunta*. tudo. ²⁶²

prae–sagio, *säga*, sagax, *sökia*.

secere, sectio, id. *säija*, loqui. ²⁶³

secare, *skära*.

²⁶¹ [...] In the next 15 lines, different etymologies are accounted for.

²⁶² tudo] In F.d. 7:3, this has been added by Stiernhielm.

²⁶³ säija, loqui] This has been added by the author in F.d. 7:3.

scido, scindo, *skidia*, *Schindel*, *skyda* (*skada*).
 prae-sertim, *sär*, *särliga*.
 in-quo, **qväda*.
 ad-ipiscor, apisci, *afla*.
 fascinare, *haska*, *hiskia*, *hexe* (*hexa*, *heckizera*), *hexen*.²⁶⁴
 con-niveo, *snäf*, *göra snäfur ögon*, ut nix, nivis, *sneo*.
 ar-bitror, *å-witra*.
 aut-umo, *aud-huma*, *aut-*, *aud-döma*, id est, *af sig sielf*.
 author, *aude*, *aud.* αὐτός, σεαυτόν.²⁶⁵
 con-futo.
 con-gruo, ingruo.
 sub-tilis.

²⁶⁴ hexen] In F.d. 7:3, this is an autograph addition.

²⁶⁵ aud. αὐτός, σεαυτόν] This is also an autograph addition in F.d. 7:3.

8. Etymology as a discipline

8.1 *Mysterium etymologicum*: the etymological mystery

8.1.1 Source, dating and contents

Source: Stiernhielm's autograph original is extant in his notebook *Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielm facientia ad illustrationem nationis et linguae Gotho-Suedicae*, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, ms. XXXII. 1715, fols. 77r–79r.²⁶⁶ A non-autograph fair copy with Stiernhielm's autograph corrections and additions is extant in F.d. 3, fols. 1r–3v (*Mysterium etymologicum*). Another copy found at the beginning of the aforementioned ms. XXXII. 1715, fol. 1r–2v, which was made after the volume was sent on loan to Leibniz by Sparwenfeldt in early 1698. Still another copy is extant in ms. Palmsköld. 406 (pp. 77–84), Uppsala University Library. The edition below is based on the autograph original and the autograph additions and amendments in F.d. 3. For a photographic image of the first page of the original (fol. 77r), see Figure 2.

Dating: On the verso-side of the front page, Stiernhielm dated the writing of his notebook (*Adversaria*): *inchoata anno 1640 in Wasula* “begun in the year 1640 in Wasula.” *Mysterium etymologicum* was dated by Stiernhielm himself to the last day of June (that is, 30 June) 1642 in notes added below the title, both in the original and in the fair copy. The fair copy itself was presumably done in the 1660s. Swartling (1909: xii) argued that Stiernhielm was mistaken in dating the writing to 1642, which in his opinion rather should be 1652. Ståhle (1951: 57) thinks it is impossible that the autograph datings in both the original and the fair copy can be faulty.

Earlier excerpts: Swartling (1909: 77f. footnotes 4 and 5) quotes some passages of the text from the fair copy, F.d. 3.²⁶⁷ Ståhle (1951: 58) quotes most of theses 1–4 in Latin (in footnote) and translates the quoted passages into Swedish (in the main text).

²⁶⁶ In editing *Mysterium etymologicum*, I have used the photostatic copy of this manuscript volume at Royal Library, Stockholm, shelfmark N. 24, 77v–79v.

²⁶⁷ Swartling quotes the first sentences of theses 1 and 3 (F.d. 3, fol. 1r) and parts of a passage in which Stiernhielm rejects contemporary etymological methods (fol. 3r, the passage beginning *Daemones* (misread by Swartling as *Dormones*) and ending *destituit*) and the subsequent sentence in F.d. 3 (from *Ridiculae* to *nostris*).

Contents: This treatise deals with the nature of signs (§§ 1–3), the phono-semantic structure of words (§§ 4–11) and the contemporary practice of etymology and Stiernhielm’s criticism of its deficiencies (§ 12, a paragraph making up the bulk of the treatise). Stiernhielm gives expression to language patriotism in his opposition to the assumption that Hebrew is the primeval language and Latin is the source of Germanic vocabulary. In his view Swedish retains more primary roots, *radices primitivae*, than Hebrew, while German and Swedish are more ancient and more pure than Latin. Stiernhielm also denounces the practice of deriving all Germanic words from Latin, all Latin words from Greek, all Greek from Hebrew. He criticizes the practice of investigating the origin of words by a random application of the categories *prosthesis* (addition), *aphaeresis* (removal), *apocope* (dropping), *syncope* (elision), *metathesis* (transposition), *crasis* (contractio) and *antiphrasis* (use of a meaning contrary to the proper or natural one).

8.1.2 *Mysterium etymologicum: textual edition*
(ms. XXXII. 1715, 77r, and F.d. 3, 1r)

Mysterium etymologicum
illustrissimo Domino Cancellario
revelatum et consecratum
a GEORGIO STIERNHIELM.
ult. Junii 1642 ex tempore.²⁶⁸

Positiones sunt:

1. Primae linguae omnia vocabula primitiva rebus imposita fuisse iuxta cuiusque nativam indolem et proprietatem. Probo 1. autoritate S[acro]s[anctae] Scripturae; 2. scientia Adami, contra quam ut ageret absurdum esset, cum etiam hodie unusquisque rei ante nunquam visae pro suo captu ex usu vel apparente aliqua proprietate nomen indat.

2. Primitiva continere non nisi generales rerum notiones. Derivata ex illis variari et limitari, intendi et remitti²⁶⁹ pro qualitate et quantitate indolis specialis et propriae,²⁷⁰ quam ex generali illa notione trahit. Multas enim et varias species unum genus

²⁶⁸ ultimo Junii 1642 ex tempore] So Stiernhielm’s autograph reads. F.d. 3 has: “Ex tempore conceptum ult. Junii anno 1642.”

²⁶⁹ et limitari, intendi et remitti] In the autograph, this has been added partly above the line, partly in the margin.

²⁷⁰ specialis et propriae] In the autograph, this has been added in the margin.

complectitur.²⁷¹ Simili colorum: ruber est ruffus, subrubeus, dilutior non minus quam satur etc. Item tonorum: *A. a. aa.* Item qui sunt *b* vel *h*, et sonorum *a. e. i. o. u. y.* etc. Notam oportet rei convenire.²⁷²

3. Conveniens esse, ut res et symbola rerum sive characteres et signa rebus, quarum characteres et signa sunt, respondeant. Prima enim rerum veritas, inquit Postell., *De orig.*, cap. 3, ex nominum recta ratione seu ex sacro etymo pendet,²⁷³ et cap. 4 etc.:²⁷⁴

Quare ab ipsissima Dei sapientia fuisse infusa nomina rerum secundum veritatis aeternae omnia ordinantis rationem est omnino necesse. Divinitus itaque Adam accepit vocabula a sapientia seu ab intellectu agente et possibili, cuius universi sumus membra.²⁷⁵

Iam vocabula sunt symbola rerum. Ergo.

4. Ut res distinguuntur suis accidentibus, ita vocabula diversa gignuntur ex diversis literis ceu primis elementis. Quae singulae singula illa accidentia generalia vi sua naturali imitantur et exprimunt. Quo fit, ut a primo vocum fabro ut rerum intelligentissimo voces, quae suis elementis rebus congruunt et per naturam id quod significare intendunt significant, primitus impositae sint. NB. Omnia fere vocabula linguae Suethicae sunt facta per onomatopoeiam, ubi sonus et literae conveniunt significationi rei.²⁷⁶

5. Ut clarum et obscurum, ut molle et durum, ut asperum et laeve etc. generalissima accidentia inter se distinguuntur, ita (**F.d. 3, 1v**) conveniens est, ut vocabula, quibus res, quibus talia insunt, explicentur et talibus constant elementis.

6. Elementa literarum talia esse docet ipse sensus auditus. Exempla autoritate Platonis et aliorum²⁷⁷ comprobata recenseantur. supra ostensa.²⁷⁸

²⁷¹ Multas ... complectitur] In the autograph, this sentence has been written in the margin.

²⁷² Notam ... convenire] In the autograph, this sentence has similarly been written in the margin.

²⁷³ Guillaume Postel(lus), *De originibus seu de varia et potissimum orbi Latino ad hanc diem incognita aut inconsiderata historia, quum totius Orientis, tum maxime Tartarorum, Persarum, Turcarum et omnium Abrahami et Noachi alumnorum origines et mysteria Brachmanum retegente*, Basel 1553, p. 62. The reference to chapter 3 is a mistake. The quotation (from *Prima* to *pendet*) occurs in chapter 14.

²⁷⁴ See Postel(lus), *ibidem*, p. 15. The reference to chapter 4 is correct.

²⁷⁵ Prima membra] In the autograph, this quotation has been written in the margin.

²⁷⁶ NB. ... rei] In the autograph, this passage has been written in the margin.

²⁷⁷ et aliorum] The autograph reads thus. F.d. 3 pleonistically has *et aliorumve*.

²⁷⁸ supra ostensa] So only the autograph. By this reference Stiernhielm aims at his remarks on Plato's *Cratylus*, *Notae ad Platonis Cratylum*, fols. 30r–32v, in the same volume. See my edition, Vol. 1, Section 9.3.1. The words *supra ostensa* have been left out in F.d. 3 and crossed out in the copy in ms XXXII. 1715, fol. 1r.

7. Quod una litera simplex non efficit, quod tamen fit plerumque principaliter, id duae (et vix plures) faciunt coniunctim. Quo accidit, ut nulla fere radix prima pluribus constet literis essentialibus quam binis. Quae quidem in Hebraea non adeo sunt multae.

(XXXII 1715, 77v) 8. Vocales plerumque sunt instar & rasae tabulae, quae recipit omnes colores. Interdum magnam vim imprimunt ideoque nec semper negligendae. Exemplis utrumque demonstrandum. In radicibus omnes fere reducuntur ad A, in derivatis non semper.

9. Ut notiones rerum generalissimae, ita primitiva prima (matres vocabulorum) pauca esse. Sufficientia tamen esse, ad quae omnia reliqua (modo sciens quis esset plene linguarum) referri possint.

10. Et talia fere communia esse omnibus linguis. Id arguit unam primam linguam generalem esse omnibus gentibus nec eam, nisi qua dialectos in Confusione Babylonica in diversa abiisse. Demonstrabitur uno vel altero exemplo. In reliquis fiat remissio ad *Sagam meam*.²⁷⁹

11. Qui hucusque etymologias conscripserant, quia hoc mysterium ignorarunt, misere se torserunt in literarum commutationibus. Ea quae commutabilia putarunt vel quae iisdem literis vel parum alienis constabant, omnia censuerunt esse unius prosapiae, non attendentes, ut debebant, simul ad naturam rei et vocabuli sive literarum, quibus rei natura indicatur. Id quod in tot errores eos induxit, quot sine numero indies experimur. Nec enim omnia vocabula, quae iisdem vel affinis constant literis, si affinitas significationis desit, cognata sunt. Id quod aliquot exemplis elucidari debet.

12. Nec putandum in una aliqua lingua, ea sive Hebraea sit sive alia, omnes radices primitivas existere. Imo pauca habet Hebraea primas, nostra vero longe plures. Reliquae aut paucissimas aut nullas. Ratio est quod ex Hebraea, quae olim in captivitate Babylonica circa ²⁸⁰ abhinc annum desiit, non habeamus nisi pauculas ex tanto naufragio hinc inde collectas tabulas, quae certe omnia, quae tota continebat lingua, comprehendere nequeunt. Cui rei argumento est, quod nec Rabbini ipsi Hebraei in hunc usque diem plurimorum vocabulorum veram radicem et inde dependentem intellectum assecuti sint. Qui hic optime coniectatus est, optimum egerat vatem. Quae literis iisdem notantur, etiamsi sensus sit diamentaliter

²⁷⁹ Saga] In the early 1640s, Stiernhielm called his planned etymological dictionary *Saga Aramaeo-Gothica*, which he refers to as forthcoming in his *Magog Aramaeo-Gothicus*, Uppsala (c. 1643), s.v. שָׂא ('iš) and שָׂר (yēš) *ens, existens*.

²⁸⁰] In the autograph there are four dots. In F.d. 3, there are five dashes. The number to be supplemented should be c. 2228, since the Babylonian Captivity began c. 586 BC and Stiernhielm wrote this treatise in 1642.

oppositus (XXXII 1715, 78r), ea omnia iussa sunt unam agnoscere matrem. (F.d. 3, 2r) Exempli causa ...²⁸¹

Nostra vero, quae ab iisdem cunabulis, Noachica scilicet,²⁸² a quibus Hebraea orta, semper eadem a prima in has oras e regionibus Araxeis transmigratione, quoad ipsa fundamentalia, in continuo usu permanserat, non mirum est, si multa, quae illa perdidit, retineat. Vide Mylii *de lingua Belgica* cap. 28, p. 146.²⁸³

Reliquae, Graeca praesertim et Latina, multas passae sunt mutationes. Graeca Barbara mixta, imo propemodum ex Barbara nata teste Platone etc. Latina minime prima, sed orta et varia mixtura aboriginum, Pelasgorum, Phrygum,²⁸⁴ Thuscorum coalita. Deinde utrique hi populi cultu poesi et elegantiae studio suas linguas corruperunt, et quia prae antiquis semper nova placuerunt, priscas omnes origines oblivionis caligini involverunt. Quo usu venit, ut raro quidpiam, nisi ex sterquilinio Ennii vel scrutis Pacuvii Luciliive, quod primam aetatem²⁸⁵ et cunas Aramaeas redoleat, offendas. Unde tandem nec Cicero nec Varro, ipsi Romanorum doctissimi, quorum hic ex professo linguam suam maternam conscriptis libris explicare aggressus est, nec illi, qui ipsis ea in parte peritiores haberi voluerunt, linguam Latinam in hunc usque diem recte intellexerunt. Quin imo plaustra argutiarum et doctissimorum nugamentorum, non sine ingenti expectantium quidem frustratione, sed imperitorum applausu, mundo invexerunt, contenti acquiescere in vocula aliqua Graeca, quam nescias prior an connata sit Latina; cuius demum originis aequae ignarus evadas atque Latinae illius, cuius etymon desiderabas.

Ultra si moliantur, quod tamen fit rarissime, idem contingit. Voculam aliquam trilateram consignant. Quam, modo literae admittant, per varios tropos, per antecedentia et consequentia, et si aliter non succedit, per ipsa contraria et antiphrases invitis genio et Musis interpretando eo tandem pertrahunt, ut ipsorum ingenio servire cogatur. Quod si literae omnino non respondeant, ibi ad protheses, aphaereses, epentheses, metatheses, apocopas, syncopas,

²⁸¹ ...] In the autograph, there are three dots. In F.d. 3, there are five dashes.

²⁸² Noachica scilicet] In the autograph, this is a marginal addition. F.d. 3 lacks it.

²⁸³ Vide Mylii ... p. 126] In the autograph, this reference has been added in the margin. In his treatise on the Dutch language, *De lingua Belgica* Mylius (or van der Myl) deals in chapter 28 (pp. 142–158) particularly with the topic of the changeability of other languages than Dutch over time and the relative unchangeability of Dutch over time, which is proved by an interlinear comparison between an old Dutch and a modern Dutch translation of Psalm 19.

²⁸⁴ Phygum] In the autograph, Stiernhielm first wrote *Aeneadum* and replaced it then by *Phrygum* above the line.

²⁸⁵ aetatem] In the autograph, Stiernhielm replaced *antiquitatem* by *aetatem* above the line.

metaplasmos,²⁸⁶ et nescio quid non, concurritur, suum ut sensum – suum inquam, non quem ipsa infert rei (XXXII 1715, 78v) et vocabuli natura – originationi infundant. Non dico non necessarium esse ista adhibere. Sunt enim plane ex usu nec unquam, nisi ubi voces eadem sunt, non utenda occurrunt.²⁸⁷ Sed haec mea mens est, ut parce et cum mica salis nec quidvis in quovis quadratur. Sed id potissimum²⁸⁸ spectandum (F.d. 3, 2v) esse, quod rationi maxime²⁸⁹ obvium nec a natura rei dissentaneum sit.

Laudo et admiror magna illa ingenia, qui multum in hic genere praestiterunt. Metum quorundam puerilem et servilem observationem, qui nihil de se, nihil nisi ex dictatura magistri in lucem edere sustinent, probare non possum. Nec magis ferendi sunt, qui omnia Graeca ex Hebraeis, omnia Latina ex Graecis, omnia Germanica ex Latinis derivare pergunt. Quasi pluris²⁹⁰ nihil haberet Graeca praeter ea quae hodie in Hebraicis extant; nihil Latina, nisi quod a Graecis acceperat; nec Germanica, nisi quod heri et nudius tertius in eam ex Latina deliquatum est. Quasi Germanica, quae non nisi dialecto ab ita nostra Sueo-Gothica,²⁹¹ ipsa Latina ut nunc est vel tempore, quo desiit, longe non esset antiquior, purior, excellentior, utpote quae ipsi Hebraea coeua, eam non matrem, sed sororem domi educatam, peregrina agnoscat. Sed de hisce alibi. Vide Mylium, cap. 28.²⁹²

NB. Radices vocum Latinarum, quas ex lingua Suethica educo, non sunt Suethicae, sed Scythicae.²⁹³ Eodemque respectu Graecae

²⁸⁶ metaplasmos] This term has been added in the margin.

²⁸⁷ In the margin of F.d. 3, there is a note: *Casaubonus de lingua Saxonica*. This is a reference to Meric Casaubon's treatise *De quatuor linguis commentationis pars prior, quae de lingua Hebraica et de lingua Saxonica*, London 1650. Stiernhielm possessed this book. Uppsala University Library holds his copy (inventory nr. 58. XI. 3), which contains a lot of autograph marginalia. On the last folio, Stiernhielm wrote a note that makes it possible to date his reading of the book: "In portu prope Waxholm[iam] die 13 Aug. 1656. GS." It can be concluded that Stiernhielm read this book on his voyage from Tallinn to Stockholm. Stiernhielm had left his estate Wasula, north of Tartu, on the 6th of June 1656.

²⁸⁸ potissimum] In the autograph, this word has been added above the line.

²⁸⁹ maxime] In the autograph, this word has been added above the line.

²⁹⁰ pluris) The autograph and F.d. 3 have this reading, while the copy in *plus*.

²⁹¹ quae non nisi dialecto ab ita nostra Sueo-Gothica] In the autograph, this clause has been supplied in the margin.

²⁹² Vide Mylium, cap. 28] This reference has been added in the margin. In his treatise *De lingua Belgica* Mylius claims the Dutch language in terms of antiquity is equal with Hebrew and superior to Greek. In chap. 28 he argues that Greek has changed more from its ancient form than Dutch, which therefore ought to be revered.

²⁹³ non sunt Suethicae, sed Scythicae] The autograph reads: *non sunt Suedicae, sed Hetruscae, imo Iapheticae*. In F.d. 3 the the same wording was first copied, but in a

linguae sunt ea, quae Plato in Cratylo professus est ex Barbarorum, id est Scytharum, lingua assumpta fuisse in Graecam. Qualia sunt πῦρ etc. ἄop, ὄap.²⁹⁴

Daemones²⁹⁵ seu spiritus auxiliares, quos adiurant et in auxilium accersunt etymologi ad erunda mysteria vocum, sunt:

Prosthesis, qui ad modum rhinoceratis ingens cornu in naso gerit. *Aphaeresis* eadem ex gente Blemmyarum²⁹⁶ esse: capite caret, oculum gerens in pectore. *Apocope* turpem simiam refert, nudis posterioribus cauda castratus. *Syncope* nullum habet ventrem, capite et collo insistentibus lumbis. *Crasis* totus est contractus et distortus dorso gibbo, pedibus manibusque falcatis. *Metathesis*, ridicule monstrosus est membris suo loco non dispositis, apparente interdum capite in medio et ventre loco supremo, nonnunquam²⁹⁷ capite inverso manibus incedit, cauda et partibus imis sursum conspicuis. *Antiphrasis* instar Iani bifrons est, una candidus, altera Aethiops. Hic omnium est potentissimus est sapientissimus. Quidquid enim reliqui omnes ignorant novit hic unus. Ideoque ubi cessat ars et auxilium, hic adiuratus certissimam fert opem nec cultorem suum unquam destituit.

Nota: ex adiunctis et variis accidentibus vocabula rebus induuntur, etiam ex interitu, ut *mortalis pro homo* etc.²⁹⁸

(XXXII 1715, 79r, F.d. 3, 3r) Ridiculae certe sunt metatheses et inversiones vocum Hebraicarum, ut ex iis eliciantur origines nostrarum, quasi nobis non sufficerent radices, quas habemus in linguis nostris, propriae. Exempli gratia ex Hebr. גַּב, *gab*, inverso scilicet *bag* dicunt Angl[icum], imo nostrum *bak*, i.e. dorsum sive id quod retro est. *Bak* est vox composita *be*, *bi-ak*, *ak*; *aister*, i.e. retro.²⁹⁹ Item Germ. *biegen*, *brügen*, Suet. *bögia*, i.e. flectere, arcuare etc. Quasi omnino sit necessarium omnium vocum radices existere in Hebraea, si non rectas, at saltem inversas et factas et coactas. O coecum sectariorum pecus! Quin nostra radix *Ba*, unde *Bua*, i.e. facere, parare, aptare, flectere, componere, fabricare, abunde nobis

revision of the copy Stiernhielm crossed out *Hetruscae* and replaced it by *Scythicae* in the margin.

²⁹⁴ NB. Radices ... Qualia sunt πῦρ etc. ἄop, ὄap] In the autograph, this paragraph has been written in the margin in the middle of 78v. In F.d. 3, it has been inserted in the main text in the present place. In F.d. 3, ἄop and ὄap have been left out.

²⁹⁵ Daemones] So the autograph has, while F.d. 3 has *Doemones*. Swartling (1909) incorrectly reads this word (in ms. F.d. 3) as *Dormones*.

²⁹⁶ Blemmyarum] So reads the autograph. The copyist in F.d. 3 wrote *Blemmiarum*.

²⁹⁷ nonnunquam] So reads the autograph. The fair copy has *nonumquam*.

²⁹⁸ Nota ... etc] In the autograph, this sentence has been added in the margin.

²⁹⁹ *Bak* est vox composita *be*, *bi-ak*, *ak*, *aister*, i.e. retro] This sentence only occurs in Stiernhielm's autograph.

satisfacit eaque nativa est, non facta aut ficta, ut simplicissima, ita ditissima.³⁰⁰

Nec minus inepti sunt et miseri, ubi etymon ignorantes quidvis pro quovis adsciscunt, idque ut aptent, trahunt, distrahunt, cudunt, torquent, fingunt, flectunt, molliunt, mutant literam in literam. Nulla nulli non erit cognata.³⁰¹ Exempla mutationum similium mille cumulant. Nihil non comminiscetes, fabulantes, interpretantes, ut verum et genuinum esse persuadeant. Nihil enim ignorare volunt videri. Ad manus sunt ut Divae auxiliares *prosthesis*, *aphaeresis*, *syncope*, *apocope*, *crasis*, *metathesis* et, quae instar habet sacrae anchorae, *antiphrasis*. Quid *tropi* et, quam non illibenter admittunt *catachresis*? Et quod vilissimum est, pauci sunt, qui aliquid de suo promunt, servum pecus, ut bos bovis millies calcata vestigia calcant. Siquid vir aliquis magnus, qui in Republica literaria, ut fieri videmus, tyrannidem occupavit, aliquid commentus est, sit licet absurdissimum delirium, ab eo ut recedant piaculum est. Nec profecto, ut quod res est fatear, aliter possunt. Sciunt etenim, si secus faciunt, parata sibi ferulam et flagella.

Exempla talium originationum habemus in vocibus *Bis*, quam dicunt factam ex Δίς, mutato D in B. Sic *bellum* ex *duellum*, *bonum* ex *duonum* etc. *Germen* ex *genimen*, *carmen* ex *canimen*. Et in quam crassa caligine versatur vir alioqui (3v) magnus I[ulius] C[aesar] Scaliger, dum etymon vocis *caligo* a natura rei alienissimum doctis probare et persuadere conatur? Ecquid non comminiscitur, ut pastorum illud *calare*, cum aliud non occurrit, ut probum et proprium obtrudat?³⁰² Vide etiam Voss[ium], in *Oppido* Etymologic[um], item Voss[ium], de Idololatria libro 1, p. 155 in voce *Gallus*.³⁰³

Causa vero huius delirii est error in principio. Fixum et firmum ipsis stat omnia Latina orta ex Graeca, omnia Graeca ex Hebraea, omnia Barbara, ut illi vocant, hoc est Germanica, Suethica etc. ex

³⁰⁰ The autograph (79v) has three lines that have been crossed out in F.d. 3: “ex se gignens etiam ipsum Hebr. בֶּן, בַּת et בֶּת (‘filius, filia’) et Gr. βινέω, i.e. in eo, coeo, liberos creo). Suethice Angerm[annicum] *bāna*, parere, *bān*, quod est barn, *bāne*, i.e. barnet.” בָּנָה (*bānā*) means “to build”, בֶּן (*ben*) “son” and בַּת (*bat*) “daughter”.

³⁰¹ Nulla nulli non erit cognata] This is the reading of Stiernhielm’s autograph. The fair copy incorrectly reads: *Nulla nulli est cognata*.

³⁰² Obtrudat] The autograph reads *obtruderet*. In the fair copy in F.d. 3, *obtruderet* is changed to *obtrudat* by Stiernhielm himself.

³⁰³ Exempla talium ... Gallus] In the autograph, this paragraph has been written in the margin. The works of Gerard Vossius referred to are his etymological Latin dictionary, *Etymologicon linguae latinae*, published posthumously in Amsterdam in 1662, and his treatise on pagan theology, *De theologia gentili et physiologia Christiana sive de origine ac progressu idololatriae*, Amsterdam 1642. These references are later autograph additions in ms. XXXII.1715 by Stiernhielm in his handwriting after July 1641. These references are not found in the copy F.d. 3.

Latina. Hoc autem principium falsissimum esse certis et indubiis demonstrationibus manifestum dare mihi propositum est. Unum saltem nunc dicam: Lingua Suethica origine tenus Latina et Graeca longe est antiquior, Hebraeae coaeva et soror, imo Hebraeae antiquior, ex Iaphetica scilicet orta.³⁰⁴

8.2 *Palmarium artis: the purpose of the art*

Source: F.d. 6, fol. 25v, columns 1 and 2 (autograph original) with the size 212 x 325 mm. As far as the text is concerned, F.d. 7:3, fol. 3v is an identical copy.

Dating and contents: around 1650–1651. Stiernhielm proposes an etymology which is universalistic, when it explores roots common to all languages, and particularistic, in so far as it investigates roots that are specific to each language.

(25v, col. 1)

Palmarium artis

1. Indagare radices omnibus linguis communes. Tales sunt generalissimae, in primis significatis *esse, habere, manare, posse, valere, facere, generare, penetrare, unire*. Item *unitatis, entis, alicuius, huius (ego)*. Ex hisce nascuntur voces significantes species rerum.

2. Indagare radices singulis linguis peculiares et proprias. Quae quidem eadem sunt cum generalibus aut ex illis ortae, sed uni linguae plus quam aliis usurpatae et frequentatae. Exempla dabo. In lingua Ungarica *unus* significatur voce *Egy, eggy*.

(25v, col. 2)

Omnes vocales in voce radicali sunt una. Prima radix omnium vocum nihil est aliud, quam simplicissimus sonus et eiusdem character oculis subiectus, expressus per vocalem A.

8.3 *Verborum scientia: the science of words*

Source: *Adversaria quotidiana et Monile Minervae*, F.d. 9**, p. 90.

Dating: The next page in the manuscript, p. 91, is dated Marby 22. 8br. 1657, that is, 22 October 1657. The text of p. 91 is an immediate continuation of the text of p. 90. The topic in which the date occurs is a discussion of the cardinal virtue *prudentia*, prudence.

Contents. In this text, which is a part of *Monile Minervae*, chapter 3, Stiernhielm puts etymology into a wider epistemological context.

³⁰⁴ ex Iaphetica scilicet orta] This is an autograph addition by Stiernhielm in the fair copy (F.d. 3). In the autograph, the corresponding passage reads: *imo ipsa scilicet Iaphetica et Noachica*, which however has been omitted in the fair copy.

Scientiae natales

Numerus et ordo gignunt scientiam. Infinitorum et confusorum nulla datur scientia. GS. Scientia 1. eruit abstrusa, 2. explicat intricata, 3. finit et numerat infinita, 4. ordinat confusa, 5. dubia tollit, 6. vera demonstrat. GS.

Ex scientia nascitur sapientia. Cuius tria sunt obiecta: res, rerum mensurae, verba. Horum origines et causas qui reddere novit, is demum vir mihi sapiens est. Res quae docet scientia, physica dicitur, a qua perperam distinguunt metaphysicam, cuius propria est contemplatio mentis, quae principium est physicum. Mensuras, et quod ipsorum est principium, numerum, docet mathesis. Verborum scientia in hunc usque diem incognita latet oppressa opinione omnium animis inveterata Confusionis Babylonicae, qua sibi persuasum habent linguas non naturali via in diversa abiisse, sed miraculosa Dei voluntate. Eorum vero, quae non sunt naturalia, nullam naturalem reddi posse rationem. Quo tamen non obstante plurimi clarissimi viri, inter quos summi sunt Scaligeri, qui hanc sibi proviciam ornandam susceperunt multaque in ea, fateor, praestiterunt. Sed dum principiis non veris fulciuntur, necessarium est frequenter eos cascari et fallere. Et, quod ipsi non animadvertunt, dum se putant etyma reddere et origines, nihil agunt minus. Cum alliterationes tantum et similitudines, et quod multum est, cognationes diversarum linguarum vocum afferunt, de communi cognatarum matre et origine prima ceu radice eiusque causa ex natura rerum deprompta parum solliciti <sunt>. Sed instat hora, qua et haec scientia, si Deo sic placet, in lucem prodeat, meo ingenio per afflatum divinum concepta et edita. De quo dum Deo Ter Optimo Maximo gratias ago, non curo, ne sit invidia verbo.

8.4 *Divinae huius scientiae fundamentum*: basic assumptions

Sources: Stiernhielm's autograph original *Specimen etymologicum unius radice MA*. 𐌆𐌆, F.d. 2:2:1, fol. 2r, and Örnhielm's copy *Radix Ma sive specimen etymologicum unius istius vocis*, F.d. 2:2:2, fol. 2r.

Dating: The date 1649 is found in the autograph (2v) and in the copy.

Contents: Stiernhielm puts forwards his hypothesis of a primordial monolingualism of humankind and of a dialect diversification of the original linguistic unity. He regards this as the basis of etymology, in so far as every dialect has to a greater and lesser extent preserved a store of word roots that derives from the primeval language.

(F.d. 2:2:1, 1v)

Divinae huius scientiae FUNDAMENTUM unicum est:


Omnes linguae sibi invicem cognatas esse. Nec enim aliud sunt quam diversae dialecti, omnes simul convenientes in una generali, ex qua ortum trahunt singulae et in diversa abeunt. Haec generalis hodie non est una aliqua. Fuit autem olim ea, quam RATIO Adamo dictavit, conservata in Noah et per filios eius in universum terrarum orbem propagata, confusa in iis, qui aedificationi Babyloniae interfuerunt, sed non nisi in cognatas dialectos, in quibus sparsim reperiuntur voces primae – sive matres sive radices dixeris – ex quibus oriuntur omnes omnino voces et dictiones. Sunt enim omnibus communes illae radices, licet in diversis reperiantur. Exempli gratia radix *a*, quae omnium prima est et universalis et EST et UNUM significat, nusquam reperitur nisi in nostra Suedica et eius filia³⁰⁵ Anglica (pro unus). Nec tamen minus eius surculi et rami, hoc est voces inde derivatae, per omnes omnino et singulas in universo linguas rationales diffunduntur. Talis est radix ἄω in Graeca, et in Hebraea radix אור, *or*, i.e. lux etc.³⁰⁶

8.5 Radix: the stem's relation to ontological categories

Source: F.d. 6, fol. 24r. Dating: around 1651.

Radix

Omnis radix est et positiva et privativa. Omnes radices sunt ambiguae et quasi in medio constitutae inter lucem et materiam, inter vitam et mortem, potentiam et impotentiam, ortum et occasum, generationem et corruptionem suntque enim nodus in Clepsydra vitae et mortis. Sic est.



Radix: a, va, ba, za, pa, sa, ta, ba, la, ra, na, ma, an, ar.

³⁰⁵ filia] F.d. 2:2:2 has *sorore*.

³⁰⁶ Talis ... lux etc.] F.d. 2:2:2 has: "Talis est radix ἄω, ex qua Hebraea radix אור, *or*, i.e. lux etc."

8.6 *Notarum in Ulfilam scopus: lexicographical aims*

Source: F.d. 12: Stray notes on Gothic words in *Codex Argenteus* (the Silver Bible). Dating: about 1666. At the outset of these remarks, he states the goals of his revision of the Gothic dictionary by Franciscus Junius. First of all he intends to prove that “Sweo-Gothic” is the common mother of all other Germanic languages. The second purpose is to provide more substantial etymological evidence than that proposed by Goropius Becanus, van Schrieck and Mylius.

Notarum in Ulfilam scopus praecipuus est docere

I. Linguam Sueo-Gothicam esse omnium reliquarum Gothicæ Moesianæ, Francicæ veteris et modernæ, Alemannicæ, Theutonicæ, Saxonicae, Anglicæ, Cambricæ, Norrenæ seu Islandicæ etc. matrem communem. Omnium esse easdem radices omnesque esse et ab initio fuisse unam.

II. Pleraque, quæ habent hæ dialecti cum Graecis, Latinis ipsisque Hebraicis et affinis communia origine esse nostra et ex nostris lucem et intellectum foenerari. Nostræ proinde primigeniæ esse propriorem et reliquis mansisse puriorem, simpliciore et integriorem. Laborarunt hoc ostendere ante me viri quamplurimi docti. Inter quos praecipui Becanus, Schrieckius, van der Myle etc. argumentis non satis validis et etymologiis fictis atque fanaticis ideoque recte non potuerunt stare talo, doctissimorum hominum cachinnis et irrisionibus exsibilati. Horum exempla doctior aliam ingredior viam.

9. The origin of some Hebrew and Germanic words

9.1 On the origin of biblical proper names

9.1.1 Source, dating and contents

Sources: Stiernhielm's original in *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, fol. 43r (measuring 210 x 325 mm), and Örnhielm's copy with Stiernhielm's autograph additions *Discursus philologicus de omnibus linguis in genere*, F.d. 14a, fols. 28r–29v (with the measurements 162 x 210 mm), which is copied in ms. NKS. 150 quarto, fols. 21r–22v, The National Library of Denmark (the Royal Library), Copenhagen, and by Arvid Moller in ms. R. 21, fols. 19r–20r, Uppsala University Library. The present text was planned to be a part of *Runa Suethica*, part 1, chapter 20. For a photograph of the original, see Figure 4.

Dating: January–February 1655, provided that this date can be concluded from the place of the text in the manuscript volume F.d. 6, where fol. 42r has the date “Stiernlund, 14 January 1655”, and fol. 46r the date “Wasula, 13 February 1655”. Moreover, a chronological clue can be inferred from F.d. 6, 45r, where Stiernhielm dates his first journey to Livonia with Johan Skytte as having occurred twenty-five years previously (see Section 9.4, where this passage is edited). This trip took place in 1630 (January–March).

Contents: The biblical proper names given before the Confusion of Languages at Babel were generally regarded in the 17th century as a means of linguistic proof for determining the identity of the original and primeval language of humankind.³⁰⁷ The majority of philologists argued that these proper names were of Hebrew origin, an argument that provided etymological evidence for the Hebrew monogenesis hypothesis. In repudiating the Hebrew etymologies as inappropriate and proposing Swedish etymologies for these names, Stiernhielm dissociated himself from the common opinion, at the same time as he endeavoured to support his claim of the great antiquity of Swedish.

³⁰⁷ See my forthcoming monograph *Albert Schultens as the innovator of Hebrew etymology and lexicography*, Chapter 7 (which surveys ancient, medieval and early modern ideas about Hebrew as the primeval and holy language).

9.1.2 Latin text

(F.d. 6, 43r, F.d. 14a, 28r) CAPUT XX

Voces Ebraeas, cuius generis sunt Adam, Eva, Cain, Seth etc., quas pro antiquitate linguae Ebraeae vulgo eius assertores adducunt non minus Scythicas, imo Suethicas, esse magis quam Hebraeas.

Firmissimum hoc esse rentur argumentum stabiliendae antiquitatis gloriae linguae Hebraeae plerique omnes. Verum id quam leve sit et per consequens fallax ipsa thesis, paucis demonstrabo.

Adam ducunt a אדמה *adamah*, id est terra, non ita dicta a propria indole terrae, sed ab accidenti rubedinis. Non igitur proprie *adamah* est terra, sed terra rubra, uno verbo rubrica. Suethice vero *dam* proprie est pulvis tenuissimus terrae et copia pulveris, ut plene significet *A–dam* Ex–pulvere.³⁰⁸ NB. א hic esse epitheticum, non radicale, ut in plerisque radicibus sub litera א.³⁰⁹

Eva, *Hava*, *Chava*, mater viventium,³¹⁰ חיה *chajah*, vivere. Radix simplicior seu origini suae prior est היה *haja*, et הוה *hava*, esse. Sed simplicissima et generalissima Suethica est *a* et *ha*, (F.d. 14a, 28v) i.e. esse et habere. Inde formantur *aga*, *ava* et *hava* a prima *a*. Graecum est ἔω, *sum*. Ab *aga* ἔχειν et Hebr. אחז *achaz*.³¹¹ Ab *hava* Lat. *habeo*. (Gr. *ἄβειν) et Hebr. הוה היה *havah*, *hajah*, essendi et habendi notione illis linguis communi et hinc notione vivendi חיי *chaji*.³¹² Nobis et Germanis vetus est *ga*, *gah*, Gallis *gay*, Italis *gaio*, Teutoniis *kay* et *gaw*, vividus, alacer, vegetus. Quin et hodie *gā* nobis significat naturam, et *gādi* (unde *Gr. γηθέω et Lat. *gaudeo*) naturam

³⁰⁸ A–dam Ex–pulvere] In his draft of a universal dictionary (F.d. 9:6, fol. 3r), Stiernhielm propounded five additional etymologies apart from the present one. Referring to the name Adam, he states: “Dic etymon et proprietatem. 1. *dam*, terra, pulvis, item vapor, aqueus, Anglosaxonicum *aedm*, vapor, ἄτμός, ἄτμός; 2. *adem*, spiritus; 3. *dom*, *daem* (θμός, דמה), mens, ratio, iudicium; 4. *ada*, *atta*, pater; 5. *am*, אום, coetus, congregatio, populus, multitudo ex notione unitatis et generativa: *am*, *sam*, *samna*, *samla*, congregare; 6. *am* habet notionem generationis, Hebr. אם, mater, – et ipsum אם, gens, populus – nostrum *amma*, Hisp. amo, nutritius etc. Talis Adam, “amo” totius generis humani. Erit definitio Adam: Homo est pulvis vita et mente animatus. Adde de primo homine pater gentium.” Stiernhielm here confuses the non-existent אם with עם (*am*), which means “people, nation”.

³⁰⁹ NB – litera א] This sentence does not occur in the original autograph, but was added by Stiernhielm in the margin of Örnhielm’s copy.

³¹⁰ mater viventium] In F.d. 6, 43r, this expression comes after *vivere*.

³¹¹ achaz] This transcription is an addition by Stiernhielm in F.d. 14a, 28v. The Hebrew verb in question means ‘to hold, seize, grasp’.

³¹² chaji] This is an addition by Stiernhielm in F.d. 14a, 28v.

prolificam.³¹³ Notionem gignendi etiam habet nostrum *häfda*, coire, *hafvande*, praegnans. Germanicum *Heb-amme*, obstetrix.³¹⁴

חַי *chaj*, vita חַיָּה *chajah*, animal. Sueth. *qui, que, qued*, uterus, unde Gr. κύω, utero fero. *Que, queg*, animal, et in specie propter eminentem utilitatem vacca dicitur *ko*, Ger. *Kuhe*, et ipsa vox vacca quasi *qvacka*³¹⁵ hinc etymon habet. *kviga*, iuvenca.³¹⁶ *quick*, vivus, et *keck*, alacer, fortis, quibus respondet Hebr. כּוֹחַ *choach*.

Mille possem huius prosapiae vocabula in nostris linguis usitata et ingenita recensere ad demonstrandum **(F.d. 14a, 29r)** tot et talia³¹⁷ non esse peregrina et ex Hebraea accersita. Remitto lectorem ad *Clavem meam linguarum universalem*. Hic sufficit indigitasse radicem huius nominis primam *a* penes nos esse.

Cain, id est acquisitus, a קָנָה *kanah*, Sueth. est *köna*, Lat. **geno*, Gr. γενάομαι, id est gigno; *kön*, Lat. *genus*, Gr. γένος, Angl. *kind*, Germ. *kind*, proles. Et affini notione et voce *gena*, *gina*, commodum affere, *gagna*, lucrari. Gall. *gaigner*, Sueth. *gagn*, G. *Gain*, lucrum, acquisitio. Et ne arbitreris *köna* descendere a קָנָה, radix est **anna*, hodie *unna*, Ger. *gynnen* T. *jonnen*,³¹⁸ i.e. cupere, propensum esse alicui. Et hinc ansa hominis vel rei alicuius curam gerere, observare, custodire.³¹⁹ Suethis etiam olim in obscenam partem sumptum, *jöna* et *hiöna*, comprimere aliquem, unde *hion*, par coniugum, *hione-lagh*, coniugium. Proprie alias *hion* in genere significat personam.³²⁰

Abel, vanitas הֶבֶל *hebel*, Sueth. *äfl*, vanitas, a verbo *äflas*, vana cogitare et versare. Vin' plura? Sueth. *walla* significat deficere, delinquere. Ger. **apud* Otfrid. *balo* et *belis*, malum, inde *ubalo*, i.e. *ubel*. Teut. *övel*, malum, Angl. *bealve*, malum, Isl. *bol*, dolor, et verb. *bölva*, id est maledicere, Hung. *bal*, scaevus et delirus, Cambr. *ball*, pestis.³²¹

(F.d. 14a, 29v) Seth, repositus a שֵׁט *sätta*, ponere, Sueth. *sätta*.

³¹³ Here follows in F.d. 6, 43r, the sentence: *Notionem gignendi etiam habet noster häfvda, coire, hafvande, praegans, Germ. heb-amma, obstetrix*. This has been crossed out F.d. 14a, 28v.

³¹⁴ notionem gignendi ... obstetrix] In F.d. 14a, this sentence has been crossed out.

³¹⁵ quasi *qvacka*] In F.d. 14a, this word has been added by Stiernhielm above the line.

³¹⁶ *kviga*, iuvenca] In F.d. 14a, Stiernhielm added these words in the margin.

³¹⁷ tot et talia] In F.d. 6, the order of these words has been indicated by numbers (1–2) above the lin. F.d. 14a, 29r, accordingly has *tot et talia*.

³¹⁸ hodie ... *jonnen*] In F.d. 14a, 29r, this is a marginal addition by Stiernhielm.

³¹⁹ Et hinc ... custodire] In F.d. 14a, 29r, this has been added by Stiernhielm both above and below the line.

³²⁰ Suethis ... personam] This is a marginal addition by Stiernhielm in F.d. 14a, 29r.

³²¹ Vin' plura? ... pestis] This has been crossed out in F.d. 14a, 29r.

Noah (consolabitur nos) ducunt a נוֹחַ, quievit, Sueth. est *nöga*, Ger. *ver-gnügen*, satisfacere, quietum reddere, a *nogh*, satis, sufficiens.

Peleg (divisit) a פֶּלֶג *phalag*, cui affine פֶּלַח, *Phalag*, *Phalach*, dividere, discindere, et simplicissimum פֶּלֶה, segregare (Sueth. *flå*). Sueth. *plöga*, Germ. *pflugen*, aratro discindere terram, Teut. *pegel*, terminus, *pegelen*, dimetiri. *plogh* aratrum, *plugg*, papillus, cuneus, *plocka*, evellere, *fläckia*, secundum latitudinem dissecare. *Piäla* et *spiäla*, *spiälka*,³²² in tabulas diffindere. Hinc *spiäl*, tabula, *påle*, Lat. palus, Teut. *pael*, terminus, *paelen*, determinare, *paele*, Lat. pala.³²³ *pijl*, sagitta, *spila*, sudis, *spilra*, festuca. Teut. *spalken*, rixare, proprie dissidere.³²⁴

9.2 On the origin of the tetragrammaton

9.2.1 Nomina deorum origine esse Scythica

(1) Sources, dating and contexts

Sources: Stiernhielm's autograph original: F.d. 6, fols. 84r–84v^{line 42} (with the dimensions 212 x 325 mm) and Örnhjälms's fair copy: F.d. 14a, fols. 32r–34r^{line 7} (with the size 162 x 210 mm), which contains Stiernhielm's autograph additions. Arvid Moller(us) copied F.d. 14a in ms. R. 21, Uppsala University Library, fols. 20v–22r.

Dating: around 1651–1655.

The below text is the former part of a chapter of *Runa Suethica*, part 1, chapter 26: *Nomina deorum pleraque omnium gentium origine esse Scythica*. For its latter part, see Vol. 1, Section 7.2.1.

In his analysis of the tetragrammaton יהוה (YHWH), Stiernhielm argues that it is related to the Hebrew verb הָיָה, *hāyā*, or its older form הָוָה, *hāwā*, and then posits an etymological kinship between the verb הָוָה, *hāwā*, and the Swedish verb *hava*, “to have”. In other texts, he proposes other marvellous syllabifications and semantizations of the tetragrammaton. *Ie–ho–va* is thus construed as comprising lexical morphemes with the meaning *semper* (Ie) *qui* (ho) *sum* or *fuit* (va).³²⁵

In the first paragraphs in the present text, Stiernhielm presupposes to this kinship. He goes on to reconstruct the verb word form *a* as the historical “Scythian” form or origin of the Swedish verb *hava* and argues that *a* in Old Swedish – in medieval law codes – has a twofold meaning: *to be* (*esse*) and *to have* (*habere*).

³²² spiälka] This word has been added in the margin.

³²³ Paele Lat. Pala] This is lacking in F.d. 14a in relation to F.d. 6.

³²⁴ proprie dissidere] This has been added in F.d. 14a in relation to F.d. 6.

³²⁵ See F.d. 4:4:1, p. 38; F.d. 6, fol. 1r., F.d. 6, 80v. In *Collectanea philosophica*, F.d. 4:4:1, p. 38, Stiernhielm proposed alternative syllabifications: *Ih–ho–va*, *I–ho–va*, *Ia–ho–va*, and explained them as having the sense *Ego–qui–sum*.

(2) Text

(F.d. 6, 84r, F.d. 14a, 32r)

*Nomina deorum pleraque omnium gentium
origine esse Scythica
A IOVA principium.*

אֱלֹהִים, *all, Pan.* Dii nominantur ex proprietatibus et effectis.³²⁶ IEIOVA. IEHOVA. Per אֱהִיָּה hae literae omnes sunt una /a/, quae et nomen est ipsum, et radix nominis huius mirabilis. Quod hoc ipso prae aliis Dei nominibus, quae etiam ab /a/ derivantur, est mirabile. In nomine ישוע, *Jesu*, similiter tendunt omnes literae ad unitatem per *ahevioz*. Idem in אֱהִיָּה et compendiose in יְהִי. Ludovicus Capellus in Oratione de nomine יהוה³²⁷ contendit scribendum esse יְהוֹה et legendum esse *Iahvo*.³²⁸

Iactant Magistri et Cabalistae magna mysteria sanctissimi nominis Dei veri יהוה. Quae omni procul dubio maxima sunt et pro magnitudine significati ineffabilia. Neminem tamen in huc usque diem contigit videre, qui quidquam alicuius pretii ediderit.³²⁹ Nihil etenim asserunt praeter ea quae de summo ente, existente a seipso, ab aeterno, in aeternum, omnibus aliis extra se existentiam et existentiam communicante, vulgo afferri solent. Quae quidem³³⁰ ut revera magna et quae nemini competere possunt, nisi Deo, ita trita³³¹ sunt et cuivis philosopho etiam ethnico de ente entium disputanti obvia, ut pro mysteria nullo modo haberi possint.³³²

Cabalistae³³³ valde sibi placent in³³⁴ singulari, ut putant, mysterio,

³²⁶ אֱלֹהִים ... effectis] This is found in the margin. 'elōah is the singular for "God".

³²⁷ Oratione ... יהוה] The work referred to is *Oratio de nomine tetragrammato ac genuina eius pronuntiatione*, by Louis Cappel, the famous textual critic of the Old Testament, professor of Hebrew and theology at the University of Samur. The speech was delivered in 1634 (22 June) and published in *Ad Novam Davidis Lyram animadversiones cum gemina diatriba*, Salmurii/ Saumur 1643, see pp. 135–206. In his critical remarks (*animadversiones*), Cappel comments on a treatise by the Dutch theologian and Hebraist Franciscus Gomerus, viz. *Davidis lyra seu nova Hebraea Sacrae Scripturae ars poetica* (Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1637).

³²⁸ IEIOVA ... Jahvo] This has been written in the right-hand margin.

³²⁹ Between *ediderit* and *Nihil*, a single sentence and the beginning of the next one has been crossed out in F.d. 6, 91r: *In radice huius vocis יהוה, quae verbum substantivum ESSE designat, aiunt immensa recondita esse mysteria. Sed.*

³³⁰ Quae quidem] In F.d. 6, this has been added in the margin to replace *Haec*, which has been crossed out on the line.

³³¹ trita] In F.d. 6 *vulgaria* has been crossed out; *trita* has been added in the margin.

³³² ut ... possint] In F.d. 6, this has been added in the margin.

³³³ Cabalistae] This word has been written above the line; *quidam* has been crossed out on the line.

³³⁴ The preposition *in* was in F.d. 6 originally followed by a clause that has been crossed out: *eo quod in verbo אהיה pro variata punctorum applicatione trium temporum formationes grammatici elicere possunt.*

quod latere aiunt³³⁵ in huius nominis forma, in qua (F.d. 14a 32v) omnium trium temporum characteres sunt expressi: literam י ab initio characteristicam esse futuri, ו in medio participii temporis praesentis, ה in fine cum chametz (.) subscripto praeteriti. Et quod huic vicinum est Deum Exodi cap. 3, v. 14 et 15 Mosi duo sua nomina revelasse יהוה et אֶהְיֶה non sine causa, quod nimirum ex illis coniunctis componantur ista tria הֵיָה *fui*, הָיָה *sum*, אֶהְיֶה *ero*. Sed eheu! *Quam pingui macer est mihi taurus in arvo*.³³⁶

Quid enim hic tam divinum est et sublime, quod non exprimat Graecorum τὸ ὄν aut Latinum *ens*. De quo, si unum Platonem audias, longe sanctiora et recondiora mysteria accipias, quam ex universa Rabbinorum et Cabalistarum Iliade. Haec enim ipsa vox trilatera *ens* vel bilitera ὄν – infinitum tempus, quod aeternitas est, et ambitu suo praeteritum, praesens et futurum complectitur – includit.³³⁷ Numeros ipsorum et pueriles nimis ineptias mitto. Ad radices veniamus. Ea est היה aut היה, id est, *fui*; *factus*, *ortus*, *natus est*. Haec certe nihil habet speciale et eximium formando nomini Dei: *factum*, *ortum*, *natum esse* non quadrant.

(F.d. 14a, 33r) Notum est Orientalibus ESSE et HABERE eodem verbo significari. Hoc intuitu erit radix הוה, *hava*, etiam nostra, hoc est Scythica et, si hoc nomen reformides, Iaphethica vel Noachica, ut communem stipitem agnoscas,³³⁸ totidem et iisdem literis *hava*, unde Latini *habeo*, quod in Latium³³⁹ a Phrygibus invectum puto. Pamphyliorum enim (qui Phrygibus vicini sunt) lingua testatur Hesychius ἄβεις idem esse, quod Gr. ἔχεις.

Nunc videamus an ductu huius communionis in hac voce linguarum Scythicae et Hebraeae penetrare possimus ad sublimiora. Quod non erit difficile, (F.d. 6, 84v) cum pateat *hava* esse infinitivum eundem qui *hau*, formatum ab *ha* vel quod simplicissimum est *a*, id est *sum*, *est*, *habeo*, *habet*. Quarum significationum exempla tibi suppeditabit affatim *Antiquarius meus Sveo-Gothicus*, cuius specimen edidi anno <1643>³⁴⁰ Stokholmi impressum.

Haec vocula, quae radix radicum et mater est omnium omnino vocum rationalium, quae ex naturae ingenio factae sunt, haec illa est, in qua essentia et proprietas entis entium et sanctissimi illius nominis

³³⁵ latere aiunt] F.d. 6 has *lateat*, which was copied in F.d. 14a, where Stiernhielm changed it to *latere aiunt*.

³³⁶ Quam ... arvo] This is a quotation from Virgil, *Ecloga* 3, 100.

³³⁷ Haec enim ... includit] In F.d. 6, this passage has been written in the margin. In F.d. 14a, *includit* has been incorrectly crossed out, as it seemed to be unnecessary.

³³⁸ et, si hoc ... agnoscas] This as an autograph addition by Stiernhielm in F.d. 14a.

³³⁹ in Latium] This is an autograph addition by Stiernhielm in F.d. 14a.

³⁴⁰ 1643] The manuscript does not give the date of publication, but only three dots.

Dei recondita latet. Quae mox ut ignis e silice coruscans emicabit. Haec enim non paulo latius patet, quam limitatum illud הוה, in quo, qui nihil nisi Hebraice sciunt, subsistunt. Iam itaque radix *a* non solum entis et (F.d. 14a, 33v) essentiae significationem habet propriam, sed omnium: primo quae cum ente convertuntur: unius, boni, veri, et secundo quae ex ipsorum indole et notionibus generalibus usque ad specialissimas descendunt, adeoque tertio ipsius entis affectiones omnes, ut ita dicam, proprias. Horum, quae dixi, omnium catenam ex solio Iovis dependentem videre est in opere, quod adorno sub titulo *Nuptiarum Panos et Echus*, quo remitto benevolam quemcunque lectorem,³⁴¹ cui forte minus probabilis videbitur aliqua consequentia, quam in progressu huius dissertationis offenderit.

Nunc redeo ad nostram radicem *a*, quam dico significare *esse, unum, hoc, verum, bonum, aeternum*.³⁴² Id ita esse nunc demonstrandum erit. De prima significatione *esse*, quae includit *habere*, ut ante dictum, certum te facient omnes nostri libri paulo antiquiores, inter quos praecipui codices variarum Provinciarum Legum, in quibus nihil frequentius, quam phrases huiusmodi: *konungr a frid giva*, i.e. rex habet pacem dare, vel quod idem est: regis esse pacem dare; *han a thet göra*, i.e. ipse habet id facere, idem pro: illius est id facere. Versione ve- (F.d. 14a, 34r) teri dictum S[ancti] Petri “Aurum et argentum non habeo” sic redditur: *Gull eda sölf a eg eigi*.³⁴³

De significatione unitatis praeterita literatura antiqua, adi plebem nostram et superioris Germaniae, Frisios et Anglos, ex quibus audies *a man, a whif, a thing*. Qua locutione et unus et hic et ille et certus et aliquis comprehenditur. Quae sequuntur sunt impertinentia et alibi monstranda.³⁴⁴

9.2.2 Nomina deorum seu templum seu pantheon

Source: F.d. 6, fols. 79r, 79v and 80r. Size: 193 x 312 mm.

Dating: Stiernhielm dates this text 9 April 1652. In the title of the text he abbreviates his name with the initials GS.

Contents: In the first part of the text, he deals with the principles of etymology and criticizes the role of authorities and preconceived opinions in the scholarly community. In the second part, he discusses different etymologies of the tetragrammaton (that is, the name of

³⁴¹ lectorem] In F.d. 6, *authorem* has been crossed out on the line.

³⁴² aeternum] The word *aeternum* has been added above the line.

³⁴³ *Gull eda sölf a eg eigi*] The quoted passage is The Acts of the Apostles 3:6.

³⁴⁴ Quae sequuntur ... alibi monstranda] This sentence has been added by Stiernhielm in ms. F.d. 14a and is accordingly also found in ms. NKS. 150, 4:º, 24r.

God, YHWH) and then proposes his own etymology of it, just as in the preceding text (Section 9.2.1).

In the first part, he compares the art of etymology to architecture. In his practice of it, he has raised an edifice unlike the temple of the Israelites and dissimilar to the Doric, Ionic or Corinthian architectural styles, but similar to Gothic architecture, which he exemplifies with Gothic churches in Italy. He declares that in raising his etymological edifice he metaphorically speaking has used building blocks (i.e. word roots) from the Caucasus, more exactly Mount Ararat in Scythia.

In the heading of the second part, Stiernhielm transliterates the divine name as IOVA. This transliteration was either invented or at least consistently used by the biblical humanist Sebastian Castellio in his new Latin translation of the Old Testament (*Biblia interprete Sebastiano Castellione*, Basel 1551). Castellio's transliterated name comes close to an inflected form of the name of the Roman god Jupiter, viz. the ablative singular Iove, a similarity that agrees with the classicizing style of his Latin target language. His contemporaries interpreted this representation of the tetragrammaton as an example of stylistic paganism (*ethnicismus styli*).

As the title of the second part, Stiernhielm writes *A Iova principium* "The beginning is from YHWH". This expression alludes to the phrase *Ab Iove principium* "the beginning is from Jupiter," recorded in Virgil, *Aeneis* VII, 219. The heading is syntactically linked with the last clause of the preceding paragraph, *Fiat ergo*. The meaning of the sentence is: "Let us begin with the name IOVA or YHWH." Here he proposes his etymology of the tetragrammaton from the medieval Swedish verb *a*, which had the meanings of both 'to be' and 'to have'. He argues that derivatives as a definite article, pronouns, and adverbs of place and time are found in Swedish, other Germanic languages, and in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew and other Semitic languages.

(79r) GS. NOMINA DEORUM seu TEMPLUM seu PANTHEON
Coeptum Stiernlund. 9. Apr. 1652.

Nomina deorum diversarum linguarum et gentium pro modulo ingenii explicare animus est. Explicata scio quamplurima a viris huius aevi doctissimis nec dubito, quin pleraque recte, imo recte et subtiliter ingeniose pro ratione scientiae etymologicae, quae hodie floret, et eorundem virorum sapientum, quasi collatis manibus et operis, ad summum evecta conspicitur. Egregium certe et admirabile aedificium, si firmioribus fundamentis niteretur et si apex eo pertenderet, quo suadet ars et ratio architectonica: in fundamento

desidere veritatem, in apice intellectum. Vox ipsa etymon intendit verum. Hoc an absque intellectu cognosci et acquiri potest ambigo. Finis tamen etymologi est, et esse debet, verum et intellectus veri. Eum se assecutum putat, si vocem aliquam derivatam ad thema simplicius aut saltem ad vocem similem, cuius intellectum verum et fundamentalem tamen ignorat, in lingua aliqua, quam antiquiorem aut originalem praesupponit, producere possit.

E.g. vox Deus ducitur θεός, et hoc vulgo sufficit. Sapientiores inquirunt in intellectum vocis θεός, quem eruunt alii ex verbo θέω, curro, alii ex θεάομαι, intueor. Rationes afferuntur utrinque probabiles et plausibiles; ex motu, qui Motori Perpetuo, ex visu, qui Summae Sapientiae et Menti Divinae cuncta videnti, ante omnia competit. Subtiliores ultra penetrant usque in adyta Hebraeae, in cuius fundo veritatem residere sibi persuadent. Ii aiunt et Latinum Deus et Graecum θεός, ex דַּי, *daj*, a radice דָּהָה,³⁴⁵ quod sufficientiam significat, originem trahere, ut Deus idem sit ac αὐτάρκης,³⁴⁶ ipse sibi sufficiens. Vere haec et recte omnia. Horum etymorum nullum rejiciendum est. Concurrent enim omnia in vero intellectu vocis Deus. Vere, inquam, et recte, si ex certa scientia, quae principiis niteretur demonstrativis et infallibilibus, proficisceretur. Sed ipsis pro fundamento conjectura est. Divinus haberetur, qui optime potest divinari. Casu ipsis interdum verum obtingit, non arte aut scientia, eoque duce se putant invenisse veritatem et sensum formalem vocis. Nihil invenerunt praeter cognitionem nec eam semper veram. Aliquarum vocum in Graeca et Hebraea cognitionem, inquam, invenerunt, cognitionem vero minime.³⁴⁷

Haec eo non dico, ut studia doctissimorum virorum culpam, quae potius laudo et veneror, sed ut suo loco et successive demonstrarem multa adhuc in illa scientia desiderari, quae humano ingenio erui et sciri potuerunt, nisi obstitissent magnorum virorum autoritas et praeconceptione opinio nihil in hac parte sapientiae restare, cuius possessionem nacti non fuerint. Autoritas, inquam, et opinio, quod dolendum est, regnum obtinent et tyrannidem exercent in Republica Literaria. Hae certis se legibus munierunt et vetarunt,³⁴⁸ ne quis rationis et veritatis ductu sapientiam sectari queat, de se persaepe evidentem et obviam. Quam si quis absque earum nutu³⁴⁹ arripit et

³⁴⁵ a radice דָּהָה] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁴⁶ αὐτάρκης] The manuscript has the non-existent αὐταρχός. The present word is an emendation based on the given meaning “ipse sibi sufficiens”.

³⁴⁷ Casu ipsis ... cognitionem vero minime] These sentences have been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁴⁸ et vetarunt] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁴⁹ Absque earum nutu] This qualification has been added in the right-hand margin.

amplectitur, vapulat et acerbissimis convitiis in vulgus differtur et proscinditur. Hinc tandem nemo audet hiscere, aut, si quis audet, blanditur et adulatur, contentus ire viam quam montraverunt ipsae.

Hac, de qua loquor, scientiam veritatis verborum terminarunt, imo obstruxerunt hisce repagulis:

1. Vocabula rerum non esse natura aut rationis ductu, sed temere aut arbitrio humano introducta et usurpari coepta.
2. Linguam Hebraeam esse primam et adeo fundamentum et regulam omnium reliquarum, ideoque in ea subsistendum neque ultra aliquid quaerendum.
3. Et quod omnem spem tollit plenioris cognitionis, nullam dari posse vocum seu radicum, ut vocant, Hebraearum, rationem aut intelligentiam praeter eam, quam sparsim et et aegre colligunt ex usu et coniecturis.

Haec, et longe plurima sunt, quae struxerunt munimenta firmissima et hactenus inexpugnabilia [...?]³⁵⁰ tuendae ignorantiae. Ea verbis et argumentis velle expugnare hominis esset temerarii et inexpertissimi rerum, qui ignoraret, quam strenui, quam invicti et nulla ratione expugnabiles sint ingentium copiarum duces Authoritas et Opinio, praeterim si eo genere armorum velis experiri. Tot a suis partibus habent ignivomes fauces, tot virulentissimas linguas, tot calamos, tot stilos, sagittas et arcus, tot bolides et balistas, quibus non solum ingentia saxa ex acervis sanctorum ecclesiae patrum congesta, sed et scruta ex locis, ut vocant, topicis Aristotelis, calumniis et sophismatis tincta eiaculantur, ut in ipso aditu et primo congressu protinus obruaris et misere pereas. Aliis itaque armis, alia via adgrediundi sunt. Ipsis moenibus subeundum est et fundamenta tentanda (79v) re et opere; verbis et logomachiis insuper habitis. Sed haec forsitan videbuntur nimiae audaciae, an ergo sic parcius.

Ego vero cum viribus et armis longe me imparem cognoscam, tantum abest, ut lacescam aut³⁵¹ bellum indicam heroibus invictissimis, ut tantum mihi loci in territorio literario concedatur, quantum non byrsae, sed templo deorum extruendo suffecerit. In quo non bellator, sed pacificus numinum cultor Menti et Veritati aras iam olim ab aevo Anaxagorae collapsas instaurem, reponam, reaedificem, et restituam.³⁵² Templum igitur aedificare constitui non ad modum templum Israelitici aut Iudaici nec opere Corinthiaco aut Dorico aut

³⁵⁰ [...] The manuscript either has an unconventional sign of abbreviation (the letter I with two strokes through it) or this is only a deletion of the initial in *Ignorantia*.

³⁵¹ lacescam aut] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁵² instaurem, reponam, reaedificem, et restituam] The words *instaurem et reponam* have been written in the main text, while *reaedificem, restituam* have been added in the right-hand margin.

Ionico, sed architectura recentiori, quam Itali Gothicam vocant. Qua praecipuae in Italia basilicae magnifice exstructae hodie conspicabiles sunt. Saxa pro fundamentis ex Caucaso et monte Gordiaeo in Scythia excisa sunt. In eo deos omnes sed plerosque convocabo sub numen et imperium summi Iovae, qui solus et unus verus Deus. Cui reliqui omnes ut regi et creatori parent et serviunt. Per numina etenim, quae coluerunt gentes, aut verum Deum intenderunt, aut potestates ipsius, quas in rerum natura deprehenderunt, celebrarunt primi praesertim mortalium, licet abusus postmodum et idololatria plebem imprimis³⁵³ et coecum vulgus invaserit conniventibus ob apparentem aliquam utilitatem et tranquillitatem publicam regibus et consentientibus ob lucrum privatum sacerdotibus. Sed de his, conscriptis libris,³⁵⁴ abunde egerunt nostra aetate viri doctissimi, Joh. Seldenus Anglus et in Belgio Ioh. Gerhard Vossius, lumina nostri seculi clarissima. Quorum ego industriae nihil habeo, quod demam vel addam, nisi ut nominum deorum origines, quas illi dextre deduxerunt ex Hebraea et affinis paulo altius ex ipsis radicibus linguae Scythicae, quam ego antiquiorem puto, bona ipsorum venia, repetam. Ex hoc illud templum est, quod me pro viribus meis³⁵⁵ diis aedificaturum promisi. Fiat ergo

A IOVA PRINCIPIUM

Caput 1.

Ingentia iactant Hebraeorum magistri et Cabalistae Sacrosancti Nominis Tetragrammati יהוה mysteria. Quae procul dubio maxima sunt et pro magnitudini significati ineffabilia. Sed, ut quod res est fatear nihil adhuc ex Synaga praecipui, quod huc faciat, videre contigit praeter nugas aliquot grammaticales et coactam quandam literarum significationem, qua scripturam Sancti Nominis – quod essentiae habet notionem et idem est quod ὁ ὢν, ens³⁵⁶ – trium temporum futuri, praesentis et praeteriti comprehensionem in se continere gloriantur. Nomen ipsum recte deducunt ex יהוה, *hava*, id est fuit, et praeterea factus, ortus, natus est, quae Deo non competunt.³⁵⁷ Verbum valde generale est nec tam simplex quam EST Latinum. Ex prima tamen et simplicissima notione fuit nomen יהוה formatum est. Cuius litera prima (י) iuxta grammaticam Hebraeam est (ut aiunt) character temporis futuri, ה in medio participii temporis praesentis, ה

³⁵³ Imprimis] Stiernhielm added this above the line, while crossing out *praesertim* on the line.

³⁵⁴ conscriptis libris] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁵⁵ pro viribus meis] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁵⁶ Quod essentiae ... ens] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁵⁷ In the left-hand margin, Stiernhielm added his own etymology of YHWH. As stated above (Section 7.2.1), he divided it into the syllables *je-ho-va*, which he interpreted as semantic morphemes with the meaning *semper qui fuit*.

in fine cum chametz (,) subscripto praeteriti. Nec sine mysterio factum aiunt, quod Deus Exod. 3, v. 14 et 15 Mosi duo sua nomina revelaverit יהוה et אֶהְיֶה, *Jehova* et *ejhe*, id est ero, quod nimirum ex illis coniunctis componantur haec tria הָיִה *fui*, הָיָה *sum*, אֶהְיֶה, vel ut refert Ludovicus Capellus יִהְיֶה, *ero*. Et haec fere sunt grandia illa mysteria sanctissimi huius nominis a Cabalistis prodita, ut merito liceat cum bubulco Virgiliano exclamare: *Heu! Quam pingui macer est mihi taurus in arvo*³⁵⁸ quasi in monosyllabo Latino *ens* aut Graeco ὦν, ὄν haec omnia non inessent et plura quae videre est apud Platonem et philosophos.³⁵⁹

Quid, quod in toto nomine nec una quidem sit litera radicalis? In tantum abiit haec vox a vera et prima sua radice. הרה enim non est radix, sed vox derivata et formata a vera radice, quae non extat in lingua Hebraea. Certum enim est nullam radicem esse bisyllabam. Vocum enim est eadem genitura, quam rerum. Omne primum consistit in puncto et unitate. Omne secundum et³⁶⁰ quae oriuntur ex puncto fluunt in lineam, quae prima est magnitudo divisibilis et capax numeri.³⁶¹ Inde se dilatant in superficiem et corporantur in profunditatem. Semen enim, qua semen, est unum, simplex et indivisibile. Idem in genesi vocum accidere alibi demonstravi et docebit res ipsa in *Lexico* meo *Universale*.

(80r) Simplicior tamen et monosyllaba extat in Hebr. הוּא, quiescente א Syris et Arabibus הו, quod ipsum est Graecorum ὁ, ἡ, id est *hic*, *haec*; *is*, *ea*, *hoc*, *illud*, particulae distinctivae designantes ens, qua est hoc vel illud, aliud ab alio. Verum simplicissima et quae in Orientalibus non extat est Scythica eademque Suethica radix *a*, ens, unum, aliquid, verum, sempiternum etc. et esse et habere, quae relative unum sunt, in linguis praesertim Orientalibus, in quibus frequens *Est mihi* pro *habeo*. Idemque *a* praeterea nobis significat debet et convenit, in quibus notionibus rectitudo et bonitas entitativa consistunt. Harum significationum et locutionum exempla ex legibus nostris et aliis antiquitatibus congesta exhibeno in *Lexico Antiquario linguae Suethicae et Gothicae*, cuius specimen in litera A impressum est Stocholmiae A. C. <1643>.³⁶² Eius generis sunt *a man*, *a ting*, unus vir, una res vel vir quidam, res aliqua. Anglis adhuc in usu.

A, *ä*, *e*, *i*, *ja* etc. aliquid. *Ä-hvad*, Saxonice *e-wat*, Germanice *je-was*, aliquid.

A, *ä*, *e*, *i*, *ja*, *je*, *jo*, *ju* semper, perpetuo. Item: sic, sic est, verum.

³⁵⁸ Quam ... arvo] As noted above, this is a quotation from Virgil, *Ecloga* 3, 100.

³⁵⁹ quasi ... et philosophos] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁶⁰ Omne secundum et] This has been added in the left-hand margin.

³⁶¹ divisibilis et capax numeri] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁶² 1643] In the ms. there is no date of publication, but only five dots.

usque, in aeternum.³⁶³

Han ä inte här. Non est hic.

Gull a eg eigi. Aurum non habeo.

Konunger a frid gifva. Rex habet vel debet, vel Regem decet vel
convenit, vel Regis est pacem dare.

In hanc formam simplicem reciderunt Gallice et Italice *à*, id est, habet, et *è*, est.

Iam ex nostro articulo *a* factum est verbum *ha, ho, hu*, quis, *han, hon, henne, honom, ham*.³⁶⁴ Teut. *he, hy*, etc. Graec. ὁ, ἡ, τό, ὅς. Latin. *hi, hae, haec, hoc, is, ea, id*, etc. Hebr., Chald., Syr., et Arab.³⁶⁵ הוּא, הו, הִי, הֵן, הֵם, אֵנָּה *hu, hi, haj, hen, henna, hym, innan*, etc.

In summa, ex nostra simplicissima *a* omnes omnium linguarum nascuntur articuli, pronomina, adverbia loci et temporis et quicquid distinctionem entis ab ente infert.

Ex eadem radice *a* sunt declinatae et ad generum distinctionem formatae voculae nostrae *an*, *en*, unus; *een*, una; *at*, *et*, *it*, unum. Quibus consonant Latina *unus*, *-a*, *-um* et Graeca εἷς, ἕν. Hebraea אֶחָד nostrum est *at*, *et*. Unde idem אֶחָד. Post demonstrabitur. Cum nostro *et*, *it* conforme est etiam Latina *id*, *idem*.

Ex nostra radice *a*, *ā* in notione perpetuitatis is Graeca ἀἰ, semper, perpetuo, unde αἰόν, ut nobis ab *ā*, semper, *āve* et *evig*, unde Latinis *aevum*. Ex eodem est **aade*, aetas, et *aad*, vetus, Frisiis in usu. Unde Latina *aetas* et *aeternus*. Indidem quoque Graeca ἔτι, Hebraea עַד, adhuc, dum, et aeternitas; עַד עַד עַד, in aeternum. Eiusdem sobolis sunt Hebraea עוֹלָם, ³⁶⁶ Hebraea עַד, Chaldaica עַד עַד, Syriaca עַד עַד, Aethiopica *iddan*, *aeddān*. Similiter nobis ex eadem radice vocula *ān*, adhuc. Unde Lat. **annare*, *perennare* et *annus*, circulus temporis in se redeuntis, Gr. ἔνος, ἔννος. Ex eadem radice et notione formatur Suethicum *aar*, annus, olim tempus in genere, ³⁶⁷ unde Germicum *Jahr*. Indidem Teutonicum *Uur*, tempus, opportunitas, Graecum ὥρα, tempus, Latinum *hora*. Ex eadem radice est Gallicum *aage*, idem quod Finnonicum *aica*, id est, aetas. ³⁶⁸ Et quis recensebit omnia?

Ex radice *a* in notione veri est nostrum et multis nationibus commune *ja* et Gallicum *ouy*. Inde Latinum *ajo* et Gr. ἤμί, ἠῶ, ἦς, ἦ, unde φάω, φημί, ajo, dico.

³⁶³ Anglosaxonice ... semper. Suethice ... in aeternum] These comparisons have been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁶⁴ henne, honom, han] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁶⁵ Chaldaice, Syriace et Arabice] This has been added in the right-hand margin.

³⁶⁶ Indidem quoque Graeca ἔτι ... Hebraea אַת] This has been added in the margin.

³⁶⁷ olim ‘tempus’ in genere] This has been added in the margin.

³⁶⁸ idem quod Finnonic. *aiea*, id est 'aetas'] This has been added in the margin.

9.3 *Nativitatis certamen*: the battle of etymological origins

Source: *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, fols. 26r, col. 1, lines 1–18, and col. 2 (21 lines). Size: 212 x 325 mm. Dating: around 1651.

Contents: Stiernhielm proposes the etymological rule that a word should have cognates in the language from which it derives, if it is original in this language. Otherwise, it has likely been borrowed from another language. In the text edited, he exemplifies with the word for wind in Latin (*ventus*) and in German (*Wind*). In the second column, he refers to two etymological rules advanced by Goropius Becanus, namely (1) that a word cannot be original in a language in which it has no underlying reason and (2) that a compound originally belongs to the language in which each element has a meaning. He adds the assumption that a word, the meaning of which is more general in one language is likely more original than in the languages where it has a more specific referent. In the rest of the text (26r, col. 1, lines 18–43, and fol. 26v, 17 lines), which is not edited, he exemplifies the second principles of Goropius Becanus by the compound *Iuniperus* in Latin (*Ginebro* in Italian, *Enebro* in Spanish). He argues that it should be derived from Swedish *enebär*, because both parts of the compound (*en* or *än*, translated as *smak* in Swedish, that is “taste”, and *bär*, that is berry, are meaningful in this language).

(26r, col. 1) Quando censetur de vocis alicuius origine, sitne e.g. Latinae potius quam Germanicae³⁶⁹ originis vox *wind*, Lat. *ventus*, dicunt grammaticastri *wind* esse a *ventus*. Ego vero dico: *ventus* est a *wind*. Quare? Quia nihil sunt in tota Latina, unde *ventus* recte derivari potest. *Wind* autem in Germanica a *wehen*, *wejen*, *ween* recte derivatur etc. Verbalia enim a verbis derivatur. Ergo *wehen* prius quam *Windt*, ex quo immediate facta est vox Latina *ventus*, quoniam alius unde fiat non habet. Hinc elicitor regula: Ubi origo, ibi patria. Secunda regula erit: Ubi vita, ibi patria, hoc est, in quacumque lingua vox est significativa (significatio enim vocis vita est), ibi etiam videtur esse nativa. In qua vero lingua mortua est, in ea videtur esse ascititia et peregrina.

(26r, col. 2) Verissimae sunt regulae Becani Goropii in Hermathenae lib. 2 circa finem: 1. Vocem primigeniam (hoc est radicem) in ea lingua non esse, in qua nulla eius vera causa reperitur. 2. Si quod vocabulum duabus pluribusve linguis sit commune, id eius linguae proprium germanumque censi, in qua rei significatae convenientissima potest ratio reddi.

³⁶⁹ Germanicae] *Suethicae* has been crossed out on the line; *Germanicae* has been added above the line.

Ego addo: si una eademque vox radicalis inveniatur in duabus aut plurimis linguis, in ea videtur propria, ubi notionem habet generaliore, quam scilicet capit et comprehendit in se omnes specialiores, e.g. Cambrice *da* significat *bonus*, in Islandica *da* virtus, in Hebraea ך sufficientia. Hic Cambrica videtur praevalere. 2. Vox radicalis multam habens prolem in una lingua, nova non est nec adscititia, sed indigena etc. Cautela. Nihil tamen praecise tribuendum uni alicui linguae seorsim, cum possint, et plerumque fit (in antiquis), ut ex una prima communem habeant vocabula radicem.

9.4 *Observatio de etymo vocum Fader, Moder, Broder*

Source: Stiernhielm's autograph *Observatio de etymo vocum Fader, Moder, Broder, Syster, Amma, Barn, Dotter, Son* is extant in F.d. 2:7:2, envelope 4 (1r–3r). This writing was published together with Stiernhielm's treatise on the old Scandinavian idol Oden, *Dissertatio de Opino*, in *Greinir or þeim gaumlu saugum, laugum och iprotter*, Stockholm 1763, pp. 217–219. My edition is based on the autograph under comparison with the copy R 21, pp. 60 ff., UUB, and the print.

Contents: Stiernhielm argues that the hereditary Germanic words father, mother, brother share a common origin with Greek, Latin and Persian. To this end he cites proofs of the Persian-Germanic kinship.

OBSERVATIO³⁷⁰ de etymo vocum

Fader, Moder, Broder, Syster, Amma, Barn, Dotter, Son

(1r) In originatione harum vocum idem nobis contingit, quod in aliis plerisque omnibus, quae cum Latinis nobis sunt communes. Ea enim plerorumque est vilitas, ea est securitas, ut si quaeras, unde haec vox vel illa derivetur, mox audias ex Latino, ex Graeco. Si, qua ratione et qua via id fiat, percontor, haesitabit, aut antiquitatem idiomatis Latiaris prae nostro aut cum ipso imperio in hasce etiam oras propagationem causabitur. Falso et ex caeca vulgi praeconceptione et iam diu inveterata opinione, quam cuius, qui veritati bellum non indixit, stirpitus, ut spero, eradicabit Mea <Saga>³⁷¹ evidenter demonstrando neque per imperii, quod ad nos nunquam pertigit,³⁷² neque per (1v) literarum religionisve propagationem tantam dictionum nubem in linguam nostram irrumpere eandemque innumbrare potuisse.

Antiquitatem quod attinet, docebit eadem LATINAM filiam esse NOSTRAE, quae antiquitus CELTICA dicta fuit apud Europaeos, in

³⁷⁰ Observatio] This word only occurs in the print 1763.

³⁷¹ Saga] Stiernhielm crossed out *Adelruna* without replacing it by *Saga*, which refers to the planned dictionary *Saga Aramaeo-Gothica*.

³⁷² quod ... pertigit] In F.d. 2:7:2:4, this clause has been added in the margin.

Asiaticis vero SCHYTHICA ARAMAEA, et viguit in Thuscis, Italiae ante Aeneades dominatoribus, quorum vernae erant Romani, ut iure ipsis opprobavit rex Asiae Mithridates fatente antiquitatum Romanarum probatissimo scriptore, et ipso Romano, Fabio Pictore, Lib. 2. mihi fol.³⁷³ 135. Sed de hisce fusius loco et tractatu dicto.

Ad voces venio. *Fader, Moder, Broder*, etc., communes sunt utrique sermoni, nostro et Latino, in PATER, MATER, FRATER. Ut nostras a Latinis, ita has a Graecis ortum trahere asserunt, scilicet a πατήρ, μήτηρ. In voce³⁷⁴ FRATER haerent, nullus enim ad Graecos fontes, ut autumant, recursus. Sed et cum Graecis commune nobis est *Dotter*, Germ. *Dochter, Daugter*, Latinis exclusis, in θυγάτηρ. Unde hoc a Graecis, quibuscum nullum nec imperii nec tantum literarum aut religionis commercium? Cur non potius, ut a MATER *Moder*, a PATER *Fader*, etiam vox aliqua a FILIA depravata in sermonem nostrum irrepsit? Sed nugae!

(2r) Ex vetustiori Barbara, ex qua multa sese hausisse ipsi fatentur Graeci, haec et similia in utramque fluxere. Neque in hasce solas, sed in multas etiam alias, vastissimis terrarum et marium tractibus a Latio et Hellene dissitas. Persicam cito, in qua, ut innumera, nobiscum sunt communia. *Phedar, Madar, Berader; Dochtar* etc. Sic praeter haec etiam multa alia, quae cum Latinis nullam habent affinitatem, qualia sunt: CHODA, *Gudh*; BAND, *Band*; BEGRIJST, *begret*; DROG, *Bedrägerij*; GRIIFT, *Griper*; STAR, *stierna*, Anglica dialecto *Starre*; TEHOM, *tohm* etc.³⁷⁵

Vetustam vero Barbaram istam omnes antiquitatum scriptores uno pene ore confitentur esse Schythicam sive Aramaeam,³⁷⁶ quam maiorum nostrorum Getarum fuisse vernaculam eandemque etiamnum hodie in nobis eorumque posteris quoad ipsam substantiam et voces primigenias durare, superius citata *Saga*³⁷⁷ ad oculum monstrabit.

(2r) Nunc propius veniamus. Fontes dictarum vocum inquiramus, etegamus. Linguam, in qua reperientur cardinalem ac principem, e qua in alias dictiones istae migraverunt, reputabimus ipsoque iure nuncupabimus. Latini de ulteriori etymo securi Graecis voces PATER et MATER acceptas ferunt. In Graecia quia nihil universim reperitur, unde commode deduci possunt, itur ad Hebraeam ut fontem et scaturiginem, ut putatur, reliquarum omnium. PATER deductum

³⁷³ fol.] R 21 has *mihi* before the reference to the folio number.

³⁷⁴ voce] In the print 1763 *voce* has been added before *FRATER*.

³⁷⁵ Phedar ... star] The Persians words are drawn from Lipsius' list in his letter to Henric Schotti 1598 (19 December), for which see Section 3.4.2 above, p. 42.

³⁷⁶ Aramaeam] So read F.d. 2.7:2:4 and ms. R 21. The print 1763 spells *Arameam*.

³⁷⁷ Saga] In F.d. 2.7:2:4, Stiernhielm crossed out *Adelruna* and replaced it by *Saga*.

volunt ab אָב, *ab*, per metathesin, et MATER ab אִמָּה, *em*. Radicem prioris nescio quam allegant; posterioris scitam et appositam agnosco in אָמָן, *aman*, i. e. nutrire.

Sed melius et aptius eam quadrare putarim ad vocem nostram *amma*, quae totidem literis nutrire et nutricem indigitat, quam ad vocem MATER. Quae radix itidem genuine Matris nomen format in lingua Esthonica, nimirum *Emman*. Atque tam propinqua vox in eodem significato, ab Hebraeo *em*, in Graeca derivari potuisset, sed quis non videt metathesin et derivationem istam coacte ac invite huc traduci? **(3r)** Graec. *πάω, *pasco*, *fōa*, παίω, idem quod ποιῶ,³⁷⁸ facio, patro, pario.

Πάω, πατήρ, παῖς, filius, *poŷke*, Anglicum *boy* a *bua*, facio.

Patro. Pater, qui patrat filium. *Fōa*, **fōdur*, genitor.

9.5 On the origin of a couple of Moesogothic words

9.5.1 The noun *hairto*, “heart”

Source: F.d. 12, fol. 7r, a note on Matthew 6:21. Contents: There are cognates of Moesogothic *hairto* in Germanic languages as well as in Latin and Greek. Stiernhielm observes the sound change from Latin C to Germanic H.

v. 21 *hairto*. Isl. *hiärta*, S. *hierta*. **hiorta*. A.S. *heort*. A. *hart*, *heart*. T. *hert*. G. *Hertz*. Tam varia et variarum dialectorum scriptio. Lat. *cor*. Ital. *cuore*. Gal. *coeur*. Una vox est unaque origo. H in C mutato. Ex Graeco καρδιά originem ducunt. Originis gloria utrique lingua sit tribuenda patebit ex Runa Suethica.

9.5.2 The verb *haban*, “have”

Source: *Glossarium Ulphila–Gothicum*, 1670, pp. 78–79, s.v. *Haban*. Contents: Criticism of the derivations of Germanic words from Greek and Latin. Gothic *haban* is derived from the medieval Swedish word *a*, which meant ‘to have’ and ‘to be’.

(78, col. 2) *Haban*, G. *Haben* ducunt quotquot sunt etymologi ab *habeo* et hoc ab ἄβω. Quod si fallit ἀφή, id est tactus, ἀφεῖν tangere, est qui ducat a πάειν, id est possidere. Salmasius contorto collo tradit ab ἀπέχειν immemor sui dogmatis (in *De Hellenistica*) ex lingua barbarica esse natam Graecam. Sed quae est illa **(79, col. 1)** barbarica? Scythica, Thracica, Getica, Gothica orta ex Japhetica. Hinc ergo arcessenda est origo vocum Graecarum et ex iis derivatarum Latinarum. Sed contra fit: ducunt ex Graeca quasi

³⁷⁸ ποιῶ] R 21 has the uncontracted form ποιέω.

antiquiore vocabula Latina, ex Latinis Gothica, Celtica, Germanica, in quo valde exorbitant et hallucinantur viri alias doctissimi, nec mirum.

Quis enim tantum operae impendit Gothicae vel veteri Celticae cognoscendae, quantum Graecae et Latinae? Ego multum laboris et aetatis in iis funditus discendis insumpsi. Quo factum est, ut etiam multas multis abstrusas et ignoratas originum radices acquisiverim. Inter quas ea, quae hic quaeritur, vocis *Haban* vel *Habeo*, omnium prima, simplicissima et universalissima est. Ea est monosyllaba, Gothica *A*, duo significans: EST vel HABEO, et UNUM seu ALIQUID. Harum significationum veritatem variis locutionum exemplis in meo *Inventario linguae veteris Sueo-Gothicae* illustratam exhibeo. [...] Ex vocula *A* tria praecipue formantur infinitiva *ava*, *aga* et *hāga*. *Ava*, aspiratum *hava*, in genere significat habere; *aga* proprium habere, possidere; *hāga* servare sartum tectum, sanctum habere. Ab *hava* orta sunt Goth. *haban*, Gr. ἄβω, Lat. *habere*, Heb. חוה, *hava*, i.e. esse. Orientalibus idem est esse et habere. ‘Est mihi’, i.e. habeo. [...]

9.5.3 The Gothic adjective *hails*, “sound, whole”

Source: *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum*, p. 81, cols. 1–2, s.v. Hails.

Contents: Stiernhielm gives the Germanic cognates of the Gothic adjective *hails* “sound, well, hale”³⁷⁹ and proposes a derivation from the Swedish adjective *all*, that is, “all, whole”. Moreover, when deriving Latin *bellum* from the Old Swedish verb *bälla* and the noun *bälde*, he anticipates criticism of this etymology by reminding the critics that in its historical origins Latin had the status of a mixed language: Latin non only derives from its archaic Italic stage and Greek, but also from its mixture with Celtic languages and Phrygian.

(col. 1) A[nglo]S[axonice] *hal* est salvus, sanus, Alem[annice]] *heil*, Belg[ice] *heel*,³⁸⁰ S[uehice] *hālsa*, sanitas, *hālsosam*, salubris, salutaris, G[ermanic] *hell*, sanitas, salus, prosperitas. Inde *heilig*, S[uehice] *helig*. [...] Ego contra puto ὅλος et ἕλος esse Gotho-Iaphetica *heel*, totus, integer, universus. [...] (81, col. 2) Radix est Gotho-Celtica *Al*, quae multos ex se diffundit ramos fructiferos. Hinc enim nata sunt quae iam dixi, *heel*, Anglice *whole*; *hail*, *heela*, *hālsa*,

³⁷⁹ Elof Hellqvist, *Svensk etymologisk ordbok* (2nd ed. 1939), s.v. *hel*, similarly refers to Gothic *hails*, ‘sound’ and *gaheils*, ‘whole, without defect’.

³⁸⁰ *hal ... heel*] Cf. OED, s.v. *whole*: “Cognate with Old Frisian *hēl* (West Frisian *hiel*), Old Dutch *hēl* (Middle Dutch *heel*, *heil*, Dutch *heel*), Old Saxon *hēl* (Middle Low German *hēl*, *hēil*), Old High German *heil*, *hēl* (Middle High German, German *heil*), Old Icelandic *heill*, Old Swedish *hel*, *heel*, *heil*, *hāl* (Swedish *hel*), Old Danish *hel*, *hiæl* (Danish *hel*), Gothic *hails*, Crimean Gothic *iel*.”

ὄλος, οὖλος, οὖλω, valeo. Hinc Suethicum *väl*, Germanicum *wol*, Teutonicum *weelde*, voluptas; **wela*, Anglicum *welche*. [...]

Ab *al* quoque est **bälla*, Dalekarlis adhuc in usu, id est, posse.³⁸¹ Unde *bälde*, potentia [...] Nec dubito, quin ab eodem *bella* et *belde* ortum sit Latinum *Bellum*, potius quam a *Duellum*. Hic, scio, ringitur iterum Momus nescius linguam Latinam non solum ex prisca Latini et Graeca, sed etiam ex Celtica et Phrygica (quae eadem cum Geto-Gothica) conflatam esse, quod nec diffitetur ipse etymologorum pater Vossius, quem vide in praefatione ad *De vitiis sermonis*, licet Vossius ipse hoc suum dogma in originationibus (**col. 1**) suis parum observet.

9.6 On the derivatives from the morpholexeme *a*

Source: *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam pertinentia*, F.d. 6, 87r. The text likely dates from 1652. Stiernhielm demonstrates his ideas about the lexical diversification of the morpholexeme *a* in the verbal sense of *being* and the pronominal sense of *one, this* or *something*.

Radix radicum omnium *A* in prima sua significatione, qua *ens, unum, hoc* et *aliquid* designat, in lucem exhibit, primo nuda et mox vestita, tum etiam suffulta consonantibus servilibus. Quae quidem nihil faciunt ad ipsam originem, sed ipsam radicem diffindunt in multa synonyma et flectunt ad distinctionem rerum, personarum, numeri, generum, temporum et locorum, etc.

S[uehice] **a*, sum, est. Habet hodie persona prima *är*, sum, secunda *äst*, tertia *är*, est. Graece ἔω, sum, ὅν, ὅν. Latine *es, est, ens*.

S[uehice] et A[nglice] *a*, unus, *an, en, een, ain, ein*, Rospig[iis] *jän, jen*, A[nglice] *one*. Gr[aece] εἷς, ἐνός, unus, ἕν, unum. εἷς etiam Martini dicit ab εἰμί. Lat[ine], *unus, -a, -um*. **As* <unitas>.

Suehice *at, et, it, äit, jet*, unum. Ch. A. ἡ, *hhad*, H. ἡ, *ahhad, echad*. Eadem et ἡ, *jaad* (Sueh. *jet*) in significatione unitatis.³⁸²

Ut radix *a+* flectitur in *es, est, är, שׂ, תא, ens*, etc. ita etiam flectitur in significatione unitatis.

Iam vides radicem *a* assumpsisse literas flexus *n, s, t*, etc., et terminationes *us, a, um*, nimirum ut distinguantur his genera. Graece etiam servili *H* aspiratur et Hebraice crassius per *ת* et nostris *jod* praefigitur, aliis alia. En dabo schema radicis *a* in significatione unitatis cum flexibus in fini et servili literarum praefixione in initio.

³⁸¹ *bälla*] The frequency of this word among the Dalecarlians is also pointed out by Johan Ihre, *Glossarium Suiogothicum*, Uppsala 1769, col. 145, s.v. *bälla*, with the example “Eg bäll intet”, that is, “I am not able, I cannot”, and also “I will not”.

³⁸² Hebrew תא, *'ahhad*, means “one”. At the bottom of the page, the root morpheme תי is added with the Latin translation *univit*, “to unite”, which is its meaning in the stem-form pi‘el (viz. the perf. *yahed*). The noun תי (yahad) means “unitedness”.

A. <i>an.</i>	L. * <i>as</i>	S. <i>At. Et.</i>	Scyth. <i>ari</i> , unus, <i>arima</i> , id.	Ex informatione
S. <i>en.</i>	T. <i>as.</i>	<i>It.</i>	Turc. <i>bir</i> , unus.	literae g, ut <i>äga</i> ,
<i>een.</i>	S. <i>ess.</i>	* <i>äit.</i>	NB. in sequentes	<i>eg</i> , <i>ego</i> .
G. <i>ain.</i>	Gr. εἷς. ἴος.	<i>jät.</i>	articulos Turcicos et	Heb. עֶחָד, <i>echad</i> .
<i>ein.</i>	foem. ἴα.	<i>jet</i>	pronomina <i>bu</i> , <i>ben</i> .	Eadem, <i>ehad</i> .
A. <i>one.</i>	οἷος,	Scl. <i>edn.</i>	<i>bis</i> , ‘hic, ego, nos’.	Ung. <i>Egy. Eggy.</i>
S. F. <i>jen.</i>	sola,	<i>eden.</i>	Ger. <i>bin</i> , <i>bem</i> , <i>ben</i> ,	Fin. <i>Yx.</i>
Gr. ἕν,	solus.	Pol. <i>ieden.</i>	<i>bis</i> , <i>bist</i> . et	Persic. <i>Iax. Iox.</i>
unum.		Lus. <i>ieden.</i>	* <i>birut</i> , id est,	
ἐνός, unus.		Dal. <i>yedan.</i>	werdet.	
Radix ab		Boh. <i>geden.</i>	Ung. <i>birom</i> , ‘habeo, possideo, teneo’.	
יָד, unum.		Chal. יָד, <i>chad.</i>	AS. <i>beo</i> , ero, <i>beod</i> , erit.	
יָדָא, ἕνα, una.		Arab. יָד, <i>chad.</i>	Scl. <i>bi</i> , <i>biti</i> , esse, fieri.	
		H. עֶחָד, <i>echad.</i>	Adde Cambricum <i>bud</i> , fuit.	
		Ar. <i>vahid.</i>	Omnia haec sunt affinia. Scythicum	
		Abys. <i>ahadu.</i>	<i>ari</i> , <i>arima</i> exponitur unus apud	
		Afr. <i>quachad.</i>	Herodotum, lib. 4, ubi dicit <i>Arimaspu</i>	
		Gothi Tauric. <i>Ita.</i>	significare un-oculum. <i>Spu</i> enim	
		Hebr. בָּד, <i>bad</i> . ³⁸³	oculum denotare. Utrumque nostrum est.	
	Vascon. <i>bat</i> , <i>vad</i> , solus.		Ut enim <i>är</i> una significatione denotat	
	Esth. <i>ytte</i> et <i>ytz</i> .		‘est’ ab <i>a</i> , ita secunda significatione <i>ar</i>	
	G. <i>jed</i> , <i>jeder</i> , i.e. singulus.		notat unitatem ab eodem <i>a</i> , quod etiam	
	<i>jedweder</i> , unusquisque.		unum designat. Ab <i>ar</i> videtur quod	
	יִד, <i>iod</i> , unitas, apex, punctum.		superlativus factus <i>arima</i> aut aliud	
In hisce notandum est literas			derivativum, quo unicus indigitatur.	
initiales ante primam voculam,			<i>Spu</i> , oculus, fit a verbo <i>spea</i> , <i>speia</i> , id	
ut sunt <i>j. g. v. b. ch. qu. y.</i> ,			est ‘oculis perlustrare, explorare’.	
nihil mutare qua substantiam			Quod a Gothis nostris in Italos	
vocabuli, sed variare tantum			tractum, id iisdem hodie dicitur	
dialectos. Quod etiam de integris			<i>spiare</i> , unde <i>spione</i> , explorator. Ab	
syllabis tenendum est, ut <i>ech</i> in			hoc Scythico <i>ar</i> factum est Turcicum	
<i>echad</i> , <i>vah</i> in <i>vahid</i> , <i>ah</i> in			<i>bir</i> , ut ab <i>at</i> , <i>et</i> Vasconicum <i>bat</i> , quod	
<i>ahadu</i> , <i>quach</i> in <i>quachadu</i> ,			convenit cum <i>wat</i> , id est, aliquid.	
ut nec terminationes in <i>eden</i> ,			<i>a</i> . est. <i>a</i> . unum. <i>ar</i> . est. <i>ar</i> . prior,	
<i>geden</i> , <i>ahadu</i> . Sola enim radix			idem quod primus et unus. <i>arist</i> , primus,	
<i>at</i> spectanda est. Sic in omnibus.			ἄριστος. <i>arim</i> , <i>fram</i> , primus, <i>framest</i> .	

Ex eadem radice *a* pura fiunt affectae *ma*, i.e. aliquid, <et> *ween*, unus, Lettice. S[uethice] **mia*, *mea*, *miat*, aliquid. Gr. μία, una, ab ἴα. Arm[enice] *mi*, *maegh*, i.e. unus, *maeck*, solus, *misagh*, *maagh*. [...]

³⁸³ bad] In a separate column Stiermhielm adds: “Cum בָּד convenit nostrum *bāda*, i.e. ambo. Quod videtur contrarium notioni unius soli. Verum hic considerandum *bāda*, ‘ambo’, sic capi ut intelligantur duo, singuli singulariter sumpti.”

PART 3. HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE
LANGUAGE STUDIES

10. *Adelruna* and *Anti-Cluverius* (1639–1644): early ideas on ethno-linguistic relationships

10.1 *Scopus Adelrunae*: plans for antiquarian and etymological Swedish lexicography

10.1.1 Preliminaries

Source: Stiernhielm's letter to the Regency, of March 1639: "Epistola ad illustrissimos Dominos Regentes Sveciae, specimen operis sui *ADELRUNAE sive SIBYLLAE Sueo-Gothicae exhibens*." This letter was published in *Acta literaria et scientiarum Sveciae*,³⁸⁴ vol. III, Uppsala 1738, treatise 10, pp. 45–52. I have used this edition in the excerpt from the theoretical introduction of the letter below (Section 10.1.2). The entire text of the letter has been republished by Per Wieselgren with an analysis of its contents as a commentary on the royal letter of copyright (dated 9 March 1639) to Stiernhielm for his planned works, inter alia *Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica*.³⁸⁵

In his letter Stiernhielm describes his plans for his dictionary *Adelruna*. He divides it into two parts, the first of which is an antiquarian dictionary of technical terms in Swedish medieval law codes, which he intends to compare with those of the Langobards (i.e. Lombards), Visigoths, Icelanders, Norwegians, Alamans, and the Anglo-Saxons. It is titled *Lexicon Antiquarium*. Stiernhielm finished a sample of this work in *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, that is, "Storehouse of the ancient Swedish and Gothic language," comprising words beginning with the letter A.³⁸⁶

³⁸⁴ That is: "the Journal of the Uppsala Society of Sciences and Letters" (Vetenskaps-societeten i Uppsala).

³⁸⁵ Per Wieselgren, *Brev till Georg Stiernhielm*, Lund 1968, pp. 90–96.

³⁸⁶ Stiernhielm probably based this dictionary (Stockholm 1643) on his sample of *Adelruna*. On verso of the title page he renders the title in Latin as *Antiquarius linguae Scandia-Gothicae* and specifies its contents as follows: "quo Gothicae praeae reliquiae et fragmenta recolliguntur, antiquae leges et legum termini iam desiti vocesque et phrases pene innumerae alta temporum caligine sepultae luci et vitae restituuntur, detergentur, illustrantur", i.e. "in which the remnants and fragments of the Gothic language, the ancient laws and the antiquated terms of the laws and almost countless words and phrases buried in the misty oblivion of time are restored to light and life, cleansed and illustrated." The first draft is preserved

The second part of *Adelruna, Lexicon primitivorum*, is presented as an etymological dictionary of Swedish primitive roots and derivatives in comparison with other languages, which are specified as Hebrew, Greek, Latin, modern German, modern English, modern French, modern Spanish, Old Aramaic, Persian, Phrygian, Etruscan, Sabinian³⁸⁷ and the language of the Perecop Goths on the Crimea.

10.1.2 *Excerpt of the theoretical introduction*

Scopus *Adelrunae sive Sibyllae Sueo-Gothicae* quoad maiestatem linguae consistit 1. in linguae priscae interpretatione, cui inserviet LEXICON ANTIQUARIUM serie alphabetica digestum, cui diversis locis, ubi usus postulat, varii de etymologiis et rebus ipsis per vocabula significatis interseruntur discursus, variae leges nostrates veteres et modernae cum extraneorum, ut Langobardorum, Visigothorum, Alemannorum, Islandorum, Norvagorum, Anglorum, Normannorum etc. plurium, quicunque haberi possunt, conferuntur et explicantur reddunturque tritis terminis legum Romanorum et iuris civilis. Eius rei breve specimen exhibeo in adiuncta charta, ubi pleraque, quae sub litera A cadere possunt antiqua collecta et explicata reperiuntur.

2. consistit in linguae nostrae et aliarum cum ea convenientium vocum linguarum, Hebraeae, Graecae, Latinae, Germanicae, Anglicae, Italicae, Hispanicae modernarum, priscae Arameae, Persicae, Phrygiae, Thuscae, Sabinae, Getarum Precopitarum in Taurica Chersonneso,³⁸⁸ earum quae apud bonos authores haberi possunt etc. ex ipsis PRIMITIVIS fontibus deductione. Cui rei usum praestabit LEXICON PRIMITIVORUM. In quo ad ordinem alphabeticum collocantur *voces primitivae* et simplicissimae, quas sequuntur deinceps sua quaeque derivata cum brevissima sed sufficiente explicatione. Exempli gratia PRIMITIVA GOTHICA sunt sequentia eaque omnia partim monogrammata sive uniliterae, partim monosyllaba, quod primaevam SIMPLICITATEM, PURITATEM, genuinam et ab Adamo profectam PROPRIETATEM et rerum significatarum INDOLEM ipsamque prae aliis EMINENTIAM arguit et MAIESTATEM.

as four leaves under the heading *Specimen philologicum in primam literam A*, see ms. F.d. 13:1, Royal Library, Stockholm.

³⁸⁷ Sabine] Sabinian is today classified as a branch of Sabellian languages.

³⁸⁸ Getarum Precopitarum in Taurica Chersonneso] The Crimean Goths are here named after the Perecop Isthmus which connects the Crimean peninsula to the Ukrainian mainland. When Stiernhielm wrote this, they had attracted the interest of European scholars during almost 50 years, ever since the Austrian diplomat Augier Ghiselin de Busbecq published his famous wordlist of Crimean Gothic (1595). See my footnote 102. They are usually referred to like this, as living on *Chersonessus Taurica*, i.e. the Crimea, or *ad Maeotum*, i.e. on the shores of the Sea of Azov.

10.1.3 Account of the latter lexicographical part

In his letter to the Regency Stiernhielm provides a specimen of his dictionary on primitive word roots. The first root or stem is the ancient Swedish verb *A* with its alleged uses in different senses: (1) as a verb “to possess, owe” (in Swedish “äga”), (2) as a particle with the verbal derivative “to be” (in Swedish “vara”) and as the affirmative derivative “yes” (in Swedish “ja”).

The second root is the stem-form *ba* in the sense of “good” viewed as the etymon of the word for God in Slavonic languages, BOG. Stiernhielm proposes the adjective *god* (‘good’) as the etymon of the Persian, German, and Swedish names of God, *Choda*, *Gott* and *Gud*. At the end of the letter he compares Swedish and Persian words: *phedar* — *fader*; *madar* — *moder*; *berader* — *broder*; *dochtar* — *dotter*; *band* — *band*; *dandan* — *tand*, and *star* — Old English *starre*, Swedish *sterna* (i.e. *stjärna*). Justus Lipsius had already drawn up a similar list of Persian-German counterparts in 1598.³⁸⁹

10.2 *Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica*: twelve theses

Source: F.d. 13:2:2, fols. 1r–2v. Size: 160 x 205 mm.

Dating: According to a note on the title page, these twelve theses were presented to Axel Oxenstierna in Örebro on 5 March 1639. The same date is found on the title page of the Gothic dictionary (F.d. 10).

Contents: Stiernhielm here sums up his theoretical principles in twelve hypotheses. This was probably intended to be the introduction to the dictionary.

(fol. 1r)

ADELRUNA

seu

SIBYLLA SUEO-GOTHICA

priscam gentis et linguae Sueo-Gothicae

eminentiam et maiestatem a temporum

labe et invidiae nube in lucem vindicans.

Praesentata illustrissimo Domino Chancellario Regni Orebrogiae die
5 Martii Anno 1639.³⁹⁰

Tractatus huius fundamenta consistunt in sequentibus positionibus.
Quae authorum probatorum luculentis testimoniis et argumentis
evidentibus probabuntur:

³⁸⁹ Justus Lipsius, *Epistolarum selectarum centuria tertia ad Belgas*, Antverpiae/Antwerp 1614 (first edition 1602), pp. 56–57 (letter 44 to Henric Schotti, dated 19 December 1598). Cf. Section 3.4.3 above.

³⁹⁰ Praesentata ... 1639] This is written beside the title, in the right-hand margin.

1. Posteris Nohae qui post diluvium resederunt in Armenia, circa montes Ararat et in locis vicinis dictos fuisse SCHYTAS ARAMAEOS et SAGAS autoribus Mela, Plinio, Solino,³⁹¹ Eustathio³⁹² etc.

2. Gentis SCHYTHICAE ARAMAEAE partum³⁹³ esse GETAS.

3. Gentis GETICAE partum et sobolem esse GOTHOS³⁹⁴. Contra Cluverium et ipsius sectum: Quod docebitur itidem 1. autoritate historicorum, 2. conformitate priscorum sacrorum, legum, regiminis, morum, 3. et vestigiis, quae extant, linguae vetustae.

(fol. 1v) 4. GETAS GOTHOS post multas successivas migrationes tandem pervenisse in SCANDINAVIAM ibidemque stabiles fixisse sedes indidemque postmodum in varias orbis terrarum oras egressos etc. Contra eundem Cluverium, qui Gothorum antiquam patriam transfert in populares suos Boruscos et obscuri nominis Cassubios.

5. CELTAS, qui potissimas partes EUROPAE, HISPANIAM, GERMANIAM, ANGLIAM etc. primitus occupaverant, eiusdem fuisse cum GOTHIS stirpis et LINGUAE.

6. Linguam vetustam CELTICAM et nostram, qua etiamnum hodie utimur, GOTHICAM, esse priscam ARAMAEAM sive GETICAM sive Schyticam.

7. Verisimile esse et probabilibus argumentis doceri posse veterem linguam ARAMAEAM fuisse vernaculam NOHAE eandemque a CONFUSIONE BABYLONICA EXEMPTAM et per nepotes et posteris IAPHET in nos, IAPHETI sobolem, propagatam in hunc usque diem, quoad ipsam substantiam et primitiva, durare. Idque doceri posse ex vestigiis linguae Aramaeae, quae hinc inde reperiuntur apud autores, atque maxime ex convenientia cum lingua Hebraea. Quae tanta est, ut in primitivis totaliter propemodum ambae concurrant eademque videri possint.

(fol. 2r) 8. GRAECOS multa ex sapientia et lingua circumcolentium Barbarorum, id est Schyto-Getarum, mutuatos fuisse. Et isthuc vocabulorum in utraque lingua affinium ex parte origo.

9. THUSCOS, qui ante Aeneadam in Italiam adventum imperium tenere, gentem fuisse Scythicam³⁹⁵ eademque, qua olim Scythae³⁹⁶ et hodie nos, usos fuisse lingua.

³⁹¹ Mela, Plinio, Solino] The references to these authors and to Eustathius are given in more detail in the text *Adelrunae conclusiones* (Section 10.3.2 below).

³⁹² Eustatio] Eustathius was a 12th-century Byzantine scholar, here referred to in his role as a commentator of Dionysius Periegetes' description of the inhabited world, which Henri Estienne published with Eustathius' commentary in 1577.

³⁹³ partum] In the margin, Stiernhielm suggests the alternative *progeniem*.

³⁹⁴ GOTHOS] In the margin, Stiernhielm first equated *Gothos* with *Scandinavos sive Scanzios*, but then crossed out this addition.

³⁹⁵ Scythicam] *Celticam* has been crossed out and replaced by *Scythicam*.

³⁹⁶ Scythae] *Celtae* has been crossed out and replaced by *Scythae* in the margin.

Quod infallibiliter demonstrari potest ex bene multis vocabulis Thuscis et Sabinis, quae apud varios auctores habentur, praesertim deorum, magistratuum et locorum nominibus veteri sacrorum et regiminis forma etc. Talia sunt *Aesar*, Deus;³⁹⁷ **Ansar*, *Lar*, *Lars*, Dominus; *lord*, *lavard*, *lucumon*, *lagman*,³⁹⁸ Dan. *logmon*; *Vadimon*, Noach, *watuman*³⁹⁹; *Aruns*, legatus, *ara*, *arundmader*, *ärende* etc.

10. Atque hinc fluxisse vocabula ista, quae Gothicae nostrae et Latinae sunt communia, qualia sunt: *oculus*, *auris*, *nasus* et infinita.

11. PHRYGUM et PERSARUM linguas nostrae Gothicae valde esse propinquas. Quod similiter multorum vocabulorum inductione manifestum erit.

12. Linguas HEBRAEAM, Graecam, Latinam, Phrygiam, Persicam in multis debere nostrae GOTHICAE etymon, fontem, originem et primatum.

(**fol. 2v**) Praemissa fusius explicabuntur per Lexicon Gothicum, ubi singula vocabula cum affinibus praedictarum et aliarum linguarum vocabulis conferentur, ponderabuntur, et verum cuiusque etymon eruetur.

10.3 *Adelrunae conclusiones: the twelve theses explained*

10.3.1 Preliminaries

Source: *Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielmi*, ms. XXXII, 1715, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, fols. 37r–48r. I have used the black-and-white-inverted photostat at the Royal Library. For images of fol. 37r from the original and the photostat, see Figures 4a and 4b.

Dating: This text has the character of a draft study, which mainly can be dated to around 1640, though many further comments were continuously added until June 1664 (a dating found on fol. 40v, but not included in the below edition). A remark that Wulfila's New Testament recently has been found in the library of Prague (fol. 36v) shows that Stiernhielm elaborated his arguments in 1649–1651.

Contents: Expounding the twelve theses of his planned dictionary *Adelruna*, Stiernhielm provides the theoretical superstructure of his Swedish lexicography. His explanations essentially pertain to Gothic historiography, but some clarifications belong to his linguistic ideas.

³⁹⁷ *Aesar*] This word refers to the old Teutonic gods, in Swedish *asar*. The word *Aesir* or, as here, *Aesar* was Latinized *ansis*, *ansus* or *aesus* (in the singular); see Helander, *Neo-Latin literature in Sweden*, p. 87. Referring to Edmund Dickinson's etymology in *Delphi phoenicizantes* (Oxford 1655, p. 76), Stiernhielm (F.d. 9**, 52v) argues that *Aesar* derives from Arabic *'asara* and Hebrew *אָסַר*, "to tie, bind".

³⁹⁸ *lagman*] In F.d. 10, 9v, Stiernhielm compares *lucumon* with Swedish *lagaman* and Isl. *lögmon*, referring to Martini's Latin dictionary (Bremen 1623), s.v. *lagh*.

³⁹⁹ *watuman*] In F.d. 10, fol. 9v, Stiernhielm associates *vadimon* with Swedish *watuman*, deriving it from Swedish *wadh* (*vad*), "wade" or Swedish *watn*, "water".

He exemplifies the tenth thesis with a list of the Swedish and Latin words for the limbs of the human body and observes the change between the Latin phoneme C and the Swedish phoneme H.

In his refutation of Philipp Clüver's opinion that the Goths should be termed "Germans", Stiernhielm develops a programme that anticipates Rudbeck the Elder's declarations in *Atlantica*. This topic is found as an exposition of the second thesis. His arguments are that the Swedes are an ancient people, they have had an independent kingdom since antiquity, and they are cultivated, since they have always had their own writing. Moreover, among European nations they hold the primacy of religious worship. In the time of Tacitus, they had laws and were equipped with land forces and a navy. They have had cities long before the Germans, and many other peoples acknowledge their own origins from the Goths (cf. Section 11.5.1).

When referring to Johannes Magnus – the author of *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sveonumque regibus* – Stiernhielm mentions his last name as Magnus (once in the nominative, fol. 37r, once in the ablative, fol. 39v), the patronymic form Magni (three times, fols. 40r, col. 1; 36v, col. 2; 49r, col. 1) or the abbreviated forms Magn. (fol. 43r), Mag. (fols. 43r; 49r, col. 2) and M. (49r, col. 2). In the text edited the abbreviated forms are expanded by the patronymic Magni, which is attested in other Neo-Latin authors as well.

10.3.2 Conclusions from the dictionary *Adelruna*

(37r) Adelrunae conclusiones

1. Posteris NOAE, qui post diluvium resederunt in Armenia circa montes Ararat et in locis vicinis, dictos fuisse SCHYTAS ARAMAEOS et SAGAS auctoribus Mela, Plinio, Solino, Eustathio et M. Catone.

Plinius, *Nat. Hist.*, lib. 4, cap. 12 <§ 81>: Scytarum nomen usquequaque transiit in Sarmatas et Germanos. Nec aliis prisca illa duravit appellatio, quam qui extremi gentium harum ignoti prope caeteris mortalibus degunt.⁴⁰⁰

Mela, lib. 3, cap. 5.⁴⁰¹

Solinus, cap. 52,⁴⁰² Eosdem Sacas appellat ibidemque dicit montem Caucasum a Schythis Graucasum nominari et nivibus candicantem.

⁴⁰⁰ lib 4 ... degunt] The reference with the quotation has been added in the margin.

⁴⁰¹ Mela] Stiernhielm possessed Pomponius Mela's description of the world *De situ orbis* in Henri Estienne's edition, which also includes the description by Dionysius Periegetes: *Dionysii Alex. et Pomp. Melae situs orbis descriptio* [...], Paris 1577. In describing Scythia in book 3, chapter 5, Mela states (on p. 39) that the Scythian peoples are generally called *Sagae*. Stiernhielm's own annotated copy is preserved at Örebro University Library in the Mörner collection; see Otto Walde's article "Om Georg Stiernhielms bibliotek" in *Donum Graepanum*, Uppsala 1945, p. 144.

Dionysius et eius commentator Eustathius Sacas habent versu 750, mihi pag. 98.⁴⁰³

Vide Ann[ium] Viterb[ensem] ad Beros[um], lib. 2 in principio.⁴⁰⁴

Voces Scythicae sunt:

Schyta, *Skytte*.

Graucasus, *Grå-kusen*.

Arima, *En, ett, ädrim* ab *ä, äde*, primas.

Spu, oculus, *speya*, *spå*; *spuere* obsoletum, id est videre, prospicere, praevidere, explorare; *specio.

De Hetrusca veteri lingua, vide *Mithridatem*, fol. 53.⁴⁰⁵

Saga sive Aramaea. *Mithridates* Gesneri, p. 11 et 12.⁴⁰⁶

Veia, *wagn*, vehere, ex Hetrusca; *föra*. veho. *wehen*, <Finnonice> *wia*, ducere et ferre.⁴⁰⁷

Or collem montemque significat. *Or, sandor, standor*. *Or* etiam terram et arenam et glaream significat. Germ. *hort*. In mari etiam

⁴⁰² Solinus, cap. 52] Iulius Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, chap. 52, states that the Persians, in their language, called the Scythians Sacae and designated the Caucasus Mountains as Graucasus, which he translates as “white with snow”. This geographical summary forms a part of Henri Estienne’s above-mentioned edition of ancient geographers; see p. 93.

⁴⁰³ Dionysius et ... Eustathius] Henri Estienne published Dionysius Periegetes’ geographical description of the inhabited world with a Latin translation and with Eustathius’ commentary. In verse 749 Dionysius turns to the peoples east of the Caspian Sea at the river Iaxartes (the Syr Darya in Central Asia). Among them he first mentions the Sacae, whom he describes as archers; see verse 750, p. 98 in Estienne’s edition.

⁴⁰⁴ Annium Viterbensem] See Anniius of Viterbo (Giovanni Nanni), *Antiquitatum variarum volumina XVII*, which was published in Rome in 1498. Anniius’ forgery of the Babylonian historian Berossus is found in book 15. Stiernhielm refers to the second book, in the edition by Jean Petit (Johannes Parvus) in Paris 1515, fol. 109r (CIXr), where Berossus is made to claim that Scythia Saga or Scythia Aramaea in the Armenian plain around the River Araxes was the cradle of humankind after the Flood, and thus the first post-diluvian humans should be called Scythians. Anniius remained an authority in Swedish historiography of the 16th and 17th centuries. See M. Wifstrand Schiebe, *Annius von Vitterbo und die schwedische Historiographie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, Uppsala 1992, pp. 26–63, where Anniius’ impact on among others J. Skytte, J. Rudbeckius, J. Messenius, J. Baazius, Paulinus Gothus, M. Wexonius Gyldenstolpe, Stiernhielm, J. Windekindi and S. Pufendorf is shown.

⁴⁰⁵ Mithridatem] See Conrad Gesner, *Mithridates exprimens differentias linguarum* [...], second edition, Tiguri/ Zürich 1610, pp. 53v–54v.

⁴⁰⁶ Mithridates Gesneri] Gesner, ibidem, pp. 11r–12v, deals with the Armenian language, but confuses Aramaea with Armenia, as does Anniius in *Antiquitates*. Gesner here (p. 12r) states that the inhabitants of Armenia called Noah *Ogygisam Sagam*, which Stiernhielm interprets as “illustris sacrorum pontifex”. Gesner also reports (p. 12v) that Berossus calls Armenia *Saga*.

⁴⁰⁷ wia] In his copy of Gesner’s *Mithridates* (1610), 54r, Stiernhielm in a marginal annotation associates *Vejas* with Finnish *wia*: “A Fin. wia, id est ferre, ducere.”

har dicitur nobis, imo etiam in terra. *Hord*, quod vulgus exprimit *hohl*, id est crasso, ut et *bord*, *bohl*, *ord*, *ohl*, *mor*, *mohl*, et mille alia.

In Armenia Saga ab octo istis hominibus, qui cum Noha in Arca servati sunt, omne genus hominum seminatum est in terris. Berossus.⁴⁰⁸ Eadem etiam vocatur *Armenia Araxea* a fluvio Araxe, quem Plutarchus prius Bactrum vocatum tradit. Ortelii Thesaurus.⁴⁰⁹ Marcus Cato in fragmento.⁴¹⁰ Siquidem principatus originis semper Schythis tribuitur, a quibus auctis colonias per orbem missas ferunt.

Bactrus: Bactrianae regionis fluvius ex Tauro monte⁴¹¹ oriens.

Bactriana eadem est Armenia Araxea. Bactrianam cum Margiana, Sogdiana et Sacarum regione hodie Tartariam Zagathaeam dictam scribit Mar. Niger.⁴¹²

Getica sunt: **Gebeleize**.⁴¹³ *Blizen. blixen.* ita ut explicat Joa[nnes] Magnus in initio,⁴¹⁴ si memini. Loccenius ducit ab *geb lijsa*, da lenimentum (quantum inepte). Gothis, Getis in Moesia in usu fuit omnibus fere verbis et multis nominibus praefigere particulam *ge-geblizen*. fulgurem. *Gebli*, fulgur, Esthonibus adhuc in usu.

Phrygia sunt:

Cybele. *Kubb, Habbila. Rhea, Frea eadem.*

Gallus. *Gälling*. Vide omnino Ann[ium] Viterbens[em] f. 35b.

Bek vel kek.⁴¹⁵ *baka kaku*. Illud a *baka*, hoc a *koka*.

Fruti. Venus. *Fru. Frutta*. Diminutio.

Πῶρ. *fur*. (Plato in Cratylo)⁴¹⁶

⁴⁰⁸ Annii of Viterbo, *Antiquitatum variarum volumina XVII*, in the edition by Jean Petit (Johannes Parvus) in Paris 1515, fol. 109r, in the text pretended to be written by Berossus: “siccato ab aquis orbe non fuisse nisi dictos octo homines in Armenia Saga et ab his omne hominum genus in terris seminatum fuit.”

⁴⁰⁹ Abraham Ortelius, *Thesaurus geographicus*, which was published in 1587.

⁴¹⁰ The reference to Cato the Elder’s fragments relies on Annii’s forgery.

⁴¹¹ ex Tauro monte] In ancient and early modern geography, mount Taurus could refer to any part of the mountain ranges that extend from south-western Asia Minor to the Himalayas. In this context, it refers to the heights of Hindu Kush, west of the Himalayas. Bactrus is another name of the Balkh river in northern Afghanistan.

⁴¹² Domenico Mario Negri, *Geographiae commentariorum libri XI*, Basel 1557.

⁴¹³ **Gebeleize**] Herodotus, *Historiae* 4, 94, mentions the Getian deity Gebeleizis (also called Salmoxis).

⁴¹⁴ Johannes Magnus (1488–1544), *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sveonumque regibus*, Rome 1554, book 1, chapter 13. See, further, Kurt Johannesson and Hans Helander, *Goternas och Svearnas historia*. / *Johannes Magnus*, vol. 1, p. 106, and Helander’s commentary, vol. 2, p. 102.

⁴¹⁵ bek vel kek] As regards *bek(os)*, see Herodotus, *Historiae* 2,2.

⁴¹⁶ **Πῶρ** ... Cratylo] Plato, *Cratylus* 409 c (Hermogenes): “And what do you say of πῶρ (fire) and ὕδωρ (water)? ... 410 a (Socrates): “Well, this word πῶρ is probably foreign; for it is difficult to connect it with the Greek language, and besides, the Phrygians have the same word, only slightly altered. The same is the case with

Βέδν. *watn*, F. *wetti*. aqua. Hesych[ius]. *Ach.** Germanice aqua. Wehnerus, *Observationes practicae*,⁴¹⁷ in voce *ach*. Graece *ἄχα. Suethice *Aa. Å. aha. aa*.

Campi ante Troiam vocabantur **Grasii**. *gräse*. Item insula ibidem **Oen**. Öön.

Fluvius Gallus **Galin**, quod eius aquae potantes insanos fecerit et eviratos, a *Gall*, sterilis, *gälla*, castrare.

Strymon, fluvius in Thracia, *Strömen*.

Sigtuna. **Sigidunum** in superiori Mysia ex Zosimo.⁴¹⁸ *Singidunum* Ptolemaeo.⁴¹⁹ Velser, *Rerum Augustarum* lib. 7, p. 158.

(37v) Scandinavia. Baltia. Basilia. Basilea. Abalum.

Huius <insulae> meminit Solinus, cap. 33 (post Plin. cap. 13, lib. 4).⁴²⁰ Sed Solini exemplaria fere omnia *Gangavia* habent teste commentatore ipsius Joanne Camerte⁴²¹ ad dictum locum vel ut distinguunt alii cap. 23. NB. Pomp. Mela: Thule Belgarum littori apposita est.⁴²²

ὕδωρ (water), κύων (dog), and many other words.” English translation by Harold N. Fowler, *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, vol. 12, Cambridge, MA, 1921.

⁴¹⁷ Paul Matthias Wehner, *Practicae iuris observationes selectae*, Francofurti ad Moenum/ Frankfurt am Main 1624.

⁴¹⁸ ex Zosimo] The Greek historian Zosimus, whose *Historia nova* comprises the history of the Roman Empire from Augustus to the time just before the sack of Rome by the Goths under Alaric in 410 AD.

⁴¹⁹ In his *Geography* Claudius Ptolemy describes the location of the Roman fortress Singidunum (Σινγιδούνον) at the confluence of the Sava and Danube rivers, where Belgrade is now situated.

⁴²⁰ Solinus ... Plinius] In Giovanni Camers' edition (Vienna 1520), the passage here referred to is found in Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, chapter 33, In Estienne's aforementioned edition, the passage referred to occurs in chapter 23, which corresponds to chapter 20, § 7, in modern editions. Both Giovanni Camers and Henri Estienne have the reading Scandinavia instead of Gangavia. The cited passage reads: “Scandinavia insula e regione Germaniae” (Camers' edition, p. 159, Estienne's edition, p. 54). In Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis historia*, book 4, chapter 13, there are two pertinent passages in §§ 95–96. In § 95 Pliny states: “Xenophon Lampsacenus a litore Scytharum tridui navigatione insulam esse immensae magnitudinis Balciam tradit, eandem Pytheas Basiliam nominat.” In § 96 he writes: “inmanem ad Cimbrorum usque promunturium efficit sinum, qui Codanus vocatur, refertus insulis, quarum clarissima est Scatinavia, inconperta magnitudinis, portionem tantum eius, quod notum sit.” See further Josef Svennung, *Skandinavien bei Plinius und Ptolemaios*, Uppsala 1974, pp. 34 f.

⁴²¹ Camerte] Giovanni Lucca Ricuzzi Vellini, known as Giovanni Camers/ Camerte (1468–1546), professor of philosophy in Padua and Vienna, published a commented edition of Solinus' *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*: In C. Julii Solini *Polyhistora enarrationes*, Vienna 1520, where the passage cited is found on p. 160, line 2.

⁴²² NB. ... appositus est] This has been added in the margin. The quotation from Mela is found in *De situ orbis terrarum*, book 3, chapter 6 (the latter half).

Diodorus Siculus, lib. 5, cap. 23: “E regione Schytiae supra Galliam in Oceano insula iacet quam Basileam vocitant. In hanc succinum large a fluctibus expuitur, alias nusquam in orbe terrarum se exhibens.”⁴²³

(38r) 2. Gentis SCHYTHICAE ARAMAEAE partum et subolem esse GETAS.

(38v, col. 1) Sueci Gothi an sint gens Germanica? Affirm[at]⁴²⁴ argumentis: 1. linguae, 2. corporis habitu, 3. vestitus, 4. morum, 5. legum similium et olim regiminis formae, 6. sacrorum. His accedunt 7. auctoritates scriptorum eos Germanis annumerantium. Quorum in numero est Tacitus.

Responsio. Sex prioribus argumentis nullo modo concludi posse Suecos esse gentem Germanicam magis quam Germanos esse Suecorum progeniem. Eadem enim ratione Germani essent Galli vel e diverso. Fratres esse uterinos quasi vel eiusdem stirpis consanguineos omnino haecce convincunt, ut recte ait Cluverius, p. 29.

Taciti auctoritatem quod attinet, unicus est, qui Septentrionalium partium ignarus Suionas populis Germanicis accenset.⁴²⁵ **(38v, col. 2)** Non aliter Plinius et reliqui omnes uno errore tenentur. Cluverius hic etiam refellatur, qui etiam Finnos et Aestios etc. inter Germanos collocat. Quo respectu Tacitus excusandus venit, qui illo tempore Romae ignorare potuit. Verum Cluverius ipse Borossus, qui facile nosse potuit ad minimum Aestios et audire de vicinis Finnis etc.

(38v, col. 1) Quod vero si quis omnino harum nationum unam ab altera creatam contendat idque pervicerit adeo ut probatum dare queat Germanos progenitores extitisse Suecorum et Gothorum, tantum profecto abest, ut hoc nobis dedecori verti posse putem, ut etiam in summa hoc laude collocem a gente tam forti ac per universum terrarum orbem celebratissima natales et cunabula ducere.

Stiernhielm has the reading *apposita* “situated by the side of” instead of *opposita* “situated opposite to”, which is the reading that Henri Estienne chose in his 1577 edition.

⁴²³ Didorus of Sicily, *Bibliotheca historica* 5, 23: “Directly opposite the part of Scythia which lies above Gaul (Γαλατία) there is an island in the Ocean which is called Basileia (Βασιλεία). On this island the waves of the sea cast up great quantities of what is known as amber, which is to be seen nowhere else in the inhabited world.”

⁴²⁴ Affirmat] Stiernhielm accounts for the arguments proposed by Philipp Clüver whose *Germania antiqua* (1616) he used in the second edition in Leiden in 1631.

⁴²⁵ Suionas ... accenset] This sentence has been added above the line and replaces the following sentence: *Oceani Germanici insulam putans, eam ut terminis Germaniae ultimam appendicem Germaniae continenti adnumerandam*. In the margin (38v), Stiernhielm adds as a reflection: *Tacitus nusquam meminit Scandiae*.

Verum qui serio hanc nobis conficeret genealogiam nemo dum, quod sciam, repertus est. Nec facile reperietur, nisi qui ignorat:

1. Gentem Suecicam esse omnium, quae in Europa sunt, antiquissimam.
2. Nec ullum antiquius extare regnum.
3. Inter Septentrionales cultissimam, etiam prae Germanis.
4. Quippe quae literas habuerit iam inde a principio.
5. Quarum etiamnum extant vetustissima monumenta.
6. Apud quos deorum templum primum et unicum in universa Europa Septentrionali, et sic deorum et sacrorum in alios propagatorum primatus.
7. Qui forma reipublicae exactiore, utpote absoluta monarchia regnabantur, cum adhuc Germani plerique tempore Taciti barbaro ritu sine legibus, sine certa regiminis forma viverunt.
8. Eodem tempore prae illis, viris, armis, classibus valebant.
9. Et opibus studebant.

(38v, col. 2) 10. Urbes etc. longe ante quam Germani habitabant.

11. Et magni nominis viros existimare Germanos ex Asia per Sueciam migrasse.

12. Multas etiam nationes easque celeberrimas, si minus omnes, a Suecis Gothisque originis gloriam ducere. De Francis, vide Martin. in *Scandia* et in *Francus*, vide Cluv. p. 629.

Unde concludendum esset Germanos potius Suecis debere exordia. Utut sit, certissimum esse utramque gentem unius patris esse posteritatem, eorundem linguae et morum.

Adde Suecorum gentem nunquam sedibus suis pulsam, nulla alia permixtam, integram a prima ex Asia migratione in Suecia summi Numinis gratia in hunc usque diem permansisse, singulari prae omnibus in mundo nationibus Dei beneficio.

Germanorum nomen non fuit nisi 5 exiguis nationibus inditum a Gallis. Cluv. p. 44. l. 36. Nullum olim nomen omnibus Germanorum nationibus commune extitit.

An ergo Sueci Schythae? Affirmo: 1. quoad primam originem ex Schythia Aramaea; 2. siquidem et eodem respectu tam Germani, quam Sarmatae Schythae reputati; 3. quod Scandinavia sub Schythia Europaea ab vetustis Geographis collocata est.

Annon igitur Celtae sunt? Pernego.⁴²⁶

⁴²⁶ Pernego] Stiernhielm crossed out his first diversified answer: "Affirmo quatenus Celtae sunt [sic!] omnes nationes, quae hac utuntur lingua. Nego quatenus in Schythia nulla gens reputetur Celtica. Mixtam ergo recte dixero CELTO-SCHYTHICAM, et ita appellatam video apud Ortel[ium] in Thesauro voce *Schythae*." In the subordinate clause beginning with *quatenus* after *affirmo* the subjunctive *sint* is expected instead of the indicative *sunt*.

(39r, col. 1) 3. Gentis GETICAE partum et sobolem esse GOTHOS. Quod docebitur 1. autoritate historicorum, 2. conformitate priscorum sacrorum, legum, regiminis, morum, 3. et vestigiis, quae extant, linguae vetustae. Idque ex Ablavio et Dexippo docet Jornandes. Vide Cluverium, p. 629, quem inter alios sequitur etiam Scaliger, quem refutat Pontanus.

Thucydides, lib. 2 Deinde (inquit) superato Aemo Getas et quicumque alii populi cis Istrum fluvium magis ad Pontum Euxinum vergentes incolebant. Qui sunt Getae et qui plagam illam accolunt, Schytharum finitimi ac similes illis cultu omnes ex equis sagittarii. Tempore Sitalcis Odrysis Regis Thracum sic habitant Getae. Vide Thucyd.⁴²⁷ p. 139. Huius Sitalcis meminit Herod. p. 245.⁴²⁸

Vide etiam Herodotum de Getis ad Istrum, Thracum scilicet omnium fortissimis etc., qui immortales agunt.⁴²⁹ lib. 4, pag. mihi 249. Quorum Deus *GEBELEIZE*, *blixen*. Schythiae fines vide apud eundem p. 251.

Getae longe ante Graecos et Romanos literas coluere et philosophiam. Atque hoc idem de Gothis praedicatur, adeo ut etiam Postellus doceat nullas literas Hetruscis et Gotthicis fuisse antiquiores.⁴³⁰ Quod si itaque Getae non fuerunt Gothi, sed ut aiunt, Sarmatae, sequitur ut Sarmatae hoc sibi laudis tribuere possint. Sed nec ipsi Poloni, scilicet Russacii, Bohemi etc. vel alii hoc sibi vendicarunt nec ullus unquam historicorum tribuit. Quum econtra Gothi suas vetistissimas literas proprias mundo exhibere possint, et universa historicorum familia earundem antiquissimam possessionem unanimi ore et calamo ascribant.

⁴²⁷ Thucyd.] Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian war*, book 2, chapter 8 (referring to Sitalces, Odrysian king of Trace) in the translation of Richard Crawley: “[Beginning with the Odrysians, he first called out the Thracian tribes subject to him between Mounts Haemus and Rhodope and the Euxine Sea (i.e. Black Sea) and Hellespont;] next the Getae beyond Haemus, and the other hordes settled south of the Danube in the neighbourhood of the Euxine, who, like the Getae, border on the Scythians and are armed in the same manner, being all mounted archers.”

⁴²⁸ Huius Sitalcis meminit Herod.] Sitalkes is mentioned by Herodotus, *Historiae* 4, 80 and 7, 37. Johannes Magnus also mentions Sitalces (“Sitalchus”) with reference to Jordanes, who had misunderstood the chronology. See Johannesson and Helander, *Goternas och Svearnas historia/ Johannes Magnus*, vol. 2, p. 126.

⁴²⁹ immortales] Herodotus, *Historiae* 4, 95, states that the Getae thought that they came to their god Salmoxis after death.

⁴³⁰ See Guillaume Postell, *De originibus seu de varia et potissimum orbi Latino ad hanc diem incognita, aut inconsiderata historia, quum totius Orientis, tum maxime Tartarorum, Persarum, Turcarum et omnium Abrahami et Noachi alumnorum origines et mysteria Brachmanum retegente*, Basileae/ Basel 1553.

Hinc Tacitus Suionum civitates <memorat>. Apud Justinum l. 41, c. 4 civitatum vocabulum politiam et cultum infert.⁴³¹ Pagos vocat Germanorum societates nec, quod memini, usquam civitatem dicit. Germanicae gentis encomia vide apud Zanssum in Orat., item in Disp. Basil. vol. V, disp. 1, concl. 1.⁴³²

(39v, col. 1) Nec est quod quis putat Ulfilam Episcopum ipsorum Gothorum et Arrianae sectae primum circa annum A. Ch. 370 ipsis literas dedisse propterea quod ipsis Novi Testamenti paraphrasin⁴³³ in sermonem patrium versam et propriis literis exscriptam dedit. Cur enim ille tunc temporis proprias et ab aliis gentibus diversas literas ipsis confingeret, cum viveret in medio gentium, quae undiquaque iam tum una cum religione literas receperant? **(39v, col. 2)** Vel certe etiamnum Graecis, ut infra patet, usi sunt finitimi Germani. Credibile enim est una cum religione Latinas invectas, id quod etiam nostra in patria factum est, abolitis Runicis, incredibili cum omnis antiquitatis iactura.

(39v, col. 1) Unde rectissime iudicat optime de Gothorum lingua et literis meritis BON. VULCANIUS Geticarum literarum usum apud Getas longe ante Gulphilae tempora viguisse, per Gulfilam vero Romanis primo innotuisse.⁴³⁴ Idem paulo ante dicit ex Joh. Magno⁴³⁵ verisimile esse longe ante inventas literas Latinas et, antequam Carmenta a Graecia ad ostia Tiberis et Romanum solum cum Euandro pervenisset expulsisque aboriginibus gentem illam rudem mores et literas docuisset, GETAS literas suas habuisse. Lege reliqua. **(39v, col. 2)** At ne erres, literae illae, quibus utitur Ulphila, Graecae sunt et Latinae procul dubio, quibus usi sunt Germani in actis publicis et iudicialibus usque ad tempora Friderici II et Rudolphi testibus Lehmanno, Goldasto, Speidelio, Wehnero et aliis.⁴³⁶

⁴³¹ Apud Justinum ... infert] Justinus, *Epitome* (Abridgement of Trogus Pompeius' *Liber historiarum Philippicarum*) book 41, paragraph 1, states that the Bactrian empire comprised thousand cities ("opulentissimum illud mille urbium Bactrianum imperium"). According to book 41, paragraph 4 Theodotus, a Bactrian commander, controlled thousand Bactrian cities ("mille urbium Bactrianarum praefectus").

⁴³² Germanicae gentis encomia ... concl. 1] This has been added on fol. 39r, col. 2.

⁴³³ Novi Testament paraphrasin] This has been added in the margin and replaces *Biblia* in the main text on the line.

⁴³⁴ The Flemish humanist Bonaventura Vulcanius (1538–1614), *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum*, Leiden 1597, dedicatory letter, p. 3r.

⁴³⁵ Idem ... dicit ex Joh. Magni] Johannes Magnus, *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sveonumque regibus* 1, 7. Vulcanius relies almost verbatim on Johannes Magnus (from *longe ante inventas literas literas suas habuisse*), though replacing *Gothi* with *Getae*. Stiernhielm quotes from Vulcanius, *ibidem*, dedicatory letter, p. 2v.

⁴³⁶ At ne erres ... et aliis] This paragraph has been added in the margin. Stiernhielm cites the same authors in *De linguarum origine praefatio* (see Section 12.4), p. 40.

(39v, col. 1) Certum quidem authorem se habere negat, verum ex iis quae sequuntur probabile esse dicit. Vide Postellum p. 42, ubi literas Etruscas et Gotticas pro antiquissimis habet. Eundem vide passim, praecipue p. 18. 19. Item p. 33, ubi dicit Gallos literas omnino a GOMERO longe ante Graecos, qui a Cadmo primum suas acceperere, habuisse. Et Latinos ab Gallis et Hispanis 1300 annis ante habentibus literas accepisse, p. 34.

(39v, col. 2) Quin et ipsae, quibus nostri maiores usi fuerunt, Runicae, aliae non sunt quam Graecae, antiquae, barbatae et imperite effigatae et mutilatae, quod idem in literis quibusdam Ulphilae, imo etiam ipsis Latinis fuisse priores (quae etiam Graecae sunt) contigit. Eas a Graecis fuisse priores nullum ex iis constans monumentum probabit.⁴³⁷

(39v, col. 1) Atque inde elucet Suecos et Gothos originem non traxisse a Germanis, uti quidam coniectantur. Germanis enim non habuisse literas tempore Taciti vel Caesaris. Semper enim Suionum gens cultior habitu est gente Germanica, quod etiam ex Tacito non obscure colligitur, ubi de Suionum regimine verba facit.

(39v, col. 2) Imo Scandinavia ipsa Germaniae caput est et Ingaevones ipsi Scandinaviae indigenae, Germanorum primi. Idem Sueci, Sueones, Suevi ibidem. Mons Sevo⁴³⁸ Graecis auctoribus pro Sueo vel Svevus difficilis Graecis scripturae. Hinc Suevorum in ipsa Germaniae continente, Francorum, Saxonum, Teutonum etc. exitus et origo.⁴³⁹

(39v, col. 1) Ante tempora Caroli Magni in Germania literae Latinae non fuere in usu, sed Graecae, ad scribendum scilicet idioma Teuthonicum. Taciti tempore nemo nec ex primoribus nec ex plebeiis legere vel scribere potuit. Vide Speidel. ex Lehmanno haec allegante, p. 864. **(39v, col. 2)** Jod[ocus] Willichius in Germania Taciti omnes rationes et acta Graecis literis usque ad Rudolphum Imperatorem (qui circa annum 1273 ad regnum pervenit) Germanos scriptitasse testatur. Speidelius mihi pag. 858. et eae sunt literae illae, quas pro Gothicis venditat Vulcan[i]us.

(39r, col. 2) Getas esse Thraces adseverat Strabo lib. 7 et Mela lib. 2 cap. 2, Cluv. p. 37. *Bria* in urbium nominibus, quale est *Selimbria*, *Mesembria*, significare idem pro Celtis, *Bria*, *Briga*,

⁴³⁷ Quin et ... probabit] This paragraph has been added in the margin.

⁴³⁸ Mons Sevo] Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* IV, 96, and Solinus, *De mirabilibus mundi* 21, locate the Sevo mountain in the country of the Ingaevones. Stiernhielm here maintains that the Ingaevones inhabited Scandinavia, but in his *Anti-Cluverius* (pp. 121–123) he argues that the Sevo mountain was not situated in Scandinavia.

⁴³⁹ Imo Scandinavia ... exitus et origo] This paragraph is a marginal addition.

Burgum. Cluv. p. 49. l. 50, imo *Bro*. Getae ad mortem paratissimi sunt etc. Mela lib. 2, cap. II, de situ orbis. Vide Loccen[ium], de Schythis dissert. 2, cap. 5. Vide Martin[ium] in *Gothi*.

Ex Gothorum in Thracia (quae hodie Bulgaria est sive Turcia) lingua videntur ea vocabula, quae hodie Gothicae nostrae cum Schlavonica, Moschovitica et Polonica sunt communia, in Schlavoniam migrasse. Talia sunt *likar*, *lekiare* [...nitza?] [...tz?] etc. Traces enim et istae gentes confines sunt et invicem bellis et consortiis mixtae. Quin et ad harum linguarum mixturam multum iuvat Gothorum in Moesia et circa Danubium vetus patria. Quae iam maximam partem a gentibus Schlavonicis insidetur, hodie Moldavia et Walachia.

(40r, col. 1) 4. GETAS GOTHOS post multas successivas migrationes tandem pervenisse in SCANDINAVIAM ibidemque stabiles fixisse sedes indidemque postmodum in varias orbis terrarum oras egressos.

(40r, col. 2) Qua via? Vix per Germaniam, ut amoeniorem terram et fertiliorem. Id enim de Germanis verisimile non videtur Tacito, ut Asia, Africa vel Italia relictas aliquis Germaniam peteret, informem terris, asperam coelo. etc. Vide Cluver., cap. 4, lib. 1. Ergo per terras Sueciae minus laetas, borealiores scilicet vel minus cultas. etc. Sed quaeritur an ipsorum arbitrio steterit stare aut ire?

De migratione gentium insignem locum Senecae, vide apud Pontanum, p. 642, l. 30. A Borea Austrum versus pleraeque populorum migrationes. Idem, p. 640 et 641.

Solinus. Mons Sevo etc. initium Germaniae facit. Hunc Ingevones tenent. Vide Pontanum, p. 640. Ergo a Suecis initium, qui et per excellentiam et propter prioritatem *In-woner*. An hinc derivamen in reliquos? Non, sed a rege *Ingve*. Cluverius, inquit, certum igitur est totam Scandinaviam INGAEVONUM occupasse nomen, p. 698. Ingevones interpretatur Aventinus *Ein-woner*, Istevones *Euster-woner*, nostra vetere *yther-woner*, *yste-woner*. *Yst* enim veteres docebant pro *ytst*, quod nunc *yterst*, ut et vet. *ädst*, pro *främst*, nunc obsoletum.

NB. Hermiones, Hermundurus, Hermion. Ego puto genuina nomina esse Germanorum. Germundar etc. atque hinc ortum primum Germanorum nomen, quod nugantur alii. Germanorum nomen etiam Caesari usitatum est, et Ciceroni in *Oratione pro Balbo*. Martin[ium] vide ibi de Thogarma, etc.

Sunt qui Alemannos, Francos, Saxones ut alios ex Scandia deducant praeter Langobardos. Quod colligo ex Cluverio, pag. 629 n. 10. Sed negat Cluverius ibidem.

Cauchi, qui? *Kokins härad* an *Cogeni* Jornandis? Aut ex his orti?

(40r, col. 1) Cimmerii, quorum propaggines sunt Cimbri, Sicambri, Franci, sedibus ad Bosphorum Cimmerium a Gothis fuere exuti authoribus Herodoto et Beroso circa A[nnum] M[undi] 3520. Lazius, *De migr[atione] g[entium]*, lib. 3, p. 43.⁴⁴⁰

Gothi in Mysia. Strabo (sub Augusto vixit) lib. 7 sic scribit:⁴⁴¹ In Thraciam nostris annis Aelius Cato ex trans-Istra regione quinquaginta Getarum millia illic habitatura traduxit. Quae gens eadem, qua Thraces utitur lingua. Qui hac etiam aetate hic habitant Mysique vocantur, videlicet quia et prius eo nuncupabantur nomine.

Valachiae ad meridiem terminus est Ister.

Gothi e Scandia duce Berico egrediuntur authore Joh. Magni circa A[nnum] M[undi] 2532.⁴⁴² Id vero fabulosum asserit Pontanus, p. 676, eos dicens primum egressos post nativitatem Christi circa annum 190, p. 682 et pag. 59.⁴⁴³

(40r, col. 2) E Scania egressos Gothos arguit: 1. quod Scandiae Rex Rodulf ad Theodericum in Italiam ut gentilem migravit. 2. Quod Gothi Herulique legatos miserint in Scandiam (de quo Pontanus, p. 682, l. 5, et seqq. Confer omnino Cluver. p. 657) autoritate Procopii,

⁴⁴⁰ Lazius ... lib. 3, p. 43] Wolfgang Lazius (1514–1565), Austrian historian and physician, *De gentium aliquot migrationibvs, sedibus fixis, reliquiis, linguarumque initii et immutationibus ac dialectis libri XII*, first published in Basel 1557, book 3, at the beginning (p. 43 in the 1600 edition): “Cimmerios, quorum propaggines per Europam late quondam diffusas aliosque Cimbros, Sicambros alios Francosque appellatos, in confesso est in Pannonias transgressos videlicet, cum sedibus ad Bosphorum Cimmerium Gothis fuissent exuti, non solum ex lib. IV. Herodoti elicitor, sed perscripsit hanc ad plenum, quod aiunt, historiam Berossus Chaldaeus, qui duce Meradaco id contigisse anno a creato mundo MMMDXX advertit.” See Herodotus, *Histories* 4, 11, 12 f. Since the Creation of the world was dated to about 3960 BC, the expulsion of the Cimmerians from the Cimmerian Bosphorus (i.e. the Kertch strait at Crimea on the Sea of Azov) would have taken place in 440 BC according to Annius of Viterbo’s forgery of Berossus.

⁴⁴¹ Strabo, *Geography*, book 7, chapter 3, section 10: “In our own times, Aelius Catus transferred fifty thousand persons from the country on the far side of the Ister into Thrace from among the Getae, a tribe with the same tongue as the Thracians. And they live there in Thrace now and are called Mysians (Μύσοι). Whether those of former times were so designated, and had their name slightly varied in Asia into Mysians, or, as is more suitable to the poet’s history and his expression, those in Thrace were at the first called Mysians, is not certain.”

⁴⁴² Gothi e Scandia ... 2532] Johannes Magnus, *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sveonumque regibus* 1, 15, thus dates the migration of the Goths from Scandia under king Berik to around 1428 BC. See Kurt Johannesson and Hans Helander, *Goternas och Svearnas historia/ Johannes Magnus*, vol. 2, pp. 91 and 103.

⁴⁴³ Pontanus ... p. 682 et pag 59] The work referred to is *Rerum Danicarum historia*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam 1631, by the Dutch historian Johannes Isacius Pontanus (1571–1639). In F.d. 14a, p. 5, Stiernhielm added a similar note: “Gothos e Scandia egressos A[nno] C[hristi] 161 ex Dione probare nititur Isac. Pontanus, p. 676. Post[ea] p. 682 ait Gothos Scandia egressos A[nno] C[hristi] 190.”

qui Scandinaviam vocat *Thulem*, quod nec abnuit Cluverius, dicta pagina.

(40r, col. 1) *Juti. Joeti, Jöti, Jättar*, Cimbri, gigantes Pontanus, *Rerum Danicarum <historia>*, p. 57, lib. 5. Juthi Gothi <p.> 653. Bedae scribitur *Geada* pro *Jute* (Geta).

Inquirendum omnino in nomen et initium civitatis Dantisianae ad confutendum Cluverium, p. 637, lib. 20. Etiam in Littawia est oppidum Gedan.

Gothonos, qui ad Vistulam residerunt, procul dubio sunt Gepidae, qui ulteriori expeditione sprete ibi residerunt. Jornandes. Vide Cluverium, p. 630, lib. 40.

Electrum ubi nascatur. Cluv. p. 7, lib. 10 et 35. Pontanus 669. et 659, <lib.> 30. Egregium quoque errorem vide p. 691, lib. 48. 688. Ante omnia vide pag. 652, 655 et tot. cap. 38, lib. 3.

Prussia Aesthiorum quondam et ante hos Venedorum sedes. Hi vero Venedi⁴⁴⁴ sunt Fenni.

(41r, col. 1) 5. CELTAS, qui potissimas partes EUROPÆ, HISPANIAM, GERMANIAM, ANGLIAM etc. primitus occupaverant, eiusdem fuisse cum GOTHIS stirpis et linguae.

Germanos eiusdem semper cum Galatis Celtisque seu Gallis et linguae et originis fuisse asserit Lazius, p. 33.

Quin imo Germanos et plures nationes e Gothis originem traxisse multis asserunt. Vide Cluverium 629, lib. 10, negantem.

De Germanorum origine et populis vide Hadriani Iunii Bataviam,⁴⁴⁵ cap. 21. Idem de Celtis, quod Germani fuerunt, non Galli, cap. 22. Pag. 355 ait e Scandia erupisse Vandalos, Gothos, Danos, Burgundiones, Pictos.

An etiam ex Sueonibus (qui iidem Suethi, Sueci, Suedi) Suevi. Suezzi in Luzitania, Suizzeri in Helvetica. Suebi apud Ortel[ium], Swaben, Schwaben.

⁴⁴⁴ Venedi] Pliny the Elder (*Nat. hist.* 4,97) and Tacitus (*Germ.* 46,1) mention the tribe of *Venedi*. In early modern Latin literature, the name *Venedi* could refer either to Wendic, that is, Slavonic, tribes on the coasts of the southern Baltic or to the Finns. See Helander, *Neo-Latin literature in Sweden*, p. 286.

⁴⁴⁵ Hadriani Junii Bataviam] Hadrianus Junius, *Batavia, in qua praeter gentis et insulae antiquitatem, originem, decora, mores aliaque ad eam historiam pertinentia declaratur*, Leiden 1588. Stiernhielm possessed this work (see Section 15.1 below). Exploring the origin of the Germans and their tribes (chapter 21, pp. 348–375), Junius, p. 357, divides the Germanic nations into *Ingevones*, *Istevones* and *Hermiones*. In Chapter 22, pp. 375–381, dealing with the controversy whether the Celts were Germans or Gauls, he argues in favour of the former. Junius' *Batavia* is studied by Coen Maas and Nico de Glas in the conference volume *The kaleidoscopic scholarship of Hadrianus Junius (1511–1575): northern humanism at the dawn of the Dutch golden age*, ed. by Dirk van Miert, Leiden 2011.

(41r, col. 2) Tacitus: Ipsos, ait, Germanos indigenas crediderim minimeque aliarum gentium adventibus et hospitiiis mixtos. etc. Vide Lazium de migratione gentium p. 16.

Germanos ex partibus Septentrionalibus in Europam venisse non pauci asserunt. Inter hos Postellus, lib. de originibus, cap. 21, p. 112, “Magogi,” inquit, “seu Massagi filius primus, dixit Asknazim Germanos, qui primum ex partibus Septentrionalibus irrupere in ea loca, ubi nunc agunt.”⁴⁴⁶ Ex Septentrione confirmat exemplis Sycamborum, Germanorum, Hunnorum, Gottarum, Vandalorum, Persarum, Turcarum Caucasiorum etc. Et paulo post: “Vocabulo Askenazim Hebraei, etiam Asiatici, Germanos hodie appellant.” Dixit an duxit?⁴⁴⁷

(42r) 6. Linguam vetustam CELTICAM et nostram, qua etiamnum hodie utimur, GOTHICAM, esse priscam ARAMAEAM sive GETICAM sive Scyticam. Idque patebit ex lexico et originationibus, tum ex Gethicis et Scythicis vocabulis, qui usquam extant.

(43r, col. 1) 7. Verisimile esse et probabilibus argumentis doceri posse veterem linguam ARAMAEAM fuisse vernaculam NOHAE eandemque a CONFUSIONE BABYLONICA EXEMPTAM et per nepotes et posteros IAPHET in nos, IAPHETI sobolem, propagatam in hunc usque diem, quoad ipsam substantiam et primitiva, durare. Idque doceri posse ex vestigiis linguae Aramaeae, quae hinc inde reperiuntur apud autores, atque maxime ex convenientia cum lingua Hebraea (quae primigeniam sentiunt). Quae tanta est, ut in primitivis totaliter propemodum ambae concurrant eademque videri possint.

Diodorus Siculus lib. 3⁴⁴⁸ ex Ethesia affirmat exercitum Nini adhuc vivente Noë⁴⁴⁹ immensum fuisse. Perdita nimirum ad 1700000 equites 200000 falcatorum currum fere 10600 citante Johanne Magni, lib. 1, c. 2. Item ipse Noë reliquis terrarum orbis partibus filiis divis

⁴⁴⁶ Postellus ... Caucasiorum etc.] Guillaume Postel, *De originibus seu de varia et potissimum orbi Latino ad hanc diem incognita aut inconsiderata historia* [...], Basileae/ Basel 1553, p. 112. Postel here discusses ancient testimonies to the names of the Japhethites. Here he refers to Pomponius Mela, who is the subject of *dixit*.

⁴⁴⁷ Vocabulo ... appellant. Dixit an duxit?] Postel, *De originibus*, 1553, p. 112. Stiernhielm's comment is a critical remark concerning Postel as an authority. “Did he (Postel) state or think so?” It is unclear which writer Postel himself refers to.

⁴⁴⁸ Diodorus Siculus lib. 3.] Citing Ctesias (History of Persia), Diodorus of Sicily, *Bibliotheca historica* 2, 5, 3–4, states that Ninus' army consisted of 1700,000 foot-soldiers, 210,000 cavalry and 10,600 scythe-bearing chariots. Stiernhielm follows Johannes Magnus when writing Ethesias instead of Ctesias; see See Johannesson and Helander, *Goternas och Svearnas historia/ Johannes Magnus*, vol. 2, p. 93.

⁴⁴⁹ In the margin, Stiernhielm adds: *vixit enim 350 annos post Diluvium*.

toti orbi, sed maxime occidentali et septentrionali praefuit. Id ex aliis Johannes Magni, cap. 3.

Omnino NB. quod Suecia etc. 108 annis ante Italiam habitata fuerit et quod BABYLON etc. ferme 24 annis post primum Italiae incolatum principe Nimbrote inceperit. Haec qui credit, ei non difficile est omnia credere. Miror certe Johannem Magni non asseruisse mundum in Suethia creatum fuisse?⁴⁵⁰

(44r, col. 2) Linguam Hebraeam non esse primam contendit Cluv. lib 1, cap. 8, p. 60.

(44r) 8. GRAECOS multa ex sapientia et lingua circumcolentium Barbarorum, id est Schyto-Getarum, mutuatos fuisse. Authore Platone in Cratylo. Et isthuc vocum utrique genti communium originem tractam videri. Sed Barbaros illos alii interpretantur Phoenices et Hebraeos.

Aliter sentit Lazius, qui docet <De migrationibus gentium> lib. 2 (mihi pag. 32) linguam Germanicam mixtam Graecae tribus potissimum de causis. Quas vide toto illo libro de Gallo-Graecis et summatim pag. citata.

Germanos Graecis literis usos ex Caesare asserit idem, p. 46. Plura vide p. 132, ubi et contrariam Annii sententiam refert, scilicet Gallos Italosque libros legesque non a Graecis, sed Graecos potius literas et philosophiam ex Gallis accepisse. Gallis etiam literas proprias easdem fuisse, quae Gothis, p. 133. NB. Galli et Celtae vocati sunt etiam Germani, et affines. Graecorum nugacitas notatur a Postello cap. 10. Literae illae Graecae, quibus usos fuisse tradit Caesar, non sunt aliae quam nostrae Runae, Getis et Thracibus cum Graecis priscis communes. G[eorgius] S[tiernhielm].

Barbaros volunt diu Phoenices, Chaldaeos, Hebraeos, Aegyptios.

Diogenes Laërtius initio de vita philosophorum, “philosophiam,” inquit, “a Barbaris initia sumpsisse plures auctores asserunt.”⁴⁵¹ Annii de Samothe,⁴⁵² ad Berosum, p. 36, verum contradicentem postmodum Laertium refutat. Vide omnino. “Thubal, Samothēs et

⁴⁵⁰ Miror ... creatum fuisse] Stiernhielm expresses doubts concerning the reliability of Johannes Magnus, whose chronology of the peopling of the world he finds too credulous. Stiernhielm probably thought that Mesopotamia as the cradle of civilization must have been peopled before Italy, and in turn Italy before Sweden.

⁴⁵¹ Diogenes Laërtius, *De vita et moribus philosophorum*, the preface: Τὸ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἔργον ἐνιοὶ φασὶν ἀπὸ βαρβάρων ἄρξαι, “There are some who say that the study of philosophy began among the barbarians.”

⁴⁵² de Samothe] Annii of Viterbo, *Antiquitates* XV, fol. 120r, invents Samothēs as a brother of Tubal and Gomer, and thus as a son of Japheth, and makes him the ancestor of Britons and Gauls.

Tuiscon anno 4^o Nini formant legibus sua regna”⁴⁵³, ibidem; de Gallorum libris, p. 37.

Graecia autem non semper ab iisdem est habitata, sed a diversis, ut non sit mirum aliarum quarundam gentium sermonem cum Graeco habere affinitatem. Strabo lib. 7 scribit:

De Peloponesso Hecataeus Milesius tradit eam ante Graecis fuisse habitatam a Barbaris. Et fere tota Graecia antiquitus Barbarorum fuit sedes, quod ex his ratiocinari licet, quae memoriae prodita sunt. Nam et Pelops e Phrygia secum adduxit populum denominatum ab ipso Peloponnesum, et Danaus ex Aegypto, et Dryopes, Caucones, Pelasgi, Leleges alique eorum similes intra Isthmum sita obtinuerunt, quin imo et ea quae sunt extra Isthmum. Atticam enim Thraces, qui cum Eumolpo venerant, possederunt; Daulidem Focidis Tereus, Cadmeiam Phoenices, Cadmi comites, ipsamque Boeotiam Aones, Tembices atque Hyantes, atque ut ait Pindarus:

Tempus erat, porcos (ῥῆας) cum dicerent gentem Boeoticam.

Quin et nomina quaedam prae se barbariem ferunt, ut Cecrops, ut Codrus, Aeclus, Cothus, Drymas, Crinanus.⁴⁵⁴

Hinc multae exoticae voces in eum sermonem sunt ingestae, quem Graecum appellamus. Vide Salmas. Hellenistica p. 403.

Vide Martinium voce *Graecus*, ubi tandem concludit: “Itaque putem aliquando Graecorum fontes dici, qui revera sint rivuli ex alienis.”⁴⁵⁵ Et quia ex citato loco Strabonis integro putet quod Pelops e Phrygia secum adduxerit populum ab ipso denominatum Peloponnesum. Item quid Thraces duce Eumolpo Atticam possiderunt. Facile est coniectari unde cognatio linguae Celticae cum Graeca. Celtica etenim et Phrygia videtur fuisse una, ut liquet ex vocibus Phrygiis *Cybele*, *Gallus*, *bek* vel *kek*,⁴⁵⁶ item ex sacris

⁴⁵³ Thubal... regna] Annius, *ibid.* XV, 120r; cf. IV, 36r: “Anno quarto Nini litteris et legibus format Tuyscon gigas, Celtas vero Samothēs et Celtibros Thubal.”

⁴⁵⁴ Strabo, *Geography*, book 7, chap. 7, section 1: “Hecataeus of Miletus says about the Peloponnesus that before the time of the Greeks it was inhabited by the Barbarians. Even almost the whole of Greece was in ancient times a settlement of the Barbarians, if we are allowed to draw conclusions from former accounts. For even Pelops brought colonists from Phrygia into the Peloponnesus, which took his name; Danaus brought colonists from Egypt. Dryopes, Caucones, Pelasgi, Leleges, and other barbarous nations obtained the country on this side of the Isthmus and similarly the land on the other side of the Isthmus; for Thracians, under their leader Eumolpus, take possession of Attica; Tereus settled Daulis in Phocaea, and the Phoenicians who followed Cadmus, peopled the Cadmeian district (of Boeotia), while Aones, and Temmices, and Hyantes inhabited Boeotia itself. Pindar says:

‘There was a time when we called the Boeotian people swine’ (*hyes*).

Moreover, some names show their barbarous origin, as Cecrops, Codrus, Oeclus, Cothus, Drymas, and Crinacus.”

⁴⁵⁵ Matthias Martini, *Lexicon philologicum*, Bremen 1623, s.v. Graecus.

⁴⁵⁶ bek vel kek] According to Herodotus, *Histories* 2,2, *bek* (βεκός) is a Phrygian word. Stiernhielm juxtaposes the word *kek*, since Joseph Justus Scaliger suggested

Cybeles, quae eadem fuere genti Germanicae in nemore Casti. Thracicam Gothiam fuisse manifestum est, si Gothi fuere Getae.

(45r, col. 1) 9. THUSCOS, qui ante Aeneadum in Italiam adventum imperium tenere, gentem fuisse Celticam eademque, qua olim Celtae et hodie nos, usos fuisse lingua. Quod infallibiliter demonstrari potest ex bene multis vocabulis Thuscis et Sabinis, quae apud varios auctores inveniuntur, praesertim deorum, magistratuum et locorum nominibus veteri sacrorum et regiminis forma etc.

Vide Dissertationem Lubini de Remo.

Nomina propria virorum Thusca It. *Lugumon* et nobis *Laghman* Utrumque etiam est appellativum. Officii est *Olenus* et Etruscus *augur*, nobis vet. *Olo*, *Ole*, *Olaf*, apud Latinos *Aulus*. Huc cieantur vocabula vetera Hetrusca, quae alibi passim a me recensita inveniuntur.

(45r, col. 2) Etrusci, qui iidem Thusci, primi Italiae incolae. Postell. c. 10, p. 41. Thyrcar.

(46r, col. 1) 10. Atque hinc fluxisse vocabula ista, quae Gothicae nostrae et Latinae sunt communia, qualia sunt: *oculus*, *auris*, *nasus* etc.

(46r, col. 2) Vide quod de voce *Burus* argumentatur Cluverius pag. 89. **(46r, col. 1)** Latina lingua conflata est maximam partem ex Graeca et Hetrusca atque hinc harum alterutri sua primitiva debebit. Quicquid igitur ex Graeco fonte derivari non potest, id Hetruscum esse necesse est. At in infinitis vocibus, quae Graecae non sunt, cum nostra conveniat. Inde videtur sequi ut etiam Hetrusca cum nostra conveniat. Quae enim in uno tertio conveniunt, ea inter se conveniunt. At nostra et Hetrusca et Latina conveniunt. Ergo quamquam credibile sit, imo manifestum est in matris <lingua> omnes tres concurrere, Gothica scilicet Hetrusca et Graeca. GS.

(46r, col. 2) Sed et ex Phrygia coalita est lingua Latina. Eam Aeneas secum in Latium intulit. Phryges Troiani orti sunt ex Phrygia Thraciae, ubi ipsis cum Getis fuit lingua una. Et huc pertinent vocabula Phrygia a me observata eiusdem cum nostris Suethicis esse originis.

(46r, col. 1) Membra corporis humani. NB. nostrum H permutatur fere ubique in latinorum C. Exempla habes alibi.

the reading *κεκός* (instead of *βεκός*). Herodotus says that *βεκός* is the Phrygian word for 'bread'. According to the story of Herodotus, Phrygian was to be regarded as the oldest language and people, since two boys, who had been isolated since their birth, articulated this word when they were offered bread.

höfd. huvud. hovd.
 Germanice *Haupt*.
 Teutonice. *hooft. Kopp. Kopf.*
håår. håren.

Finnonice *karva*.
öga. Germanice Augelein.
öra.
läpp.
ör-läpp.
tand.
 Germanice *geel, Kohl, gööl.*
hals. Teutonice kahle. kohle.
backe.
axl.

kinner.
näsa.
arm.
*hert. hierta.*⁴⁵⁷
hiärna.
goom.
 Germanice *Hamme. (gamba)*
lubb, lumb.
knä.
häl. Belgice hiel.
fot.
foot-sola.
ball.
hud.
 Germanice *Fell.*
bard.
a nicka.
hale.
kahl.
ars-hohl.
*fysa.*⁴⁵⁰

caput.

crinis.

oculus.
auris.
labium.
lobus.
dens, dentis.
gala.
collum.
bucca.
axilla ab ala. Non est
diminutivus.

genae.
nasus.
armus, inde armilla.
cor.
cerebrum.
 Lat. *guma.⁴⁵⁸ Γεῦμα⁴⁵⁹ *credo.*
femur.
lumbus. lobus.
genu.
calx.
pes, pedis.
solum. solium.
phallus.
cutis.
pellis.
barba.
nutus oculi.
*cauda (colis), Italice cola.*⁴⁶⁰
calvus.
culus.
*visire, vissire*⁴⁶¹

⁴⁵⁷ hert. hierta. hiärna] In the margin, Stiernhielm gives his usual etymology of *hjärta*, viz. “a *hverva, horva, hurra*, ‘currere, vertere, gyrare’, a perpetuo motu.” He adds: “Cor est fons motus vitalis, cerebrum animalis. Inde enim principium sensuum et nervorum, qui sunt organa sensuum.”

⁴⁵⁸ *guma] Stiernhielm used the symbol * for a non-recorded form (Section 7.7).

⁴⁵⁹ Γεῦμα] Greek γεῦμα means “taste”.

⁴⁶⁰ caulis] i.e., “stalk” (of plants).

⁴⁶¹ fysa. visire, vissire] In the dictionary *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, F.d. 6a, *fysa* is explained *hugas* (i.e. *hågas*) “to be inclined or disposed”.

(47r) 11. PHRYGUM et PERSARUM linguas nostrae Gothicae valde esse propinquas. Quod similiter multorum vocabulorum inductione manifestum erit.

Phrygas Teutonicam linguam habuisse probat Lazius, *de migrationibus gentium*, lib. 3, p. 47.

Jornandes. Ex quorum (Gothorum scilicet) nomine vel genere Trogus Pompeius Parthorum dicit extitisse prosapiam.

(48r) 12. Linguas HEBRAEAM, Graecam, Latinam, Phrygiam, Persicam in multis debere nostrae GOTHICAE etymon, fontem, originem et primatum.

Vide Martin[ium] in Graecus⁴⁶² ubi ex Strabone docet Graeciam non semper a Graecis habitatam, unde non mirum sit aliarum quarundam gentium sermone cum Graeco habere affinitatem.⁴⁶³ Ubi concludit hisce: “Itaque putem aliquando Graecorum fontes dici, qui revera sint rivuli ex alienis.”⁴⁶⁴ Verissime.

In Germania nullae fuere urbes ante tempora Marcellini. Cluverius, <*Germania antiqua*> pag. 636. Id est Anno Christi 350. An in Suecia fuere? Ubsalia. Sigtuna etc.? Quid templa et cultus solennis deorum? Quae Suionum civitates, Tacite?

Gentem Suecicam Germanica tempore Taciti longe fuisse cultiorem arguunt civitates, status monarchicus purus, arma, viri, opulentiae honos, politica armorum custodia. Et haec genti nostrae vitio vertit Cluverius locis, quae vide in indice ipsius Sueo. Ecquae fuit apud Germanos causa contemptus opum? Virtus an torpor et ignavia? Quippe qui in diem vivebant ex raptu, ad agrorum culturam desides. Unde apud Suecos opum honos? An quia industriae suae merces? An quia cultiori iam populo politurae et elegantiae sua cura, suum premium? Confer Germanos hodiernos cum priscis istis cultos cum Barbaris. An nullus apud eos opibus honos? Hic autem semper morum et politiae polituram sequitur. Romanos vide, qui dum prisca vigit simplicitas, e figulinis edebant et hodiernis dormituri stragulis contenti erant? Confer luxum temporum posteriorum etc. Confer hospitalitatem et liberalitatem Sueonum in hoc opum honore cum tenacitatem Germanorum.

⁴⁶² Martin. in Graecus] This reference aims at the etymological Greek dictionary of Matthias Martini, *Lexicon philologicum praecipue etymologicum; in quo Latinae et a Latinis auctoribus usurpatae tum purae, tum barbarae voces ex originibus declarantur* [...], first published in Bremen 1623, s.v. Graecus.

⁴⁶³ Martini, *Lexicon philologicum*, p. 525 in the 1697 edition in Utrecht.

⁴⁶⁴ Martini, ibidem, p. 525 in the 1697 edition in Utrecht.

Cur vero hoc praecipue loco, ubi de regimine Sueonum loquitur Tacitus, de opum apud ipsos honore loquatur et quid sibi velit, non capit Cluverius. Apud Suecos Gothosque quae fuerit ab initio in haec usque tempora fere continuata militiae ratio Cluverium et omnes sui similes rerum domesticarum et falso laudatores externarum aut incuriosos aut lividos contemptores fugit. Hic, explicato quid militia ea eaque stata et forma in Regno, requirat: *homines, equos, commeatum, vestes, stipendium*, atque haec continuata.⁴⁶⁵ Aperietur prudentissimum primorum apud Sueo-Gothos regum consilium et lex (quae habitur *Kongb.*, cap. 11),⁴⁶⁶ cuius sanctione unusquisque civis honestus et integrae famae immunitatem nanciscitur omnium suorum bonorum et praediorum, si seipsum vel sui loco alium equitem cataphractum,⁴⁶⁷ equo et armis ad constitutum precium respondentibus expeditum virum animo fortem et corpore robustum Reipublicae obtulerit eaque sit opum facultate, ut eandem militiam sustinere iugiter ac continuare possit etc. Vides quales sit apud Sueonas opibus honos? Confer leges Visigothorum, item censum Romanorum, huic tamen instituto disparem.

(36v, col. 2) GENTIS GOTHICAE,⁴⁶⁸ toti mundo et universis omnium nationum scriptoribus celebratissimae, sedes, iam a primis

⁴⁶⁵ *homines, equos, commeatum, vestes, stipendium*, atque haec continuata] That is, “warriors, warhorses, food supplies, armours, salaries of soldiers, and such things being permanent ones”. Stiernhielm highlights what he perceives as the key words in the law of the king (*Konungabalken*), which he refers to below.

⁴⁶⁶ *Kongb.*, cap. 11] *Konungabalken*, which is part of the Country Law of Magnus Eriksson from around 1350. Stiernhielm paraphrases a passage, which reads as follows (in Elias Wessén’s revision): “Sålunda skola frälsemän tjäna sin konung: Den som vill hava sin egendom frälse, vare sig han är riddare eller sven, ingen undantagen, han skall hava en så god häst, att den är väl värd fyrtio marker penningar, bättre och ej sämre, därtill sadel för stridshäst, färdig hjälm och fulla vapen, både på kroppen och på benen, intet undantaget av det som en fullgod man må värja sig med.” In § 2, the law of immunity is extended to commoner farmers: “Om så händer, att någon av bönderna vill bliva frälseman, då skall han före den dagen utrusta sig både med häst och med vapen, så att de som skola hålla vapensyn å konungens vägnar kunna pröva hans mandom och frejd, hans häst och hans vapen, så ock om han förmår hålla det frälset vid makt med sin egendom, så som förut är sagt.” Stiernhielm also refers to these laws in *Virgula divina*, fol. 22r.

⁴⁶⁷ equitem cataphractum] In Neo-Latin, the expression *eques cataphractus* refers to heavily armed cavalry. In ancient Latin, the Greek loanword *cataphractus* (κατάφρακτος “covered, decked, clad”) means “heavily armed mounted soldier”. See Helander, *Neo-Latin literature in Sweden*, p. 178.

⁴⁶⁸ *Gentis Gothicae*] This is written as the heading, but forms part of the following sentence (where it is the attribute of *sedes*). Stiernhielm first wrote *Gens Gothica*.

temporibus et Noachidarum ex Asia migrationibus antiquissima, et quam hodie etiamnum incolunt, est Gothia in immensa illa peninsula SCANDIA intra fines Regni Sueciae, quod iam olim ex duobus diversorum nominum unius vero originis et linguae populis in unum coaluit, sita, duabus itidem respectu situationis invicem⁴⁶⁹ appellationibus in Oestrogothiam et Westrogothiam distincta.

Gens, quae lingua et legibus utitur Gothorum iam inde ab immemorabilibus temporibus a prisco aevo, cuius initium adhuc latet historicos, ea gens est Gothica. Sed nostri Sueo-Gothi etc. Ergo minor⁴⁷⁰ probatur ex inductione legum et quae in ipsis habentur vocum Gothicarum, quales sunt *allodium* et aliae voces, quas fatentur originis esse Gothicae, quales sunt *feudum*, *adel*, etc. Tales non fuerunt in usu Borussis vel novi nominis Pomeranis etc.

Aliud. Natio, quae inde ab immemoriali aevo usa est literis, quae vocantur Gothicae, ea procul dubio est Gothica. Sed nostra iis etiam ante Ulphilam usa est, quarum perperam inventor proditur Ulphilas, ut testantur praeter Johannem Magni quamplurimi cippi, qui etiamnum hodie visuntur ante aetatem Ulphilae erecti. Ergo, quid in Casubii vel Pomeranis simile?⁴⁷¹ Esto, sint literae illae ab Ulphila inventae et postmodum invectae. Nonne ut in patriam veterem et consanguineos? Cur non in Borussiam, in Pomeraniam? Vilzos et Velatubos?⁴⁷²

(36v, col. 1, at the bottom of the page) Ulphilas si quas literas invenit, eae sunt, quae ex Graecis et Latinis distortae visuntur in tractatu de lingua Getica Vulcanii. Runicae vero haudquaquam sunt, quippe quarum monimenta visuntur in Suecia longe antiquiora.

⁴⁶⁹ invicem] *inter se* has been crossed out and replaced by *invicem* above the line.

⁴⁷⁰ Ergo minor probatur] “Thus the minor premise is proved”. Stiernhielm here, and in the next paragraph, argues by a syllogism. Here *minor* refers to the minor premise, “Sed nostri Sueo-Gothi”, which is preceded by a major premise, “Gens, quae”, etc., and followed by a conclusion, which begins with “Ergo”. The phrase *Ergo minor probatur* is typical of the dissertational language.

⁴⁷¹ Aliud. Natio ... Pomeranis simile?] In this syllogism, Stiernhielm argues that the Goths have had their own writing since times immemorial. Because it is called Gothic writing, only the Gothic nation can claim it as its own. This is proved by the testimony of Johannes Magnus and by runic stones, which are said to have been raised in Sweden before the time of Wulfila, who is generally considered the inventor of the Gothic writing. Granted that the Gothic letters still were invented by Wulfila and later delivered to Sweden, we must enquire into why they were not introduced in their supposed homeland, namely Prussia and Pomerania.

⁴⁷² Cur non in Borussiam, in Pomeraniam? Vilzos et Velatubos?] That is, “Why, then, was runic writing not introduced in Prussia, Pomerania and among the Wilzi and Welatubi?” Wilzi and Welatubi were Slavonic tribes in Pomerania; see *Dissertatio de originibus Pomeranicis*, in Christoph Harfnoch, *Res publica Polonica* (Francofurti & Lipsiae/ Frankfurt and Leipzig) 1678, p. 43.

Quod tamen ego valde dubium habeo. De antiquitate literarum allegetur Postellus.

Ulphilae Novum Testamentum iam hic est Stokholmiae in Bibliotheca Pragensi repertum.⁴⁷³

(36v, col. 1, from the top of the page) Omnium regum et populorum consensu Gothi habentur et habiti sunt Sueci. Gothorum vera patria Suecia habetur. Gothos Sueonas esse probabitur:

1. Authoritatibus veterum et novorum scriptorum.
2. Regum et populorum consensu.
3. Communibus legibus, institutis, sacris.
4. Lingua.
5. Literis, monumentis.
6. Legibus, de iis qui in Graecia militarunt, specialiter sancitis.
7. Epitaphiis eorum, qui in expeditionibus istis mortui sunt.
8. Rodulfi regis Scanziae profectio ad gentilem suum Diethricum Veronensem, de quo Jornandes.⁴⁷⁴
9. Herulorum legatione Gothorumque in Scandiam, quam vocat Procopius *Thulen* (de quo Pontanus, p. 652).
10. Nominibus Gothorum propriis, Suecis hodie etiam usitatissimis.

Linguam Gothicam Teutonicam fuisse probat Lazius de migratione gentium, lib. 10, p. 547, ex nominibus regum in Dacia, in Illyrica, in Italia etc. vere, licet male nomina illa Germanica restituat. Sed rectius forte, si dicat linguam Teutonicam Gothicam fuisse. Gothicam vero perhibent viri magni matrem.

(40v, col. 1) [...] Si Gothorum sedes fuit tempore Taciti ad Vistulae ripas, ubi nunc? Ibi manent. At nullum est nomen, nullum vestigium, nulla respublica, nullae leges Gothorum nomen praeferentes, nulla terra, nullus locus. Sed pulsi alio recesserunt. A

⁴⁷³ Ulphilae Novum Testamentum ... Bibliotheca Pragensi repertum] That is, "Wulfila's New Testament is now here in Stockholm after it has been found in the (Imperial) Library of Prague." This remark implies that the librarians of the Royal Court actually had identified *Codex Argenteus* with Wulfila's Bible translation before Isaac Vossius passed it on to his nephew Franciscus Junius the Younger for textual editing in 1655. Stiernhielm must have written this comment after the war booty from Prague had reached the Royal Castle in Stockholm in 1649, when it began to be catalogued, and before Vossius brought *Codex Argenteus* to the Netherlands in 1654. Since Stiernhielm left Stockholm early in August 1651, the remark should date between April 1649 and July 1651.

⁴⁷⁴ Rodulfi regis Scanziae profectio] This Herulian king Rudolph is mentioned by Procopius (*Bellum Gothicum* 6, 14). Jordanes tells the story of an unnamed king from Scanza who visited Theodoric the Great in Italy (*Getica* 25). In the Saga tradition, the latter is called Didric of Bern with many variations in spelling, here Diethricus Veronensis.

quo? Quando? Quas in terras? In Suecicas. Ergo eas, quae nunc Ostro- et Vestrogothiae nomine celebres sunt. Nos ergo, non tu Cluveri, Gothica natione et nomine merito gaudemus. Tu enim ex iis, qui Gothis ibi successerunt, sanguinem trahas necesse est, ex Wendis scilicet seu Wandalis, qui Gothos inde expulerunt. Et hoc verum est. Plebs enim Prussiae, ut et Curlandiae et Lithuaniae, Wendica seu Sclavonica est, lingua utens Lettica. Postmodum milites Ordinis Teutonici subiugarunt gentem illam et sub iugum servitutis miserunt, sed non exterminarunt. Quod etiam in Livonia factum est. Ipsi quidem Teutones barbaris istis super-immigraverunt, sed eos non expulerunt usurpantes eos pro servis et aratoribus, quorum laboribus beati fruerentur. Et si tempore Taciti ad Vistulam fuere Gothorum sedes, quid vetat eos ex Scandia eo transmigrasse? [...]⁴⁷⁵

(49r, col. 1) Gothos e Scandinavia profectos, esse a Getis et Dacis diversos, contra Jornandem et alios monstrare nititur Isacius Pontanus his potissimum argumentis:

1. Getarum nomen apud Graecos esse vetustissimum. Gothorum vero appellatio nonnisi paullum ante tempora Constantini cum gentis ipsius in Thraciam irruptione nota esse coepit.
2. Getas esse Thracas demonstrat Herodotus, Strabo et eos secutus Stephanus, *De urbibus*.⁴⁷⁶ Gothos autem seu Guthas Scandiae incolas et Germaniae populis accensendos docent Ptolemaeus, Mela etc. Ergo Gothi non possunt esse Getae.
3. Nullo historiographo demonstrari posse Gothos egressos ex Scandia tot seculis ante Bellum Troianum, Anno Mundi, scilicet, ut vult Johannes Magni, circiter 2530.⁴⁷⁷ Et unde hoc vel

⁴⁷⁵ I omit some remarks on fol. 40v, col. 2, regarding the Saxons, the Ingaevones and Mont Sevo with the dating 11 June 1664: "GS: die 11 Junii anno 1664, Stokholmii." Stiernhielm here refers to the Hadrianus Junius' *Batavia* and Conringius' *De nominibus locorum in Germania communibus locis in Suecia*.

⁴⁷⁶ Stephanus of Byzantium (6th century), *Περὶ πόλεων* which first was published in Greek with a Latin translation (titled *De urbibus*, 'On cities', in Venice in 1502.

⁴⁷⁷ tot seculis ante Bellum Troianum, Anno Mundi ... circiter 2530] The year of the Creation, *Annus Mundi*, was according to Johannes Magnus 3960 BC or in this case 3970 BC. In his world chronology, the Flood occurred 2314 BC, the Gothic egression took place 836 years later, that is, around 1478 BC, that is roughly 2500 BC. For these dates in Johannes Magnus' world cronology, see Kurt Johannesson and Hans Helander, *Goternas och Svearnas historia. / Johannes Magnus*, vol. 2, pp. 91 and 103. Thus, more than three centuries would have passed between the Gothic egression from Scandinavia and the Fall of Troy, which in ancient historiography was dated between 1194 and 1184 BC. (Troy could have been destroyed by Mycenaean Greeks in 1270 BC, 1190 BC or 1050 BC, since these dates corresponds to the destructions of Troy VI, VIIa and VIIb.)

Jornandi vel Dexippo, quem sequitur Jornandes, vel Ablavio, 2000 circiter post innotuerit?⁴⁷⁸

4. In Dacia primum consedere circa annum Christi 161. Itaque Getae esse non potuere, qui multis retro seculis terras illas inhabitant. Atque hunc natam illam confusionem authorum, qui gentem hanc eandem cum Getica et Dacica censebant. etc.

5. Getae sunt populi Daciae Ptolemaeo, atque ab eodem Gutae locantur in Scandia.

[...]⁴⁷⁹ (49r, col. 2) Responsio ad 1: Quasi tanta esset differentia inter *Geta* et *Goeta*, ut pro uno nomine non possit haberi. Nec vox *Gothus* recte exprimit gentis huius verum nomen. Se enim ipsos *Göthas* vocant. Scribendum proxime Latinis literis *Goeta*.⁴⁸⁰ Nec enim Latini literam habent, qua *ö* exprimant.

Ad 2 responsio: Inter Thraces sunt Scythae. Imo ipsimet Thraces possunt gens esse Celtica et habitare in medio Schytharum et Sarmatarum etc. Et hoc innuit benedictio illa divina: Dilatet Deus Japhet et habitet in tabernaculis Sem, etc.⁴⁸¹ Gentem Germanicam incoluisse ad Paludes Moeotidos⁴⁸² dubitari non debet. Adscribantur versus Dionysii ex Goropii *Francica*, p. 6.⁴⁸³ Quin et Herodotus⁴⁸⁴ Germanos recenset in exercitu Herodoti, quicquid sive Pontanus sive Cluverius pro lubitu et more suo omnia ad suum sensum

⁴⁷⁸ unde hoc vel Jornandi ... innotuerit] The historian Jordanes of Gothic descent flourished around 550 AD, when he wrote his account of the Gothic past, *Getica*, closely following the now lost gothic history of Cassiodorus; see *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, third edition (2003), s.v. Jordanes, p. 798.

⁴⁷⁹ [...] I here omit a passage (49, col. 1) on the coincidental derivation of ethnic names from a region of a country, such as the Finnish designation of Sweden as *Ruotsi* from the region *Roslagen* on the western opposite coast.

⁴⁸⁰ Goeta] Stiernhielm first wrote *Goetha* and then crossed out the letter *h*.

⁴⁸¹ Dilatet ... tabernaculis Sem] Gen. 9:27: "May God enlarge Japheth and may he dwell in the tents of Shem."

⁴⁸² Paludes Moeotidos] This is "the Sea of Azov". Stiernhielm here uses the Greek genitive *Moeotidos*.

⁴⁸³ versus Dionysii ex Goropii *Francica*] In Emperor Hadrian's time, Dionysius Periegetes compiled a geographical description of the inhabited world. Goropius Becanus quotes from it in his book on the Franks (*Francica*) in *Opera hactenus in lucem non edita nempe, Hermathena, Hieroglyphica, Vertumnus, Gallica, Francica, Hispanica*, published posthumously in Antwerp in 1580. Each book has a separate pagination. In *Francica*, p. 6, Goropius thus quotes some verses from Dionysius Periegetes on the peoples inhabiting the area north of the Azov Sea in Greek, with a Latin translation, which reads as follows:

Hinc Boream versus variae multaeque morantur
gentes, post alias aliae Maeotidos usque
ostia: Germani, Samatae, Geta Bastarnaeque.

Hinc regio haud facilis Dacorum, hinc fortis Alanus.

⁴⁸⁴ Herodotus] See Herodotus, *Historiae* 1, 125, where 16th-century editions have *Germanioi*, while Clüver and Pontanus proposed the reading *Caramanioi*.

invertans substituat *Caramanos* etc., causatus nomen Germanorum esse novum. Quod ego non puto etc. Hermiones, Hermunduri etc. [...] lingua Persica. Sacae et Dahae.

Responsio ad 3: Nec Tacito ullus fuit scriptor, a quo ille cognoscere potuit gentis Germanicae authorem fuisse Mannum, cui filii fuere Ingaevones, Hermiones et Isthævones etc. Sed regeris: Habuit ille hoc ex carminibus Druidum (quod solum memoriae genus apud Germanos). Concedo. Et Dexippus et Ablabius, a quibus ista habuit Jordnandes et post eum Johannes Magni, sua habere potuere ex carminibus gentis Gothicae, imo ex literarum monumentis neque illi literis caruere tot seculis quot Germani. Huc de Vulfila opinio, quae refutetur. Stabiletur autem haec sententia verbis Postelli et aliorum. Et quid? Putasne adhuc in ipso Septentrione literis et carminibus celebrari Gothorum res gestas ad Troiam? Non dico de postrema hac expeditione et direptione Troiae facta a Gothis tempore ⁴⁸⁵ circa annum a Christi nato, sed de priori illa Graecorum etc. Si placet, exemplar monstrari potest veteri lingua Gothica ex ipsis literis Runicis transcriptum, quod asservatur apud virum etc. Johannem Bureum titulo *Trojomanna-saga* etc. Consule etiam Wormium in *Runis* etc. Et si hic fama gentium, communi ore celebrata, carmina et a maioribus tradita nullum locum habebunt, rogo, ut Romanorum, ut Graecorum, ut Chaldaeorum, ut Germanorum virorum et nullius non gentis primordia certis, claris et indubitatis omnique exceptione maioribus documentis literariis mihi exhibeatis. Verum quod Livius de Romae etc. initiis ipsemet fatetur,⁴⁸⁶ hoc etiam necesse est verum fateatur Aventinus etc. Johanni ergo Magni vitio verti non potest. Vide Cluverium p. 683, lib. 20.

(49v) Responsio ad 4: Gothi in Dacia consedere primum circa annum Christi 161. Ergo Getae fuere alii, qui iam antiquissimis temporibus consederunt. Concedo. Getas Thracicos vel Dacicos iis temporibus fuisse alios a Getis Scandicis sive Gothis. Hoc vero non vetat, quin eadem gens potuerint esse in genere olimque fuisse unum populum, uno primo satore propagatum, una lingua, unis moribus. Quod equidem etiam hodie contingere posset, si Gothi Sueci Tauricam Chersonesum invaderent. Reperirent enim priscos populares suos ibi Gothos adhuc ex antiquissimis temporibus

⁴⁸⁵] A space of seven dots is found in the manuscript.

⁴⁸⁶ quod Livius ... fatetur] Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, praefatio 6: "Quae ante conditam condendamve urbem poeticis magis decore fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis traduntur, ea nec adfirmare nec refellere in animo est. Datur haec venia antiquitatis, ut miscendo humana divinis primordia urbium augustiora faciat" etc.

resides. Quibus facile propter linguae redintegratum commercium unita⁴⁸⁷ in unam iterum gentem coalesceret.⁴⁸⁸

Getas autem Gothicam gentem fuisse suadere videntur:

1. Lingua. Quod colligitur ex vocabulis quae habentur passim apud authores.
2. Vestitus, inprimis Braccae apud Loccenium.
3. Mores apud eundem. Qui quidem in genere conveniunt Schythis, verum hi Schythae omnino intelligendi sunt non de Sarmatis sive nomadibus, sed de Getis et Gothis. etc.
4. Cultus et sacra, utrique nimirum communia, inprimis Martis et apud Herodotum *Gebeleize* sive *Blixen*, id est Jovis Tonantis.
5. Utrique communis genti opinio de immortalitate animae et contemptus mortis.

10.4 *Anti-Cluverius*: statements of Swedish Gothicism

10.4.1 Preliminaries

Source: *Anti-Cluverius seu scriptum breve Johanni*⁴⁸⁹ *Cluverio Dantisco-Borosso oppositum Gentis Gothicae originem et antiquissimam in Scandia vel Scandinavia sedem vindicans*, Holmiae/ Stockholm 1685, 128 pp. For the titlepage, see Figure 5.

Dating: As demonstrated above (Section 10.3), in his notes titled *Adelrunae conclusiones* Stiernhielm had begun his critical remarks on Philipp Clüver's *Germania antiqua* (2nd ed. 1631) in the years 1640–1642. The treatise was probably more or less finished in 1644. Johannes Loccenius refers to it in the preface to his complimentary poem to Stiernhielm's *Magog Aramaeo-Gothus*. Örnhjälms copy is extant under shelfmark F.d. 14 at Royal Library, Stockholm. It should date to between 1660 and 1663. The occasional marginal notes by Stiernhielm and someone else show that the author was revising the treatise. According to the colophon in F.d. 14, p. 98, Stiernhielm put the final touch on his manuscript on 16 March 1669: "GS. die 16 Martii 1669" (cf. the print, p. 128). In the fair copy, Stiernhielm enters a reservation against his historical assumptions in this essay (see F.d. 14, p. 98). The treatise was published without his reservation by Johan Hadorph, who dedicates the work to Bengt Oxenstierna and dates his own preface 6 May 1685.

⁴⁸⁷ unita] *unitis* is expected, but the manuscript has *unita*.

⁴⁸⁸ Quod equidem etiam hodie ... coalesceret] i.e. "This could certainly happen still today, if the Swedish Goths would invade the Crimea. They would find their ancient Gothic countrymen remaining there since most ancient times. After easily joining them [the Crimean Goths] because of the restored linguistic contact they [the Swedish and Crimean Goths] would grow together into one people again."

⁴⁸⁹ Johanni] This name is a mistake. It should (in the dative) be *Philippo*.

10.4.2 On the great antiquity of the Goths and their homeland

Source: *Anti-Cluverius* (1685), pp. 1–2. Stiernhielm claims that the Goths continuously have inhabited Gothia in Scandinavia since the earliest times after the Flood and have long ago politically merged with the Swedes into the kingdom of Sweden.

(1) *Dissertatio prima: qui GOTH? Et quae vera Gothorum patria et antiqua sedes? Gentis Gothicae universo iam mundo et cunctis omnium nationum Scriptoribus celebratissimae sedes et patria a primis usque temporibus et NOACHIDARUM ex Asia migrationibus antiquissima et haereditaria est GOTHIA, quam hodie etiamnum incolunt in immensa illa peninsula gentium vagina, SCANDIA sita, intra fines Regni Sveciae, quod ex diversorum nominum, unius vero originis et linguae populis, SVEONIBUS ET GOTHIS, iam olim in unum coaluit, ubi duabus itidem a regionum inter situ mutuo appellationibus in OSTROGOTHIAM et WESTROGOTHIAM distinguitur.*⁴⁹⁰ Atque haec constans, propria et perpetua post primam ex Asia mi- (2) grationem est GOTHORUM patria. Extra quam nusquam terrarum nomen GOTHICUM, nisi peregrinum et adventitium celebratur. Id quod praeter omnium populorum et omnis aevi authorum unanimem consensum etiam sacro-sanctarum legum nostrarum vetustissimo ac veridico oraculo comprobatur.

10.4.3 On the migration of the Japhethites from the Caucasus and on their identity with the Scythians

Source: *Anti-Cluverius* (1685), pp. 86–87 and 105–106. Raising the question of whether the Goths and the Swedes by their descent are Scythians or Celts, Stiernhielm argues that the Japhethites migrated in waves from the Caucasus into the different parts of Europe, and that they were known as Scythians until the Greeks and Latins distinguished themselves from the rest and called them Barbarians as a collective term before specifically dividing them into Scythians, Celts or mixed Celto-Scythians. Stiernhielm refers to a number of sources: Flavius Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, Diodorus of Sicily's *Library of History*, and Annii of Viterbo's *Antiquities*, which is based on feigned books of the Babylonian historian Berossus, Hieronymus of Egypt, Mnaseas, and Nicolaus of Damascus.⁴⁹¹ He rejects Clüver's hypothesis that all the peoples of Europe were originally Celts, whether called Celts or Celto-Scythians.

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. *Adelrunae conclusiones*, Section 10.3, remarks on thesis 12 (on fol. 36v).

⁴⁹¹ Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 1, 94, refers to these names. Johannes Magnus, *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sveonumque regibus*, book 1, ch. 1, has a similar list containing some mistakes that he had copied from Annii.

(86) Dissertatio secunda: An Gothi et Sueones Scythae vel Celtae? Demonstratis iam qui et unde egressi fuerint olim Gothi et quae vera ipsorum fuerit et hodie etiamnum PATRIA, merito quaeritur num SVEONES GOTHIQUE SCYTHAE sint an vero CELTAE? In haecce enim nomina universae, quae Europam incolunt gentes dispescuntur. Ad quam questionem distinctius enucleandam paulo altius rem repetendam video. Constat autem autoritate S[acro]S[anctae] Scripturae, nimirum Gen. 8, Arcam Noae statim a diluvio in montibus ARARAT sive ARMENIAE, qui aliter Caspii dicuntur, SCYTHIAE vicinis, non procul ab Araxi fluvio constitisse atque in eo loco primum genus humanum, quod tunc ad octo solummodo animas redactum fuerat, reparatum **(87)** et in proxima primum, mox remotiora loca, cum indies augescentem multitudinem non caperet una regio per colonias transmissum.

Cui sententia merito suffragatur Iosephus, *Judaic. Antiquit.* lib. 1, cap. 4, qui ibidem testatur omnes omnium gentium vetustissimos scriptores, scilicet Berosum, Hieronymum Aegyptium, Mnaseam, Nicolaum Damascenum et alios, eidem sententiae calculum suum adjicere. Quos secutus Diodorus Siculus, lib. 2 *Bibliotheca Historica*, asserit primos gentium SCYTHAS ad Araxem fluvium initio consedissee. Atque hanc primam posterorum Noae circa haec loca propaginem in universum SCYTHAS appellatam fuisse omnes consentiunt historici atque adeo hoc nomen (posteris SEM et CHAM in suas sibi divinitus destinatas terras et alia nomina digressis) posteritati JAPHET ibidem et inde in loca vicina et hinc in ipsam Europam sese dilatanti constanter et in multa tempora remansisse, nec alio nomine ipsos initio Germanos et universos septentrionalis Europae incolas (quod itidem ad Hispanos et Gallos extendit Cluverius, *Antiqua Germania*, lib. 1. cap. 2) distinctos fuisse, usque dum primum Graeci et Latini sese BARBARIS (ita enim omnes reliquos appellabant) eximerent, atque BARBAROS deinceps in SCYTHAS et CELTAS et mixtos tandem CELTOSCYTHAS disternerent.

(105) GOTHOS vero et SUEONAS et universim omnes SCANDIANOS Celtas esse vel nuncupatos fuisse, nemo mihi ullius idonei authoris fide comprobaverit, multo minus (nisi per errorem Celto-Scythas). Nullam enim Dei Optimi Maximi beneficio singulari, iam a primis initiis, Scandia sensit gentium peregrinarum mixturam, de quo alibi fusius. [...] **(106)** [...] Malumus cum primis nostris progenitoribus indubitatis SCYTHIS ARAXEIS sive SAGIS sive ARAMAEIS, SCYTHAE certe manere et nuncupari. Sic enim sive MAGOG sive ASCHENAS sive GOMER vel quivis alius ex filiis vel nepotibus Japhet gentis nostrae conditor et origo fuerit indubitato Scythae erimus. CELTA

ille primus, quis vel unde fuerit vel an ullius nominis unquam homo fuerit et si non qua occasione, quo eventu, quando et ubi nam sit nomen illud, nemo unquam dixerit.

10.5 Digression: *De Hyperboreis dissertatio*

Source: *De Hyperboreis dissertatio*, which was published together with *Anti-Cluverius* in Stockholm in 1685, see the pages 129–169. In F.d. 6, fols. 60v–65v, Stiernhielm’s original draft of this treatise is extant. It must date to his stay in Ingria and Livonia 1651–1653.

In his universal history, *Bibliotheca historica*, book 2, ch. 47, Diodorus of Sicily accounts for the mytho-historical tradition that Hecataeus of Abdera (4th cent. BC) handed down about the people in the north known as the Hyperboreans.⁴⁹² In *De Hyperboreis dissertatio*, Stiernhielm first discusses the location of Hyperborea, which he equates with the Scandinavian peninsula (ibidem, pp. 129–134). He goes on to quote Diodorus of Sicily’s ethnography of the Hyperboreans (ibidem, pp. 135–138) and comments on conspicuous statements (ibidem, pp. 138–142), notably that the Hyperboreans are those who inhabit the regions beyond the north wind (*Boreas*), that they have their own poetry, language, and writing, and that the mythical sage Abaris is said to have renewed the friendship between the Hyperboreans and the inhabitants of the island Delos. Stiernhielm argues that the furthest tracts of the European Continent were considered the limits of the north wind, that the language of the Hyperboreans is the primordial one, that their letters derive from the Greek ones, and that the kinship between the Hyperboreans and the Greeks can be explained by their common descent from Japheth.

p. 138 (c) Boreae terminum statuerunt extrema litora Continentis. Insulam quae ultra iacebat, Hyperboream vocabant. *Ytter-Norsk, Öfver-Nordlingar*.

p. 140 (m) Linguam ipsis propriam eandemque primigeniam volente Deo demonstrabo.

p. 141 (o) Literas Runicas nostras Graecas esse alibi demonstro.

p. 141 (p) Cognatio cum Graecis in stipiti Japheti incipit. Hinc quoque linguarum utriusque cognatio demonstrabitur per totum opus meum.

⁴⁹² The Hyperboreans are described by Herodotus (*Histories* 4, 32–36) and Pindar (3rd *Olympian* and 10th *Pythian* song) and are mentioned by Greek authors such as Hesiod, Homer, Sophocles, and Aeschylus, and further discussed by Ptolemy (*Geographia* 2, 21), Strabo (*Geographia* 11, 4 3), Pomponius Mela (*Geographia* 3,5) and Pliny the Elder (*Nat. hist.* 4,12 and 6,13). Cf. Timothy P. Bridgman, *Hyperboreans: myth and history in Celtic-Hellenic contacts*, London 2004.

11. *Runa Suethica* (1649–1653): the conspectus, the preface, and drafts of chapters, stray notes and diagrams

11.1 Conspectus in a draft and two prints (1650–1669)

There are two manuscript drafts and two prints of the conspectus, i.e. the table of contents, of *Runa Suethica*. The drafts most likely date from around 1650. The first printed table of contents was published as a print proof before early July 1651, when Stiernhielm sent it to some foreign philologists and historians, David Blondel, Samuel Bochart and Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn. Another print of the table of contents with some revisions and additions was published in 1669.

11.1.1 *The first manuscript draft of the conspectus*

Source: The first manuscript draft is extant in *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, fol. 1r–1v (with the measurements 210 x 325 mm), Royal Library, Stockholm. The second draft is extant in *Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielm*, ms. XXXII: 1715, fol. 66v–68r, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover. Since this draft is just a fair copy of the first draft in F.d. 6, fol. 1r–1v, only the text of the first draft is transcribed below. Both drafts are written in another hand than Stiernhielm's, although the first draft (Section 11.1.1) abounds in autograph additions by Stiernhielm himself in the margin, above the line or on fol. 4r in F.d. 6. The entire last thesis, no. 25 is an autograph addition, the first part of which corresponds to no. 27 in the print. Additions above the line or on it are generally not accounted for in the critical apparatus. For a photograph of folio 1 recto, see Figure 6.

Dating: around 1650.

(1r) RUNA SUETHICA

duabus systematibus comprehensa,

quorum primum exhibet Dissertationem de linguis et vera linguarum origine,

secundum Radices universales et omnibus fere linguis communes eruit et aperit. Ex iisdem rivi eliciuntur in praecipuas et inde ex iis ortas linguas.

Primi systematis capita sunt sequentes:

1. Videri omnes linguas, quae in orbe cognito extiterunt et hodie extant, ortas ex una et ad unam posse reduci.
2. Naturae conveniens, imo omnino necessarium fuisse ex una lingua multas oriri.
3. Ex Confusione Babylonica nullam novam linguam exortam, et si qua exorta est, momentaneam et ad breve tempus extitisse.
4. Hebraeam, Phoeniciam, Chaldeam, Syram, Arabicam, Aegyptiam Aegyptiam, Aramaeam-Araxenen, quam alio nomine Scythicam vocitant, dialectorum, non linguarum esse vocamina.
5. Temporum et locorum intervallis dialectos abire in linguas.
6. Ex Scythica ortas linguas primas Septentrionales et Occidentales, et ad Orientem, Phrygiam et Persicam.
7. Thraces et Getas fuisse Scythas.
8. Ex hisce profectos primos populos primamque linguam Graeciae, quam culto novo antiquatam, minime⁴⁹³ vero extirpatam, posterioribus temporibus barbaram nuncupaverunt. Hinc est illa communio nostrae linguae cum Graeca. Quippe quae in una tertia, Scythica scilicet, conveniunt.⁴⁹⁴ Vide Salmas. *Hellenistica*, p. 2, c. 2.⁴⁹⁵
9. Scytharum propaginem esse Germanos, Gallos, Iberos, Britannos, Aborigines sive Umbros, primos Italiae incolas. Hisce omnibus unam linguam fuisse Scythicam in varias dialectos scissam.⁴⁹⁶
10. Germaniae caput et principium olim fuisse Scythiam Europaeam Minorem, peninsulam nimirum Scandiam, quam et Scanziam vel S[c]andinaviam, antiquissimi vero scriptores Balthiam, Basiliam, Abalum, Bannomannam etc. et Hyperboreorum insulam indigetarunt. In hac enim Ingevones, Germanorum primi, sedes habuerunt. Suethiam Scythiam vocat Adamus Bremensis passim et cap. 50 al. LII scribit episcopus Unni apud Bircam obiisse, et post: Obiit autem in Scythia, ut scribitur, anno Dominicae incarnationis 936, et post: “Eo tempore, quo Unni ad Scythas legatus extitit.” Mare Balthicum eidem dicitur Scythicum. Salmasius, *Hellenist.* part 2, cap. 2⁴⁹⁷ docet Scythas, Getes et Gottos idem esse.⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹³ minime] The negative *non* has been crossed out on the line.

⁴⁹⁴ Hinc est illa communio ... conveniunt] This sentence is a marginal addition.

⁴⁹⁵ Salmas. *Hellenistica*, p. 2, c. 2] This has been added on the line. Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, part 2, ch. 2, pp. 330–392, on the history of Greek.

⁴⁹⁶ In the margin, Stiernhielm adds: “Hic inseri debet θεσις 13.”

⁴⁹⁷ Salmasius. *Hellenist.* part 2, cap. 2] See *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 369.

⁴⁹⁸ In hac enim Ingevones ... idem esse] All this is an autograph addition at the bottom of the page. Stiernhielm adds in brackets: *Angarius cum Withmario primi in Sueonia Christum praedicarunt sub Biorn rege circa A[nnum] C[hristi] 830.*

- (1v) 11. Ex hac insula (revera peninsula) derivatos in Germaniam et diversas orbis terrarum regiones non solum multos populos, sed etiam sacra, ritus et deos. Eodem capite specialiter disseretur de gentis Sveonum antiquitate, regimine, cultu, sacris, literatura prisca, lingua casca et moderna.
12. Graecis cum Suethis ab antiquissimis usque temporibus communionem fuisse sacrorum amicitiae et mutuae necessitudinis, et quod magis est, Graecos deos coluisse inter maximos in Suethia natos.
13. Graecos cultum, elegantias, poesin, Musas, sacra Deosque ex Thracia habuisse.⁴⁹⁹ Probat Salmas. *Hellenistic*. parte 2, cap. 2 et 3.⁵⁰⁰ Vide Lips. *Manuduct. in philosophiam Stoicam*, lib. 1, cap. 5 de philosophia barbarica et poetica. et cap. 17. Quaerendum cuiates fuerint Musaeus, Linus, Orpheus Thrax.⁵⁰¹
14. Linguam Latinam ortam ex tribus potissimum: Aboriginum scilicet, quae Umbrorum fuit, Thusca seu Hetrusca vocitata; Graeca, et Phrygia.
15. Ciceronem et Varronem, qui propter peculiarem linguae Latinae peritiam habitus [est] fuit Romanorum omnium sapientissimus, linguam Latinam non intellexisse;⁵⁰² nec Demosthenem ipsumque Platonem linguae Graecae fundamentalem scientiam habuisse.
16. Nugas agere qui linguam Hebraeam in specie dictam pro primigenia et Adamaea venditant. Eandemque vix eam esse qua locutus est Abraham. Ad θ[έσιν] 16, vide epistulam Iosephi Scaligeri ad Thomson. apud Buxtorf[ium] in Dissertatione de linguae Hebraeae conservatione etc. § 6, ibidemque § 7 Erpenii iudicium de lingua Hebraea.⁵⁰³

⁴⁹⁹ In the margin, Stiernhielm writes: "Haec thesis debet inseri supra post 8^{am}, ut sit nostra 9^{na}."

⁵⁰⁰ Probat Salmasius ...cap. 2 et 3] This reference has been added above the line.

⁵⁰¹ Vide Lips. ... Thrax] This is a marginal addition. Justus Lipsius published his *Manuductionis ad philosophiam Stoicam libri tres* in Antwerp in 1604.

⁵⁰² In a note in the left-hand margin at the bottom of the page, Stiernhielm adds: "Thesin 15 quod attinet, colligantur omnia quae haberi possunt Ciceronis et examinentur. Similiter totus liber Varronis de caussis linguae Latinae una cum scholiaste istius Scaligero cursim refutetur, cum ocium fuerit."

⁵⁰³ Ad thesin 16 ... Hebraea] This has been added by Stiernhielm in F.d. 6, fol. 4r. The letter referred to is Joseph Scaliger's letter to Richard Thomson, see *Epistulae omnes*, Leiden 1627, book 3, no. 242, pp. 518–520. Cf. his similar letter to Stephen Hubert, ibidem, book 4, letter 362, pp. 701–702. Johannes Buxtorf the Younger quotes from these letters in his *Dissertationes philologico-theologicae* (of which the third dissertation is titled *De linguae Hebraeae post confusionem conservatione et propagatio*), Basel 1645. Erpenius expressed his opinion in his inaugural lecture as professor of Hebrew at Leiden, which was published in his

17. Proprietates vocum linguae Hebraeae veras impossibile esse dari posse, nisi ex radicibus linguae Scythicae.
18. Voces Adameas, cuius generis sunt Adam, Eva, Cain, Seth, Noah etc., quas pro antiquitate linguae Hebraeae vulgo eius assertores adducunt, non minus Scythicas, imo Suethicas esse magis, quam Hebraeas.
19. Vocabula priscae linguae Gallicae et Ibericae reliqua Scythica esse et inter ea plurima quae ex Phoenicia deducit doctissimus Bochartus.⁵⁰⁴
20. Antiquas voces Thuscas, quae supersunt ex lingua Aboriginum, Scythicas esse.
21. Linguam Cambricam dialectum esse linguae Scythicae.
22. Voces, quae supersunt linguae Phrygiae, Scythicas esse.
23. Linguam Persicam hodiernam maximam partem constare ex lingua Scythica. Quod item de Armena moderna intelligendum.
24. Deorum nomina pleraque omnium gentium, origine esse Scythica. Et ibidem sanctum Dei nomen tetragrammaton יהוה origine esse Scythicum nec ullum hactenus Hebraeum aut Cabalistam veras nominis istius proprietates, multo minus mysteria aperire potuisse. Ea Deo dante dabo.
25. Sermonem primo homine concreatum aut cum ipsa ratione infusum, cuius character est et index in sensum incurrens. Ludovicus de Dieu in Epistula dedicatoria ad *Grammaticam linguarum orientalium* scribit.⁵⁰⁵ In Hebraea, primo nostro

Orationes tres de linguarum Ebraeae atque Arabicae dignitate, Leiden 1621, pp. 97–132. It is partly quoted by Buxtorf (ibidem). See my monograph *Albert Schultens as the innovator of Hebrew etymology and lexicography*, Section 7.4.2.

⁵⁰⁴ In the margin, Stiernhielm adds *Scythismus quid?* most likely as a questioning on Bochart's concept of the Scythian language.

⁵⁰⁴ In the margin, Stiernhielm adds *Scythismus quid?* most likely as a questioning on Samuel Bochart's views on the Scythian language.

⁵⁰⁵ In Hebraea ... edocta] In the dedicatory letter of his Grammar of the Semitic languages, *Grammatica linguarum orientalium, Hebraeorum, Chaldaeorum et Syrorum inter se collatarum*, Leiden 1628, Louis de Dieu on page *2v discusses the historical priorities of Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac. He chose them because they were spoken by peoples of the most ancient civilization of the world – Hebrew as the primordial language and the interpreter of the divine prophecies, Aramaic as the language of two biblical books (Daniel and Ezra) and of Bible translations (the Targums) and Syriac as the vernacular of Jesus and the Apostles. Referring to Hebrew he states: “Prima harum prima quoque est omnium et praestantissima linguarum, primo nostro parente Adamo coeva, cum ipso nata aut creata potius, non a homine, sed ab ipso Deo edocta.” That is: “The first of them is also the first of all and the most pre-eminent language, coeval with our first ancestor Adam, emerging or rather created with him, not by a human, but taught thoroughly by God himself.”

parente Adamo coaeva, cum ipso nata aut creata potius, non ab homine, sed ab Deo edocta.

Ad θ[έσιν] 25. Dico linguam primigeniam, quae in omnibus elucescit esse primo homini naturalem et per consequens omnibus posteris, sed quoad radices et ipsa fundamenta, non quoad formationes et flexiones grammaticas. Nemini enim naturalis est sermo aliquis sive ad Hebraeorum sive Graecorum Scytharumve idiotismum flexus et factus sit, sed ipsae voces primae informes et investes⁵⁰⁶ nobis naturales sunt, ex propagine scilicet linguae primae, quae primo homini concreata fuit. Vide Meric. Casaubon., *De quatuor linguis*, in initio de Hebraea.⁵⁰⁷ NB. Nulla lingua naturae propior est quam nostra Europaea Borealis.⁵⁰⁸

SYSTEMA SECUNDUM

- Exhibet: 1. Coniugium Cadmi et Harmoniae, itemque nuptias Panos et Echus, hoc est harmoniam et analogiam rerum et verborum.
2. Traduntur observationes et axiomata, quae proprie spectant ad scientiam etymologicam.
3. Eruitur et aperitur certus numerus radicum universalium.
4. Ponuntur sigillatim singulae radices, ex quibus certo ordine et methodo in ipsa rerum genesi fundata, educuntur rivi et flumina vocum in praecipuas et ex his ortas linguas. Et hoc est LEXICON seu CLAVIS LINGUARUM OMNIUM UNIVERSALIS.

11.1.2 *The first printing of the conspectus*

Source: The printed conspectus of *Runa Suethica* from 1651 is extant in some copies.⁵⁰⁹ One copy is annotated by Stiernhielm and thus contains numerous corrections and explanatory notes. See *Runa Suethica et alia miscellanea*, F.d. 5, fols. 2r–3v, with the size 200 x 310 mm). This copy is transcribed with an account of Stiernhielm's

⁵⁰⁶ investes] In F.d. 6, *implumes* has been crossed out before *investes*.

⁵⁰⁷ Ad θ[έσιν] 25 ... de Hebraea] This was added by Stiernhielm in F.d. 6, fol. 4r. Most of the addition (*Ad thesin 25 until concreata fuit*) is copied in F.d. 7:3, 2r. In *De quatuor linguis commentationis pars prior: quae de lingua Hebraea et de lingua Saxonica*, pp. 14–15, Casaubon put the natural emergence of linguistic variety or diversity in opposition to a miraculous one and thus equated the former concept with “the variety which belong to usage”. In his copy, Stiernhielm commented on this passage: “Naturalis linguarum propagatio qualis”; see Figure 20a.

⁵⁰⁸ NB. Nulla ... Borealis] In F.d. 7:3, 2r, this is written beside the above addition.

⁵⁰⁹ At Royal Library, Stockholm, in F.d. 5, fols. 2r–3v; at Uppsala University Library, in Palmsköld. 356, fols. 33–34 after fol. 387, and Westin Rar. 413, and in a re-editio of Stiernhielm's *Archimedes Reformatus*, Stockholm 1720.

manuscript additions and changes in the critical apparatus. Its first page (F.d. 5, fol. 2r) is reproduced in Figure 7.

Dating: most likely in May or June 1651, but decidedly before July 1651, because Stiernhielm sent printed copies of his conspectus to scholars on the European continent, such as David Blondel, Samuel Bochart and Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn, in July 1651 (see Stiernhielm's letter to Blondel in late 1651; Section 13.1.2).

Later publications: the printed conspectus of *Runa Suethica*, 1651, was made available in Daniel Georg Morhof's treatise on German language and poetry, *Unterricht von der Teutschen Sprache und Poesie*, Kiel 1682, pp. 25–28,⁵¹⁰ and in Georg Johann Eccard's history of the etymological study of the German language, *Historia studii etymologici linguae Germanicae*, Hannover 1717, pp. 194–199. Swartling (1909: xiii–xiv) partly follows the text in the *Runa Suethica* manuscript in F.d. 6 (on points 2–5). Schück reproduces the printed conspectus of two copies, the first of which contains Stiernhielm's annotations, while the second lacks them.⁵¹¹

(2r)

R U N A S U E T H I C A
duabus systematibus comprehensa,
 quorum PRIMUM
exhibet Dissertationem de linguis et vera linguarum origine,
 SECUNDUM
Radices universales et omnibus fere linguis communes
eruit et aperit. Ex iisdem rivi eliciuntur in praecipuas
et inde ex iis ortas
 L I N G U A S.

Primi systematis capita sunt sequentes.

1. Videri omnes linguas, quae in orbe cognito extiterunt et hodie extant, ortas ex una et ad unam posse reduci.⁵¹²
2. Naturae conveniens, imo omnino necessarium fuisse, ex una lingua multas oriri.⁵¹³
3. Ex Confusione Babylonica nullam novam linguam exortam, et si qua exorta est, momentaneam et ad breve tempus extitisse.

⁵¹⁰ Morhof strictly follows the printed conspectus from 1651 with the exception of one minor deviation: *Phrygicam* instead of *Phrygiam* in the first part, point 4.

⁵¹¹ Schück, *Kgl. Vitterhets historie och antikvitets akademien*, vol. 2: Antikvitetskollegiet, Stockholm 1933; the unnumbered pages between p. 128 and p. 129.

⁵¹² In the right-hand margin, Stiernhielm adds: "Et hoc asserunt omnes, qui omnium matrem esse volunt Hebraeam."

⁵¹³ In the right-hand margin, Stiernhielm adds: "Vide Emerici Casauboni de lingua Hebraea et ibi pag. 17 patris Isaaci Casauboni de lingua Hebraea sententiam."

4. Hebraeam, Phoeniciam, Chaldeam, Syram, Arabicam, Aegyptiam, Aethiopicam, Phrygiam, Persicam,⁵¹⁴ dialectorum, non linguarum esse vocamina.⁵¹⁵
5. Temporum et locorum intervallis dialectos abire in linguas.⁵¹⁶
6. Ex Scythica ortas linguas primas, non minus Orientales, quam Septentrionales et Occidentales.⁵¹⁷
7. Thraces et Getas fuisse Scythas.
- (2v) 8. Ex hisce profectos primos populos primamque linguam Graeciae, quam alias dictam barbaram, culto novo politam, minime vero extirpatam, posterioribus temporibus demum Hellenicam et Graecam nuncupaverunt.⁵¹⁸
9. Graecos cultum, elegantias, poesin, Musas, sacra Deosque ex Thracia habuisse.
10. Scytharum⁵¹⁹ propaginem praeterea esse Europaeos: Germanos, Gallos, Iberos, Britannos, Aborigines sive Umbros, primos Italiae incolas. Hisce omnibus unam linguam fuisse Scythicam in varias dialectos postmodum scissam.
11. Germaniae caput et principium olim fuisse Scythiam Europaeam Minorem, peninsulam nimirum Scandiam, quam et Scanziam vel Scandinaviam, antiquissimi vero scriptores Balthiam, Basiliam, Abalum, Bannomannam etc. et Hyperboreorum insulam indigitarunt.

⁵¹⁴ Phrygiam, Persicam] These words have been crossed out.

⁵¹⁵ In the left-hand margin Stiernhielm adds: "Huc transferuntur thesis 18, quae eadem est." On the right-hand side in the margin, he adds: "Hoc probant lexica et ipsae adhuc superstites linguae."

⁵¹⁶ Stiernhielm changes the order of theses 3, 4, and 5 by re-numbering them. The third thesis is marked as the fourth, the fourth as the fifth and the fifth as the third. I have of course retained the numbering in the print.

⁵¹⁷ On the same line and in the right-hand margin Stiernhielm adds: "Scythicam intelligo linguam primam Noachidarum. In Scythia enim circa Gordiaeum montem primi mortales sedes habuerunt. Inde egressi sunt et dispersi in insulas, campos, Sennaar, et successive longo seculorum tractu in universum terrarum orbem." At the bottom of the page he continues: "Scythicam linguam primam, qua usus est ipse Noah, in posteris Iaphet (concessam etiam post Confusionem Babylonicam qualemcunque) inviolatam et integram conservatam in se nec nisi temporis et necessarie contingentium vicissitudinibus variatam et in innumeros dialectorum et quasi novarum linguarum ramos dispertitam in nos et nostra tempora propagatam adhuc, praesertim in Septentrione, durare paucis sed validissimis argumentis ipsa experientia suffultis probatum dabo."

⁵¹⁸ In the left-hand margin, Stiernhielm adds: "Vide Salmas. p. 403, vide mea Adversaria, prima §. Graecos multa ex sapientia et lingua Barbarorum."

⁵¹⁹ In the left-hand margin, Stiernhielm adds: "Salmasius, p. 400, et Voss. *Idol.* l. 2, p. 623 Thracum Dii fuerunt Plistor, Mars, Mercurius, a quo se oriundos praedicabant (hic Oden est, Beudis). Ea est Dea Magna, Rhea, scil. Freä."

12. Ex hac insula (revera peninsula) derivatos in Germaniam et diversas orbis terrarum regiones non solum multos populos, sed etiam sacra, ritus et deos.
13. Peninsulae eiusdem et Hyperboreorum gentem principem fuisse Sueonas, sive Suecios, quos hodie Suehos, Suecos, et Suecos, vocitant.⁵²⁰
14. Graecis cum Hyperboreis ab antiquissimis usque temporibus communionem fuisse sacrorum, amicitiae et mutuae necessitudinis, et quod magis est, Graecos Deos coluisse inter maximos apud Hyperboreis natos.⁵²¹
- (3r)** 15. Suehis cum Thracibus et Byzantinis communes fuisse Deos adeoque ipsos Deos Phrygios ad Hyperboreos migrasse.
16. Linguam Latinam ex tribus ortam potissimum: Aboriginum sive Thusca, Graeca, et Phrygia.⁵²²
17. Ciceronem et Varronem, qui propter peculiarem linguae Latinae peritiam habitus fuit Romanorum omnium sapientissimus, linguam Latinam non intellexisse nec Demosthenem ipsumque Platonem linguae Graecae fundamentalem scientiam habuisse.⁵²³
18. Linguam Hebraeam non minus quam Chaldaeam, Chananaeam et Arabicam dialectum⁵²⁴ esse linguae primae, minime vero ipsam linguam primam.⁵²⁵
19. Indolem et proprietates vocum linguae Hebraeae veras impossibile esse dari posse, nisi ex radicibus linguae Scythicae.
20. Voces Adamaeas, cuius generis sunt Adam, Eva, Cain, Seth, Noah etc. quas pro antiquitate linguae Hebraeae vulgo eius assertores adducunt, non minus Scythicas, imo Svethicas esse magis, quam Hebraeas.

⁵²⁰ In the left-hand margin and at the bottom of the page, Stiernhielm adds: "Probatur ex Diodoro Siculo et aliis, qui quotannis primitias frugum ex Hyperboreis Delos missas scribunt. Asscribantur quae ego commentatus sum de Hyperboreis, quos describit Diodorus Siculus."

⁵²¹ At the bottom of the page, Stiernhielm adds: "De Oden (Wodan) vide Cluv. *Antiqua Germania*, p. 185, etc."

⁵²² In the margin, the terms *Phrygia* and *Tusca* have been explained. *Phrygia* is qualified as: "quae eadem Thracica, Getica, Celtica, Teutonica, Scandica. Vide Vossium, *De vitiis sermonis* in praefatione, et meam dissertatiunculam praefixam Cadmo Graeco-Phoenici. Thusca eandem esse quam nos hodie etiamnum *Tyrha* vocamus, argumentis non vanis probare contendunt viri clarissimi Eilhard Lubinus in dissertatione de sepulcro Remi etc. et Hafor[...] Observationum lib. 13, cap. 15. Suehica igitur longe antiquior et simplicior Latina."

⁵²³ Stiernhielm adds: "Allegentur quaedam etyma Varronis et Ciceronis."

⁵²⁴ dialectum] Stiernhielm changes the ending *-um* into *-os* (i.e. *dialectos*).

⁵²⁵ Stiernhielm adds: "Hebraeam non fuisse primam contendit Cluverius, *Antiqua Germania*, l. 3, c. 8, pag. 60." In the right-hand margin, he adds that this thesis is the same as thesis 5: "Haec thesis eadem est, quam 5^a. Eo igitur transscribenda."

21. Ex vocalibus priscae linguae Gallicae et Ibericae⁵²⁶ reliquiis eas probari Scythicas fuisse.⁵²⁷
22. Antiquas voces Thuscas, quae supersunt ex lingua Aboriginum, Scythicas esse.
23. Linguam Cambricam, quae vetus est Cimbrica, dialectum esse linguae Scythicae.⁵²⁸
24. Voces quae supersunt linguae veteris Phrygiae, Scythicas esse.⁵²⁹
- (3v) 25. Linguam Persicam hodiernam, ut et Armenam, maximam partem constare ex lingua Scythica.⁵³⁰
26. Deorum nomina pleraque omnium gentium, origine esse Scythica et in illis sanctum Dei nomen tetragrammaton יהוה origine esse Scythicum nec ullum hactenus Hebraeum vel Cabalistam veras nominis istius proprietates, multo minus mysteria, aperire potuisse. Quae Deo dante reddet author.
27. Ultimo sermonem primo homine concreatum aut cum ipsa ratione,⁵³¹ cuius character est et index, in sensum incurrens, infusum.

SYSTEMA SECUNDUM

Exhibet: 1. Connubium et nuptias Panos et Echus, hoc est harmoniam et analogiam rerum et verborum.

2. Tradit observationes et axiomata, quae proprie spectant ad scientiam hanc novam etymologicam.
3. Eruitur et aperitur certus numerus radicum universalium.
4. Ponuntur sigillatim singulae radices, ex quibus certo ordine et methodo in ipsa rerum genesi fundata, rivi et flumina vocum, in praecipuas et ex his ortas linguas educuntur.

Et hoc est

LEXICON seu CLAVIS LINGUARUM PRIMARUM UNIVERSALIS.⁵³²

⁵²⁶ et Ibericae] In the right-hand margin, these words have been crossed out and changed to *seu Hispanicae*.

⁵²⁷ In the right-hand margin, Stiernhiem adds: "hoc est Suethicas: probatur ex specimine vocum, quas origines Phoenicias seu Hebraeas esse vult Bochartus in Phaleg a me refutatus."

⁵²⁸ In the right-hand margin, Stiernhielm adds: "hoc est Suethicae. Huc adscribendum specimen vocum Cambricarum."

⁵²⁹ Below the line, Stiernhielm adds: "hoc est Suethicas, quod probatur ex specimine vocum Phrygicarum."

⁵³⁰ In the left-hand margin, Stiernhielm adds: "Vide Salmas. p. 393." On the line, he adds: "hoc est Suethica, quae eadem cum Germanica."

⁵³¹ ratione] In the left-hand margin, Stiernhielm replaces *ratione* by *mente*

⁵³² After *universalis*, Stiernhielm adds: "cui titulus: BABEL DESTRUCTA."

11.1.3 *The second printing of the conspectus*

Source: *Babel destructa* at Lund University Library (shelfmark Äldre samlingen, Sv. Språkv. Allm.) and British Library (shelfmark General Reference Collection, DRT Digital Store 628. f.1.3). Stiernhielm printed this revised copy of the conspectus to attach it to his application for membership in the Royal English Society of Sciences in the autumn 1669. This printing has minor differences as compared with the first one. Minor additions are found in theses 1–5 and 27 and minor changes occur in the title and theses 7, 8, 13, 14, 17. Thesis no. 18 has been deleted.

Dating: According to the colophon, 27 September 1669.

GEORGII STIERNHIELMI
BABEL DESTRUCTA
seu
RUNA SVETHICA
duabus systematibus comprehensa
quorum PRIMUM
exhibet Dissertationem de linguis et vera linguarum origine,
SECUNDUM
Radices universales et omnibus fere linguis communes
eruit et aperit. Ex iisdem rivi eliciuntur in PRIMAS
et inde ex iis ORTAS LINGUAS.

Primi systematis capita sunt sequentes.

1. Videri omnes linguas, quae in orbe cognito extiterunt et hodie extant, ortas ex una, qua radices, et ad unam posse reduci.
2. Naturae conveniens, imo omnino necessarium fuisse, ex una lingua multas et ex multis innumeras orituras.
3. Ex Confusione Babylica nullam ex SS. Scripturam demonstrari posse novam linguam exortam, et si qua exorta est, momentaneam et ad breve tempus extitisse.
4. Linguam Hebraeam, non minus quam Chaldaeam, Chananaean, Arabicam, Punicam, Persicam, Aegyptiam, Aethiopicam etc. Phrygiam dialectos esse linguae primae.
5. Temporum et locorum intervallis dialectos abire in linguas demonstratur experientia et commistione dialectorum.
6. Ex Scythica ortas linguas primas, non minus Orientales, quam Septentrionales et Occidentales.
7. Thraces, Phryges, Dacos, et Getas fuisse Scythas.
8. Ex hisce profectos primos Populos primamque linguam Graeciae, quam alias dictam Barbaram, scil. Pelasgicam, culto novo polita,

- minime vero extirpatam, posterioribus temporibus demum Hellenicam et Graecam nuncupaverunt.
9. Graecos cultum, elegantias, poesin, Musas, sacra Deosque ex Thracia habuisse.
 10. Scytharum propaginem praeterea esse Europaeos: Germanos, Gallos, Iberos, Britannos, Aborigines sive Umbros, primos Italiae incolas. Hisce omnibus unam linguam fuisse Scythicam in varias dialectos postmodum scissam.
 11. Germaniae caput et principium olim fuisse Scythiam Europaeam Minorem, peninsulam nimirum Scandiam, quam et Scanziam vel Scandinaviam, antiquissimi vero scriptores Balthiam, Basiliam, Abalum, Bannomannam etc. et Hyperboreorum insulam appellarunt.
 12. Ex hac insula (revera peninsula) derivatos in Germaniam et diversas orbis terrarum regiones non solum multos populos, sed etiam sacra, ritus et deos.
 13. Peninsulae eiusdem et Hyperboreorum gentem principem fuisse Sueones, sive Suecios, quos hodie Suethos, Suecos, et Suedos, vocitant.
 14. Graecis cum Hyperboreis ab antiquissimis usque temporibus communionem fuisse sacrorum, amicitiae et mutuae necessitudinis, et quod magis est, Graecos Deos coluisse inter maximos, Apollinem et Dianam, apud Hyperboreos natos.
 15. Svethis cum Thracibus et Byzantinis communes fuisse Deos adeoque ipsos Deos Phrygios ad Hyperboreos migrasse.
 16. Linguam Latinam ex tribus ortam potissimum: Aboriginum sive Thusca, Graeca, et Phrygia.
 17. Ciceronem Romanorum eloquentissimum et Varronem, qui propter peculiarem linguae Latinae peritiam habitus fuit Romanorum omnium sapientissimus, linguam Latinam funditus non intellexisse; nec Demosthenem ipsumque Platonem linguae Graecae fundamentalem scientiam habuisse.
 18. Indolem et proprietates vocum linguae Hebraeae veras vix dari posse, nisi ex radicibus linguae Scythicae.
 19. Voces Adamaeas, cuius generis sunt Adam, Eva, Cain, Seth, Noah etc. quas pro antiquitate linguae Hebraeae vulgo eius assertores adducunt, non minus Scythicas, imo Svethicas esse magis, quam Hebraeas.
 20. Ex vocalibus priscae linguae Gallicae seu Hispanicae reliquiis eas probari Scythicas fuisse.
 21. Antiquas voces Thuscas, quae supersunt ex lingua Aboriginum, Scythicas esse.

22. Linguam Cambricam, quae vetus est Cimbrica, dialectum esse linguae Scythicae.
23. Voces quae supersunt linguae veteris Phrygiae, Scythicas esse.
25. Linguam Persicam hodiernam, ut et Armenam, maximam partem constare ex lingua Scythica.
25. Deorum nomina pleraque omnium gentium, origine esse Scythica et in illis sanctum DEI Nomen Tetragrammaton יהוה origine esse Scythicum nec ullum hactenus Hebraeum vel Cabalistam veras nominis istius proprietates, multo minus mysteria, aperire potuisse. Quae Deo dante reddet author.
27. Ultimo sermonem primo homine concreatum aut cum ipsa mente, cuius character est et index, in sensum incurrens, infusum. Unde patet primigenias vocum radices non fortuito, sed ex natura et rationis fundo enatas.

SYSTEMA SECUNDUM

- Exhibet: 1. Connubium et nuptias Panus et Echus, hoc est harmoniam et analogiam rerum et verborum.
2. Tradit observationes et axiomata, quae proprie spectant ad scientiam hanc novam etymologicam.
 3. Eruitur et aperitur certus numerus radicum universalium.
 4. Ponuntur sigillatim singulae radices, ex quibus certo ordine et methodo in ipsa rerum genesi fundata, rivi et flumina vocum, in primas et ex his ortas linguas educuntur.

Et hoc est

LEXICON seu CLAVIS LINGUARUM PRIMARUM UNIVERSALIS.

Stockholmiae, die 27. Sept. anno 1669.

11.2 Title page and preface

11.2.1 Title page

Source: F.d. 5, fol. 33v. Dating: c. 1652.

RUNA SUETHICA.

Aquilex Schytha neo-cascus
ex fontibus Araxis flumina eliciens in campos Sinear, Hellenen,
Hesperiam, Iberiam, Celtica, Theotisciam, Scandiam
indeque in omnes culti orbis angulos.

“THE SWEDISH RUNE.

The neo-ancient Scythian water diviner
who from the sources of Araxis draws rivers to the plains of Shinar,
to Hellas, Hesperia, Iberia, the Celtic lands, Germany, Scandinavia
and thence to all corners of the inhabited world.”

11.2.2 Preface

Source: F.d. 6b:1, fol. 29r–29v. Size: 164 x 210 mm.

Dating: c. 1654. Stiernhielm states that he published the conspect of *Runa Suethica* three years ago (“tribus abhinc circiter annis”).

Contents: Stiernhielm states that he has achieved what he has been capable of in fulfilling his goals for *Runa Suethica*. He tells how his own practice of etymological research has resulted in a theory of an etymological science, through which one will be able to reconstruct the universal or common word roots of the languages of the ancient world. Stiernhielm expressly excepts the American Indian languages, which he considers irrational. He declares his intention to publish a summary of his planned universal etymological dictionary. He sets out a couple of principles on which such a dictionary should be based.

(29r) Cato cordatoque lectori salutem

Tribus abhinc circiter annis in publicum edidi capita aliquot concepti operis, quod RUNAM SUETHICAM inscribere placuit, quo linguarum imprimis unitatem et ab una dependentiam re et opere demonstrare in me recepi. Ex illo tempore remis velisque (ut dicitur) incubui, ut quod promisi praestarem, ne mundo literato vanus pollicitator spem et expectationem fallerem. Feci igitur, quantum a uno fieri potuit. Socium enim, qui scopum et mentem meam intelligere quiret invenire non erat. Linguas, a multis iam annis, quotcumque in manus inciderunt meas, perscrutatus sum, vocum similitudinem, affinitatem, immutationem, depravationem studiose observavi, notiones generales, speciales, genuinas, abusiones et contrarias exacte annotavi, analogias, anomalias et exorbitantias perpendi.

Philologorum atque etymologistarum industriam, sagacitatem, oscitantiam, imperitiam, divinationes et varia iudicia non sine admiratione et ingenti animi delectatione versavi, examinavi atque inter se invicem⁵³³ comparavi, ex quo factum est, ut⁵³⁴ tandem quorundam fortuita inveniendi felicitate ac vicissim plurimorum coecis erroribus edoctus audere inciperem totum hoc linguarum negotium in artem aut *scientiam* suis principiis certis et causis infallibilibus⁵³⁵ fultam et fundatam componere.

Ad cuius scientiae praescriptum omnium linguarum ex Adamaea ortarum, **(29v)** hoc est omnium in hoc orbe cognito, quae hodie

⁵³³ atque inter se invicem] This has been added in the margin.

⁵³⁴ ex quo factum est, ut] This has been added in the margin.

⁵³⁵ infallibilibus] In the ms. the letter *l* in the suffix *-ibilis* is doubled, namely *infallibillibus*.

extant et olim extiterunt (Americanas enim, quas irracionales deprehendi, semper excipio) clavem universalem⁵³⁶ adornare institui. Clavem inquam,⁵³⁷ cuius beneficio penetrare possis in adyta⁵³⁸ et intimas notiones ex causis cuiusvis vocis nudae, etiam ignotissimae tibi linguae dato significatu communi. Ac quia totum hoc opus publici iuris facere mearum virium non est, exiguum hoc novae artis specimen expectantibus edere constitui. Quo demonstrare intendo:

I. Dari radices universales atque omnibus linguis communes, ex quibus omnium linguarum vocabula enata, ad easdem possint et debeant reduci. Unde sequitur linguas cunctas posse reduci ad unam. Quod intellectum volo qua materiam, i.e. nuda vocabula primitiva, non qua formam, hoc est terminationes et modos, declinationes, casus, coniugationes, derivatorum formationes et quae his sunt similia. Ea etenim singulis non solum linguis, sed affinissimis dialectis quibusque sunt peculiaria.

II. Hebraeam et quae ei adiacent dialecti, Chaldaeam, Syriacam, Arabicam etc. nondum funditus cognitae esse nec a quoquam, qui linguarum nostrarum ignarus est, rite posse cognosci. Radices harum linguarum trilateras non esse veras radices, nisi quae constant א ה י ע et interdum כ, נ et aliis otiosis. Reliquas esse voces aut compositas aut derivatas et modificatas, id quod in hoc specimine in nonnullis palam fiet.

11.3 Drafts not included in the preface on languages origins

11.3.1 De linguis in genere: a language classification

Sources and dating: Stiernhielm's autograph original in *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, fol. 54r–fol. 54v (with the size 210 x 325 mm), to be dated 1650–1652, and four different copies by

- (1) Claudius Örnhielm, F.d. 14a, pp. 1–3,⁵³⁹ Royal Library, Stockholm, 1661–1663, with autograph changes by Stiernhielm,
- (2) an anonymous copyist, ms. NKS⁵⁴⁰ 150, quarto (*kvars*), fols. 1r–2r, the National Library of Denmark, Copenhagen,
- (3) Arvid Moller, who used Örnhielm's copy as archetype, R. 21, fols. 1r–2r, Uppsala University Library,⁵⁴¹

⁵³⁶ clavem universalem] Stiernhielm first wrote *lexicon aut clavem universalem* and then crossed out *lexicon aut*.

⁵³⁷ Between *inquam* and *cuius*, *universalem* has been crossed out.

⁵³⁸ adyta et] These words have been added in the margin.

⁵³⁹ In *Discursus philologicus de linguis in genere et in specie de lingua Suethica*.

⁵⁴⁰ NKS. is an abbreviation of Ny Kongelig Samling, "New Royal Collection."

⁵⁴¹ At the end of the manuscript volume R 21, Mollerus states that he copied the text in Stockholm in 1701. He writes: "Haec p. m. Stiernhielmi opuscula

(4) another unnamed copyist, ms. D. II. 37, fols. 1r–2r, National Library of Finland, Helsinki. This copyist has not, however, included all the additions by Stiernhielm in Örnhiälm's copy. The last two paragraphs does not occur in the Helsinki ms., but is found in the others (F.d. 14a, NKS 150 4° and R. 21).

Contents: In this text, Stiernhielm first classifies the languages of the ancient world into two major branches, the Oriental and the Occidental, each with its own main dialects. The Occidental branch of languages is called Scythian. Stiernhielm then describes his views on the outcome of language mixing in a number of languages

(F.d. 14a, p. 1) GEORGII STIERNHIELMII⁵⁴²

(F.d. 6, 54r) DE LINGUIS IN GENERE⁵⁴³

obiter et ad diligentiores inquisitionem annotata⁵⁴⁴

⁵⁴⁵ A principio una ex uno homine orta est lingua, literis et sensu conveniens cum ipsa indole et natura rerum. Hanc linguam usque ad Noham continuatam per eiusdem posteros per totam Europam, Asiam et Affricam⁵⁴⁶ propagatam adhuc durare unam in multas dialectos et linguas ortas seu mistas divisam idque necessitate naturae omnino fieri debuisse, etiamsi nulla unquam confusio miraculosa contigisset.⁵⁴⁷ Eadem enim plane est ratio hominum, rerum et linguarum. Fiat explicatio per genealogias, progressus plantarum et rerum ex una materia manufactarum et ipsius naturae⁵⁴⁸ uni materiae inducentis varias formas.⁵⁴⁹

posthuma, ut fuerunt truncata ex nobilissimi quondam Örnhiälmi apographo descripsi Holmiae mense Januario Anni MDCCI festinantissime Arvid Mollerus.”

⁵⁴² Georgii Stiernhielmii] F.d. 14a and D. II. 37 have the so-called *i longa* (F.d. 14 GEORGI STIERNHIELMI and D. II. 37 GEORGI STIERNHIELMI), While NKS 150 and R. 21 have the ending –II (NKS. 150 Georgii STIERNHIELMII and R. 21 GEORGII STIERNHIELMII). The autograph does not have any author attribution.

⁵⁴³ DE LINGUIS IN GENERE] The autograph original has a full stop between the second and third word in this title (that is, DE LINGUIS. In genere.).

⁵⁴⁴ obiter ... annotata] In comparison with the autograph, this is an addition in F.d. 14a, also occurring in NKS. 150, D. II. 37, and R. 21.

⁵⁴⁵ In F.d. 6, fol. 54r, the first sentence has been crossed out: *Origo et fons linguae unius a natura per Adamum.*

⁵⁴⁶ Affricam] The autograph and all the copies with the exception of NKS. 150 have dittography of the letter f, while NKS. 150 has haplography (i.e. *Africam*).

⁵⁴⁷ In F.d. 14a, Stiernhielm added a sentence in the margin to be inserted in the main text. The first words read: *Ratio ipsa, experientia et tempus.* After *tempus* the rest, written in a faint pencil writing, is perhaps to be read as: *funditus clare et palam evincent.* R. 21 has in the margin only: *Ratio ipsa, experientia et tempus.*

⁵⁴⁸ Naturae] The autograph and all the copies except for NKS. 150 have this correct reading. NKS. 150 mistakenly has *natura*.

⁵⁴⁹ idque necessitate ... formas] In F.d. 6, 54r, this has been written in the margin.

Primam divisionem fuisse in Orientalem et Occidentalem: illam, quae Asiam Australem⁵⁵⁰ et Affricam invasit, hanc, quae Europam occupavit (**D. II. 37, 1v**) et septentrionalem Asiam. Illam duos fratres Sem et Cham, hanc tertium Iaphetum⁵⁵¹ aut ipsum Noham⁵⁵² propagasse credimus.⁵⁵³

(**F.d. 14a, p. 2**) Orientalis dialectos esse minime simul ortas, sed temporum intervallis enatas.⁵⁵⁴ Hebraeam, Chaldaeam, Syriacam, (**NKS 150, 1v**) Aegyptiam, Indicam, Troglodyticam,⁵⁵⁵ Aethiopicam, Punicam et⁵⁵⁶ in genere Arabicam in mille subdialectos diffusam.

[Occidentalis seu Europaeae fuere primitus Graeca, Barbara seu Schythica. Illa suos habuit subdialectos.]⁵⁵⁷

Occidentalis, quam etiam Asiaticam septentrionalem comprehendere diximus, uno nomine generali Schytica⁵⁵⁸, et quatenus (**R. 21, p. 2**) ex Armenia scaturiret, Schythica Aramaea dicta est. Ea postmodum in tres ramos seu dialectos principales digressa est, scilicet in Tartaricam seu Sarmaticam veterem, Geticam seu Gothicam, cuius suboles Celtica, et Graecam.⁵⁵⁹

Celtica fuit Hispanica vetus seu Iberica, cuius reliquiae putantur Cantabrica seu Guasconica.

Italica prima Aboriginum, quae Thusca seu Hetrusca vocatur. Gallica vetus. Germanica, Teutonica, Saxonica, Anglica.

⁵⁵⁰ Australem] In the autograph (F.d. 6, 54r), this has been added in the margin.

⁵⁵¹ Iaphetum] So the autograph. All the copyists used the spelling *Japhetum*.

⁵⁵² aut ipsum Noham] In F.d. 6, 54r, this has been added in the margin.

⁵⁵³ A draft of this paragraph is found in F.d. 6, 7r: “Prima et una lingua scissa fuit in duas: Orientalem scilicet, quam locuti sunt posterii Sem et Cham, et Occidentalem, quae Iapheti fuit. Orientales fuerunt primariae.”

⁵⁵⁴ minime ... intervallis enatas] In F.d. 6, 54r, this has been added in the margin.

⁵⁵⁵ Aegyptiam, Indicam, Troglodyticam] These languages (Egyptian, Hindi, and some dialect of Ethiopic called “Troglodytic”) are only found in NKS. 150 and R. 21. They are not mentioned in F.d. 6, in F.d. 14a or in D. II. 37.

⁵⁵⁶ et] F.d. 6, 54r, has *aut*. In F.d. 14a *aut* has been crossed over and replaced by *et* above the line by Stiernhielm. NKS. 150, R. 21 and D. II. 37 therefore have *et*.

⁵⁵⁷ Occidentalis ... subdialectos] This passage has been crossed out in F.d. 6, fol. 54r, and is not found in the copies (F.d. 14a, NKS. 150, R. 21, 1r, D. II. 37, 1v).

⁵⁵⁸ Schythica] The autograph and F.d. 14a and D. II. 37 consistently have the spelling *Schythica*, while NKS. 150 and R. 21 consistently have *Scythica*.

⁵⁵⁹ Tartaricam seu Sarmaticam veterem, Gethicam seu Gothicam, cuius suboles Celtica, et Graecam] So F.d. 14a, p. 2, according to Stiernhielm’s correction. F.d. 6, 54r, reads: *Tartaricam seu Sarmaticam veterem, Celticam et Graecam*. In F.d. 14a, NKS. 150, p. 2, and R. 21, fol. 1v, have: *in Scythicam propriam seu Geticam seu Gothicam (cuius suboles Celtica), in Tartaricam seu Sarmaticam veterem et in Graecam, quae ex Phoenicia et Pelasga seu Getica orta est*. D. II. 37, 1v, has: *Scythicam propriam seu Phrygiam, Tartaricam veterem, Celticam et Graecam*, thus leaving a void space between *seu* and *Phrygiam*.

In Gothica, Suedica, Danica, Norvegica, Islandica vetus adhuc perennat Gothica. Adhuc durantes nec ullam aliarum mixturam passae, nisi quod ex vetusta et primigenia (F.d. 14a, p. 3) videantur per cultum evasisse nitidiores.⁵⁶⁰ (D. II. 37) Anglica seu Britannica vetus, dicta Cambrica vel Wallica, eademque Gallica.⁵⁶¹

Ex harum varia mixtura ortae sunt variae linguae, ut ex Schythica et Orientali *Persica, Armenica, Turcica*. Persae et Parthi iidem, orti ex Scythis, Scythica olim usi sunt lingua et hinc illa convenientia cum Suedica, Germanica et Graeca.⁵⁶²

Getas et Thraces gentes Schythicas esse, quae ad (R. 21, 2r) inferiorem Danubii partem, quam Istrum veteres vocabant, habitabant. In superiori Danubii parte, Daci, Gothi, Suevi etc. Germani appellantur. Ubi notandum Cluverio Germanos non ex Schythis oriundos.⁵⁶³

Ex Getica⁵⁶⁴ et Graeca orta est *lingua Sclavonica*.⁵⁶⁵

Ex Graeca et Celtica (Thusca scilicet et Phrygia)⁵⁶⁶ *Latina*.

Ex Latina iterum et Gothica⁵⁶⁷ *Italica moderna*.⁵⁶⁸

⁵⁶⁰ In Gothica ... evasisse nitidiores] So F.d. 14a, p. 2, according to Stiernhielm's corrections. F.d. 6, 54r, reads: "Suedica, Gothica, Danica, Norvegica, Cimbrica, Islandica, Teutonica adhuc durantes nec ullam aliarum mixturam passae, nisi quod ex vetusta et primigenia videantur per cultum evasisse nitidiores. D. II. 37, 1v, has the same reading as F.d. 6. In F.d. 6, 54r, the passage *nec ullam ... nitidiores* has been added in the margin. In his corrections in F.d. 14a, Stiernhielm changed the syntax of the first part by introducing the idea that ancient Gothic is preserved in the Scandinavian languages. NKS. 150 and R. 21 correct the resulting anacoluthia of the second clause by changing the participle *durantes* into the finite verb form *durant* and by adding the subject *Gothicae nostrae* (viz. *linguae*): *In Gothica, Suedica, Danica, Norvegica, Islandica vetus adhuc permanet Gothica, et Gothicae nostrae adhuc durant nullam aliarum mixturam passae, nisi quod ex vetusta et primigenia videantur per cultum evasisse nitidiores*.

⁵⁶¹ Anglica ... eademque Gallica] Thus F.d. 14a according to Stiernhielm's own corrections. NKS. 150 and R. 21 have the same reading as F.d. 14a, except that they add *olim* before *Gallica* (that is: *eademque olim Gallica*). In F.d. 6, 54r, the text reads: *Anglica vetus dicta Cambrica vel Wallica*.

⁵⁶² Persae ... Graeca] In F.d.14a, this is an autograph addition by Stiernhielm in the margin. In R 21 and NKS. 150 this addition is retained.

⁵⁶³ Getas et Thraces oriundos] This paragraph has been added in the margin of F.d. 14a, p. 3. It is retained in NKS 150 and R. 21, but omitted in D. II. 37.

⁵⁶⁴ Getica] Thus F.d. 14a according to Stiernhielm's own change. R. 21 follows this change and thus has *Getica*. F.d. 6, 54r, and D. II. 37, 2r, have *Sarmatica*.

⁵⁶⁵ lingua Sclavonica] F.d. 6 and D. II. 37, 2r, have only *Sclavonica*. In F.d. 14a, *Illyrica* is as an alternative written above *Sclavonica*. In R 21 has *lingua Illyrica et Sclavonica*. NKS. 150 has *Illirica et Sclavonica*.

⁵⁶⁶ scilicet et Phrygia] So F.d. 14a according to Stiernhielm's addition, which R. 21 follows. F.d. 6, 54r, and D. II. 37, 2r, only have *Thusca*.

⁵⁶⁷ Gothica] So F.d. 14a according to Stiernhielm's correction. F.d. 6, 54r, and D. II. 37, 2r, have *Celtica*. NKS. 150 and R. 21 retain *Gothica*.

Ex Celtica (Germanica, Francica et Gothica) et Latina, forte et Graeca Massiliensium, coaluit *hodierna Gallica*.

(F.d. 6, 54v) Ex Gothica, Hispanica seu Iberica veteri,⁵⁶⁹ Latina, et Punica Maurorum⁵⁷⁰ *Hispanica moderna*.⁵⁷¹

Est autem lingua Punica eadem quae Arabica. Schiell, p. 1614.

Ex Saxonica, Iutica⁵⁷² et Gallica *lingua Anglica moderna*.⁵⁷³

Ex Sarmatica, Graeca et Getica⁵⁷⁴ *Esthonica*, cuius dialectus est⁵⁷⁵ *Finnonica*.

Ex iisdem et Getica⁵⁷⁶ alia forma *Lettica* seu⁵⁷⁷ *Churlandica*.

(R. 21, 2r) Scythicae linguae proximam fuisse Germanicam et gentes vicinas ex Scythis originem ducere, Voss. *Idol.* lib. 2, p. 723.⁵⁷⁸ (F.d. 14, p. 4) Vide Cluv. *Ant. Germ.*, cap. 2, ubi docet Scytharum nomine comprehensa tria gentium genera et nomina: Arimaspos, Sarmatas, et Hyperboreos, sub quorum nomine Illyrii, Germani, Galli, Hispani, Britanni, omnes uno nomine Celtae. Quorum fines vide ibidem. De Getis, Thracibus et Pelasgis Graecisque nullum verbum. (F.d. 14, p. 5) Gothos olim natione Suevos fuisse ait Cluverius, p. 669.

(F.d. 14, p. 4) Scandiam Tacitus vocat insulam Germaniae. Pythias apud Plinium Baltiam vocat insulam Scythiae etc. Sed Celtae deinde a Scythis separati, capite eodem. Negat tamen Cluverius⁵⁷⁹ Germanos ex Scythis ortos. pag. 30. NB.

⁵⁶⁸ Italica moderna] So F.d. 6, F.d. 14a and D. II. 37, while R 21 has *Italica hodierna* and NKS. 150 *Italiana hodierna*.

⁵⁶⁹ Hispanica seu Iberica veteri] This only occurs in NKS. 150 and R. 21.

⁵⁷⁰ Ex Gothica ... Hispanica moderna] According to Stiernhielm's corrections in F.d. 14a *Gothica* replaces *Celtica*, and *Maurorum* has been added above the line. F.d. 6, 54v, and D. II. 37, 2r, have: *Ex Celtica, Latina et Punica, Hispanica moderna*. R 21 has a different wording: *Ex Gothica, Hispanica seu Iberica veteri, Latina, et Punica Maurorum Hispanica hodierna*.

⁵⁷¹ Hispanica moderna] NKS. 150 and R. 21 have *Hispanica hodierna*.

⁵⁷² Ex Saxonica, Iutica] So F.d. 14a according to Stiernhielm's correction of *Celtica* into *Saxonica* and *Cimbrica* into *Iutica*. Fd. 6, 54v, and D. II. 37, 2r, have *Ex Celtica (Cimbrica) et Gallica moderna*.

⁵⁷³ Anglica moderna] NKS. 150 and R. 21 have *Anglica hodierna*.

⁵⁷⁴ Ex Sarmatica, Graeca et Getica] This is the reading of F.d. 14a and NKS. 150. F.d. 6 and D. II. 37 have: *Ex Orientali, Sarmatica, Graeca et Celtica*. In F.d. 14a Stiernhielm crossed out the words *Orientali* and *Celtica* and replaced the latter by *Getica*. In R 21, 1v, *Celtica* is similarly replaced by *Getica*.

⁵⁷⁵ est] So F.d. 6, F.d. 14a, D. II. 37 and NKS. 150. R 21 omits *est*.

⁵⁷⁶ et Getica] This is an addition in F.d. 14a, copied in NKS. 150 and R 21.

⁵⁷⁷ seu] So F.d. 14a and NKS. 150. F.d. 6 and D. II. 37 have *cuius species est*.

⁵⁷⁸ Scythicae linguae ... Voss. *Idol.* lib. 2, p. 723] This is an autograph addition in F.d. 14a. In NKS. 150 and R 21 refer to Vossius differently: Vossius censet de *Idol.* lib. II, p[agina] m[ea] 321.b. 329.b. 361.b. omnino.

⁵⁷⁹ Negat tamen Cluverius] This is added in F.d. 14a, p. 4. R. 21 has *Negat idem*.

11.3.2 Scythian as a term of the proto-language of humankind

Source: *Collectanea philosophica*, F.d. 4:4:1, fol. 50r. Size: 208 x 319 mm. Dating: the text is dated “Stiernlund, 8 September 1651.” For a photograph of this text, see Figure 8.

Contents: Scythian is proposed as a term of the proto-language of humankind, that is, the common origin of not only the Japhetic, but also the Semito-Hamitic branches of languages. The chronology and diversification of the Scythian is then discussed. Stiernhielm argues for and against his own use of the term Scythian as a designation of the primordial language. The text has almost the form of a dialogue of claims, objections, and answers.

Adversaria quotidiana, in Stiernlund die 8. 7br. 1651 coepta.

[...] ⁵⁸⁰ **(F.d. 4:4:1, fol. 5r)** Noah vixit post Diluvium 350 annos. Quaeritur ubi vixerit, an in Armenia? An cum filio, cuius posteris illae regiones divina providentia erant destinatae?

Si illi una cum reliquis convenerunt in campis Sennaar, iterum post Dispersionem ipsis redeundum erat in Armeniam. Nonne praevidit hoc adhuc vivens propheta Noah? Ad quid igitur frustranea illa profectio in terram alienam, aliis destinata? Aiunt nescio cuius auctoritate confusionem demum ⁵⁸¹ factam postquam 40 annos aedificationi Turris insudassent? Unde interim victus tot peregrinis in terra aliena? Credendumne est eos aedificia, imo urbes iam extructas, agros cultos et sativos, vineas et hortos iam consitos et fructificos deseruisse (post centum scilicet et quod excurrit annorum culturam) et in terram vastam, ubi nulla illis gleba, ubi nulla ipsis portiuncula, cum uxoribus et parvulis etc. unde mox ipsis fugiendum erat, concessisse? Sponte non credo. Sed quo cogente? Nimbrodo nullum fuit imperium in Armenos. Sed nec Nimbrodo per aetatem interesse potuit Structioni Turris. Eximit illum Bochartus in *Phaleg*, quem vide. ⁵⁸² Deinde nec usquam in turris et dispersionis historia

⁵⁸⁰ Between the heading and the text edited below, there is a reference to the jurist and teacher of law at the University of Altdorf Konrad Rittershausen's (1560–1613) edition of and commentary on Johannes Bassianus's summary of Emperor Justinian's New Constitutions (“Novellae”): *Ioannis antiqui glossatoris summa in Novellas Iustiniani ... ex bibliotheca et recensione Conradi Rittershusii* (Frankfurt am Main 1615). Ritterhusius refers to a law code of the Goths, which the French jurist and legal humanist Jacques Cuias (Jacobus Cuiacius, 1522–1590) praised. Stiernhielm writes: Who and where is he? (“Quaerendum quis et ubi ille?”).

⁵⁸¹ demum] Stiernhielm first wrote *primum*, which he then crossed out.

⁵⁸² Eximit ... vide] Samuel Bochart, *Geographiae sacrae pars prior: Phaleg seu de dispersione gentium et terrarum divisione*, Caen 1651. In chap. 10 (p. 43 in the 1681 edition), Bochart argues that Nimrod was still a boy or not born at the

ulla fit mentio Noachi aut Iapheti eiusve filiorum. Chamo vero et Semo cum suis sedes et terrae distribuuntur, de Iapheto vero et ex illo natis quippe absentibus et sortem suam iampridem tenentibus altum silentium. De iis dicit Sacra Scriptura Noachidas suo loco postquam recensiti sunt, antequam ulla Turris fieret mentio (non per anticipationem aut hysteron proteron, ut quidam omnia suo sensui aptantes fingunt) cap. 10, v. 5: “Ex hisce omnes insulae gentium distributae sunt in suas terras iuxta cuiusque linguas in generationes et populos.” Vide in hunc locum Rivet[um].⁵⁸³

Scythas mortalium omnium primos et ex iis propagatas omnes gentes prodiderunt historici omnes pene antiqui. An ergo et ipsorum lingua omnium prima?

Noah cum filiis et posteris 101 annos resedit in Armenia, quae ipse caput est Scythiae ante coeptam Turrim. Lingua Semi et Chami exeuntium in campos Sinnear fuit lingua paterna, ergo vernacula Scythica, sed lingua Semi exempta fuit a Confusione et continuata in Eber, ex quo deinceps Ebraea dicta est. Ergo Ebraea, quae Semi fuit vernacula, Scythica est. Ex Ebraea antea descendunt reliquae Orientales, ut dialecti. Ergo et hae origine sunt Scythica. Omnes quos eximunt ab aedificatione Turris, ut⁵⁸⁴ Sem, Arphaxad, Salam, Eber, retinuerunt linguam antiquam. Ergo Scythicam. Omnes qui non interfuerunt, ut Iectan cum 13 filiis et plures, vide Rivetum. Sed horum lingua postea dicta fuit Arabica. Ergo et haec ex Scythica.

Obiectio: Sed Scythica multis seculis post Noah demum Scythica dicta fuit, nec ipsis indigenis, sed exteris ita dicta. Salmas[ius] *de Hellenist[ica]*. Responsio: Nihil refert, quo nomine post vel ante vel quid a quo appellati sint, quos ego Scythas voco, modo constat me unum eundumque populum intelligere eandemque terram, cuius primi conditores et incolae fuerunt Noah et Iaphet – eius, inquam, populi, quem Cato in frag., Beros[us], Myrsil[ius] L[esbius] ...⁵⁸⁵ mox ab initio Scythas nuncupant,⁵⁸⁶ linguam, quam longe post

building of the Tower of Babel and rebuilt the city of Babel many years after its destruction, because it is written: “the beginning of his kingdom was Babel” (Gen. 10: 10).

⁵⁸³ Stiernhielm here refers to André Rivet, probably his commentary on Genesis *Theologicae et scholasticae exercitationes CXC in Genesin*, Leiden 1633, but it is unclear what passage he means. In exercise 64 Rivet deals with Noah’s blessing over Shem and Japheth. In exercise 65 he deals with the ruler Nimrod, his identity and the sense of his being “a mighty hunter”.

⁵⁸⁴ ut] After *ut*, the example *Elam* has been crossed out.

⁵⁸⁵ ...] A lacuna has here been left in the manuscript. Stiernhielm evidently refers to ancient historians according to Anniius of Viterbo’s forgery of fragments: *Berosus Babilonicus de his quae praecesserunt inundationem terrarum. Item Myrsilius de origine Turrenorum. Cato in fragmentis* [...], Paris 1510.

⁵⁸⁶ nuncupant] The manuscript has *nuncupat*, but the syntac requires *nuncupant*.

Scythicam ego intelligo. Mihi enim una est lingua Scythica, Iaphetica, Noachica.

Sed dices: Eam, quae fuit Noachi, non fuisse Scytharum. Responsio: Noah sator fuit Scytharum. Ergo etiam linguae. Iterum pergis: Sed illa vetusta Scythica procul dubio primis seculis evanuit subnata nova, quam hodie Scythicam (proprie) vocamus. Responsio: Esto. Perierit vetus illa Scythica, qualis fuit primo aevo. Vivit tamen in propagine sua, quae est Ebraea. Vivit in variis ortis, quibus hodie utimur Scandii et Germani. Vivit in Arabica, orta ex Iectan, filio Eber. Vivit magna sui parte in ipsa Graeca in Platone, in Aristotele, in Demosthene, et Homero, quibus ipsismet ignaris multa Scythica familiaria sunt.

11.3.3 The momentary duration of the Confusion of Languages


Source: *Collectanea philosophica*, F.d. 4:4:1, fol. 50v.

Dating and contents: September 1651. To prove his hypothesis of the monogenetism of languages, Stiernhielm refers to his diagram of peoples and languages, which he drafted in F.d. 5, fols. 29r–30v and 31v as “Genealogia gentium et linguarum,” and then completed in a chapter draft of *Runa Suethica*, F.d. 6, fols. 72v–73r.

Confusio Babylonica

Ad cap. 3: *Confusionem Babylonica non fuisse nisi momentaneam*

Hoc opus, hic labor est. Sed quare momentanea? Alias non video, quomodo salvetur veritas Sacrae Scripturae. Nullam enim novam exortam video. Omnes, quarum in toto (credo) Veteri Testamento fit mentio, sunt unius matres filiae, dialecti parum invicem discrepantes, non natae ex Confusione Babylonica, sed per thesin 2, ex natura et inevitabili vicissitudinis necessitate. Sunt autem hae: Ebraea, Chaldaea, Syra, Arabica, Aegyptica, Aethiopica, Persica ex Elam. Sed ut cuivis haec quae scribimus, probemus et manifesta demus, en clarissimum diagramma. Habes alibi.



Etymologici et philosophi Aristotelici praesertim universam rerum naturam cuivis per se intelligibilem et manifestam turpissimorum errorum caligini involverunt et primaeva nocte obscuriorem reddiderunt.

11.3.4 The nature of the Confusion of Languages

Sources: *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, fol. 71r–71v (with the size 210 x 327 mm), and ms. D. II. 37 at National Library of Finland. The edition follows F.d. 6 and records the differences in relation to ms. D. II. 37, but does not accounts for all the textual changes in F.d. 6 itself.

Dating: the autumn of 1651. Stiernhielm refers to a letter to him from the French Protestant clergyman and historian David Blondel on 18 July 1651. His reply letter to Blondel (for which, see Section 13.1.2) has many similarities with the text edited below.

Contents: Stiernhielm refutes Blondel's criticism on his ideas in the conspectus of *Runa Suethica*. He deals with the nature of the Confusion of Languages at Babel and the nature of linguistic change. This text forms a part of *Runa Suethica*, part 1, chapter 3.

(71r) CAPUT III/ IV⁵⁸⁷

Ex Confusione Babylonica nullam novam linguam exortam et si qua exorta est, momentaneam et ad breve tempus extistisse.

De naturali variarum linguarum ortu et interitu iam egimus. Nec puto aliquem tam obesae naris fore, qui non intelligat naturae legibus non minus obstrictum esse sermonem hominum quam homines ipsos. Nunc de miraculosa linguarum confusione videndum. Ad eam linguarum omnium nativitatem referunt plerique, coeci ad causas quas docet natura et experientia, quasi Deus Ter Optimus Maximus interdum miraculose non praeveniat naturam, quae lente et successive, rite servatis numeris, progreditur nec saltum facit. Deus aliquando dicitur miraculose cievisse pluvias, tempestates et ignem de coelo, nec tamen minus haec etiam sunt naturae opera. Nihil itaque vetat, quominus lingua una, quae natura in multas potuit diffundi sed longo annorum tractu, a Deo naturae mod-imperatore⁵⁸⁸ uno in momento in plures sit confusa. Objiciunt theologi, inter quos eximium decus nostri seculi, clarissimus David Blondellus, singulari ad me epistola Amsterodami data 15. Kal. Aug. 1651. Objiciunt, inquam ex Sacra Scriptura, locum Gen. I. vers. 11. Blondelli verba sunt:

Cum (Deo ipso auctore) ad annum usque mundi 1750, et quod excurrit, unius labii et verborum eorundem terra universa fuerit nec ante desierit illa labii unitas, quam Dominus turris structorum colluviem confuderit, ne labium proximi quilibet eorum exaudiret. Necessitatem, quam notas, omnimodam ex una lingua

⁵⁸⁷ CAPUT III] In F.d. 6, 71r, this chapter is called CAPUT IV. In the archetype of D. II. 37 Stiernhielm returned to the original order; so that it is called CAPUT III.

⁵⁸⁸ mod-imperatore] D. II. 37, 33v, has *moderatore*.

in multas deflectendi non video. Deflexus ille non natura est, quae per 1750 annos primaevae conditionis modum non excesserat, sed poena; non primigenia Dei Optimi Maximi institutio, sed iudicium, quo superbas mortalium mentes ad propriae imbecillitatis confessionem retraxit et quodammodo infra se deiecit. Ex qua divisione labii genus humanum punitum est, necessarium evasit quod antea penitus non erat. Sic natura filii irae ab utero sumus et naturae vitium necessitas (ut sic dicam) factum est. Si mecum sentis, palam et pluribus ad maiorem lucem, quod spero facies, edissere; si dissentis, doce. Haec Blondel[lus].

Syllogismus talis est: Si necessarium sit et per naturam aliter fieri non possit, quin una lingua devergat ad plures, utique iam olim tot annorum decursu ante diluvium plures extitissent linguae. At a creatione ipsa usque ad tempus Exstructionis Babylonicae totis 1750 annis fuit universa terra unius labiii et eorundem verborum, id est non extituerunt plures, quam una lingua. Ergo nulla talis urget necessitas. Minorem firmat dicto Biblico v. II. c. 1. Genes. iam recitato.

Argumentum sane sat⁵⁸⁹ speciosum et efficax, si adaequate sententiam meam premeret. Sed effluit, cum mea assertio non pariat consequentiam, quam infert propositio maior. Necessarium⁵⁹⁰ assero linguarum mutationem. Tempus, intra quod, non definio. Et quamquam tempus videatur necessitatis istius causa potissima, plures tamen causae concurrunt, quas tempus omnes includit et intra se comprehendit.

Causae illae sunt mutationes rerum humanarum crebrae, mortes, obliviones, abusus, segregationes, et dislocationes nationum, vitae brevitates, bella, (71v) discidia populorum ac imperiorum excidia, ac quae causa causarum perpetua rerum omnium, vicissitudo, qua omne ortum occidit et quae non sunt esse occipiunt.

Minorem possem rejicere, quandoquidem nulla, loco isto fit mentio mundi, qui iam⁵⁹¹ periit, sed universae terrae, quae denuo hominibus repleta erat. De iis enim fiebat mentio, ut apertissime claret ex verbis ipsius Dei versus 6 eiusdem capituli cap. 11: *Dixitque Jehovah: En populus unus et labium omnibus unum ISTI*. Nec obstat, si unus sermo fuit Noachidis, quin si plures fuerunt nationes ante diluvium, plures etiam extituerunt linguae.⁵⁹²

⁵⁸⁹ sat] D. II. 37, 34v, leaves out this word.

⁵⁹⁰ necessarium] D. II. 37, 34v, has *necessitatem*.

⁵⁹¹ D. II. 37, 35r, adds *ante diluvium* between *iam* and *periit*. F.d. 6 lacks this.

⁵⁹² Minorem possem ... extiterunt linguae] This paragraph is a marginal addition.

Sed valeant isthaec et posito, quod verisimillimum est, seculis antediluvianis linguam omnibus mortalibus mansisse integram unam. Quod mihi sane non adversatur nec mirum est, quin potius, si contrarium evenisset magis mirarer. Totum enim illud tempus usque Noah non debet reputari nisi pro unius hominis aetate et memoria. Tanta enim erat vitae prolixitas. Vixerunt omnes praeter ipsum Adamum et Seth aliquot seculis etiam cum ipso Noaho. In familias tributi, imo una quasi familia omnes sub nutu unius patrisfamilias, dum vixit, Adami, quiete vitam traducebant. Nulla bella, nulla discidia,⁵⁹³ emigrationes et coloniae novae nullae. Una sub uno imperio natio,⁵⁹⁴ uno in loco, una aetate et memoria. Qui fieret, ut, dum istae conditiones durabant, linguam mutarent?

Sed da nullo unquam diluvio humanum genus intercedisse, sed usque et usque immensis auctibus⁵⁹⁵ crevisse, ut, quod postmodum factum est, usus postularit, ut in diversas subinde colonias emigrarent atque sic locis et imperiis distraherentur: aio impossibile fuisset per naturam linguam unam tandem in idiomata varia non deflexuram, etiamsi nulla unquam contigisset Confusio Babylica. Causas iam antea memoravi.

Et ne ulli amplius sit hac de veritate ullus dubitandi locus, experientiam in medium adducam, irrefragabilem et omni logomachia robustiorem.⁵⁹⁶ America plusquam mille habet idiomata diversissima. Quot sunt pagi, tot sunt linguae, quarum specimina aliquot edidit in America sua Iohannes de Laet.⁵⁹⁷ – Causa multitudinis idiomatum apud Americanos est feritas et inhumanitas, quae homines in societates civiles coire vetat. In perpetua hostilitate vivunt, raris pagis, montibus, fluviis, et insulis, longe inter se dissiti. Vocabula et nomina rerum ipsis dictat necessitas et docet usus.⁵⁹⁸ – Illasne, mi Blondelle, divinitus inflictas fuisse gentibus illis credis per supplicium temeritatis structorum turris? Nemo, puto, sanus hoc crediderit. Quid ergo? An natae sunt in solo proprio? Babylone in Americam non sunt devectae. Numerosa nimis classe opus fuisset devehendis tot familiis aut tot idiomatum singulorum consortiis.

⁵⁹³ discidia] D. II. 37, 35v, apparently has *dissidia*.

⁵⁹⁴ una ... natio] In F.d. 6 *una* ... *natio* replaces *unus* ... *populus*.

⁵⁹⁵ auctibus] D. II. 37, 35v, mistakenly has *auctoribus*.

⁵⁹⁶ logomachiam robustiorem] F.d. 6 originally had *luce clariorem*.

⁵⁹⁷ in America sua] The Dutch geographer Jean de Laet published his ethno- and geographical description of South and North America in Dutch in 1625 as *Nieuwe wereldt ofte beschrijvinghe van West-Indien* (Leyden). It was translated into Latin as *Novus orbis seu Descriptio Indiae Occidentalis* (Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1633) and into French as *L' Histoire du Nouveau Monde ou Description des Indes Occidentales* (Leyde 1640).

⁵⁹⁸ Causas ... docet usus] In F.d. 6, this sentence has been added in the margin.

Nihil itaque superest, opinor, nisi et mecum sentias linguarum generationem per se esse naturalem et necessariam.

De Babylonica vero linguae turbatione, quod scribis, eam non ex institutione Dei Optimi Maximi evenisse, sed poenam fuisse insanum opus molentibus, tuae sententiae subscribo. Nec enim infrequens Deo iusto vindici est naturalibus, ut turbinibus, igne, aquis, grandine, terrae motibus, fulmine, flumine et similibus praevenitis causis ordinariis, miraculose uti ad poenam impiorum. Quae eo non minus naturalia manent et sibi suis causis relictas suo tempore de se easdem operationes naturaliter et sine miraculo edere valent.

His nunc, quae obstare videbantur, remotis, ad ipsam thesin nostram descendamus.

11.3.5 The language of the Japhethites

Source: *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, fol. 77r–77v (with the size 210 x 327 mm). Dating: c. 1651–1652.

Contents: The text deals with the language of the Japhethites, a topic that according to the conspectus of *Runa Suethica* corresponds to unfinished chapters 6 and 10. Stiernhielm here argues that the Japhethites, known as Scythians, migrated in waves from Caucasus. They gradually settled vast areas and sought their subsistence as foresters, farmers and hunters, like contemporary Finns, Lapps and Livonians. He is displeased about Anniius of Viterbo's contention that Noah founded Italy and ruled in Latium as a king together with his son Comesus. He rejects this tradition as a mere fable. He argues that the original linguistic unity of the Japhethian nations split into a multiple diversity, which is not to be deduced from the Confusion of Languages at Babel, but has natural causes.

(77r) CAPUT

Ultra vellem. Sed revocat Iaphet cum Patre Noah residans in montibus Gordiaeis. Condiderunt illi gentem Scythicam mortalium primos. Scythae fuerunt omnes Iapheti filii, quisque cum propria familia et aliquot posterorum aetatibus. Ita tamen, ut unum omnes constituerent gentem usque dum in immensum aucti unis locis non caperentur eoque necessitatis telo adacti dulci patriae solo relicto, sensim primo et sparsim, post vero turmatim erumpentes novas sibi sedes quaerere cogerentur, nec hoc uno tempore, sed diversis et longissimis, ut hodie etiamnum fieri experiemur, intervallis. Nec credendum est illos consulto ac certa praelectione aliqua protinus immediateque loca petiisse longissima a solo patrio remota. Inculta enim erant omnia vastaque et ignota omnibus. Nec auster ipsis notus

nec septentrio. Errabant huc illuc in proximis montibus atque sylvis, securim et aratrum et rete et arcum adhibentes ubi per alium quemque maxime licuit et erat commodum, sedes et domicilia sensim et successive eo transferentes, quo invitabat maior vivendi et sustentandi se facilitas. Idem videmus adhuc quotidie fieri: Docent hoc Finni, Lappi, Livones et omnes qui eremos et vastas sylvas incolunt. Et certe, ut quod res est, aperte dicam nimis simplices sumus et pueri, qui credimus Noah ipsum conditorem et regem fuisse Italiae, Camesum, quem Inuum vocant.

[Thubal. Gomer. Magog.]

Nugae haec merae sunt et aniles fabulae, quae facile est deprehendere et refellere, si quis tempora computet et conferat considerans unde tam paucis annis tanta hominum multitudo, quae tot nationes, regna et imperia tam diversis et dissitis inter se locis componant, enasci potuerit. Scio tritum illud mihi obverti

Sed nil nisi verba sunt. Calculum ponamus et liquabit quantum homini, non puero, credendum sit.

(77v) Verum hic dimissis deveniamus ad institutum nostrum. Linguas contemplemur posteritatis Iaphet. Ipse procul dubio — adfuerit aedificationi Babylonicae, abfuerit — lingua paterna Noahi locutus est. Soli vero nullus esse potuit usus. Cum filiis igitur locutus est omnibus vel pluribus vel uno saltem. Sed nullo subesse potest causa, si cum uno, cur non cum pluribus, et hinc cum omnibus, quamdiu una cohabitabant. At in posteris ipsorum multiplex elucet linguarum diversitas. Unde ergo illa, nisi in conturbatione Babylonica? Quasi scilicet linguae aliter corrumpi et vicissim generari nequiverint. Sed hoc supra ad sufficientiam demonstratum est. Hic saltem dispiciendum manet quae extiterunt et quam differentes primae linguae Iapheticae.

11.3.6 The original Japhetic language preserved in Swedish

Source: F.d. 7:1, fol. 43r.

Lingua Iaphetica originalis conservata est in angulo Septentrionis apud Suecos sub custodia literarum Runicarum. Quas antiquiores Latinis et Graecis testatur Postellus De originibus [1553]. Sueci semper literas habuerunt. Germani nullas. Rudissimi fuerunt usque ad tempora Caroli Magni testante Lehnmanno in Chronico Sperensi.

11.3.7 Hebrew is not to be equated with the primordial language

Stiernhielm rejected the then common equation of the identity and nature of the primordial language with Hebrew in different notes, which are collected below (nos. 1–3).

Text 1: De lingua Hebrea

Sources: F.d. 5, fol. 37r and F.d. 3, fol. 7r (non-autograph fair copy).

Dating of the autograph: probably 1651–1652.

Contents: Hebrew does not have the nature and quality that one expects from the primordial language of humankind. First of all, it ought to contain all the word roots of the other languages, but on the contrary it is lexically poor, it abounds in morphological anomalies and other grammatical deficiencies, and it is characterized by lexical and syntactic ambiguities.

De lingua Hebrea NB. Quod si illa sit Adamaea et omnium prima, ex qua volunt fluere omnes reliquas, necesse est, ut contineat omnium vocum, quae in reliquis usurpantur, radices aut plerasque. Sed hoc fallit. Ergo:⁵⁹⁹ Est enim omnium pauperrima, plena anomaliis et defectibus, adeo ut cogatur multotiens absone et inepte, ne dicam pueriliter, explicare sensa, plena ambiguis et amphiboliis.

Text 2: Lingua Hebraea non est originalis

Source: *Miscellanea etymologica*, F.d. 7:1, fols. 119r, 121r and 122r. Opposing the common opinion of his own time that Hebrew is the primeval language, Stiernhielm advances his criteria of linguistic primordality: monosyllabicity of word roots and unchangeability of the lexical substance of language over time. He argues that only a few Hebrew roots monosyllabic,⁶⁰⁰ while the most are bisyllabic and that Hebrew underwent change during the extended sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, a reason being put forward in greater detail in the public dispute with Johannes Terserus in 1653 (Chapter 14) and in the preface to the 1671 edition of *Codex Argenteus* (Section 12.3).

(F.d. 7:1, fol. 119r, col. 1) Lingua Hebraea non est originalis

Ut lingua aliqua sit originalis requiruntur:

1. Ut derivatorum suorum ipsa habeat omnia primitiva eaque simplicissima, monosyllaba scilicet et unilitera. Nullum enim primitivum habet duas syllabas. Quales sunt quae falso vocantur⁶⁰¹ radices Hebraeae. Sed talia primitiva non habet Hebraea, nisi paucissima. Reperiuntur vero quamplurima in lingua Japhetica, Schythica scilicet et Graeca, quorum derivata passim et affatim reperiuntur in Hebraea. Exempla petas licet ex Meis etc.. [...]

⁵⁹⁹ Ergo] After *Ergo*, a space of 3–5 letters is left in the manuscript.

⁶⁰⁰ In F.d. 7:1, fols. 119v–120r, Stiernhielm recorded monosyllabic Hebrew roots (mainly so-called *verba geminata*, *verba mediae waw/ yod* and *verba tertiae he*).

⁶⁰¹ vocantur] *sunt* has been crossed out; *vocantur* has been added on the line.

2. Ut a primo aevo manent integra et incorrupta. Sed hoc non accedit Hebraeae. Quingentis enim propemodum annis quibus posterius Abrahami in Aegypto commorati sunt non potuit non corrumpi lingua ipsorum, quippe qui immixti genti linguae alienae, servi et non sui, alieno arbitrio et imperio obnoxii. Nullam Rempublicam, nulla sacra, nullum doctorem aut prophetam, nec literas nec scholas ullumve cultum habuerunt. Atque hoc tanto annorum intervallo. etc. Septuaginta annorum spatio, quo detenti fuerant in captivitate Babylonica tota lingua eorum faciem pristinam mutavit atque abiit in alienam, Syriacam scilicet.

Quid factum putem spatio annorum 500? Cum et exinde haec ipsa Syriaca mutata est in Rabbinicam sive Talmudicam. Deinde etiam in libris veteris Testamenti magnam varietatem pro ratione temporum et locorum, ubi scripti sunt, invenies. Insigne certum argumentum non minus hanc, quam alias linguas mutationi et corruptioni subiectas fuisse. Vide Bibliandr[um], p. 50.⁶⁰²

(121r) Nota. Ante Mosis scripta nullum extat linguae Hebraeae jota. Nulla scriptura, nulla prophetia. Nihil itaque fuit propter quod integra servaretur illa lingua ab Adamo vel saltem a Noah et Diluvio usque ad Mosen etc. Israelitas inter Aegyptios dispersos habitasse manifestum est ex eo, quod unusquisque circa exitum mutuatus fuit a vicino suo aurum <et> argentum. Textus.⁶⁰³ Eos nullum Deum ideoque nulla sacra, nullam libertatem ideoque nec Rempublicam et hinc nec scholas nec literas habuisse ante Mosem clarum est ex ipsa historia. Ignoratum ipsis fuit nomen *Iehovah*. Quod per Mosem primum ipsis revelatum est.

(122r) Argumentum palmarium est omnibus primatum linguae Hebraeae adstruentibus: lingua, quae rationem et etymon habet nominum propriorum in Genesi memoratorum, ea est antiquissima. Sed talis et Hebraea. Ergo ego assumo talis est Suethica. Ergo et amplius pergo. Quaecunque rationem in se continet non solum nominum propriorum, sed etiam appellativorum ea est antiquissima. Hoc praestat Suethica. Ergo minorem probo per inductionem vocabulorum. [...]

In the ensuing list, Stiernhielm derives Hebrew words in Genesis 1 from Swedish, e.g., תְּהוֹם (*tēhōm*) “sea, deep, abyss” from Swedish *toom* “void”, *vacuus*, and “voidness”, *vacuitas*, *vacuum* (see F.d. 5, 119r), רָקִיעַ (*rāqī‘a*), “extended surface, expanse” (the firmament) from the Swedish verb *räckia* in the sense “to stretch, extend”; פָּנֶה (*pānæ*), “face” from the Swedish noun *panna*, i.e. “forehead”, חֹשֶׁן

⁶⁰² In *De ratione communi omnium linguarum* (548), p. 50 Bibliander argues that Hebrew underwent historical changes over time even in the biblical antiquity.

⁶⁰³ Textus] In the manuscript, this word is followed by some blank lines.

(*hōšæk*), “darkness, obscurity” from the ancient Swedish words *hiski*, “a void, dark, cold, desolate place”, *locus vacuus, tenebrosus, frigidus, desolatus* (see F.d. 5, fol. 119r) and *hiskelig*, i.e. “frightful, dreadful (*formidabilis, terribilis, horribilis, deformis*), so that חֹשֶׁךְ is thought to mean “frightful darkness”, and אָמַר (*’āmar*), “to utter, say” from German *Mär*, “account, report” (from Old High German *māren*, “to announce, say”, cf. Old Nordic *mæra* “to praise”, Gothic *mērjan* “to announce”) and Swedish *märkia* “to mark, indicate”.

(3) *Hebraea pleraque dissyllaba*

Source: ms. XXXII. 1715, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, fol. 66r. A copy of this text is found in F.d. 9:3 (*Analogia rerum et verborum*), fol. 7v.

Contents: the origin of Hebrew triconsonantal or bisyllabic roots from compounds of two different monosyllabic roots.

Hebraea pleraque dissyllaba videntur composita esse ex duabus radicibus. Talia sunt פָּנַל, divisit, a פָּל et גַּל. לָג in hac significatione invenitur in חָלַק, divisit in partes. Suet[hice] **lāgia* est pungere, discindere. S[uethice] *klykia*, furca; *klyfva*.

11.4 Mesopotamian and biblical chronologies

11.4.1 Text 1: Preliminaries and transcription

Source: *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, fol. 81r. Size: 212 x 325 mm. Dating: in all probability in 1651 or early 1652.

Contents: In this text, Stiernhielm discusses the chronology of the earliest Mesopotamian empires according ancient historians such as Sextus Julius Africanus (*Chronographiae*), who tried to synchronize Egyptian and Babylonian chronologies with the biblical one, and Marcus Junianus Justinus (*Historiae Philippicae et totius mundi origines*). Stiernhielm also relies on the historians and chronologists of his time to correlate the early Assyrian dynasties with certain pre-historical events such as the Flood and the Confusion of Languages at Babel. In identifying Assyrian kings with persons in the biblical narrative, he refers to the different opinions of 16th- and 17th-century historians, e.g. J.J. Scaliger, *De emendatione temporum* (1583), Seth Calvisius, *Opus chronologicum ex auctoritate potissimum Sacrae Scripturae et historicorum fide dignissimorum* (1605), Chr. Helwig, *Theatrum historicum et chronologicum* (1609), J.H. *Encyclopedia* (1630), Dionysius Petau, *De doctrina temporum* (1627), and Conrad Pawel von Adenstedt, *Consilium chronologicum* (1627).

In ancient historiography Belus is considered founder of Babylon and the first king of Assyria. However, some ancient historians

made a distinction between the Babylonian Belus and the Assyrian Belus, a distinction that was known to Stiernhielm, who refers to *Belus Assyrius*.⁶⁰⁴ The topic of the below heading does not agree with subject matter of the text, but indicates that the discussion of this topic would be comprised within a comparative approach to synchronise the pagan and biblical chronology of prehistory.

(F.d. 6, 81r) Confusio linguarum Babylonica

Diluvium incidit in Anno Mundi⁶⁰⁵ 1656.

Secundum Africanum, quem sequitur Scaliger, tres fuerunt dynastiae Babyloniolorum. Prima est Chaldaeorum, regum 7, ante diluvium. Eius initium incidit in Anno Mundi 1325. Duravit annos 224. Secunda dynastia est Arabum in Babylonia, regum 6, itidem ante diluvium. Incidit in Anno Mundi 1549. Duravit annos 216. Tertia dynastia est ipsa monarchia Babylonica, in qua Scaliger numerat reges 41 a Belo usque ad Sardanapolum. Scaligero initium Beli incidit in Anno Mundi 1593. Helvico, Alstedio, Calvisio, et iis qui Iustinum sequuntur, Belus incidit in Anno Mundi 1717. Recensetur haec series regum: Belus, Ninus, Semiramis, Ninyas, Zames, Arius, Aralius, Xerxes, et Armanithres.⁶⁰⁶ Connectendi sunt cum Sala, Hebero, Peleg, Regu, Serug, Nahor, et Thara.

Sequitur non primus in partibus Orientis regnavit Belus, ut maximae historicorum parti placuit. Nam ante Belum Arabes in Babylonia, ante illos Chaldaei ibidem regnum obtinuerunt. Hic Belus Assyrius dicitur, cuius initium connectimus cum Sala et Eber. Quorum ille natus est Anno Mundi 1693, ille 1723. Belus vero regnare coepit Anno Mundi 1717, anno scilicet 61 post Diluvium (quod incidit Anno Mundi 1656) et 40 ante Confusionem Babylonicam, quae incidit in Anno Mundi 1757 vel 1758. Haec ex Alstedio recensente ex Helvico et Calvisio, qui habent Belum pro Nimrod.

Ninum quidam aiunt esse Nimrod. (*Nin-rod*, i.e. Ninus rex a נִין, *rada*, i.e. dominari, ut *Asta-roth*, amoris regina.) Bucholaerus vero

⁶⁰⁴ In Assyria, Belus was succeeded by king Ninus and queen Semiramis. The name Belus is plausibly an euhemerization of the Babylonian god Bel Marduk. The name Ninus is probably an eponymism of the city Niniveh. The name Semiramis is evidently a distortion of the name of the historical person Shammuramat, wife of king Shamshi-Adad V who ruled the Neo-Assyrian Empire in the end of the 9th century BC.

⁶⁰⁵ Anno Mundi] According to early modern world chronology, the year of Creation, *Annus Mundi* (A. M.) occurred in the span between 4004 and 3950 BC.

⁶⁰⁶ Armanithres] The spelling with -n- instead of -m- is an alternative for the name Armamitres. The incorrect form is attested ever since antiquity.

regnum Nimrodi ponit circa Annum Mundi 1788, post Confusionem Babylonicam annis 30. Et illinc ad Ninum 120 annos.

Libet videre Petavium et Pavellum seu Paulum ab Arenstedt⁶⁰⁷ in Consilio chronologico.

Alii Belum, ut Helvicus et sectatores. Etiam Vossius, Idol. l. 4, c. 24, arbitratur Nimrodum esse.

11.4.2 Text 2: preliminaries and transcription

Source: ms. XXXII. 1715, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, fol. 36r ms. XXXII. 1715. Dating: c. 1641.

Contents: the synchronization of prehistoric chronology.

(36r, col. 2) Belus, qui Babylonem condidit et in S[acra] S[criptura] vocatur NIMBROD, testibus multis historicis vixit et regnavit tempore nativitatis Peleg, quo facta est Divisio terrae et Confusio linguarum in aedificatione Turris Babylonicae, scilicet circa Anno Mundi.⁶⁰⁸ Natus enim est Peleg Anno Mundi 1757 et facta est Divisio Terrae. Ninus, Beli filius, regnavit circa Annum Mundi 1780. Diluvium autem incidit in Anno Mundi 1656 et Confusio linguarum Anno Mundi 1757. N[ota] B[ene]: initium Regni Babylonici Belo, verum Monarchiae Nino ab omnibus tribuitur.

Et hanc supputationem habeo ex Helvico, qui eam proxime ad veritatem Scripturae Sacrae accedere. Ex Aventino: Tuisco, filius Noae, regnat in Germania Anno Mundi 1787.

Aschkenaz ex Asia in Europam duxit Anno Mundi 1792, a Diluvio 136. Cluverius, lib. 1, cap. 9.

(36r, col. 2) Ninus, primus omni Asia exceptis Indiis regnavit secundum Eusebium circa Annum Mundi 3141.

secundum Georgium Monarcham <circa Annum Mundi> 3271.

secundum Berval dum <circa Annum Mundi> 1965.

secundum Funccium <circa Annum Mundi> 1906.

Haec ex Bongersio ad Iustinum Berneggeri.

Joannes Annius, de regibus Hispanorum, prima tempora sic partitur, autoritate, ut dicit, Berosi et Moysis. A Diluvio, inquit, ad 43^{um} annum Nini Regis Assyriorum anni numerantur a Beroso 292. Totidem Moyses enumerat Genes. capit. II ab eodem Diluvio usque ad ortum Abrahae. Quare castigatissime posuit Eusebius Abraham ortum anno Nini 43^o. Haec sequitur Helvicus.

Eusebius computat a nativitate Abrahae retro ad Diluvium annos 942, a Diluvio usque ad Adam 2252. Haec ex eodem Bongersio in Chronologia ad Iustinum.

⁶⁰⁷ Arenstedt] The correct name is Adenstedt.

⁶⁰⁸ Anno Mundi] After *Anno Mundi*, the year 1717 has been crossed out in the ms.

Metasthenes de iudicio temporum ex Beroso tradit ante Ninum 249 annis regnatum fuisse sub tribus Diis regibus, quorum primus, qui universo imperavit orbi, fuit Ogyges, qui praefuit inundationi terrarum. Inde Saturnus fundata Babylonia regnavit annis 56. Belus Jupiter, eius filius, 62. Ninus, eius filius, qui primus monarchiam coepit, annis 52, etc. Vide hic Annium in notis, fol. 220 b, ubi dicit: Saturnum hic appellat Nymbrotum, patrem Beli et avum Nini, ut Berosus exprimit. Itaque ab Ogyge usque ad Ninum fuerunt anni 249, ut convenit inter authores Berosum, Metasthenem, Xenophontem, Fabium Pictorem et Catonem etc.

Genes. 10, v. 8, Nimrod fuit filius Cush, filii Cham, filii Nohae.

Noha	Ogyges	
Cham	Saturnus. 56.	
Cush	Belus. 62.	
Nimbroth	Ninus. 52.	

Quomodo cohaerent?

11.5 The antiquity and particular nature of Swedish

11.5.1 De antiquitate linguae Suedicae

Sources: Stiernhielm's autograph original in *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, 58r–58v. It was copied by Claudius Örnhjäl in *Discursus philologicus*, F.d. 14a, pp. 30–36, which is supplied with Stiernhielm's autograph additions. Arvid Moller copied Örnhjäl's copy, see R. 21, UUB, fols. 14r–16r. There is also a copy of F.d. 14a in NKS 150, quarto, fols. 15r–16v. In editing the text, I have used Stiernhielm's original (F.d. 6) and his additions and changes in F.d. 14a. For a photograph of F.d. 6, fol. 58r, see Figure 9.

Dating: 1651. In F.d. 6, fol. 58v, Stiernhielm refers to Bochart's *Phaleg* (the first volume of his *Geographia sacra*) as a recent work. It was published in Caen in 1651.

Contents: Stiernhielm deals with the following topics:

- (1) The antiquity of the Swedish nation and different ethnonyms of the Swedes in ancient and modern times.
- (2) The geographical position of Sweden as part of the ancient conception of Scythian territory, viz. as Minor Scythia.
- (3) The status of the Scythians as proto-European ancestors of European nations in three main branches, namely the Sarmatians, the Celts, and the Celto-Scythians.

(4) The status of Swedish as the most archaic of the Scythian languages.

(F.d. 6, 58r / F.d. 14a, p. 30) Linguae Suedicae antiquitatem ex ipsius gentis antiquitate metiri licet. Gentem vero⁶⁰⁹ Sueonum sive Suionum, ut eam Tacitus appellat, sive Suecorum aut Suedorum, ut Germanis aliisque hodie nuncupamur, eiusque regnum **(F.d. 14a, p. 31)** antiquissimum esse omnes uno ore testantur historici, imo etiam ipse Cluverius de Suevis in fine. Eandemque Gothicam esse et ex ea Gothos in diversas orbis terrarum regiones egressos nemo unquam negavit aut dubitavit ante eundem Philippum Cluverium in *Antiqua sua Germania*. Cuius argumenta futilissima peculiari dissertatione sufficienter, ut spero, refutavimus.⁶¹⁰

Hanc ipsam primorum Scytharum propaginem ipsamque Sueciam Scythiae annumeratam Europae, olim parvam Scythiam seu minorem vocatam esse multi magni nominis scriptores tum exotici quam domestici docuerunt.⁶¹¹ Nec ipse refragatur Cluverius, l. 1, c. 2, ubi ex antiquissimis auctoribus Timaeo, Xenophonte, Lampsaceno et Pythea apud Plinium docet Baltiam seu Basileam, eandem Scandinaviam Plinii, quae Suionum est patria, Scythiae insulam (quae tamen peninsula est) habitam fuisse. Quod etiam inter multos testatur Nicetas Choniates in vita Comneni Gothos nimirum Schythas fuisse, de quo ipsi et reliquis valde, sed temere, succenset Cluverius. lib. 1, cap. 50.⁶¹²

(F.d. 14a, p. 32) Vossius, Idol. lib. 1, cap. 82, ubi de nominibus deorum Scythicorum, quae prodit Herodotus:

Sed si tamen (inquit) de origine eorum commentari animus sit, non ea aliunde arcessam, quam a veteri Germanorum lingua, cui proxima erat illa Scytharum, quum ex Asiatica Scythia Scythiam Europaeam vicinasque magnae Germaniae gentes genus ducere validis evincere argumentis admodum nobis est proclive.⁶¹³

⁶⁰⁹ vero] R. 21 has *enim* instead of *vero*.

⁶¹⁰ dissertatione sufficienter, ut spero, refutavimus] So F.d. 14a, p. 31 according to Stiernhielm's correction and addition. F.d. 6, 58r, has *libro peculiari refutavimus*.

⁶¹¹ In the margin of F.d. 6, 58r, Stiernhielm adds: "NB. Historia Islefi dicit omnes terras quae a Tanais se extendunt versus Oceanum Norvegicum vocatas Suediotes. Sed verba non memini." F.d. 14a and NKS 150 omit this passage.

⁶¹² Quod ... cap. 50] In F.d. 6, 58r, Stiernhielm added this in the margin.

⁶¹³ Vossius ... proclive] This quotation is a marginal addition in F.d. 6, 58r. See Gerard Vossius, *De theologia gentili et physiologia Christiana sive the origine et progressu idololatriae*, Amsterdam 1641, p. 723f. (part of book 2, chapter 82).

Nec desunt qui nomen Suethiae ex Scythiae corruptum arbitrentur. Nec mirum, cum ipsa Germania olim magnae Scythiae⁶¹⁴ nomine et finibus comprehensa fuerit. Salmasius, *Hellenist.*⁶¹⁵ ex Γέθης facit Σκύθης. Salmasius, *Hellen.* p. 368: Σκύθης, Γέτης et Γοτθός idem est. Item Δάοι, Δάαι, Δάσαι, Δάκοι, et Dani. Sic Iuti et Guti ipsorum lingua vocati Aeolum more praeposito Σ a vicinis Graecis Σγύθαι et Σκύθαι appellati sunt, et nota bene pag. 371, 369, 380, p. 366.⁶¹⁶

Posterioribus vero temporibus nomen Schytharum Europaeorum in diversa abiit, scilicet in Sarmatarum, Celtarum et Celto-Scytharum. Sub Sarmatis omnes gentes Sclavonicas. Sub Celtis Germanos, Illyros antiquos, Gallos et Hispanos. Sub Celto-Scythis videlicet Hyperboreos, Cimbros et omnes Septentrionales complexi sunt.⁶¹⁷

Schytharum communem patrem et conditorem omnes consentiunt esse Iaphet, filium Noe, et in specie Iapheti filium Magog. (F.d. 14a p. 33) Unde manifestum evadit linguam Suecorum Scythicam⁶¹⁸ esse eandemque Iapheticam, omnibus Scythis olim, tam Asiaticis quam Europaeis communem. Quae deinceps cum ipsis populis in diversas regiones, dialectos et nomina dispersa est.

Linguarum Germanicae, Gallicae, Hispanicae, Cimbricae, Britannicae, Belgicae, Celticae identitatem multis post alios demonstrat idem Cluverius, *Antiqua Germania*, cap. 5, p. 39,⁶¹⁹ ut mihi istis inhaerere nihil opus sit. Quibus ego addo Italicam primam Aboriginum sive Tuscanam eandemque Umbriam seu Thyrenam.⁶²⁰ Vide etiam Iunii dedicationem ad Ulfilam.⁶²¹

⁶¹⁴ Scythiae] In F.d. 6, 58r, the spelling *Schythiae* is changed to *Scythiae*.

⁶¹⁵ Hellenist.] See Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 369.

⁶¹⁶ Salmasius ... 366] The quotation (Σκύθης ... Dani) and the paraphrase (Iuti ... appellati sunt) have been added by Stiernhielm in the margin of F.d. 14a, p. 32.

⁶¹⁷ In F.d. 14a, p. 32, Stiernhielm adds at the bottom of the page: "Scythae omnium hominum primi Salmas. 374 ex Herodoto."

⁶¹⁸ Scythicam] In F.d. 6, 58r, *Schyticam* is changed to *Scythicam*.

⁶¹⁹ *Antiqua Germania* cap. 5, p. 39] In F.d. 14a, p. 33, Stiernhielm added this in the margin. The title *Antiqua Germania* has here been abbreviated as *A. G.*

⁶²⁰ Quibus ... Thyrenam] Stiernhielm adds this in the margin of F.d. 14a, p. 33.

⁶²¹ Iunii ... ad Ulfilam] Stiernhielm adds this in the margin of F.d. 14a, p. 33. Franciscus Junius the Younger published *Codex Argenteus* in 1665 with the title: *Quatuor D.N. Jesu Christi evangeliorum versiones perantiquae duae Gothicae scilicet et Anglo-Saxonica, quarum illam ex celeberrimo Codice Argenteo nunc primum depromsit Franciscus Junius*, Dordrecht 1665. In a dedicatory preface to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie, Junius proposes his theory of linguistic kinship: Anglo-Saxon and Franconian has developed from ancient Gothic (proto-Germanic in modern terminology), while ancient Gothic and Greek descend from a common origin. Junius states (ibidem, preface, p. 4): Francicam enim Anglo-Saxonicamque ex vetere Gothica promanasse, ipsam vero Gothicam (ut quae sola dialecto differat a Graeca vetere) ab eadem origine cum Graeca profluxisse iudicabam.

Ego vero priusquam ipsi ignota et intacta aggrediar, aio, nostram linguam Suethicam eandemque Gothicam omnium istarum manere etiam hodie purissimam et simplicissimam, hisce potissimum fultus rationibus:

1. Quia gens ipsa ab antiquissimis usque temporibus intra suas primas sedes et limites antiquos manet integra, et, quod de Germania olim praedicavit Tacitus, nullis aliarum nationum connubiis infectam, illibatam et ab extraneis viribus intactam, quam neque Bacchus neque Hercules aliorumve heroum quisquam (ut de Britannia loquitur Diodorus Siculus) bello lacesivit.⁶²² **(F.d. 14a, p. 34)** De quo nulla alia, si fiat comparatio, hodie potest gloriari. Multas enim amisit colonias, nullam unquam admisit.

Suethicae autem includo omnes dialectos Scandicas et Islandicam, quam **(F.d. 6, 58v)** nec ipsa quidem natura quoad ipsas radices corrumpere potuit.⁶²³ De Gallis, Hispanis, Illyriis, Britannis etc. res ipsa loquitur. Germania multas passa est incursiones et misturas barbarissimarum nationum: Sclavorum, Vandalorum, Hunnorum, Alanorum, ex quorum colluvie impossibile est, quin multa adhaeserint, et splendorem pristinum obscuraverint locis quibusdam, non omnibus, sed potissimum⁶²⁴ in locis limitaneis, et ubi haeserunt, ut in Hungaria et Bohemia, aut reliqui⁶²⁵, ut in Lusitania, Cassubia et similibus.⁶²⁶ Proxime tamen ad integritatem accedunt nobis proximae Saxonicae inferiores dialecti.

(F.d. 14a, p. 35) 2. Quia antiquissimum habuerunt usum literarum, quas Runas vocaverunt, de quibus fusius alibi. Literarum autem beneficio linguas aeternare nemo nescit.

3. Nullum Suethiae aut Scandiae cum linguis et gentibus exoticis est confinium. Undiquaque enim mari clauditur nec est adversis litoribus alii, quam qui dialectis affinis utuntur.

4. Ipsa experientia et praxis, qua radices et vocum formationes simplicissimae educentur,⁶²⁷ rei evidentiam satis superque comprobabunt.

⁶²² et quod de Germania ... bello lacesivit] In F.d. 6, 58r, this passage has been added in the margin to replace *in corrupta nulli exoticae permixta*, which has been crossed out.

⁶²³ et Islandicam ... potuit] This clause has been crossed over in Fd. 14a, p. 34.

⁶²⁴ sed potissimum] Thus F.d. 14a, p. 34, according to Stiernhielm's correction. F.d. 6 58v, has "et vix nisi."

⁶²⁵ reliqui] So F.d. 6, 58v. F.d. 14a, p. 34, has *reliquae*.

⁶²⁶ locis quibusdam ... Cassubia et similibus] In F.d 6, 58v, this passage has been added in the margin.

⁶²⁷ educentur] F.d. 6 has the future passive, while all the copies (F.d. 14a, NKS. 150, R. 21) have the present indicative passive: *educuntur*.

Hisce ut notis et omnibus pene praecognitis praemissis ad ulteriorem linguae nostrae cum aliis convenientiam indagandam et aperiendam brevissima, qua fieri potest, via progrediamur.

Proximum itaque erit, ut dispiciamus, quae et quot gentes, cum suis linguis a Iapheto sint exortae. Ne vero actum agamus et nos in iis quae magno labore reperta sunt et demonstrata a doctissimis viris excruciemus, pro veris et indubitatis supponemus ea, quae de dispersione gentium in suo PHALEG nuper edidit vir ingenii et doctrinae laude eminentissimus Samuel Bochart.⁶²⁸ Ille Iapheti filio primo Gomero ascribit⁶²⁹ Phrygiam et huius filiis (F.d. 14a, p. 36) Aschenazi Bithyniam, Riphath Paphlagoniam, Thogarmae Cappadociam. Unde sequi videtur⁶³⁰ hasce gentes linguas suas habere ex Phrygia. Iapheti filio secundo Armeniam et Scythiam tribuit. Tertio Madai Mediam. Quarto Iavan Graeciam et ipsius filii Dodanim seu Rhodanim Galliam, Elisae Peleponessum, Tharsi Hispaniam et Chittim Italiam. Unde videtur velle concludi linguas Peleponnesiacam, Gallicam et Hispanicam fuisse unius propaginis ex patre Graeco. Quarto⁶³¹ Iapheti filio Thubal Iberos et Tibarenos ad Colchidem⁶³². Colchi usi sunt lingua Aegyptiaca. Eustath. in Dionys. Gesner. Mithridat.⁶³³ Quinto⁶³⁴ Mesech Moscos in Albania. Sexto⁶³⁵ Thiras Thraciam assignat.

Hic video magnam doctissimorum virorum catervam mihi occurrere clamantem absurdissimum esse putare omnes Iaphetidas

⁶²⁸ Samuel Bochart, *Geographiae sacrae pars prior Phaleg seu de dispersione gentium et terrarum diuisione facta in aedificatione turris Babel*, published in Caen in 1651. The author deals with the settlements of the Japhethites in book 3, pp. 167–225: specifically those of Japheth's first son Gomer in chapter 8, p. 194, of Gomer's sons Ashkenaz, Riphath and Togarmah in the subsequent chapters (pp. 96–204), of Japheth's second son Magog in chapter 13, p. 212, of his third son Madai in chapter 14, p. 219, of his fourth son Javan in chapter 3, p. 174, of Javan's sons Elisha, Kittim, Dodanim or Rhodanim and Tarshish in the subsequent chapters, pp. 176–194, of Japheth's fifth and sixth sons Tubal and Meshech in chapter 12, p. 204, and of his seventh son Tiras in chapter 2, p. 172.

⁶²⁹ ascribit] So F.d. 6, 58v. F.d. 14a, p. 35 has *adscribit*.

⁶³⁰ sequi videtur] In F.d. 6, 58v, Stiernhielm first wrote *sequitur*, then he crossed out *-tur* and added *videtur* above the line.

⁶³¹ Quarto] Stiernhielm mistakenly repeats the same ordinal number as above for Javan. He should have written *quinto*. This mistake has not been corrected in the copies.

⁶³² Between *Cholcidem* and *Cholci*, Stiernhielm crossed out the word *assignat*.

⁶³³ Colchi ... Mithridat.] These references have been added in the margin of F.d. 6. See Archbishop Eustathius' commentary on Dionysius Periegetes' description of the inhabited world and Conrad Gesner's *Mithridates: de differentiis linguarum* (1555).

⁶³⁴ Quinto] This should accordingly be *sexto*.

⁶³⁵ Sexto] This should consequently be *septimo*.

aut ex uno aliquo filio omnes Iapheti nepotes retinuisse aut saltem in regiones dissitissimas abduxisse unam eandemque linguam. Omnes Confusione Babylonica me confundere satagunt. Ego vero dum hoc ago, inducias postulo libens oportuno tempore responsurus, consiliis omnia prius et bonis verbis malens experiri quam armis. Iam igitur pergam ad dissertationem omnium primo de <convenientia linguae Suethicae cum lingua Phrygia>.⁶³⁶

11.5.2 *De proprietate linguae Suethicae*

Sources: *Runa Suethica et alia miscellanea*, F.d. 5, fol. 36r, col. 1 and col. 2 at the top. A non-autograph fair copy is found in F.d. 3, fol. 6r. The original is photographically reproduced in Figure 10.

Contents: the text deals with characteristic properties of Swedish as a language, which according to Stiernhielm are the number of letters, their pronunciation, the use of definite articles, declination (of nouns and adjectives) and conjugation (of verbs). The concept of letter (*littera*) refers to both phonemes and graphemes. Stiernhielm also considers the ontological connections between the original stem and the nature or properties of their referents to be a distinctive mark of Swedish. In his study on Johannes Bureus as the father of Swedish grammar, Hjalmar Lindroth argues that Stiernhielm reveals himself to be a pupil of Bureus in his morphophonological approach to language studies with reference to this text on the features of the Swedish language.⁶³⁷

De proprietate linguae Suethicae

Ea consistit in literarum numero, in pronuntiatione, in usu articulorum, in declinatione, in coniugatione.

Divinum plane esse omnes fere voces ortas nostrae linguae⁶³⁸ habere plura etyma, quae ad vocis propriam indolem constituendam et definiendam concurrunt. Exempla manifesta ubique se produnt.

11.5.3 *Dialecti Danicae proprietas*

Source: *Runa Suethica et alia miscellanea*, F.d. 5, fol. 36r, col. 3 at the bottom (the original), and F.d. 3, 6v. Dating: around 1651.

⁶³⁶ Hic video ... primo de] This paragraph has been crossed over in F.d. 6, 58v. It does not occur in F.d. 14a. I have supplemented the unfinished sentence from the heading of the text that follows in the manuscript (F.d. 6, fols. 59r–65v).

⁶³⁷ Hjalmar Lindroth, *J. Th. Bureus. Den svenska grammatikens fader*, Stockholm: Norstedt, vol. 2, 1912, p. 326. Lindroth refers to this text as occurring in F.d. 5, on fol. 33r, instead of on fol. 36r.

⁶³⁸ linguae] F.d. 5 and F.d. 3 mistakenly have *linguas* instead of *linguae*.

Dialecti Danicae proprietas est; et a nostra differentia.

Suethice	Danice	<Suethice>	<Danice>
a. finale	e.		
p. löpa.	b. löbe		
k. läkia	g. läge		
t. huijt	d. huijd	äta	äde
		maat	maad
g. krage	f. krafue	skog	skouf
		lågh	lauff
n. man	nd. mand		
g. lag	w. low.		

In another draft (in *Autografsamlingen*, first envelope, 1r, Royal Library, Stockholm), Stiernhielm points out the agreement between Danish *d*, *g* and *b* and Swedish *t*, *k* and *p*:

Dani in plurimis D utuntur ubi nos T; G, ubi nos K; – *rodne*, *lijs*, *wijge* – B, ubi nos P. Nota bene, in genere mollioris oris sunt.

11.5.4 An aphorism on linguistic primordality

Source: F.d. 9:1, fol. 1r. Dating: the 1650s.

Quo gens quaeque simplicior et originum tenus barbarior, eo linguae primigeniae proprior.

In English translation: “The more simple and barbarous a nation is in its origins, the closer it is to the primordial language.”

11.6 The nature of language diversification

11.6.1 A half-circle diagram

Source and dating: F.d. 4:5, fol. 17r. The half-circle diagram has a diameter that measures 122 mm and most likely dates from 1652.

Contents: The text demonstrates the diversification of languages from Noah’s language into the following ones: (1) Scythian, (2) Getic and Germanic languages, (3) Persian and Phrygian, (4) Greek, (5) Hebrew, (6) Arabic, (7) Celtic languages, and (8) Latin. They are related to colours on a scale from white to black. The diversification is related to certain intervals of time, which are connected with vowels on a scale from /a/ to /u/. Stiernhielm apparently contends that the languages under consideration arose gradually, though the space of time separating their formation do not conform with biblical chronology.

Diagram 1




Figure 1. Diagram of language diversification, a half circle, F.d. 4:5, fol. 17r. Reproduction: Lina Löfström Baker, Kungliga Biblioteket.

Transcription of the manuscript diagram.

Color candidus gradatim divergens in fuscum.

Lux sensim fuscata in tenebras.

Lingua Noachica.

Primum centum.

Period[us] 300 annorum.

Period[us] 1000 annorum.

1500 an[norum].

2000 an[norum].

3000 an[norum].

4000 annorum.

5000 annorum.

a.
ä.
e.
i.
ö.
y.
å.
o.
u.


Lingua Scythica. Getica, Germanica. Persica, Phrygia.
Color candidus [ǣ]. *flavus* [e]. *fulvus* [i].

Graeca. Hebraea. Arabica. Celtica. Latina.
viridis [ö]. *ruber* [y]. *purpureus* [ǣ]. *coeruleus* [o]. *fuscus* [u].

11.6.2 Pyramidal diagrams

In ms. F.d. 6, fol. 10v, Stiernhielm drew up a pyramidal diagram of language diversification, which in the manuscript measures 212 x 325 mm and is represented graphically below (diagram 2). For a photographic reproduction of this diagram, see Figure 11.

Diagram 2



Stiernhielm comments on this diagram as follows (F.d. 6, fol. 10v):

Demonstrandum quo modo ex una lingua barbara usuali possint nasci aliae atque aliae per intervalla temporum. Lingua Carthagin[i]ensium Punica inquaerendum quot annis separata fuerit a Phoenicia Sidonica et haec quot annis a Hebraea sive a Confusione Babylonica.

“It is to be demonstrated how different languages can emerge from one common uncivilized language by the course of time. It should be enquired by how many years the Punic language of the Carthagians has been separated from the Phoenician one of Sidon and by how many years the latter diverges from Hebrew or from the Confusion (of Languages) at Babel.”

In the *Runa Suethica* manuscripts there are two other pyramidal diagrams aimed to illustrate the gradual differentiation of languages. F.d. 6, 69v, has a pyramid with six levels (diagram 3), while D. II. 37, 53r, has a pyramid with seven levels (diagram 4).

Diagram 3






Diagram 4




11.6.3 Genealogical diagrams of divergence and convergence

In the following two diagrams (F.d. 6, fol. 10r) Stiernhielm intended to illustrate the processes of language diversification and language mixing. In the manuscript, these diagrams are arranged vertically. I represent them horizontally. For a photograph, see Figure 11.

Transcription of diagram 5



Transcription of diagram 6, where the colour keying is introduced by me.




For a photograph of the manuscript diagram, see Figure 11c.
Stiernhielm comments as follows on the diagram (F.d. 6, fol. 10r):

Iterum, si una lingua conflata fuerit ex tribus hisce linguis novis (A, B, C), qualem illam futuram putas? An alicui uni intelligibilem? Nequaquam. Nihil tamen habet <aliud> quam quod continetur in omnibus.

“Moreover, if a language is conflated out of the three new languages (A, B, and C), what do you think it would look like? Would it be comprehensible to anyone? Not at all. Nonetheless, it contains nothing other than that which is contained in each one.”

In a minor diagram at the right-hand corner of the page (F.d. 6, fol. 10r) Stiernhielm clarifies his derivation of English from Old Dutch (*Cimbrica*) and Old Saxon (*Saxonica*):



11.7 Typology of language origins and differentiation

11.7.1 Types of language differentiation

Source: F.d. 4:4:2, fol. 3r (a loose leaf). The text transcribed below is found on a loose leaf in the second part (philological notes) of *Collectanea philosophica et etymologica*.

Contents: Stiernhielm argues that there are two kinds of language origin, miraculous and natural. The miraculous origin is that which is imparted by God. The natural one is the origins of new languages or language stages because of particular causes, such as (1) the long passage of time, (2) the mixing of different languages, and (3) the separation of peoples in time and space. The first cause is further defined in the last paragraph as a succession of different stages, and is exemplified by the stages of Ancient Latin according to the age-of-life periodization, viz. childhood, the time of youth, vigorous age, full-grown decline and old age.

(3v) De origine linguarum Gothicarum et in genere omnium, quae existunt, linguarum. Ea duplex est: naturalis et miraculosa.⁶³⁹ Miraculosa est a Deo subito infusa. Naturalis, qua ex una⁶⁴⁰ longo temporum decursu obsolescit et in aliam degenerasse videtur. Qualis est Latina, Germanica Otfridi etc. Tertio,⁶⁴¹ qua ex plurimarum ex una ortarum commixtione coalescit una, qualis olim Graeca, Latina. Item, qua ex una per dispersionem populorum longo temporum et locorum intervallo enascuntur multae.

Summa: Triplici modo naturaliter ex una lingua nascuntur plures. 1. Cum una lingua longissimo temporum intervallo aut obsolescit⁶⁴² aut frequenti cultu efflorescit in aliam vel quasi aliam. Id quod experientia constat contigisse linguae Latinae, cuius 5 aetates numerantur: infantia, adolescentia, vigor, virilis declinatio et senectus. Infantiam non intellexit ipse Cicero, qui vixit in vigore eius virili, quod fatetur ipse. ⁶⁴³

⁶³⁹ De origine linguarum ... miraculosa] This has been written in a pencil.

⁶⁴⁰ una] Stiernhielm first wrote *una*, *praesertim primigenia*, but then crossed out *praesertim primigenia*.

⁶⁴¹ tertio] This word has been added above the line; *item* has been crossed out on the line.

⁶⁴² obsolescit] This word has been added above the line; *degenerat* has been crossed out on the line.

⁶⁴³] In the manuscript, there are seven dots.

12. *De linguarum origine praefatio* (1651–1671): a treatise on language origins, language relationships and linguistic change

12.1 Printed and manuscript sources

12.1.1 Printed sources

Stiernhielm compiled a preface entitled *De linguarum origine praefatio* to the edition of *Codex Argenteus* that was published by the Swedish College of Antiquities, Stockholm 1671.⁶⁴⁴ The titlepage and some pages of the preface (pp. 2–3, 18–19, and 28–29) are reproduced as photographic illustrations in Figures 12a–12d.

There are variant copies of the edition with its preface. Several changes were made in the course of the two or three years of printing, 1669–1671. The variant printed versions are compared by J. Viktor Johansson.⁶⁴⁵ As far as the preface is concerned, there are some minor deviations on the third sheet (c–c4), in which there are a few printing errors in the ordinary prints, while the less common variant prints do not have these errors. This can be explained by the loss of the printing form of the third sheet (c–c4) during the final printing process (Johansson 1939: 11).

Moreover, there is a very accurate manuscript copy of the preface from the variant print in *Engeströmska samlingen*, shelfmark ms. III (fols. 1r–22v) at Royal Library, Stockholm.⁶⁴⁶

⁶⁴⁴ *D[omini] N[ostri] Jesu Christi S[acro]s[ancta] Evangelia ab Ulfila Gothorum in Moesia Episcopo circa annum a nato Christo CCCLX ex Graeco Gothice translata, nunc cum parallelis versionibus Sveo-Gothica, Norraena seu Islandica, et vulgata Latina edita*, Stockholmiae/ Stockholm 1671, printer Nicolas Wankijf.

⁶⁴⁵ Johansson, *Variantexemplar av Stiernhielms Ulfilas-edition: en bokhistorisk undersökning*, Göteborg 1939 (Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift), pp. 3–21.

⁶⁴⁶ *Engeströmska samlingen* (i.e. *the collection of Engeström*) was donated to the Royal Library by the Swedish politician count Lars von Engeström (1751–1826), who gathered this collection from different sources, among others a donation from Mattias Benzelstierna (1713–1791), the brother-in-law of Johannes Engeström. Benzelstierna had inherited the collection from his uncle Gustav Benzelstierna (1687–1746), a brother of Eric Benzeliuss the Younger (1675–1743), who in turn had done preparatory work for a new edition of *Codex Argenteus*. The manuscript copy has the emblem of Mattias Benzelstierna (with the motto *Potius esse quam*

The preface (48 pages without pagination) is preceded by a title page and a dedicatory letter to Charles XI. The sheets – each of which makes up eight pages – are numbered with printing marks on the recto of each folio (except for the last folio of each sheet where these marks are absent).

12.1.2 Manuscript sources

The bulk of *De linguarum origine praefatio* (pp. 2–32) consists of a compilation of chapter drafts of *Runa Suethica*, part 1 (*Dissertatio de linguis et vera linguarum origine*), specifically chapters 1–5. These drafts are extant in two versions:

(1) Stiernhielm's autograph draft in *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, fols. 68r–76v with the measurements 210 x 327 mm. The first chapter has the heading *Runae Suethicae caput primum* and was begun in Stiernlund on 11 September 1651 according to the dating in the right-hand corner of the first page: “Coeptum in Stiernlund, die 11 Sept. 1651”; see F.d. 6, fol. 68r). Folio 68r is reproduced as a photograph in Figure 13.

(2) A copy of a revised, now lost, fair copy of *Runa Suethica* (chapters 1–5) in a manuscript volume titled *De linguis in genere et ad diligentiorē inquisitionem annotata*, ms. D. II. 37 at the National Library of Finland, Helsinki. The revised fair copy was probably done by Claudius Örnhjälms during 1662–1663, while D. II. 37 likely dates from 1668. Chapters 1–5 occupy 31 leaves (62 pages), 25r–55v. The copy begins with the heading *Runae Svethicae cap. 1*. It generally agrees with the other extant version (F.d. 6), but differs from it in a number of passages, at the same time as it agrees with the 1671 print. There are around thirty points of agreement between D. II. 37 and the 1671 print. These are accounted for and are contrasted with the readings of F.d. 6.

12.1.3 Editorial use of the textual sources

In the critical apparatus, I have accounted for (1) printing errors, (2) word choices and phrases that are mutually different in F.d. 6 and D. II. 37, but that agree with or differ from the 1671 print, (3) omissions and additions in the 1671 print in relation to the *Runa Suethica* manuscripts, and (4) to some extent, corrections and changes in F.d. 6 itself, in so far as they are relevant for gaining a better understanding of the 1671 print.

In the edition below, I have introduced a pagination (1–44), which corresponds as follows to the printing marks of the sheets of

videri). It contains marginal notes (mainly NB, that is, *Nota Bene*, to twelve passages) and some remarks (*Simile* twice, and *Dialectus quid?*).

paper with their recto- and verso. The marks printed are here put in extra bold type:

1 = a 3 recto	15b = a separate	29 = e r
2 = a 3 verso	inserted folio,	30 = e v
3 = a 4 r	15c = a separate	31 = e 2 r
4 = a 4 v	inserted folio,	32 = e 2 v
5 = b r	16 = c 2 v	33 = 3 e r
6 = b v	17 = c 3 r	34 = 3 e v
7 = b 2 r	18 = c 3 v	35 = e 4 r
8 = b 2 v	19 = c 4 r	36 = e 4 v
9 = b 3 r	20 c 4 v	37 = f r
10 = b 3 v	21 = d r	38 = f v
11 = b 4 r	22 = d v	39 = f 2 r
12 = b 4 v	23 = d 2 r	40 = f 2 v
13 = c r	24 = d 2 v	41 = f 3 r
14 = c v	25 = d 3 r	42 = f 3 v
14b = a separate	26 = d 3 v	43 = f 4 r
inserted folio,	27 = d 4 r	44 = f 4 v
15 = c 2 r	28 = d 4 v	

12.2 Dating and summary

12.2.1 Date of composition

The drafts of *Runa Suethica*, chapters 1–5, likely date from the time between September and the end of 1651. Stiernhielm himself gives 11 September 1651 as the date when he began to compose the first chapter (F.d. 6, fol. 68r). Stiernhielm decided to publish his drafts as preface to his edition of *Codex Argenteus* around 1670. Until then, his intention had been to publish the drafts of the origin and kinship of languages as a separate treatise titled *Dissertatio de linguis et vera linguarum origine*, as the conspectus of *Runa Suethica* declares. He refers to such a work in a list of forthcoming publications from about 1662⁶⁴⁷ and mentions it in a report to M. G. De la Gardie in 1668. In the official report (dated 9th of June 1668) of the first meeting of the Swedish College of Antiquities on 28 May 1668, the assessors have defined their own tasks. A fair copy of the report was made by Stiernhielm and sent to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie on 20 July 1668. In his account of his duties as director, he unspecifically refers

⁶⁴⁷ Twelve treatises are there specified. The fourth numbered is *Runa Suethica*, which is said to be “on the single and common origin and kinship of Swedish and all other languages and their kinship relations” (ms. Palmsköld. 356, Uppsala University Library). See my transcription of the entire list in Vol. 1, Section 3.3.7.

to “a dissertation” that probably is identical with the elaborated version of *Runa Suethica*, part 1.⁶⁴⁸

In the annual report of *Collegium Antiquitatis* for the year 1670 it is stated that Stiernhielm is preparing a treatise on the origin and kinship of languages and that this will be a forthcoming treatise of the College of Antiquities.⁶⁴⁹ At the end of the preface itself, Stiernhielm refers to his preface as a dissertation on the emergence of new languages.⁶⁵⁰

The preface was not printed until 1671. The sheet number begins with a typographical mark, a 3. The title page, including the year of printing 1671, forms the first folio of the same sheet. It is marked as a 1(r) and followed by the dedication 2(r–v).

Stiernhielm wrote an introduction (page ^{line 1} – page 2^{line 5}) and the last parts of the preface (page 33^{line 4} – page 44^{line 14}) after having decided to publish the first five chapters of *Runa Suethica* as a preface to the Swedish edition of *Codex Argenteus*.

In composing the brief introduction Stiernhielm relied on Thomas Marshal’s introductory notes on Bishop Wulfila and the Goths found in his explanatory notes on the Junius edition of the Silver Bible, and in compiling the section on the Scythian languages (pages 33–36) he mainly paraphrased and quoted from Casaubon’s treatise on Old English (1650) and Salmasius’ treatise on the Hellenistic language (1643).⁶⁵¹ In commenting on the runic script (39–41) he set out from pertinent passages in Gesner’s *Mithridates sive de differentiis linguarum* (1555), Postel’s treatise on the history of peoples and languages in the Orient (*De originibus*, 1553) and Worm’s treatise on the Runic alphabet (*Literatura runica*, 1651).⁶⁵²

⁶⁴⁸ For the probability in identifying the “dissertation” with *Runa Suethica*, part 1, see Vol. 1, Section 3.3.8. For an English translation of the passage and a quotation of the Latin original, see Vol. 1, Section 3.3.8.

⁶⁴⁹ Henrik Schück, *Kgl. Vitterhets historie och antikvitets akademien. Dess förhistoria och historia*, vol. 3, Antikvitetskollegiet, part 2, Stockholm 1933, p. 9: “Georg Stiernhielm praeses praeter Archimedeum Practicum iam-pridem luci paratum, *Dissertationem de origine et affinitatibus linguarum*, eodemque pertinentes cunctis communes radices, si suppetunt res, vita, viresque, typis committere optat.”

⁶⁵⁰ *De linguarum origine praefatio* (Section 12.3), p. 41 and compare p. 29, where it is referred to as a small dissertation, “*Dissertatiuncula*”.

⁶⁵¹ Meric Casaubon, *De quatuor linguis commentationis, pars prior quae de lingua Hebraica et de lingua Saxonica*, Londini/ London 1650; Claudius Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius controversiam de lingua Hellenistica decidens et plenissime pertractans originem et dialectos Graecae linguae*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1643.

⁶⁵² For exact references to Gesner’s, Postel’s and Worms’s treatises, see the further explanatory notes in the English translation (Section 12.4, pp. 300 and 302 below).

12.2.2 Summary of the contents

Introduction (page 1, lines 1–20), in which Stiernhielm discusses the life of Bishop Wulfila and the time of the composition of his Bible translation from Greek into Gothic and places the Moesogoths in their historical and geographical context.

On page 2 (lines 1–5) he establishes the origin of the Gothic language as the purpose of the preface. When it comes to how to achieve this goal, Stiernhielm declares his twofold aim to first explore the origin of languages and then to demonstrate the derivation of particular languages from the primordial fountainhead.

The first part, corresponding to Chapter 1 of *Runa Suethica* (page 2, line 6–page 6, line 9), begins with a rejection of the prejudices of his own time in the field of comparative linguistics. His criticism of the previous discourse on the history of languages can be divided into the following areas

1. the nature of the Confusion of Languages: the belief that a limited number of main languages, *linguae matrices*, came into being at Babel as a result of the Confusion,
2. the belief in the supreme primordality, or exclusive primeval status of the Hebrew language,
3. the belief in the unchangeability of Hebrew,
4. the belief that Latin originates from Greek, an idea that reaches back to Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Quintilian,
5. the belief that all Germanic languages, such as Swedish and German, originated from Latin, and accordingly that Latin is a more ancient language than these.

Stiernhielm then argues that all languages (except the American native ones) are derived from one and the same primeval language.

The second part, corresponding to Chapter 2 of *Runa Suethica* (page 6, line 10–page 9, line 23), deals with linguistic change, in particular as manifested in dialectal diversification from an original linguistic unity and the internal and external causes of this process.

The third part, corresponding to Chapter 3 of *Runa Suethica* (page 9, line 24–page 18, line 22),⁶⁵³ deals with the nature of the Confusion of Languages at Babel and the number of the primordial post-Babelic languages. Stiernhielm argues that no new languages were created there, only new dialects. From an ethno-linguistic perspective he supports his hypothesis with diagrams of the genealogies of the

⁶⁵³ In F.d. 6, 71r, Chapter 3 (which corresponds to thesis 3 of the conspectus of *Runa Suethica*) is renumbered as Chapter 4 (*Caput IV*), because Chapter 5 (that is, thesis 5 of the conspectus of *Runa Suethica*) is renumbered as Chapter 3. In D. II. 37, 46r, the original chapter numbering of the conspectus of *Runa Suethica* is resumed.

descendants of Noah through Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The text of the preface omits the first quarter of the *Runa Suethica* chapter (where the first quarter is a refutation of David Blondel's opinions on the Confusion of Languages in a private letter to Stiernhielm on the *Runa Suethica* conspectus).

The fourth part (page 18, line 23–p. 27, line 22) corresponds to Chapter 4 of *Runa Suethica*, which discusses the historical status of Hebrew, a regional dialect of the language of the Semites, asserts its kinship with Phoenician, Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic, and finally argues that Hebrew has undergone continuous changes not only after the Babylonian Exile, but also during the Egyptian Captivity before the Exodus. In the beginning of the same chapter, Stiernhielm defines the concept of dialect in contradistinction from that of language.

The fifth part corresponds to Chapter 5 of *Runa Suethica* (page 27, line 23–page 33, line 3) elucidates the formation of new languages from linguistic varieties, identifying their temporal and geographical separation as the main cause. In this part, Stiernhielm once more tries to define the distinction between language and dialect. In a diagram he also demonstrates the twofold process of dialectal diversification and language convergence.

The next section (page 33, line 4–page 38, line 4) investigates the diversification of the Scythian language of the Japhethites both in general and in detail (corresponding to theses 6, 8, 10, and 16 in the conspectus of *Runa Suethica*). Stiernhielm here briefly refers to Gothic, that is Mesogothic, as a Germanic language and to Sweo-Gothic as the most conservative of the Scythian languages. He deals in particular with Greek and Latin as immediate or intermediate derivations of the Japhetic Scythian language.

Regarding the theory of Finno-Ugric and Finno-Greek linguistic relationships (page 38^{line 5}–page 38^{line 19}), Stiernhielm proposes a kinship between Hungarian and Finnish on lexical evidence and a remote affinity between Finnish and Greek, which he explains by the assumption of an ancient ethnic mixing of Greek colonists with the Finnish nation.

The next part (page 38, line 19–page 39, line 7) treats the state authorities' concern for the purity of the Swedish language in official use. Stiernhielm mentions the threat posed by the frequent use of French and semi-Latin loanwords and refers to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie's desire – in his role as Chancellor of the Realm – for uncontaminated use of Swedish at the Government Offices.

In the next part (page 39, line 8–page 41, line 16) Stiernhielm first deals with the etymology of the term *runes* on the occasion of a passage in Conrad Gesner's *Mithridates* (2nd ed, 1610, pp. 32v–33r).

Then he addresses the question of the antiquity of the letters of the Goths, which he equates with the runes in the same way as Bonaventura Vulcanius in *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum* (1597), which he used as his source. Referring to Guillaume Postel, *De Etruriae regione* (1551) Stiernhielm also remarks on the use of letters among the Celts and Etruscans. He discusses the use of letters among the Germans before the 13th century, as he had already done in *Adelrunae conclusiones* (Section 10.3). Finally, he engages in polemics with Ole Worm on the ethnic or national terminology of the runes, specifically regarding the question of whether these signs should be called Gothic or Danish.

In the last part (page 41, line 17 – page 44, line 14) Stiernhielm attaches samples of the Lord's Prayer in Latin and in the Romance languages, Italian, Spanish, French, Rhaetian (i.e. Rhaeto-Romance), Sardinian Catalan (i.e. Algherese), popular or vulgar Sardinian, and Wallachian (i.e. Romanian).

12.3 Critical edition of the Latin text

GEORGII STIERNHIELMII
De
LINGUARUM ORIGINE
P R A E F A T I O.

BENEVOLE LECTOR.

(1) Ulfilam Gothorum in Moesia habitantium Episcopum fuisse testantur historici ecclesiastici Socrates, Theodorus, et Sozomenus. Vixit autem circa tempora annorum a nato Christo CCCLX, imperium tunc administrantibus Valente et Valentiniano. Philostorgius historicus ecclesiasticus Ulfilae coaetaneus scribit eum literas Gothicas invenisse et totam Sacram Paginam Gothice transtulisse praeter libros Regum, qui res bellicas tractant. In Arianismum cum tota sua gente lapsum referunt supra memorati historici. Quod ait clarissimus Mareschallus verisimile esse evenisse circa vitae eius scenam extremam atque post translationes Biblicas demum confectas, cum in illis nihil tale appareat. Moesia haec, quam eo temporis Gothi incoluerunt, Inferior et a Jornande Scythia Minor dicta est,⁶⁵⁴ hodie Walachia. Hic exilium suum exegit Ovidius. Incolae Gothi Minores dicti sunt, iidem qui Imperatorem Valentem praelio superatum et tugurio latentem vivum combusserunt.⁶⁵⁵ Iidem qui paulo post Graeciam, Pannonias et Italiam vastaverunt.

(2) Nunc quae sit origo Gothicae linguae, si ad inquirendum pauculum digrediamur, non credo curioso lectori ingratum fore. Ubi de linguarum fonte in genere primum videtur aliquid praemittendum; post de rivis et derivationibus singularum videndum.

⁶⁵⁶ Duo praecipua⁶⁵⁷ sunt ingeniorum obstacula, quominus veritatem et solidam sapientiam assequi valeant: praeconcepta opinio et virorum magnorum autoritas. Haec etenim ingeniis, quantumvis acribus et ad sublimiora tendentibus, alas praecidunt eaque cogunt per trita viarum humi repere. Haec ea sunt, quae⁶⁵⁸ spes et conatus ad

⁶⁵⁴ est] The print 1671 mistakenly has *esse*. The grammar requires *est*.

⁶⁵⁵ combusserunt] The print 1671 mistakenly has *combusservunt*.

⁶⁵⁶ F.d. 6, 68r, here has *Runae Suethicae caput primum*. D. II. 27 has *Runae Svethicae CAP. I*. In the *Runa Suethica* manuscripts this heading is followed by the first thesis of the conspectus: *videri omnes linguas, qui in orbe cognito extiterunt et hodie extant, ortas ex una et ad unam posse reduci*.

⁶⁵⁷ praecipua] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 25r, but F.d. 6, fol. 68r, has *praesertim*.

⁶⁵⁸ Haec ea sunt, quae] F.d. 6, fol. 68r, and D. II. 37, 25r, only have *Haec*.

ulteriora infringunt, dejiciunt, quae robur et vim ingeniorum coelestem⁶⁵⁹ exarment et exanimant. Haec praecipua sunt, quae tyrannidem exercent in Republica literaria. Quos, multorum iam seculorum decursu ab ulteriori verae philosophiae indagine non deterruit Stagyritae maiestas et propugnatorum eius supercilium?

Quot linguas quantumque linguarum chaos ex Confusione Babylonica in mundum induxit reverenda autoritas quorundam Ecclesiae patrum? Ecquos a liberiori linguarum scrutamine non arcuerunt magnorum alias virorum sannae et sui impos stomachus abominandaque bilis?⁶⁶⁰ Quibus⁶⁶¹ dum lumen unicum, divinitatem et scientiarum summam deferimus, ipsimet talpae, caudices, omnium rerum ignarissimi, nisi qua ab illis nos patimur duci, in luto nostro haeremus; servum pecus et qui hominis nomen (3) praeferamus indigni. Haec nimirum est reverentia, quae securos nos iubet indormiscere opinionibus inveteratis et inventis alienis. Quibus a teneris imbuti et assueti altiora quaerere insuper habemus.

Ad linguas ut revertar, quis in eo studiorum genere aliquid⁶⁶² superesse putat, quod a viris doctis hactenus non sit exantlatum? Cui fixum non stat plura esse linguarum principia per Confusionem Babylonicam introducta? Quis sibi religioni non ducat in dubium vocare linguae Hebraeae super aliis eminentiam et primogenituram? Piaculum esset credere eandem aliquam mutationem passam inde ab Adamo usque ad captivitatem Babylonicam. Ecquis linguam Latinam non existimat unice ortam ex Graeca? Ecquis non asserit⁶⁶³ voces, quas frequentes habent et antiquas Gothi, Sueci et Germani⁶⁶⁴ cum Romanis communes ortas ex Latina? Quis Latinam non habet antiquiorem hisce⁶⁶⁵? Et quis has⁶⁶⁶ saltem in numero linguarum priscarum unquam habuit? praeter unum illum infelicem Goropium, cuius nimis quam male accepti vestigia cunctos fere in hunc usque diem a similibus ausis absterruerunt. Quis aliquid addi aut demi posse putat etymologiis et originationibus⁶⁶⁷ magnorum hoc seculo

⁶⁵⁹ quae robur et vim ingeniorum coelestem] This is an addition in the print 1671 in relation to F.d. 6, fol. 68r, and D. II. 37, 25r.

⁶⁶⁰ Ecquos ... bilis?] So the print 1671. In F.d. 6, fol. 68r, the original wording was: *Ecquos a linguarum fontibus ad instar dracontis Cadmaei non arcuerunt sannae Lipsii et stomachus Scaligeri?*

⁶⁶¹ Quibus] In F.d. 6, fol. 68r was originally joined with the expression *et similibus viris linguarum doctissimis* (added above the line) aiming at Lipsius and Scaliger.

⁶⁶² aliquid] The print 1671 has *aliquod*. F.d. 6, 68r, and D. II. 37, 26r, have *aliquid*.

⁶⁶³ non asserit] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 68r, and D. II. 37, 26r, have *negat*.

⁶⁶⁴ Gothi, Sueci et Germani] F.d. 6, fol. 68r, and D. II. 37, 26r, only has *Germani*.

⁶⁶⁵ hisce] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 26r. F.d. 6, fol. 68r has *Germanica*.

⁶⁶⁶ has] F.d. 6, fol. 68r, has *hanc*. D. II. 37, 26r, reads *hos*.

⁶⁶⁷ et originationibus] This is lacking in F.d. 6, 68r, and D. II. 37, 26v.

virorum? Quis tam vecors aut audax, ut eorum sive ratiocinationibus sive auctoritati contrahiscere⁶⁶⁸ sustineat? Hic scilicet esset cornicum oculos velle configere, non sine magna mala sua cruce. Sic, inquam, omnibus propemodum omnia in linguarum negotio habentur plana, elaborata, extricata, certa⁶⁶⁹ et in confesso.

Ego vero longe (4) aliter rem se habere existimo. Libere et sine respectu philosophandum duco. Viros⁶⁷⁰ multijugi doctrina clarissimos, seculi nostri decora, suspicio ac veneror quam qui maxime. Hoc tamen non tribuo, ut omnia, quaecunque homini patere possunt, ipsis solis patere putem, nobis vero caeteris ut sint plane clausa et negata⁶⁷¹: namque et nobis Deus est, et nostra calescunt⁶⁷² pectora Phoebō.⁶⁷³ Cur alienis intenti nostris diffidamus dotibus? An semper pueri, nunquam desuescemus a serperastris,⁶⁷⁴ nunquam nisi praemansa manducare et nisi quae⁶⁷⁵ alii prae-lallant,⁶⁷⁶ sermocinari⁶⁷⁷ discemus? Grati agnoscimus doctissimorum virorum industriam eamque condignis laudibus nunquam non efferemus:⁶⁷⁸ sed ita, ut et nobis liberum sit, quae nostra mens sit, aperire et ut veritatem prae omnibus suspiciamus, sectemur, amplectamur.

Nunc ut compendium dictis faciam⁶⁷⁹ et ad institutum nostrum descendam, aio *VIDERI*⁶⁸⁰ *omnes linguas, quae in orbe cognito extiterunt et hodie extant, ex una ortas et ad unam posse reduci.*⁶⁸¹

⁶⁶⁸ contrahiscere] F.d. 6, 68r, has *contra-hiscere*. D. II. 37, 27v, has *contra hiscere*.

⁶⁶⁹ certa] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 26v, while F.d. 6, 68r, does not have *certa* between *extricata* et *in confesso*, and consequently reads *plana, elaborata, extricata et in confesso*.

⁶⁷⁰ viros] In F.d. 6, fol. 68r, Stiernhielm crossed out a relative clause after *viros*: *quos nominavi et eorum pares*. The original reference is to Lipsius and Scaliger.

⁶⁷¹ ut sint plane clausa et negata] In F.d. 6, 68r, Stiernhielm first wrote *occlusa sunt et negata* and changed it to *ut sint clausa et negata*. (So reads D. II. 37, 27r.)

⁶⁷² calescunt] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 68r and D. II. 37, 27r, have *incalescunt*.

⁶⁷³ In F.d. 6, 68r, Stiernhielm crossed out *et pectora finxit*.

⁶⁷⁴ desuescemus a serperastris] In F.d. 6, 68r, Stiernhielm first wrote *relinquamus serperastros*, which has been crossed out.

⁶⁷⁵ quae] The print 1671 mistakenly has *quam*. F.d. 6, 68r, has *quae*. D. II. 37, 27r, here has the common abbreviation for *quae*, namely *q* with a line above itself.

⁶⁷⁶ alii prae-lallant] F.d. 6, 68r, originally had *ab aliis prae-lallantur*.

⁶⁷⁷ sermocinari] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 68r, and D. II. 37, 27r, have *sermonari*.

⁶⁷⁸ efferemus] So F.d. 6, 68r, and D. II. 37, 27r. The print 1671 has *efferimus*.

⁶⁷⁹ compendium dictis faciam] F.d. 6, 68v and D. II. 37, 27r, lack this phrase.

⁶⁸⁰ aio *VIDERI*] In F.d. 6, 68v, Stiernhielm originally wrote *rationi et experientiae consentaneum* after *videri*, but later crossed out this.

⁶⁸¹ After the last word of this thesis (viz. *reduci*) F.d. 6, 68v, contains a passage that was omitted in the print 1671: "Hanc thesin primam facimus, quandoquidem scopus est et meta totius operis, ad quam tuendam et salvandam succenturiantur omnes reliquae. Quibus forte ipsis periclitantibus et vario incursu laboraturis ipso opere opem feret ultima non argumentationibus et verbis, sed experientia et ipsa rerum evidētia roborata et suffulta. Ultimo igitur elucescet primae huius positionis

Unum solummodo lectorem non iniquum admonitum volo me hic non alias linguas intelligere, quam quae ex Adamaea seu Noachica originem ducunt et in orbe cognito, h.e. Asia, Affrica et Europa in usu sunt aut fuerunt. Quo Americanas et in Indiis Insulanas, ut hodie sunt,⁶⁸² omnino excludo, quippe in quibus nec rationis nec cohaerentiae aut cognationis ullum vestigium deprehendo. Unde nonnulli licet temere⁶⁸³ suspicantur hominum illorum speciem in propria potius terra factam aut exortam, quam ex Adami traduce natam.

(5) Propositionem⁶⁸⁴ vero ipsam quod attinet, nova non est. Hanc enim ipsam, praeterquam quod magni hodie viri tuentur, etiam olim magnae quidam venerationis Patres tutati sunt statuantes omnium linguarum matrem esse Hebraeam, et ex illa omnes reliquas originem trahere. Viderunt illi manifestam cunctarum convenientiam, sed Hebraeae, ut sanctae iam nomen adeptae et ipsis magis forte quam reliquarum aliqua notae, principatum detulerunt. De Scythica vero Prima⁶⁸⁵ et ex illa natis Gothica, Germanica et caeteris, quae sub Celticae nomine clarent,⁶⁸⁶ ne cogitarunt quidem nec tanti esse putarunt, ut earum saltem aliqua ratio haberetur. Patres censentes eas ex Confusione Babylonica miraculose ortas, si qua emicat vox voci alicui Hebraeae assonans, eam ex Hebraea reliquam aut ex commercio posterioribus temporibus acceptam putant, licet plurimi sint, qui omnes linguas, quae hodie extant et olim extiterunt, ex una et prima Hebraea derivatas asserant,⁶⁸⁷ inter quos⁶⁸⁸ praecipuus S. Hieronymus, qui Epistula ad Damasum⁶⁸⁹ 146 scribit: Initium oris et communis eloquii, et hoc omne quod loquimur, Hebraeam esse

veritas, remotis nimirum omnibus, quae obsistere videntur per defensionem sequentium.” In D. II. 37, 27v, there are a number of deviations, e.g. *praesto sunt et succenturiantur* instead of only *succenturiantur*, moreover *insultu laborantibus* instead of *incursu laboraturis* (however *laborantibus* is the original reading in F.d. 6), *armata* instead of *roborata*, and *pro vi ac robore* instead of *per defensionem*.

⁶⁸² et in Indiis insulanas, ut hodie sunt] F.d. 6, 68v, and D. II. 37, 28r, lack this.

⁶⁸³ licet temere] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 68v and D. II. 37, 28r, have *non immerito*. In F.d. 6, 68v, Stiernhielm first wrote *ingens profecto argumentum iis qui*, but left the relative clause unfinished. He would probably have continued with *susplicantur*.

⁶⁸⁴ Propositionem] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 68v, and D. II. 37, 28r, have *Thesin*.

⁶⁸⁵ De Scythica vero Prima] F.d. 6, 68v, only has *De Scythica*.

⁶⁸⁶ Gothica, Germanica et caeteris, quae sub Celticae nomine clarent] This does not occur in the *Runa Suethica* mss. (F.d. 6, 68v, and D. II. 37, 28v).

⁶⁸⁷ Patres censentes ... asserant] The *Runa Suethica* mss. (F.d. 6, 68v, and D. II. 37, 28v) lack the entire passage.

⁶⁸⁸ In F.d. 6, 68v, Stiernhielm first quotes from Origen: “Inter hos Origenes, *Homil. 11 super Num.*: ‘Mansit, inquit, lingua primitus data, ut putamus Hebraea, in ea parte hominum, quae non pars alicuius Angeli, sed quae Dei portio permansit’.”

⁶⁸⁹ Damasum] The print 1671 mistakenly has *Damasc*. F.d. 6, 68v, has *Damas*.

linguam, qua Vetus Testamentum scriptum est, *universa Antiquitas* tradidit. Idem super Sophoniam cap. 3: Nosse possumus linguam Hebraicam omnium linguarum esse matricem.

Ubi certe aperte adversari illis videtur, qui praeter Hebraeam ex Confusione illa plus septuaginta novas linguas novis radicibus exortas tradiderunt. Quas (si ve- **(6)** rum est) mox a destituto opere turris eas obolevisse et oblivione traditas fuisse, ut credamus necesse est. Quod in miraculosa Apostolorum die Pentecostes linguarum variarum locutione contigisse argumentatur clarissimus Salmasius in *De Hellenistica*, quem vide sis lector. Interim manet statque firma nostra thesis omnium aut sapientissimorum consensu suffulta ex una omnes linguas ortas et consequenter ad unam posse reduci.⁶⁹⁰

⁶⁹¹ Unam linguam primo homini a creatore una cum mente infusam eandemque in universum genus humanum propagatam et radice tenus usque ad Confusionem Babylonicam et ultra conservatam didicimus partim ex historia sacra, partim ex ratione, ipsa rei evidentia confirmata. Ex eadem multas ortas et adhuc, dum mundus superest, orituras nec aliter per naturam fieri posse⁶⁹² ipsa docet experientia.⁶⁹³ Linguas autem ortas intelligo eas, quae⁶⁹⁴ in radice⁶⁹⁵ et basi⁶⁹⁶ cum matre et inter se⁶⁹⁷ conveniunt, sed qua prononciationem, flexiones, accentus, phrases et alia accidentia eousque ab invicem recesserunt, ut loquentes mutuo sese intelligere

⁶⁹⁰ Ubi certe ... posse reduci] This entire paragraph is lacking in the *Runa Suethica* mss. (F.d. 6, 68v, and D. II. 37, 28v).

⁶⁹¹ Here begins *Runa Suethica*, part 1, chapter 2. F.d. 6, 69r has *Cap. II* and D. II. 37 has *CAP. II*, 29r. In F.d. 6 and D. II. 37 this heading is followed by a thesis (viz. the second one of the conspectus). *Videri naturae conveniens, imo omnino necessarium fuisse ex una linguas multas oriri*. D. II. 37, 29r, has *omnes* instead of *multas*. In F.d. 6, 69r, Stiernhielm adds in the margin: *Hanc thesin nemo negare poterit, nisi qui nescit nihil sub sole et praesertim in rebus humanis dari stabile aut uno tenore permanens*. This addition does not occur in D. II. 37, 29r.

⁶⁹² F.d. 6, 69r and D. II. 37, 29r, contain a passage which has been left out in the print 1671: *utut videtur priori enunciato contrarium, nullam tamen pariet controversiam, si quo sensu, uno alteroque loco, capiatur vocabulum linguae, intelligatur: lato nimirum et stricto. Lato, quo unius linguae generalis complexui includo omnes speciales ex illa ortas; stricto, quo ex una ortas intelligo eas quae in radicibus et basi conveniunt*. The print 1671 only retains the final sentence from *ortas* until *conveniunt* and adds *Linguas autem* before *ortas* and *inter se* before *conveniunt*.

⁶⁹³ ipsa docet experientia] F.d. 6, 69r, and D. II. 37, 29r, lack this sentence.

⁶⁹⁴ quae] The print 1671 mistakenly has *qui*. The *Runa Suethica* mss. (F.d. 6, 69r, and D. II. 37, 29v) abbreviate *quae* as *q* with a stroke above.

⁶⁹⁵ radice] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 69r, and D. II. 37, 29v, have *radicibus*.

⁶⁹⁶ basi] F.d. 6, 69r, Stiernhielm originally intended to write *fundamento*. He wrote and crossed out *fundamen* on the line and replaced it by *basi* on the line.

⁶⁹⁷ cum matre et inter se] This does not occur in the *Runa Suethica* mss.

nequeant. Has voco linguas ortas ex una lingua prima et generali, quae in suis ortis iugiter perennat, nunquam qua substantiam peritura. Qua conditione similis est materiae primae, quae capax omnium formarum, unam post aliam induit, nullius perpetuo pertinax, ipsa in basi existens immobilis et immortalis.

Et hic ge- (7) nuinus meus sensus est de linguis. Quas si quis communi rerum omnium vicissitudini exemptas putaverit, adversam sibi habebit rationem, historiam et ipsam experientiam. Super ratione aedificatum est axioma: Nihil sub sole esse stabile, et inter omnia maxime lubrica esse humana.⁶⁹⁸ Mores, consuetudines, leges, gestus, ritus, indies mutantur. Quid quae ad sermonem pertinent, vox, accentus, pronuntiatio, flexio, forma, locutio, tropus. An haec perstabunt semper et ubique eadem fixa et immobilia? Quid enim ingenio hominis magis variabile? Quid fastidiosius? Quae iam probat, mox damnat. Hodie antiqua sunt et foetent, quae heri nova abblandiebantur. Et revera, quod de Deo interrogatus respondit Aesopus: eum nihil agere aliud, quam ollas veteres confringere et novas refingere, id ad actiones naturae proprias et praecipue eas, quae sunt indolis humanae, aptissime quadrat. Immensum et insatiabile sedet omnibus mortalibus novationum studium. Cui manus praebent quaesita elegantia, cultus, ornatus, rhetorica, poesis, et ex altera parte neglectus, oblivio, cum ipsis mortalibus intermoriens usus et succedens ignorantia vocum et locutionum priorum, nunc obsoletarum et aeterna nocte damnatarum. Quae omnia sermonem, et consequenter linguas, sensim et nemine fere nisi post multa secula⁶⁹⁹ animadvertente corrumpunt et in alias a prima plane innovant et transformant.

Et hoc in linguarum interitu vel genesi temporis est opus. Locorum intervalla, ubi unus populus (8) in multos per varias terrarum regiones dissipatur, et migrationes gentium quid in hoc negotio efficiunt?⁷⁰⁰ Quibus si accedant causae violentae: bella, imperiorum eversiones, nationum captivitates, deportationes, dispersiones, commixtiones, inundationes peregrinarum gentium; quae quid fecerint et faciant, omnes omnium temporum nos docent historiae et experientia quotidiana.

Duplici vero ratione linguas omnino mutari deprehendo: una, cum lingua aliqua simplex et ab aliis illibata perennans solo diuturni temporis seu vitio seu virtute, sua sibi manens, aliam atque aliam

⁶⁹⁸ In F.d.6, 69r, Stiernhielm adds in the margin: *In natura nihil non esse mutabile*.

This does not occur in D. II. 37, 30r, neither in the print 1671.

⁶⁹⁹ multa secula] So F.d. 6, 69r, and D. II. 37. The print 1671 has only *secula*.

⁷⁰⁰ efficiunt] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 69r and D. II. 37, 30v, have *efficiant*.

successive faciem induit.⁷⁰¹ Quod, ut alias praeteream, Germanicae contigisse comperiunt omnes, qui Evangelium Otfridi tempore Caroli Magni plus septem ab hinc seculis rhytmice conscriptum inspexerunt.⁷⁰² Qua facie comparituram existimas eam, quae aetate Iulii Caesaris valuit? Eamne putas ullum Germanum, qui hodie vivit, pro sua agniturum? Ne quid dicam de ea, qua Cimbri, qui Romam expugnarunt, aut primi gentis conditores usi fuerunt?

De Suethica nostra⁷⁰³ veteri et nova appello populares meos.⁷⁰⁴ Leges nostras non antiquissima lingua scriptas, sed ante quadringentos paulo plus annos renovatas pauci sunt qui intelligant. Historias uno aut altero seculo antiquiores, nemo, nisi qui linguam priscam ut alienam et exoticam didicit, legere, nedum intelligere, quirit. Nemo, qui legentem audit, non iuraverit Arabicum potius idioma esse, quam Suethicum. Quid Dalekarli⁷⁰⁵ nostri? Sue- (9) thice loquuntur pure, et ut vetus est simplicitas, sincere,⁷⁰⁶ idiomate ab omni exotica illuvie immuni. Nemo tamen nostrum, qui alibi nati sumus vel unam sententiam intellexerit. Et si quis ad illorum pronunciationem verba literis mandare exacte competentibus voluerit, vix erit ullus, qui legens credere queat linguam esse Suethicam, cum tamen pure sit Suethica nec ulla vocula, quae exotica sit, corrupta. Idem in aliis dialectis, Smalandica, Angermannica, et similibus usu venit. Eant ad suas Germani. Coeant in unum convivium Schwitzeri, Schwabi, Saxones,⁷⁰⁷ Pomerani, Silesii, Belgae et videris, quae ibi commercia linguae!⁷⁰⁸ Cuncti tamen loquentur Germanice, et ne dubites, pure Germanice.

⁷⁰¹ sua sibi manens, aliam atque aliam successive faciem induit] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 69r, and D. II. 37, 31r, have *in aliam degenerat aut exurgit*.

⁷⁰² Quod ... inspexerunt] This passage differs from the *Runa Suethica* mss. F.d. 6, 69r, has: *Quod contigit, ut sexcentas alias praeteream, in universum Germanicae et infra suam speciem Francicae, a qua non vetustissima, sed quae aevo post Carolum Magnum proximo viguit, quantum decursu septem et quod excurrit seculorum recesserit, qua hodie utuntur, moderna, sciunt qui ab Otfrido rhytmice conscripta Evangelia inspexerunt*. D. II. 37, 31r f., has two minor deviations from F.d. 6, namely *Franciae* instead of *Francicae* and *rythmice* instead of *rhytmice*. The latter deviation, *rythmice* (D. II. 37, 31v) agrees with the print 1671.

⁷⁰³ Suethica nostra] F.d. 6, 69v, first joined it with *seu Scandica*, but this is later crossed out.

⁷⁰⁴ appello populares meos] In F.d. 6, 69v, *idem plane iudicium est* has been crossed out the line and replaced by the present wording above the line.

⁷⁰⁵ Dalekarli] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 32r. F.d. 6, 69v, *Dalecarli*.

⁷⁰⁶ sincere] The print 1671 has *sincerè*, D. II. 37, 32r, *sincere*. F.d. 6, 69v, *syncerè*.

⁷⁰⁷ Saxones] This word does not occur in the *Runa Suethica* manuscripts.

⁷⁰⁸ quae ibi commercia linguae!] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 32r, while F.d. 6, 69v, has *quae ibi exoritura sint commercia linguae!*

Ne multus sim, omnes qui Latinam didicerunt, sciunt decantatas illius aetates. Qui fragmenta XII Tabularum legerunt et aliquid ex reliquiis Carminis Saliaris audiverunt, qui sterquilinia Ennii, decermina Pacuvii, osca Titinnii, casca Livii Andronici gnariter ruspatus est, mecum fatebitur linguas senium pati, exolescere et emori iterumque renasci, adolescere, iuvenescere⁷⁰⁹ et in vegetam virilitatem roborascere.⁷¹⁰ Sole igitur ipso illustrius est linguas non solum vi et causis exoticis, sed sua natura, temporum et locorum intervallis consenescere, alterari, mutari⁷¹¹ et in alias aliasque concedere formas.⁷¹²

⁷¹³ Nunc quid de ortu linguarum ex Confusione Babylonica sentiendum sit, videamus.⁷¹⁴ Aio *videri nullam novam linguam ex Confusione Babylonica exortam, et si qua exorta (10) fuit, eam momentaneam brevi*⁷¹⁵ *evanuisse*. Id ut statuam, movet me ⁷¹⁶ experientia et veritas historica. Verum obstat iterum sententia vulgi ex Patrum quorundam decreto nata, quo quasi sancitum voluerunt ad numerum capitum familiarum exortas fuisse non minus LXXII linguas. Ad quod commentum nihil ipse respondebo, eximium huius aevi theologum Andream Rivetum opponens, Exercit. in Genesin 68 ita disserterem:

⁷⁰⁹ iuvenescere] In F.d. 6, 69v, the prefix *re-* in *reiuvenescere* has been crossed out.

⁷¹⁰ In F.d. 6, 69v, Stiernhielm here added: *Si cui lubentia est, legat meos, qui sequuntur versus, ut ex multis pauca agnoscat nunc scruta, quae olim fuerunt gemmae. Sei quoi satra placet momari*. D. II. 37, 32v, adds *pretiosissimaeque margaritae* after *gemmae*, but leaves out the verse in archaizing Latin.

⁷¹¹ consenescere, alterari, mutari] In F.d. 6, 69v, the original word order is *mutari, consenescere, alterari*, but the new order has been indicated by numbers (1–3).

⁷¹² In F.d. 6, 69v, Stiernhielm originally added the following statement, which he then crossed out: *Mecum faciunt viri magni, apud quos videre est causas mutationum linguarum: Bibliander, de ratione communi linguarum, pag. 58, sed hi omnes praesupponunt ut causam primam Confusionem Babylonicam*. Bibliander discusses the fact of linguistic diversity and the causes for linguistic change in *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum* (1548), pp. 50–61. He identifies three external natural causes on pp. 58–61: (1) the mixing of peoples and languages, (2) the language policy of multilingual empires and (3) educational negligence.

⁷¹³ Here begins *Runa Suethica*, part 1, chapter 3, the first quarter of which however is omitted in the print 1671. For the omitted text, see Section 11.3.4. F.d. 6, 71r, has *CAPUT IV*. D. II. 37, 33r, has *CAP. III*. In both mss., the heading is followed by the third thesis of the conspectus: *Ex Confusione Babylonica nullam novam linguam exortam, et si qua exorta est, momentaneam et ad breve tempus extitisse*.

⁷¹⁴ Nunc ... videamus] F.d. 6, 71v, and D. II. 37, 36v, have a transitional sentence: *His nunc, quae obstare videbantur, remotis, ad ipsam thesin nostram descendamus*.

⁷¹⁵ brevi] In F.d. 6, 71v, *mox* has been crossed out and replaced by *brevi*.

⁷¹⁶ The *Runa Suethica* mss. have *iterum*, which refers to the discussion of the first part of chapter 3, which has been left out in the print 1671.

“Sed leve plane et infirmum est fundamentum, quo innititur sententia de numero praeciso LXXII linguarum.⁷¹⁷ Probabile quidem est, quod supposuerunt totidem fuisse linguas, quot gentium fuerunt divisiones. Sed de numero gentium et nationum, quod vulgo iactatum est, si ad examen revocetur, non tantum incertum est, sed etiam falsum esse reperitur.⁷¹⁸ Nam quod dicunt c. 10 supra, in posteris Japhet⁷¹⁹ XV gentes fuisse numeratas: in stirpe *Cham* unum et triginta: in progenie *Sem* XXVI quibus omnibus conficitur numerus LXXII. Si bene expendatur, rem illam, quam certam putarunt, maxime incertam reddit: 1. enim posterii filiorum Noachi in precedenti enumeratione sunt tantum 70. Additis Semo et Iapheto essent 72. Sed cur omittitur⁷²⁰ *Cham*? 2. Si divisio linguarum in annum natalem Peleg incidit, qui fuit primogenitus Eberi, quod ex scriptura manifestum est, eximendi erunt Peleg et Joctan fratres, item 13 filii Joctani, quibus 15. demptis ex numero 70 supererunt tantum 55. Quod si praeterea, ut fieri debet ex numero Gentium (11) demamus eos, quorum posterii ibidem enumerantur a Mose, in posteritate Iaphet, duo erant⁷²¹ auferendi, Gomer et Javan, in stirpe Cham 4: Chus, Misraim, Chanaan et Regma. In Semi item 4: Arphaxad, Aram, Eber, Jectan. Quos omnes removendos esse ex earum gentium numero, quas Moses recenset, probatur ex eo:

1. quod⁷²² non possunt parentes per se ac separatim a suis posteris gentem ullam constituere.
2. quia,⁷²³ si id fieret, tum deberent etiam separatim a posteris suis numerari Noë, Sem, Cham et Japhet, et ita essent non LXXII, sed LXXVI familiae.”⁷²⁴

Hisce decem remotis, omnino adhuc decem adiungendi sunt, singulis nimirum patribus singuli filii. Alioquin neminem habuerunt, quo cum loquelam communicarent⁷²⁵ et pareissent⁷²⁶ mutis.

⁷¹⁷ de numero praeciso LXXII linguarum] Rivetus has *de numero praeciso LXXII vel LXX linguarum*. In F.d. 6, 71v, Stiernhielm omits *vel LXX*, but includes it on fol. 3r.

⁷¹⁸ reperitur] So the print 1671, F.d. 6, 72r, and D. II. 37, 37r. Rivetus and F.d. 6, 3r, have *reperietur*.

⁷¹⁹ Japhet] So the print 1671, F.d. 6, 3r, F.d. 6, 72r, and D. II. 37, 37r. Rivetus has *Japheth*.

⁷²⁰ omittitur] So the print 1671, F.d. 6, 3r, 72r, and D. II. 37, 37v. Rivetus has *omitteretur*.

⁷²¹ erant] So Rivetus and F.d. 6, 72r. The print 1671 and D. II. 37, 37v, have *erunt*.

⁷²² I. quod] So Rivetus and F.d. 6, 72r. The print 1671 and D. II. 37, 38r: 1. *Quod*.

⁷²³ II. quia] So Rivetus and F.d. 6, 72r. The print 1671 and D. II. 37, 38r: 2. *Quia*.

⁷²⁴ Andreas Rivetus, *Theologicae et scholasticae exercitationes CXC in Genesin, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1633*, p. 328, col. 1 (the end)–col. 2 (the middle).

⁷²⁵ communicarent] F.d. 6, 72r, and D. II. 37, 38r, have *communicent*.

⁷²⁶ pareissent] F.d. 6, 72r, and D. II. 37, 38r, have *pares erunt*.

Numero removendorum tuto adjici posse reor ego Iaphet cum tota familia sua his de causis:

1. Plagae mundi Septentrionales et Occidentales ei eiusque posteritati a Deo fuerunt destinatae et a patre Noah sine dubio assignatae, ut reliquis fratribus tractus Orientales et Meridionales. Hinc, cum apud patrem in convallibus Montis Gordiae a Diluvii usque decursu 100 ad minimum annos⁷²⁷ (codex Samaritanus 340, Isac Voss 531 numerat)⁷²⁸ resedisset, agros colere et vineas in terra iam propria plantare suscepisset, ibidemque filios et nepotes suos demisisset, nihil video causae cur parentibus senio confectis domicilioque certo ac proprio relicto cum filiis et familia in campos Sennaar, in terram alienam iam a filiis Cham occu- **(12)** patam et a Nimrod regnatam, ubi ipsi nec serebatur nec metebatur, exulatum⁷²⁹ excurreret. Noah vero sedem circa montem Ararat, qui Iosepho Gordiaeus dicitur, fixisse ex Scriptura Sacra colligi potest, Gen 8.4:⁷³⁰ *Coepit autem Noah*⁷³¹ *agricola plantare vineam*. Cui consonat etiam historia prophana, ex qua probat clarissimus nostri aevi sidus, Samuel Bochart, in Phaleg lib. 1, pag. 19 et 20 Noah cum filiis urbem aedificasse, nomine *Thesmanin*,⁷³² octo, animarum scilicet in arca servatarum. Quo stante non est credibile Iaphet cum suis senem parentem solum⁷³³ reliquisse in campos Sennear abeuntibus Cham et Sem, quibus ad occupandum terras sibi assignatas necessario abeundum fuit. Ecquid hic est dubii? Nimrod iam coeperat potens esse in terra. Regem agebat, quibus subditis? Quo loco? In Chaldaea seu Assyria. Iam pridem igitur, ut tanta esset multitudo, quae regno⁷³⁴ constituendo sufficeret, necessum est, ut Sem et Cham, cuius haec erat posteritas, terras hasce et vicinas occuparint. Quo sequitur, ne

⁷²⁷ 100 ad minimum annos] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 72r, and D. II. 37, 38r f., have *100 aut ad minimum 60 annos*.

⁷²⁸ codex Samaritanus 340, Isac Voss 531 numerat] These references does not occur in the *Runa Suethica* mss.

⁷²⁹ exulatum] F.d. 6, 72r, and D. II. 37, 38v, do not have this word.

⁷³⁰ Noah ... Gen 8.4] F.d. 6, 72r–72v, has: *Noah vero sedem circa montes Gordiaeos fixisse aperte docet Sacra Scriptura, Gen. c. 9. v. 20*. D. II. 37, 38v, has the same wording except for *Noach* for *Noah*. The reference to the biblical passage as Gen. 8:4 is incorrect in the print 1671. The correct reference in Gen. 9: 20.

⁷³¹ Noah] So F.d. 6, 72v. D. II. 37, 38v, has *Noach*. The print 1671 has *Nooh*.

⁷³² Thesmanin] So the print 1671 and F.d. 6, 72v. D. II. 37, 39r, *Thesmaninen*. In his *Geographia sacra*, part 1 (*Phaleg*), pp. 20–21, Samuel Bochart calls the village *Themanin* or *Thsemanin*, see further the explanatory notes (Section 12.5).

⁷³³ senem parentem solum] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 72v, has *senem solum*. D. II. 37, 39r, only has *solum*.

⁷³⁴ regno] So F.d. 6, 72v (with capital initial, *Regno*). D. II. 37, 39r, and the print 1671 mistakenly have *Regem*.

solus relinqueretur in tesquis Gordiaei desertus senex, omnino ipsi auxilio relictum Iaphet.

2. Phrasis מִקֶּדֶם⁷³⁵ *ex oriente*, in qua misere se quidam affligunt, ut sensum, quem Sacra Scriptura vix intendit, excudant. Haec locutio aperte infert eos, qui ad structuram turris convenerunt, non ex Septentrione, ubi respectu Babylonis siti erant montes Gordiaei, sed ex Oriente, Bactria forte et Persia atque interiacentibus terrarum spaciis, collectos et coadunatos. Illas enim oras, si qua alia, id aevi (13) prae aliis⁷³⁶ cultas et habitatas credere rationi consentaneum est.

3. Scriptura ipsa Iaphetidas pro sepositis et a consortio reliquorum separatis habens nullam ipsorum post turris molitionem facit mentionem. Etenim cap. 10 postquam recensisset Moses genealogiam ipsorum subiungit v. 5: *Ab istis separatae sunt insulae Gentium in terris suis, singulae iuxta linguam suam, secundum familias suas in gentibus suis*. Quod prorsus idem est, ac si dicas: isti separati sunt in insulas gentium. Quo ipso, quasi cum ultimo Vale in terris suis eos reliquit⁷³⁷ Moses. Suo loco, minime per hystorologiam, ut vulgus opinione non necessaria correptum interpretatur. His autem in sua loca dimissis recensere pergit Moses generationes Cham, cum commemoratione urbium, quas extruxerunt in terra Sinar: Babel, Erech, Achad, Chalne, item quas aedificavit Assur: Nineveh, Rehoboth, Chalah, Resen, et gentium, quarum conditores et principes fuerunt. De quibus continuat Moses sermonem cap. 11, ⁷³⁸v. 2. *Et fuit, quum proficiscerentur ab oriente, invenerunt campum in terra Sinear*⁷³⁹ *et habitaverunt ibi*. Inde inceptum ipsorum nefarium ipsamque dispersionem pertexit. Posteris Sem deinceps continuata serie usque ad Abram et ultra enumerans nullo verbo amplius memor Iaphetidarum. Ex quibus non obscure elucescere⁷⁴⁰ arbitror Iaphet⁷⁴¹ regionibus sibi divinitus deputatis contentum. Et cur relicto patre sene atque domicilio iam certo et fixo in terras alienas et (14) peregrinas, in quibus cognovit sibi et suis nullam futuram sortem,

⁷³⁵ מִקֶּדֶם] The print 1671 mistakenly has מִקֶּדֶם. F.d. 6, fol. 71v, reads מִקֶּדֶם.

⁷³⁶ prae aliis] In F.d. 6, 72v, *omnino* has been replaced by *prae aliis* above the line.

⁷³⁷ reliquit] In F.d. 6, 72v, *dimittit* has been crossed out; *reliquit* has been added above the line.

⁷³⁸ cap. 11] In F.d. 6, 72v, a passage has been crossed out after *cap. 11*, viz: "Postquam interieciisset vers. 1 *Erat autem universa terra*, praesens nimirum, de qua sermo est, recensiti scilicet posterius Noae, qui eam habitabant, *labii unius et verborum eorundem*. Et ne dubitas, de iis, et non de Ante-Diluvianis, qui potuerunt diversa habuisse idiomata, sermonem esse, repetit Deus eadem verba, v. 6: *Dixitque Iehovah En populus unus et labium unum ISTIS*."


⁷³⁹ Sinear] The print 1671 has *Sinear*. The *Runa Suethica* mss. have *Sinar*.

⁷⁴⁰ elucescere] In F.d. 6, 72v, *patere* has been crossed out on the line; *elucescere* has been added above the line.

⁷⁴¹ Iaphet] In F.d. 6 *eos* has been crossed out; *Iaphet* has been added above the line.

frustra proficisceretur, nihil habuisse causae. Et hinc infallibiliter concludi posse Iaphet cum generatione sua, quae fuit XV capitum, ad turris structuram non comparuisse. His itaque 14 (Iaphet enim iam exemptus est a Riveto) insuper demptis remanebunt ex LXXII tantum 31. Quin et ipsum, quod magis mirum,⁷⁴² Nimrod, qui vulgo insani istius consilii author habetur, Bochartus in suo Phaleg eximit. Unde ultimo XXX tantum novae linguae superessent.

Caeterum, quandoquidem a nemine hactenus reperio hanc materiam pro dignitate excussam aut extricatam, operae duxi pretium ad radices penetrare ipsas, ut quid in fundo sit omnibus aliquando dispalescere queat. Et ne variis variorum disputationibus et erroribus in designatione gentium et terrarum ipse me intricem, semper mihi laudandum Bochartum in hac sylva ducem probatissimum sequendum elegi. Cuius ductu praesens exhibeo diagramma migrationis gentium et linguarum.




⁷⁴² mirum] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 40v. F.d. 6, 72v, has *mirere*.

⁷⁴³ Primogenitus ... secundo-genitus] F.d. 6, 73r, and D. II. 37, 41r. Not in the print.

⁷⁴⁴ Numerus ... descendentium] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 41r. Not in F.d. 6.

⁷⁴⁵ Syriorum p.] So F.d. 6, 73r. Not in the print 1671, nor in D. II. 37.

⁷⁴⁶ Lydiorum et Phrygum] So F.d. 6, 73r. Not in the print 1671, nor in D. II. 37.



(15) Eberi posterii fuerunt Syri, Ismaelitae, Idumaei, Amalekitae, Moabitae, Ammonitae, Midianitae, ut et ii qui ex Jectan geniti erant, de quibus supra. Hi igitur omnes linguam Hebraeam a patre Abraham et maioribus acceptam quisque in idioma proprium deflexit. In genere omnes Hebraice locuti sunt.

Notandum praeterea linguam Syram genuinam eandem esse, quae Assyria dicitur et Chaldaea, utraque comprehensa uno nomine Aramaea. Syra vero posterior, in quam corrupta fuit Hebraea in captivitate Babylonica, Judaeis usurpata tempore Christi, alia est, nimirum mixtura quaedam ex Syra et Hebraea vel Chaldaea et Judaea.⁷⁴⁷

Lingua Hebraea nomen habet aut ab *Eber* aut ab עבר, trans, transire, עברא, traiectus, quasi *trans-ripensis*,⁷⁴⁸ *trans-Euphrataea*, ita

⁷⁴⁷ vel Chaldaea et Judaea] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 42r. Not in F.d. 6, 73r.

⁷⁴⁸ trans-ripensis] So F.d. 6, 73r, and a variant print 1671. The ordinary print 1671 and D. II. 37, 42v, here lack the hyphen: *trans ripensis*.

Linguam Aethiopicam natam ait Bochartus ex Aegyptiaca. Huius pene nullum extat vestigium. Aethiopicam scimus valde affinem esse Hebraeae, unde colligo Aegyptiam adhuc propriorem fuisse. Siquidem Aethiopica ex illa orta est. Coptam Kircheri veterem fuisse linguam Aegyptiorum nemo unquam sapiens sibi persuaserit. Philistaeorum linguam mediam putat Bochartus inter Aegyptiam et Hebraeam.

(15 b, col. 1) Notandum est⁷⁵³ nomina Misraim, Ludim, Aramim etc. non esse virorum, sed locorum et gentium, loca illa inhabitantium. Misraim enim Aegyptus fuit, Ludim Aethiopia, Leabim Lybia.⁷⁵⁴ Misraim genuit Ludim, id est, Aegyptiorum coloni sunt Aethiopes. Bochartus: Eadem quae gentium, est linguarum generatio.

(15 b, col. 3) 1.				Canaan.			
2. Sidon.		Heth.		Iebusi.		Emori.	
Sini.		Arvadi.		Girgosi.		Hivi.	
				Semari.		Hamathi.	
Arki.							

Omnes his Canaanitae fuerunt, usi lingua Chanaan seu Phoenicia. Dicti sunt Syri, Assyrii, Phoenices, Sidonii. Ex his sunt Poeni et lingua Punica in Africa. Est autem lingua Chananaea linguae Hebraeae propinquissima. Unde claret usum linguae Hebraeae etiam in posteritate Chami mansisse post Confusionem. Alii sunt Assyrii in specie ita dicti, filii Assur, qui etiam cum Chaldaeis confunduntur trans Tigrim et Euphratem. De confusione harum nominationum, vide Voss. Idol., lib. 2, c. 55.

(15 c)

JAPHET

Primogenitus Bocharto, recte.
Scaligero natu minimus, falso.

1. Gomer.		Magog.	Madai.	Javan.	Thubal.	Mesech.	Thiras.
		Scytharum pater	Medorum		Thibareni ⁷⁵⁵	Moschi in	Traces.
		in Armenia Araxene.	pater.		ad Colchi-	Iberia vel	Mysi.
					dem pater.	Albania.	Getae.
Aschenaz.		Riphat.	Thogarma.	Dodanim.	Elisa.	Tharsis.	
Chittim.							

⁷⁵³ est] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 42r. F.d. 6, 73v, has *quoque*.
⁷⁵⁴ Lybia] So F.d. 6, 73v. The print 1671 and D. II. 37, 42r, mistakenly have *Lydia*.
⁷⁵⁵ Thibareni] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 43r., while F.d. 6, 74r, has *Thibareni*.

Bithynorum pater, aliis Germanorum, Phrygum, <i>Blondell.</i> Troadum, Phrygum Bithynorum, ⁷⁵⁶ Aeolidum patrem censet Voss. Idol. Lib. 1, c. 38.	Paphlagonum pater, Bithyno- rum <i>Blondell.</i> orum pater, quibus etiam favet Paraphrastes ⁷⁵⁷ Chald(aicus) ad Ezechiel, c. 27, v.7	Cappadocum, aliis German- git Bochart. Eumque vult Graecorum Gallorum patrem. conditor.	Pelepon- nesi et orum. Hispan- cedonum pater.	Ita- lorum, aliis Ma- cedonum pater.

Judaei recentiores Syria olim ad Pontum Euxinum
Hispaniam *Sepharad*, usque protendebatur, unde et
Galliam *Carphat*, Cappadoces Leuco-Syri dice-
Germaniam *Asche-nazim* vocant. bantur, Voss. Idol. Lib. 1, c. 38, p. 280.

Suecis et Norvagis
Germani semper dicti
sunt *Garpar* et *Garphatar*.

Et hi sunt qui Scythae primi hominum vocantur.

(16) Ecce!⁷⁵⁸ Hae sunt gentium et linguarum genealogiae.⁷⁵⁹ Iam calculum ponamus. In tota genealogia Sem praeter Hebraeam nullam novam linguam invenies, nisi dialectos temporum successu procul dubio natas et a terris ad populorum magis, quam idiomatum distinctionem denominatas. Eae sunt Assyria, quae eadem Chaldaea, Syra et Arabica. Harum meminit Scriptura.⁷⁶⁰ De Elam et Lud, quarum nationum sint patres et quarum linguarum authores, nihil cum pateat ex Sacra Scriptura, nihil dicendum habeo. Coniecturae, quae ex levi nominum allusione capiuntur, tantum valent, quantum cuique fides est. Si Persae sunt et Lydi, seu Phryges, infra locum suum sortientur.

Ad generationes Cham, si aequum advertamus oculum, nihil novi deprehendemus praeter Aegyptiam, forte et ex hac natam Aethiopicam. Huius vero affinitatem cum Hebraea nemo ignorat, nisi qui in Orientalibus plane tyro est. Et siquidem Aegyptia media est, eam adhuc Hebraeae propriorem fuisse dictat ratio. Colchos et Cappadoces Aegyptiorum volunt esse colonos. Eorundem igitur erunt idiomatis consortes. De Colchis testatur Eustathius in Dionys. Filii Canaan usi sunt ipsa Hebraea nomine gentis tantummodo diversa.

Quod autem supradictae dialecti post aliquot seculorum intervalla longius a stipite communi seu unitate primigenia recesserunt, ita ut

⁷⁵⁶ Bithynorum] So F.d. 6, 74r. The print 1671 has *Bitynorum*. D. II. 37, 43v, has *Bythnorum*.

⁷⁵⁷ Paraphrastes] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 43v. F.d. 6, 74r, has *paraphrasis*.

⁷⁵⁸ Ecce!] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 43v. In F.d. 6, 74r, *Ecce* is followed by a comma.

⁷⁵⁹ genealogiae] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 74r, and D. II. 37, 43v, have *tabulae*.

⁷⁶⁰ Scriptura] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 43v. F.d. 6, 74r, has *Sacra Scriptura*.

populi sese mutuo⁷⁶¹ intelligere nequiverint, causa iam supra reddita est. Nihil enim su- (17) um non patitur aevum. Nihil perpetuum. Cum hominibus oriuntur, mutantur, differuntur, adollescunt, exollescunt, occidunt linguae. Lege naturae sancitum est omnia mundana motui esse subiecta. Motum tempus metitur. Quo quid diutius movetur, eo longius recedit a principio.

Iapheti progeniem liberali causa iam manu asserui, quandoquidem nulla in insana turris structura eius sit mentio. Eam iam ante in insulas et gentes sua cum lingua⁷⁶² dimiserat Moses. Quamobrem et nos eandem hoc loco rationibus nostris merito exemptam reputamus reservantes ipsam examini peculiari, postquam, quae de linguis seu dialectis supra memoratis adhuc dicenda restant, dicta fuerint. Quod si tamen aliquis ad omnem rationem surdus et obfirmatus Iaphetidas omnino isti colluviei immiscere voluerit, fruatur ille sua sententia, non impedio, modo ne peiori et diuturniore poena premantur, quam fratres Chamitae et Semitae. His etenim, postquam a turris structura desiverunt nullam amplius novam linguam molestam fuisse discimus ex iis, quae hactenus sunt demonstrata.

Rediit enim posteris Semi, ut patet ex diagrammate, lingua Hebraea. Rediit eadem posteris Chami digrediens cum ipsis hominibus in colonias, a quarum nominibus seculis posterioribus denominatae sunt, sensim ex ea in differentias abeuntes dialecti.⁷⁶³ Idem omnino Iapheti generationi, si insani istius coepti particeps fuit, accidisce, credere (18) par est.

Redeuntibus enim ad saniolem mentem hominibus cessavit poena, rediitque⁷⁶⁴ in intelligentiam lingua ad id tantisper confusa et turbata, ut dum mutuo non intelligerent, cogerentur opus deserere et in suas oras digredi. Hic enim finis fuit confusionis istius, ut manifesto liquet ex verbis ipsius Jehovae.⁷⁶⁵ Quo obtento verisimile est linguam et mentem ipsis redditam pristinam. Nec aliter video, qua ratione salvari possit Sacrosanctae Scripturae veritas, reclamante nimirum experientia evidentissima et ipsa historia Biblica, quae nullas novas linguas mox a diluvio commemorat, praeter iam recensitas: Chaldaeam, Chananaeam, Aegyptiam, Arabicam, Aethiopicam, quas omnibus mediocriter doctis compertum est nil nisi levi dialecto

⁷⁶¹ sese mutuo] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 44r. F.d. 6, 74r, has *mutuo sese*.

⁷⁶² sua cum lingua] F.d. 6, 74r, has *suasque linguas (cum tempore scil. oritur)*. D. II. 37, 44v, here has the same reading as F.d. 6 except that *scil.* has been left out.

⁷⁶³ sensim ... abeuntes Dialecti] In the Runa Suethica manuscript Stiernhielm first worded this clause: *sensim in differentias abeuntes et Dialectos*, but afterwards he wiped out the coordinate conjunction *et* and changed *Dialectos* to *Dialecti*.

⁷⁶⁴ rediitque] So the variant print from 1671, F.d. 6, 74v, and D. II. 37, 45r. The ordinary print 1671 incorrectly has *redeiitque*.

⁷⁶⁵ Jehovae] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 45r. F.d. 6, 74v, has *Iehovae*.

differre ab Hebraea et posterioribus demum seculis, postquam condita fuerunt imperia et gentes, in ea nomina ab Hebraea diversa concessisse.⁷⁶⁶ Quin et ipsum nomen Hebraeum aliquot post seculis natum nullos primis temporibus ulli linguae constituit terminos. Eadem fuit nulloque peculiari nomine insignita Hebraea, Chaldaea, Arabica, Aegyptia etc. Una fuerunt omnes. Nomina sortitae diversa, postquam nationes ipsae nomina diversa sunt sortitae.⁷⁶⁷ Hinc non verebor adstruere.⁷⁶⁸

⁷⁶⁹ *Hebraeam, non minus quam Phoeniciam, Chaldaeam, Syram, Arabicam, Aegyptiam, Aethiopicam etc. unius linguae esse dialectum.*⁷⁷⁰

(19) Hic lingua, quo differat a dialecto, praenoscendum est. Linguae inter se substantia ceu subiecto,⁷⁷¹ dialecti vero accidenti differunt. Linguae materia, dialecti forma distinguuntur. Et ut explicatius dicam: lingua quaeque vocabulis et ipsis vocabulorum radicibus sibi propriis et alienae linguae incognitis et peregrinis definitur. Dialectus est unius linguae deflexus in singulare nationis alicuius idioma, radicum et vocabulorum identitate⁷⁷² non differens, sed formatione accidentium, casuum, terminationum, literae aut syllabae in quibusdam additione, exemptione, traiectione, mutatione, quibus accedit compositio et usus earundum vocum saepe diversus,⁷⁷³ accentus ac⁷⁷⁴ spiritus variatio et super omnia a communi recedens pronunciatio.

Quibus omnibus recte consideratis linguarum supra memoratarum nulla erit differentia alia, quam quae cadit in dialectum. Voces⁷⁷⁵ enim omnibus unae sunt et eadem in basi, licet quibusdam quaedam

⁷⁶⁶ concessisse] So the variant print from 1671, F.d. 6, 74v, and D. II. 37, 45v. The ordinary print 1671 incorrectly has *cocessisse*.

⁷⁶⁷ nomina diversa sortitae, postquam nationes ... sortitae] F.d. 6, 74v, has: *Nomina sortitae, postquam nationes ipsae nomina sunt sortitae*.

⁷⁶⁸ After *adstruere*, F.d. 6, 74v, and D. II. 37, 45v, have *quod capite sequenti pono*.

⁷⁶⁹ Runa Suethica, part 1, chapter 4 begins here. F.d. 6, 74v, has *Cap. V* (where *IV* has been crossed out and replaced by *V*). D. II. 37, 46r, however retains *CAP. IV*.

⁷⁷⁰ dialectum] F.d. 6, 74v, and D. II. 37, 46r, have *dialectos*.

⁷⁷¹ substantia seu subiecto] F.d. 6, 74v, and D. II. 37, 46r, only have *subiecto*.

⁷⁷² radicum et vocabulorum] F.d. 6, 74v, and D. II. 37, 46r, only have *vocabulorum*.

⁷⁷³ diversus] After *diversus* the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 46r, have a colon and capitalize the following word as *Accentus*. F.d. 6, 74v, has a comma and does not capitalize the following word.

⁷⁷⁴ ac] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 46r. In F.d. 6, 74v, the conjunction *et* after *accentus* has been crossed out and replaced by a comma.

⁷⁷⁵ Voces] The ordinary print 1671 incorrectly has *Vocis*. F.d. 6, 74v, D. II. 37, 46v, and the variant print 1671 correctly have *Voces*.

sint desitae et obsoletae,⁷⁷⁶ quae aliis sunt in usu. Quibusdam servatae⁷⁷⁷ sunt radices et voculae primae, quae aliis in oblivionem et desuetudinem evanuerunt, manentibus derivativis et compositis, quarum in altera,⁷⁷⁸ vice versa, aut nullus aut infrequens usus. Sciunt haec harum⁷⁷⁹ linguarum periti. Uno utuntur omnes supradictae⁷⁸⁰ lexico. Ex uno fonte (observatis modo dictis conditionibus)⁷⁸¹ derivatae in eundem fontem redeunt. Sed in his parum spero mihi fore controversiae.

Hebraeam vero reliquis parem facere, hoc opus, (20) hic labor est. Tot enim ipsius maiestas stabilita atque stipata est rationum praesidiis totque vallata magnorum virorum autoritatibus, ut eas perrumpere et disjicere velle, nimis futurum sit arduum. Tentemus tamen. Vincat veritas.

Noachi lingua primigenia est. Ea relicta fuit post Confusionem posteris Sem. Hoc sine controversia est. Etiam posteris aliquibus Cham, ortis nimirum ex Chanaan. Nec hoc negari potest. Ergo adhuc una lingua est Semitarum et Chanaanaeorum, necdum dicta Hebraea. Sed unde tandem haec dictio? Ab Eber? An ab עברא, עברא, trans, transire, traiectus? Orta in Abraham, cum ex Chaldaea emigrans in terram Chanaan traiecisset Euphratem, eo quod hac lingua transripensi aut trans-Euphrataea usus fuisset Abraham. Si ab Eber, communis fuit non solum toti Syriae, quippe omnibus posteris Eber,⁷⁸² sed etiam Arabiae et procul dubio multis locis Indiae, quae occupaverant filii et posteritas Jectan. Perinde itaque est,⁷⁸³ vocetur Ebrea, Jectanea, Phalegea sive Ebraea, Syra, Arabica, Indica. Adde etiam Chananaea, Assyria, Phoenicia.⁷⁸⁴ Omnes etenim adhuc sunt una, nec ulla nomini Ebraeo a coeteris⁷⁸⁵ differentia. Generale fuit et omnibus idem et commune. Ebraea fuit Arabica (ita longo tempore

⁷⁷⁶ desitae et obsoletae] The print 1671 has *desite et obsolete*. F.d. 6, 74v, and D. II. 37, 46v, and the variant print from 1671 have *desitae et obsoletae*.

⁷⁷⁷ servatae] The ordinary print 1671 has *servate*. F.d. 6, 74v, D. II. 37, 46v, and the variant print 1671 have *servatae*.

⁷⁷⁸ in altera] The ordinary print 1671, the variant print 1671, and D. II. 37, 46v, incorrectly have *in alteram*. F.d. 6, 75r, has *in altera*, more precisely *alterâ*, where the circumflex was misread as a nasal stroke in the copying of the manuscript.

⁷⁷⁹ harum linguarum] Between these words, F.d. 6, 75r, and D. II. 37, 46v, add *cum vulgo loquor* in brackets.

⁷⁸⁰ supradictae] So the print 1671. This does not occur in the *Runa Suethica* mss.

⁷⁸¹ observatis ... conditionibus] This clause is not found in the *Runa Suethica* mss.

⁷⁸² communis ... posteris Eber] This line does not occur in D. II. 37.

⁷⁸³ est] In F.d. 6, 75r, the conjunction *si* before *vocetur* has been crossed out.

⁷⁸⁴ Chananaea, Assyria, Phoenicia] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 47v. In F.d. 6, 75r, Stiernhielm first wrote these names, but then crossed out *Chananaea* and *As-*, so that only *Syria* and *Phoenicia* have been retained.

⁷⁸⁵ coeteris] So the print 1671 and F.d. 6, 75r. D. II. 37, 47r, has *caeteris*.

post dicta) Ebraea fuit Syra. Chananaea Ebraea dici non potuit, quia non erat ex Eber. Eadem tamen fuit reipsa et denominatione Ebraea antiquior. Chanaan enim a Noah abfuit generatione tantum secunda, Eber vero quarta. Clarum itaque evadit **(21)** hactenus et ex hac origine nihil prae reliquis praerogativae adstrui posse nudo nomini Ebraeo, cum lingua sit una.

Ad Abraham itaque revertamur. Fuerit hoc ipsi et domui eius idioma a communi Chananaeorum dialecto peculiare dictusque sit ille Ebraeus non ab Eber, sed quod transiit fluvium Euphratem quasi transfluvialis⁷⁸⁶ dictumque sit idioma ipsius Ebraeum eadem causa et notione, sed respectu Chananaeorum, quibus peregrinus erat et hospes, minime vero popularium suorum Chaldaeorum, apud quos et a quibus natus erat. Ex Ur enim Chasdim, i.e. Chaldaeorum, traduxit illum cum Loth et uxoribus eorum pater Tareh in terram Chanaan. Chaldaei itaque fuerunt et lingua Chaldaea usi, hac nimirum ipsa, quam Ebraeam, i.e. trans-ripensem vocabant Chananaei. Ergone Chaldaea Ebraea antiquior? Imo nomine, non re. Est enim una. Quid ergo est, quod disputant et propugnant Hebraeam Chaldaea esse antiquiorem, illam primigeniam, hanc spuriam et ex Confusione Babylonica ortam? cum utraque fuerit una et palam sit nomen Hebraeum multis seculis recentius esse nomine Chasdim. Si Chaldaea dialectus est linguae primigeniae Noachicae,⁷⁸⁷ etiam Hebraea dialectus est, quia una eademque.

Sed objicient: Chaldaea temporum progressu recessit ab Hebraea et facta est prope alia. Ego aio utramque a primo⁷⁸⁸ statu recessisse et ex una lingua duo facta esse idiomata seu dialectos. Utriusque enim eadem a natura est conditio.⁷⁸⁹ Nec unam credendum est magis exemptam fuisse legibus naturae, quam alteram. Imo aiunt conser- **(22)** vata fuit Hebraea in posteritate Abraham, quia ea dignatus est loqui Spiritus Sanctus. Ea foedus sancitum est cum semine Abraham. Ea Ecclesiae suae se revelavit Deus eaque verbum suum consignavit fidelibus. Ea promissio facta est Messiae ideoque Lingua Sancta appellata est. Digna itaque fuit, quae mutatis per aevum reliquis omnibus in omne aevum immobilis et immutabilis uno tenore perennaret et vigeret.

⁷⁸⁶ quasi transfluvialis] The print 1671 and D. II. 37, 47v, abbreviate the conjunction *quasi* by the sign *q*. In F.d. 6, 75r, *quasi* has been written in full and an hyphen has been added between *trans* and *fluvialis*, that is, *trans-fluvialis*.

⁷⁸⁷ Si ... Noachicae] This does not occur in D. II. 37, 48r.

⁷⁸⁸ primo] In the F.d. 6, Stiernhielm changed *priori* to *primo*.

⁷⁸⁹ a natura est conditio] So F.d. 6, 75r, and the print 1671. D. II. 37, 48r, mistakenly has *est natura et conditio*.

Humanum sic est iudicium, rationi satis concinens,⁷⁹⁰ si eventus responderet, sed non respondet. Digna fuisset, qua ipse Messias, cum venit in carne, loqueretur. Sed ea non locutus fuit. Pridem enim periit, eadem passa quae coeterae linguae prophanae. Plures enim vicissitudines passa ad ultimum plane interiit superstite adhuc aliqua parte suae gentis. Abductis enim in Assyriam et vicinas regiones a Salmanassare decem tribubus aliisque nationibus immixtis tota periit linguae Ebraeae facies totaque loco suo mota est deductis in locum ipsorum diversorum populorum coloniis. Nec diu inter angustias regni Judaici adhuc superstitis consistere potuit lingua Hebraea. Nam et inde post annos circiter centum in captivitatem Babylonicam eiecta fuit, ubi spacio 70 annorum adeo fuit corrupta, ut cum forma etiam nomen ipsum amiserit,⁷⁹¹ ex Hebraea Syriaca nuncupata. Quae et ipsa in tres dialectos diversas digressa est, *Judaeam*, scilicet, *Galilaeam*, et *Samaritanam* et postmodum in Judaeis omnis generis nationibus interspersis in innumeras differentias et schemata discissa est.

(23) Haec nempe fuit Linguae Sanctae a corruptione immunitas! Unde luce clarius evadit illam eadem passam, quae dialecti reliquae nec magis primigeniam habendam, quam fuit *Chaldaea* seu *Assyria* seu *Syra*, quae nomina olim uno *Aramaeae* nomine continebantur. De *Syra* nova, in quam degeneravit Hebraea et qua locutus est populus Judaeus tempore Christi, sermo non est, sed de ea, quam universa posteritas tam Chanaan quam Sem in *Syra* et *Assyria* usurpavit, eadem, ut supra demonstratum est, quae ipsa Hebraea.

Habuit, inquam, *Aramaea* (sic fert natura) suas subdivisiones et, ut ita dicam, subdialectos. Terra *Aram* in sex regiones distributa fuit. 1. *Paddam Aram*, i.e. iugum Syriae. Ea fuit Mesopotamia. 2. *Aram Tsobah*, i.e. Syria inferior. 3. *Aram Beth Rechob*. 4. *Aram Dammesech*,⁷⁹² Syria Damascena eademque Coele Syria, i.e. Syria cava inter Libanum et Antilibanum. 5. *Aram Mangachah*. 6. *Syria Comagena* seu *Antiochena*. Et tot habuit lingua *Aramaea* dialectos.

Nec dubitandum est, quin et suas habuerit dialectos ipsa Hebraea in duodecim⁷⁹³ tribus dispertitas. Quod aperte patet ex pronuntiatione vocis *Schibóleth*, qua se prodiderint Ephraimitae, quibus nativum erat (nec potuerunt aliter) similes voces enunciare per װ, s, *Siboleth* pro

⁷⁹⁰ concinens] So F.d. 6, 75v, and the print 1671. D. II. 37, 48v, mistakenly has *continens*.

⁷⁹¹ amiserit] In F.d. 6, 75v, Stiernhielm first wrote fuerit *abolutum*, but then crossed it out and added *amiserit* above the line.

⁷⁹² Dammesech] So F.d. 6, 75v and D. II. 37, 49r. The print 1671 incorrectly has *Dammosech*.

⁷⁹³ duodecim ... dispertitas] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 49v. F.d. 6, 75v, has 12 in number instead of *duodecim* in letters.

Schiboleth efferentes.⁷⁹⁴ Magnum insuper discrimen conspicitur in ipsis libris Hagiographis. Alio enim stilo Pentateuchus, alio Esaias, alio Job, Daniel, Zacharias etc. scripserunt. Unde iterum manifesto elucet linguam Sanctam, non minus caeteris, suis obnoxiam fuisse (24) vicissitudinibus.

Quo magis miror omnibus persuasum et fixum stare: Linguam Hebraeam ab Abrahamo usque ad aetatem Salmanassarum stetisse immotam et illibatam. Cui sententiae cursus naturae et rationes supra allegatae haudquaquam favere poterunt.⁷⁹⁵ Nunquam enim cessat natura naturalia movere et alterare. Aetas postrema primae nunquam est similis. Nulla in re perpetua iuventa.

Eidem sententiae adhaerens clarissimus Bochartus in Phaleg,⁷⁹⁶ lib. 1, c. 15, mirari se ait cur lingua Hebraea in captivitate Babylonica mutata fuit, cum in Aegypto, quae longe fuit diuturnior, nullam corruptionem, imo nec alterationem passa sit. An quia, pergit, ex Hebraea lingua⁷⁹⁷ in Aegyptiam non tam proclivis erat lapsus: quia Aegypto ab Hebraea multo plus differebat, quam Syra <aut Chaldaea>⁷⁹⁸ ab Hebraea, cuius illae sunt dialecti ab ea non remotiores, quam a Latina – nostra vulgaris (Gallica scilicet) – aut quod erudite observat D. de Grentemesnil, quia Iudaei in Aegypto conferti habitabant, in Babylonia dispersi singuli apud dominos suos, quorum lingua uti cogeantur. Haec Bochart.⁷⁹⁹

Praesupponit vir religiosus pro certo, quod incertum est, et in quaestione versatur: linguam Hebraeam in Aegypto nullam corruptionem, imo neque alterationem passam. Qui scit hoc Dn. Bochartus? Quis vidit unquam scriptum aut documentum aliquod linguae Hebraeae veteris, cuius collatione ad idioma Mosis iudicari possit an eadem plane vel in aliquo saltem mutata reperiatur. Causas itaque reddere videtur rei nondum certae ideoque nec necessarias.

(25) Primam quod attinet linguam Aegyptiam ab Hebraea longius dissitam, quam Syram, et hic pro certo asseritur, quod dubitari potest.

⁷⁹⁴ In F.d. 6, 75v, Stiernhielm adds a reference to Judges 12:6 in the margin: *Iudic. cap. 12. v. 6.*

⁷⁹⁵ poterunt] So the print 1671. F.d. 6, 75v, and D. II. 37, 49v, have *poterint*.

⁷⁹⁶ Bochartus in Phaleg] Samuel Bochart, *Geographia sacra*, vol. 1: *Phaleg*, book 1, chapter 15, p. 52, see further the explanatory notes (Section 12.5, p. 309 below).

⁷⁹⁷ ex Hebraea lingua] The print 1671 and D. II. 37, 50r, have *ex Heb. lingua*. F.d. 6, 76r, has *ex Hebraea l.*

⁷⁹⁸ aut Chaldaea] This does not occur in the print 1671 or in the Runa Suethica mss., but has to be supplemented from Bochart, who writes: “quia Aegyptia ab Hebraea magis differebat quam Syra aut Chaldaea; quae Hebraeae linguae sunt dialecti etc.” The plural form *dialecti* thus refers to Syriac and Chaldaic.

⁷⁹⁹ Eidem sententia ... cogeantur] In F.d. 7:1, p. 208, Stiernhielm paraphrased this passage in Bochart’s *Phaleg* in the same wordings (Section 12.5, p. 309 below).

Linguam enim Aegyptiam affirmat ipse Dn. Bochartus mediam fuisse inter Hebraeam et Aethiopicam. Haec enim ab illa in populo colono orta est. Iam liquet Aethiopicam ea distantia non abesse ab Hebraea, qua Gallica a Latina. Ergo longe adhuc proprior Hebraeae fuit Aegyptia, ea praesertim aetate,⁸⁰⁰ qua dialecti erant recentiores et ab invicem breviori quippe annorum intervallo minus recesserant. Et concesso Aegyptiae ad Hebraeam minorem esse affinitatem, quam Syrae, affinis tamen erat et, si non in totum, in aliquo tamen adhaerere et eam adficere⁸⁰¹ potuit. Gallica vetus seu Celtica⁸⁰² nullam prorsus habuit cognationem cum Romana. Haec tamen ab illa et vicissim illa ab hac mutua contagione ita affectae fuerunt idque longe minori quam 215 annorum spacio⁸⁰³ et in maiori libertate, ut nec Romanus ibi natus Romane nec Gallus Gallice amplius loqui potuerit. Hispaniam praetereo Romamque ipsam et Gothos Romae indigenas. Ut et hoc taceam, quod quo longius dissident inter se linguae, eo maior fuerit necessitas voces ante non intellectas propter mutuam communicationem in linguas suas adsciscendi,⁸⁰⁴ quo fit, ut longius a puritate pristina recedant, quam si⁸⁰⁵ vicinioribus et pene suis immisceantur idiotismis.

Ad secundam, quam adfert ex observatione D. de Grentemesnil, quod Israelitae in Aegypto conferti habita- **(26)** bant, in Babylonia contra dispersi, singuli apud dominos suos etc., repono: In principio quidem, cum in Aegyptum veniret Jacob, datam fuisse ei, cum filiis suis inhabitandam terram Gosen. Verum, ea brevi repleta totam terram Misraim multiplici suorum auctu ipsis Aegyptiis angustam fecerunt, ut ipse testatur Moses, Exod. c. 1 v. 7, multiplici verborum synonymia rem exprimens: *Porro filii Israel creverunt et nati sunt in multitudine multiplicatique sunt ac roborati copiosissime et repleta est terra illis.* Et v. 9 *Rex dixit ad populum suum: En populus filiorum Israel, multus et fortior nobis est.* Et v. 12 apertissime: *Et angustis afficiebantur (Aegyptii) propter filios Israel.* Unde non obscurum est illos per totam Aegyptum fuisse dispersos. *Redegerunt itaque v. 13 in servitutem filios Israel dure.* v. 14: *Et amaritudinibus affecerunt*

⁸⁰⁰ ea praesertim aetate] In F.d. 6, 76r, originally had *iis praesertim temporibus*.

⁸⁰¹ adficere] So the print 1671 and D. II. 37, 50v, while F.d. 6, 76r, has *afficere*.

⁸⁰² seu Celtica] So the print 1671. This does not occur in the *Runa Suethica* mss.

⁸⁰³ 215 annorum spacio] So the print 1671. The *Runa Suethica* mss. (D. II. 37, 50v, while F.d. 6, 76r) have *quadringentorum annorum spacio*.

⁸⁰⁴ maior ... adsciscendi] F.d. 6, 76r, originally only had *gravior et notabilior futura sit immutatio*.

⁸⁰⁵ quam si] So F.d. 6, 76r, and D. II. 37, 51r. The print 1671 incorrectly has *quam se*.

*vitam illorum opere duro, in luto et lateribus et in omni opere in agro, cum omni opere suo, in quo opera illorum abutebantur dure.*⁸⁰⁶

Iam quaero, ubi siti fuerint hi agri Aegyptiorum, in terra Gosen? an extra, in reliqua Aegypto? Si in Gosen, immixti fuerunt Israelitis Aegyptii, qui ibi bona sua et agros possidebant. Sin in reliqua Aegypto, immixti erant Israelitae Aegyptiis,⁸⁰⁷ in quorum agris opera faciebant. Et ne quid hac in parte dubii sit reliquum, ecce cap. 3, v. ult.: *Sed postulabit mulier a vicina sua et ab hospita domus suae vasa argentea et vasa aurea et vestes. Quae ponetis super filios vestros et filias vestras et spoliabitis Misraim,*⁸⁰⁸ i.e. Aegyptum.⁸⁰⁹ Unde sole meridiano clarius elucescit Israëlitas per totam Misraim dispersos cum (27) heris et dominis suis, quorum terras colebant, cohabitasse.

Quibus iam obstaculis remotis proclive erit hunc in modum argumentari: Si lingua Hebraea in captivitate Babylonica, ubi habuerunt literas, libros, prophetas, viros sapientes et synagogas, intra unam generationem, curriculo nimirum 70 annorum, adeo immutata fuit, ut plane degeneraret⁸¹⁰ in aliam linguam prioris intellectu obliterato, utique per naturam impossibile videtur, ut ultra quatuor generationes, hoc est 400 annos (ita ipsemet Deus definit generationem Gen. cap. 15, v. 16), quibus experts literarum, librorum, virorum sapientum, doctorum et prophetarum in tenebris et barbarie immixtus populo dominatori degit populus Israel, lingua ipsorum Hebraea, ut in principio, pura et illibata permanere potuerit.

Unde credibile et rationi maxime consentaneum videtur, ut lingua, qua scripsit Moses et qua ex Aegypto reduces vulgo utebantur, quam hodie etiamnum appellamus Hebraeam, multis gradibus a prima, qua

⁸⁰⁶ Ad secundum ... dure] In F.d. 7:1, fol. 208, col. 2, Stiernhielm drafted his objection to Grenemesnil as follows: "Sed ad evasionem Grenemesnil respondeo: In principio quidem cum in Aegyptum veniret *Jacob*, datam fuisse ei, cum filiis suis inhabitandam terram *Gosen*. Verum, postea, cum nimis multiplicarentur, ut repleretur illis terra – vers. 7, cap. 1 Exodi – et angustiis afficerentur propter filios Israel, v. 12 (non scilicet in terra Gosen, quam soli possidebant; ergo in toto Aegypto) coegerunt illos colere agros suos et facere omnia opera sua."

⁸⁰⁷ agri Aegyptiorum ... Aegyptiis] The print 1671 and D. II. 37, 51v, do not capitalize the three occurrences of the proper name of the Egyptians in Latin nor the two occurrences of the proper name Egypt. F.d. 6, 76v, capitalizes all of them.

⁸⁰⁸ Iam quaero ... Misraim] In F.d. 7:1, 208, col. 2, Stiernhielm drafted this passage: "Deinde ex cap. 3 verso ultimo patet Israelitos per totum Aegyptum dispersos, cum cohabitarent cum Aegyptiis, quos quisque vicinos suos cum egrederetur vasis aureis et argenteis spoliarent: *Postulabit mulier a vicina sua et ab hospita domus suae vasa etc.* Idem Exodi cap. 11, vers. 2 et cap. 12, vers. 35. Et ubique dicitur, quod Deus eduxit eos ex terra Misraim aut Aegypto in genere, non ex Gosen etc."

⁸⁰⁹ i.e. Aegyptum] In the *Runa Suethica* mss., this explanation does not occur here.

⁸¹⁰ degeneraret] So F.d. 6, 76v, and D. II. 37, 52r. The print 1671 has *degenerarit*.

locuti sunt Abraham, et Iacob, antequam in Aegyptum proficisceretur, longe recesserit,⁸¹¹ et consequenter non minus quam coeterae, quae a primigenia degenerarunt, inter dialectos optima ratione censi debere.

*Temporum et locorum intervallis dialectos abire in linguas.*⁸¹²

(28) Conversio haec est perpetua: unam linguam abire in diversas dialectos et ultra singulas dialectos diuturnitate temporis convallescere in linguas. Dialectum voco idiomatis a prima lingua in diversa abeuntis insignem differentiam. Quae quidem differentia consistit in vocum substantialium seu radicalium diverso interdum usu⁸¹³ et ad aliam significationem depravatione, compositione, phrasi,⁸¹⁴ declinatione, coniugatione, pronuntiatione et accentu. Haec, inquam, ita variata, ut insignem constituent differentiam⁸¹⁵ nec tamen secus intelligantur, licet in quibusdam aegre, novam constituunt dialectum, etiamsi nulli aliae linguae exoticae commixta fuerit. Atque ea ratione linguae⁸¹⁶ omnes suas habent peculiares dialectos: Italica Thuscanam, Lombardicam, Venetam, Neapolitanam; Gallica Parisiensem, Tholosanam, Picardicam, Nortmannicam, Provincielem; Germanica, Suedica, et quae non tot habet⁸¹⁷ dialectos, quot⁸¹⁸ habet provincias? Singulae suas habent varietates.⁸¹⁹ Linguas vero pro diversis habeo eas, quae eo inter se intervallo distant, ut ipsae voces substantiales et forma accidentalis prorsus aliena videantur, adeo ut vulgo inter se colloquentes nullo modo, nisi per interpretem, mutuo se intelligere queant. Tales evadunt dialecti longa temporum mora longius longiusque a se invicem recedentes, in quo, ut naturalia omnia, necessum est, ut

⁸¹¹ In F.d. 6, 76v, Stiernhielm first wrote: *sed potius dialectus multum trahens ex Aegyptia eoque a pristina Syra, quam adhuc in Syria Eberi posteritas residens colebant, mutabiliter divertens*, but crossed out this.

⁸¹² This is the heading of *Runa Suethica*, part 1, chapter 5, corresponding to thesis 5 in the conspectus. In F.d. 6, it comprises 69v–70v. In D. II. 37, it begins on fol. 52v.

⁸¹³ in vocum substantialium seu radicalium diverso interdum usu] In F.d. 6, 69v, Stiernhielm originally wrote: *in vocum substantialium mutatione, diverso usu*, (...), but then crossed out *mutatione*. The word *interdum* only occurs in the print 1671.

⁸¹⁴ phrasi] In F.d. 6, 69v, Stiernhielm crossed out *tropo* between *phrasi* and *depravatione*.

⁸¹⁵ Quae quidem differentia consistit ... ut insignem constituent differentiam] This passage does not occur in D. II. 37, 52v.

⁸¹⁶ linguae exoticae ... linguae] This line does not occur in D. II. 37, 52v.

⁸¹⁷ habet] Emendation. The print 1671 has *habent*.

⁸¹⁸ quot] Emendation. The print 1671 has *quod*.

⁸¹⁹ Germanica ... varietates] F.d. 6, 69v, and D. II. 37, 52v, have: *Germanica, Svedica, et quae non? suas habent varietates*.

progressionis naturalis indoles elucescat.⁸²⁰ Duo enim, quae unum fuere, ex unitate sua digredientia, quo longius et pluribus terminis progrediuntur, eo maiori in- (29) tercapedine et ab unitate, primordio suo, et a se invicem distant.⁸²¹

Ne vero benevolus lector taedio capiatur meae dissertatiunculae, virum citra dubium doctissimum, amicum meum dum vixit, clarissimum Salmasium egregie de hac materia *Commentario de Hellenistica*, p. 18,⁸²² disserentem audiamus:

Huiusmodi linguarum sive διαλέκτων (quae scilicet populum aliquem quasi fundum habent, in quo velut positae fixaeque haereant)⁸²³ ea natura est, ut more corporum viventium sua incrementa habeant ac decrementsa ac proinde mutationes varias patiantur. Vetera vocabula exolescunt et intereunt. Inolescunt nova, quibus subinde in locum desitorum ac desuetorum renascentibus, tota lingua mutatur. Quamdiu eadem forma manet, idem nomen retinet. Ubi autem penitus antiqua facies intercidit et in aliam quasi figuram transiit prioris formae lineamentis deletis, tum alia lingua fit et aliud nomen accipit. Scribit Quintilianus suo tempore totum mutatum esse Romanum sermonem: alius igitur fuit Ennii aetate et Pacuvii. Antiquiores etiam alium habuerunt. Alio etiam usa Roma est, quo tempore fuit condita, quo Romulus nimirum et Remus loquebantur. Post Quintiliani aevum alias atque alias μεταπτώσεις pertulit servato tamen semper eodem nomine Latini vel Romani sermonis, quamdiu servavit pristinae linguae lineamenta et colorem. Ubi vero per Barbarorum incursiones et inundationes dissipatum est Romanum imperium, lin- (30) gua quoque Romana eundem passa est exitum et cum dissipatione⁸²⁴ imperii in varias et ipsa degeneravit loquelas, quae nec filum Romani sermonis retinuerunt nec nomen. Sic factae tres linguae ex una, Gallica, Italica, Hispanica. Origo earum apparet in ipsis: Facies indicat cuius matris sint filiae. Ita tamen hae linguae a

⁸²⁰ elucescat] In F.d. 6, 69v, a relative clause referring to *indoles* has here been crossed out: *quae quo longius ab unitate recedit procedit*.

⁸²¹ After *distant*, F.d. 6, 69v, has a diagram of a pyramid with six levels (Section 11.6.2, diagram 3). Below *distant*, D. II. 37, 53r, has a diagram of a pyramid with seven levels (Section 11.6.2, diagram 4).

⁸²² See Claudius Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius controversiam de lingua Hellenistica decidens et plenissime pertractans originem et dialectos Graecae linguae*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1643, pp. 18–19.

⁸²³ quae ... haereant] The relative clause put within brackets by Stiernhielm occurs in the preceding sentence in Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 18.

⁸²⁴ dissipatione] So read the print 1671 and the *Runa Suethica* mss. Salmasius, *De Hellenistica*, p. 19, has *dissolutione*.

Romana differunt, ut filiae solent a matre discrepare. Quantumlibet similis sit matri filia, alia est. Haec Salmasius.

Mihi vero quaerere gestit animus an lingua, quae tempore Quintiliani Romae vixit, eadem fuerit qua locutus est Romulus? Et an idem ei color et filum usque perduraverit? Alio sermone locutos Romulum et Remum ait Salmasius. Linguam tamen usque ad excidium Imperii permansisse eandem. Totum quoque suo aevo immutatum a pristino sermonem Romanum fatetur Quintilianus. Quo igitur modo dici vel comprehendi potest alius et idem? Respondet Salmasius.⁸²⁵

At illa mater, quamvis primo infans fuerit, mox iuvenula, deinde floris vegeti mulier, postremo anus decrepita. Per tot illas mutationes eadem persona mansit, idem corpus circumtulit, idem nomen obtinuit. Infans ab alio infante corporis filo et specie non tantum distat, quantum a seipso, cum in virum evasit. Nec senis retorridi vultus tam dissimilis est senis alterius aequaevis vultui, quam sibi ipsi, si pictus ostenderetur, qualis in infantia fuit.

Hoc nimirum fuit, quod demonstratum volui: linguas sensim abire in dialectos et has perpetua mutation- (31) um serie transformari in alias linguas, primae plane dissimiles, qua⁸²⁶ filum scilicet, qua colorem, qua vero substantiam⁸²⁷ omnino easdem nec alias, etsi nomina longe diversissima sortiantur.


Exemplo sit lingua Germanica. Alius ei vultus nunc est ab illo, quem habuit tempore Caroli Magni et alius istius aevi vigor ab infantia Tuisconis. Confer ultima primis; nihil invenies, quod sibi sit simile, nihil unum, nihil non aliud. Ergone tota lingua est alia? Imo alia est, quia non intelligitur, nihil sonat simile nec filum habet nec colorem pristinae. Ergo alia est. At aio eandem esse, quia Germanica, quia ex eodem fonte perpetuo perennavit, quia ab omni mixtione exotica integra semper et illibata usque in hanc aetatem perduravit, radice et substantia eadem, vultu, sono et lineamentis iuventae suae dissimilis. Idem iudicare de multiplici eius sobole, variis, inquam, ex ea scaturientibus dialectis, consentaneum est. Et quid dico *soboles*? Quod mirum videtur, soboles hic cum genetrice eadem est. Dialecti Austriaca, Misnica, Suevica, Helvetica, Pomeranica, Belgica, Frisica, Flandrica et sexcentae aliae nullae sunt aliae, quam una Germanica.

⁸²⁵ See Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, pp. 19–20.

⁸²⁶ qua] *qua* is used as a preposition in the sense of “concerning, as regards”.

⁸²⁷ substantiam] In F.d. 6, 70r, originally had *substantiam et (ut ille dicit) personam*.

Rami sunt ex uno stipite⁸²⁸ se diffundentes. Quibus demptis singulis nec arbor ipsa usquam comparebit. Hae itaque dialecti omnes una sunt lingua. Ego vero earum nonnullas ita miscebo, ut plane novam exsuscitem linguam. Ecce ad oculum diagramma:



Si homines, qui hisce dialectis utuntur, in unam civitatem coeant, necesse fuerit, ut successu temporis ex omnibus una conflatur dissimillima⁸³⁰ singulis, a nullo deinceps Suevo, nullo Mechlenburgo, nullo Brabante intellecta. Ea tamen erit Germanica.⁸³¹ Pulchre Salmasius in fine *de Hellenistica*:⁸³²

Nulla, inquit, porro ratione nec numero finiri potest, quot in orbe et in genere humano linguae esse possint.⁸³³ Nam infinitae esse possunt et fere totidem, quot sunt hominum decuriae. Si decem quippe homines in aliqua insula soli ab infantili aetate mutorum ministerio et opera usque ad virilem educarentur, linguam ipsi sibi formarent ex rebus, quas cognoscere et usurpare possent, nulli alii similem. Et si alii itidem decem homines in aliqua vicina insula alerentur, qui cum prioribus illis denis nec colloquia unquam miscerent nec aditum ad eos haberent, aliam et isti sibi figurerent loquendi formam, prorsus disparem. Et ita ad infinitum.

Ex his capi potest iudicium de naturali generatione, (33) adolescentia, flore, devergio et interitu omnium linguarum. Quod enim hominum, civitatum, imperiorum, hoc idem linguarum fatum est.

De linguis orientalibus ex Hebraea ortis et affinis satis dictum existimo. Nunc ut ad Iapheticam nos convertamus monet scriptionis

⁸²⁸ stipite] In F.d. 6, 70v, *trunco*, has been crossed out and replaced by *stipite*.

⁸²⁹ et ipsa Germanica] This does not occur in the *Runa Suethica* manuscripts.

⁸³⁰ dissimillima] So F.d. 6, 70v. The print 1671 and D. II. 37, 55r, have *dissimilima*.

⁸³¹ After *Germanica* F.d. 6, 70v, and D. II. 37, 55r, add: *qua materiam scilicet, non qua formam*.

⁸³² See *De Hellenistica commentarius*, pp. 463–464.

⁸³³ In his quotation, Stiernhielm here omits: *Infinitae sunt potestate non actu*.

nostrae ratio. Tota Iapheti posteritas Scythae appellata est, unde et lingua Scythica. Primae Iaphetidarum seu Scytharum sedes fuerunt circa montem Ararat, quem Gordiaenum vocat Iosephus. Inde in loca proxima et hinc in ulteriora successive digressi vastas Asiae et Europae regiones occuparunt diversa sortiti nomina. Hinc *Bactriani*, *Indo-Scythae*, *Parthi* seu *Persae*, *Phryges*, *Lydi*, *Bithyni* etc. in Asia; hinc in Europa *Thracae*, *Gethae* seu *Gothi*, *Daci*, *Germani*, *Galli* communi nomine *Celtae*, et *Cimbri*, *Hunni*, *Alani*, *Heruli*, *Franci*, *Burgundiones*, *Normanni*, *Wandali*, *Svevi*, *Longobardi* aliique quamplurimi, quorum nominibus istorum temporum historiae refertae sunt.

Hi omnes propagine Scythae, Scythica usi sunt lingua, singuli singulis dialectis. Linguam Thracicam, Phrygiam, Persicam seu Parthicam origine Gothicam, hoc est Scythicam fuisse doctissimorum virorum sententia est. Inter quos clarissimus Salmasius in priore *de Hellenistica* commentatione, ubi “Persica, inquit, sive Parthica, quae et ipsa auctores originis habet Scythas, infinitas praefert voces, quae eadem reperiuntur in Graeca pariter dialecto et in Teutonica.”⁸³⁴ Idem in praefatione ad Cebetis Tabulae versionem Arabicam.⁸³⁵

(34) Quod ad hoc aevi, inquit, latuit plerosque eruditorum ex eadem origine fluxisse compererat (de Elichmanno loquitur, linguae Persicae peritissimo) Germanicam et Persicam linguam, ad hanc illum coniecturam ducente infinita vocum copia utrique linguae⁸³⁶ communium, sed et verbis similiter terminatis, eodem modo compositis aliisque multis argumentis.

Porro Illyriorum, Germanorum, Gallorum, Hispanorum, Britannorum unam olim eandemque fuisse linguam, Germanicam scilicet, quae eadem Gothica est (ut ex priscis plurium rerum vocabulis cap. 8 evincere satagit) pluribus argumentis sufficienter demonstrat Phil. Cluverius, *Germania antiqua*, lib. 1, cap. 5. Quibus adde priscam Italicam.

De nostra Sveo-Gothica multa dicere supervacaneum est, cum a primordio suo eam nemo neget manere sinceram et incorruptam, ab externis puram et intaminatam nihilque, nisi aevo, a prima sua origine distantem. Contra quam de ea sentit Abraham van der Mylius, *De lingua Belgica*, ubi linguam Svethicam (quam Svedanam vocat)

⁸³⁴ Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 378.

⁸³⁵ J. Elichmann, *Tabula Cebetis Graece, Arabice, Latine ... cum praefatione Cladii Salmasii*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1640, preface, p. 3. See Section 3.4.3.

⁸³⁶ utrique linguae] So Salmasius in the preface to the treatise referred to above. These words have however been left out in the print 1671.

scribit aliquid labis contraxisse ex commercio viciniorum Finnorum et Muschovitarum, sed iudicat hic bonus Mylius, ut coecus de coloribus, linguae quippe Svethicae plane ignarus. Nec enim Finnis nec Muschovitis, quorum linguae toto coelo a Svethica distant, id unquam fuit commercii cum Svethis, ut una saltem vocula linguam nostram foedare potuerint. Melius forte sibi suaeque linguae consulisset Mylius, si ad Andream Helvigium se convertisset, qui in praefat. ad origines linguae Germanicae, ubi de diversis linguis suam interponit cen- (35) suram, satis proterve de Belgica scribit:

De Belgica noli quaerere!⁸³⁷ Spuria haec est seu (ut mitius dicam) spuma nostrae Germanicae tanquam a lallantibus et balbutientibus pueris per mutuam συνθήκην introducta quondam veluti in febrim recepta in vulgus eius gentis, nisi quod ad vicinorum Hispanorum suorum Gallorumque imitationem multa semi-latina intermiscet.

Et haec mi Myli toleras! Et haec ea est lingua, quam tuus Becanus clamat et contendit esse primigeniam, matrem Hebraeae et omnium, quae unquam in mundo extiterunt et extant linguarum.

Iam quia de Iaphetica agimus et de ex illa descendentibus linguis et dialectis, ad Graecam nos convertamus, quae et ipsa Iaphetica est, ex Javane. Oportet ergo illam etiam Scythicam esse et consequenter sororem Gothicae. Quod animadvertens doctissimus Mericus Casaubonus de lingua Saxonica scribit: “Eam vel Graecae, sed ab ultima origine propaginem fuisse vel certe ab eadem, qua et Graeca, origine, ut a Graeca sola differat dialecto, profluxisse.” Id quod deinceps toto libro demonstrat conferendo cum Graecis bene multa vocabula Saxonica. Idem facit Mylius eodem sensu et fide, contendens Celtas longe antiquiores esse Graecis. Conspirat Franciscus Irenicus in exegesis Germanicae. Fr. Junius in praefat. ad Ulphiam dicit Gothicam sola dialecto differre a Graeca et ab eadem origine, qua Graeca, profluxisse. Salmasius, *de Hellenistica*, p. 378

Non dico, inquit, eandem⁸³⁸ omnino fuisse linguam Graecorum, Getarum seu Thracum, et Teutonum seu Germanorum, sed multa habuisse vocabula communia (36) ab eadem origine venientia. Persica quoque sive Parthica, quae et ipsa auctores originis habuit Scythas, infinitas praefert voces, quae eadem reperiuntur in

⁸³⁷ noli quaerere!] The print 1671 has a full stop after *quaerere*. The treatise quoted – *Etymologiae sive origines dictionum Germanicarum* – has a mark of exclamation.

⁸³⁸ eandem] So the print 1671. Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 378, has the form *eandem*.

Graeca pariter dialecto et Teutonica. Flexiones verborum in his tribus linguis eadem sunt, compositiones nominum et alia plurima etc.

Et infra p. 384 de iisdem Teutonica, Graeca et Persica:

Quaenam earum trium antiquior sit et reliquis duabus ea nomina tradiderit, haud facile dictu est, nisi tutius videatur pronuntiare Graecos a Scythis ea accepisse idque certius statui potest ex iis, quae supra docuimus homines primos, qui Graeciam populis repleverunt et Graecae linguae auctores fuerunt, e septentrionali plaga et Scythica advenisse. Sic omnium eorum vocabulorum, quae eadem⁸³⁹ in Germanica, Graecanica, Persica occurrunt, eandem quoque esse originem.

Iuvat addere quae scribit idem Salmasius, p. 427:

Graeciam, priusquam a Graecis incoletur, a variis gentibus barbaris fuisse habitatam. Graeci sive Hellenes a Thessalia orti diversis temporibus alia atque alia Graeciae sive Helladis ab ipsis ita dictae loca occuparunt. Non ejiciebant veteres incolas barbaros, sed una cum his permixti degebant eosque erudiebant atque poliebant, quod et diserte tradidit Thucydides.

Hinc facile est colligere, unde communio illa et quasi identitas linguarum nostrarum cum Graeca profecta sit. Idem Salmasius p. 405:

Lingua Graecorum ita fuit propria ipsis et peculiaris, ut tamen multa vocabula a Phoenicibus mutuata sit, plura a Getis et Thracibus. Nulla autem fuit lingua, quae plures protulerit⁸⁴⁰ mutationes etc.⁸⁴¹

De Graeca et eius cum nostris linguis cognatione satisdictum existimo.

Nunc ad Slavonicam seu Illyricam nos convertamus. Multis populis ea communis est: **(37)** Polonis, Muschovitis, Bohemis etc, quorum catalogum invenies in *Mithritate* Gesneri. Illyrii Celtis olim

⁸³⁹ eadem] So Salmasius. The print 1671 mistakenly has *eadem*.

⁸⁴⁰ protulerit] Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 403, has *pertulerit*.

⁸⁴¹ etc.] Salmasius continues: “ac μεταπτώσεις non solum in verborum flexionibus per varias dialectos aliis atque allis pro locorum ratione factis, sed etiam in ipsis verbis”.

annumerati sunt, lingua usi Celtica, quae postmodum per mixturam Graecae corrupta fuit in Slavonicam. Haec revera ea est de qua Ovidius: *Graecaque cum Getico mixta loquela sono*. Item:

Mixta sit haec quamvis inter Graecosque Getasque /
a male placatis plus trahit ora Getis.

Item: Hic quoque sunt urbes Graiae (quis credere posset) /
inter inhumana nomina barbariae. /
Huc quoque Mileto missi venere coloni /
inque Getis Graias constituere domos.

Hi nimirum sunt, qui ex Getica et Graeca conflaverunt linguam Sarmaticam, quae⁸⁴² eadem Slavonica est.

Nunc in Latium me converto. Linguam Latinam ex quatuor linguis conflata comperimus, *Aboriginum* scilicet, qua comprehenduntur etiam *Hetrusca*, *Osca* et *Sabina*, quae in unam *Latiarem* coaluerunt. Huic adde *Graecam* ab Evandro et *Phrygiam* ab Aenea invectam. His adiunge *Gothicam* seu *Celticam*, quae non exiguum sibi linguae Latinae vendicat partem. Lingua Hetrusca, Phrygia et Celtica affines sunt, omnes ex uno fonte derivatae. Nec Graeca longe distat. Iapheticae sunt omnes: ergo et ipsa Latina. Non igitur mirum est innumera vocabula dictarum linguarum communia esse cum Latinis. Eandem linguae Latinae originem asserit etiam Cl. Gerard. Ioh. Vossius in praefatione ad *De vitiis ser-* **(38)** *monis*.⁸⁴³ Cuius tamen assertionis suae immemor in *Lexico* suo *etymologico* bene multa vocabula infeliciter et invita Minerva trahit ex Graeca, quae commode et sine violentia duci potuerunt ex Celtica.

De linguis primariis et cardinalibus haec dicta sufficiant. Ex his ut multae aliae sunt ortae et mixtae, ita innumerae sunt, nobis partim notae, partim ignotae, quarum origo plane incomperta est. Inter notas de duabus saltem Ungarica et Finnonica dicam, quarum originem nemo adhuc aperire potuit. Nec enim ad Sclavonicam nec ad ullam aliam nobis notam referri possunt. Hoc quod maxime miror est, quod in *Lexico* Ungarico Molnari bene multa vocabula Ungarica invenerim Finnis communia; nationibus toto coelo dissitis. In Finnonica incredibile quam multae voces Graecae reperiantur. Unde mihi orta suspicio Gentem Finnonicam ex gente aliqua Graecis colonis mixta iam olim multis abhinc seculis originem traxisse. Finnonicae dialecti sunt Esthonica et Lapponica.

⁸⁴² quae] The print has *qui*, which must be a mistake. The correlate is *lingua* which requires a relative pronoun in the feminine.

⁸⁴³ Gerhard Johannes Vossius, *De vitiis sermonis et glossematis Latino-barbaris*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam 1645, see the preface, pp. 2–3.

Hic finem facturus eram. Verum cum recorder nonnullis ex nostris viros doctos in scriptis suis conqueri linguam nostram Suethicam quotidie corrumpi adscitis magis magisque vocabulis Gallicis et semi-Latinis. Merito. Verum iam securos esse iubeo, postquam illustrissimus Regni Cancellarius animadvertens quo res exitura esset, zizaniam in herba conculcavit vetando ne quis scribarum vel unam vocolam peregrinam conceptibus suis intersereret. (39) Qua eius providentia et vigilantia effectum est, ut in Cancellaria Regia hodie nemo non ambitiose studeat stylum ad veterem linguae integritatem servandam temperare. Quo fit, ut non verear asserere linguam nostram non magis recessisse a prima sua origine, quam vetulam vel anum a sua infantia, cui unum idemque superest corpus; facies, vero, color et lineamenta mutata sunt.

Restat ut de literis et scriptura Gothorum paulum disquiramus. Literae maioribus nostris *Runae* dictae sunt a *röna*, discere, experiri, erudiri. Qua notione dicitur mulier *saga*, seu fatidica, *al-run*a, i.e. omniscia, Islandis *fiol-kunni*, i.e. multiscia, hodie *wijs-quinna*, id est mulier sapiens. Ob eandem causam dictae sunt imagunculae ex radicibus Mandragorae efformatae *alruner*, quibus, ut omnisciis abutuntur homines vani et superstitiosi, singulari adhibito cultu vice oraculorum, quorum responsis latentia et futura sibi patefieri temere et impie credunt.

Iam si quaeras, quando et apud quos primum ortae sint illae Runae?⁸⁴⁴ erunt⁸⁴⁵ qui dicant illas inventas ab Ulphila Episcopo Gothorum in Mysia; erunt qui illas antiquiores contendat, quorum in numero Bonaventura Vulcanius, qui putat Geticarum literarum usum apud Getas longe ante Ulphilae tempora viguisse, per Ulphilam vero Romanis primum innotuisse. Idem dicit verisimile esse longe ante inventas literas Latinas et, antequam Carmenta e Graecia ad ostia Tyberis et Romanum solum cum Evandro pervenisset (40) expulsisque aboriginibus gentem illam rudem mores et literas docuisset, Getas literas suas habuisse. Postellus de origine Hetruscorum p. 42 et passim asserit literas Hetruscas et Gotticas antiquissimas esse. Item: Gallos literas omnino a Gomero longe ante Graecos, qui a Cadmo suas acceperunt, habuisse et Latinos a Gallis et Hispanis 1300 annis ante habentibus literas accepisse. Qua fide, qua auctoritate, ego conjicere nequeo.

Germani literas non habuerunt aevo Caesaris nec Taciti, ante autem tempora Caroli Magni traditur eos literis Graecis usos ad scribendum idioma Teuthonicum. Iodocus Willichius, in Germaniam

⁸⁴⁴ Runae?] The print 1671 has a mark of exclamation: *Runae!*

⁸⁴⁵ erunt] The print 1671 capitalizes this word: *Erunt*.

Taciti,⁸⁴⁶ omnes rationes et acta Graecis literis usque ad Rudolphum Imperatorem (qui circa annum 1273 ad regnum pervenit) Germanos scriptitasse testatur. Cui succinit Speidelius mihi pag. 858.⁸⁴⁷ Wehnerus praefat. ad observationes suorum librorum scribit anno Christi 1251 sub imperio Conradi IV Germanicam linguam demum literis designari et scribi coepisse beneficio Latinorum characterum.

Has ego literas Graecas aut easdem aut non longe abhorrentes a nostris Runicis suspicor. Quippe quae aliae non sunt quam Graecae, et ex iis ortae Latinae, barbatae et imperite effigatae et mutilatae, ut videre est in vulgatis nostris Runicis, non minus quam in Runis Ulfilae, imo in ipsis Latinis, quarum pleraeque ex Graecis sunt detortae.

Ultimo non possum non magnopere demirari, quid (41) in mentem venerit Olao Wormio, qui *Literatura Runica*, cap. 6, contendit linguam et literas Gothicas Danicas dictas. Ubi etiam non erubescit scribere Ulfilam alphabetum Danicum in ordinem Latinum redactum et notis quibusdam locupletatum exteris primum communicasse. Quae haec frons? Ubi tempore Ulfilae nomen Danicum? Quod ante Iornandem toti mundo inauditum fuit. Vixit autem Iornandes circa annum Christi 530, Ulfilas vero 360 vel circiter. Ubi ergo tunc nomen Danicum? Quod circiter 170 annis post primum innotuit.

Ut eius, quod in Dissertatione de linguis de ortu linguarum novarum diximus, specimen aliquod exhibeamus, en tibi, benevole lector, septem linguas novas ex una Latina natas exhibemus. Idem iudicium capere potes de innumeris aliis. His frui et vale.

Prima erit mater LATINA

Pater noster qui est in coelis. Sanctificetur nomen tuum. Adveniat regnum tuum. Fiat voluntas tua, sicut in coelo, et in terra. Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie. Et remitte nobis peccata nostra, sicut et nos remittimus debitoribus nostris. Et ne nos inducas in tentationem, sed libera nos a malo. Quia tuum est regnum, potentia et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen.

⁸⁴⁶ in Germaniam Taciti] Iodocus Willich, *In Cornelii Taciti equitis Romani Germaniam commentaria*, Francofurti ad Viadrum / Frankfurt an der Oder 1551.

⁸⁴⁷ Iodocus Willichius ... Speidel. mihi pag. 858] In F.d. 12 (*Lexicon etymologicum Ulphilianum*), fol. 1r, Stiernhielm wrote a draft of these lines: "In praefatione ad Ulphil. NB. Omnes rationes et acta usque ad Rudolph. Imperatorem, qui circa A.C. 1247 ad regnum venit, Graecis literis scriptas docet Iodoc. Willichius in Germaniam Taciti. Ita quoque Gallos, vide Speidel. p. 858."

(42)

ITALICA

Padre nostro che sei ne cieli. Sia santificato il tuo nome. Venga il tuo regno. Sia fatta la tua volonta, si come in cielo, cosi ancora in terra. Dacci hoggi il nostro pane cotidiano. E rimettici i nostri debiti, si come ancor noi gli rimettiamo à i nostri debitori. E non ci indurre in tentatione. Ma liberaci dal male. Percioche tuo è il regno, la potentia, é la gloria in sempiterno. Amen.

HISPANICA

Padre nuestro, que estás en los cielos. Sea santificado tu nombre. Venga tu reyno. Sea hecha tu voluntad como en el cielo, ansi tambien en la tierra. Da nos oy nuestro pan quotidiano: y suelta nos nuestras deudas, como tambien nosotros soltamos a nuestros deudores. Y no nos metas en tentacion: mas libra nos del mal. Porque tuyo es el reyno, y la potencia, y la gloria, por todos los siglos. Amen.

GALLICA

Nostre pere, qui es és cieulx. Ton nom soit sanctifié. Ton regne viene. Ta volonté soit faicte ainsi en la terre comme au ciel. Nostre (43) pain quotidiain donne nous aujourdhuy. Et pardonne nous noz offenses, ainsi que nous pardonnons à ceulx, qui nous ont offensé. Et ne nous induy point en tentation: mais nous delivre du maligne. Car a toy est le regne, la puissance, la gloire aux siecles de siecles. Amen.

RHAETICA

Pap noass, tu quell chi ésch in Is tschéls. Fatt saingk vennga ilg teis nuom. Ilg teis raginam véng naun proa. La tia voellga dwain taschkoa in tschéł, uschè eir in terra. Noass paun d'minchiady daa a nuo hoátz. E parduna a nuo ils noass dabits, schkoa eir nuo pardunain als noass dabittaduors. E nun ans manar in prowamaint, moa ans spendra da lg maal. Parchiai chia teis ais ilg raginam é la pussauntza, é lg laud in etern. Amen.

SARDICA

Pare nostre, che ses en los cels. Sia sanctificat lo nom teu. Venga lo regne teu. Fasase la volonta tua, axicom en lo cel, i en la terra. Lo pa nostre cotida dona a nos altres hui. I dexia a nos altres les deutes nostres, axicomi nos altres dexiam als deuois nostres. I no nos induescas en la tentatio: mas liura nos del mal. Perche teu es lo regne, la gloria i lo imperii en los sigles de le sigles. Amen.

(44) SARDICA VULGARIS

Babu nostru sughale ses in soschelos. Santufiada su nomine tuo. Bengiad su renno tuo. Faciadsu la voluntade tua, comentu in chelo et in sa terra. Su pane nostru dogniedie dona a nos ateros hoae. Et lassa a nos ateros is debitus nostrus, comentu e nos ateros lassaos a is debitores nostrus. Et no nos portis in sa tentatione: impero libera nos da su male. Poiteo tuo esti su rennu, sa gloria, su imperiu in los seculos de los seculos. Amen.

WALACHICA

Paerinthele nostru cela ce esti en cheri. Svintzas cæse numele teu. Vie enpertzia ta. Facæse voe ta, cum en tzer ase si præ pæmentu. Pæne noastre tza sætzioace, dae noaæ astezi. Si lase noaæ datorii le noastre, cum si noi se læsæm datornitzilor nostri. Si nu dutze preno i la ispitire: tze ne mentueste prenoi de viclianul. Amen.

12.4 English translation with explanatory notes

GEORG STIERNHIELM
ON
THE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGES.
A P R E F A C E.
TO THE BENEVOLENT READER.

(1) The church historians Socrates, Theodoretus and Sozomen testify that Wulfila was Bishop of those Goths who inhabited Moesia.⁸⁴⁸ He lived about 360 years after the birth of Christ,⁸⁴⁹ when Valens and Valentinian held imperial power. The Church historian Philostorgius, a contemporary of Wulfila, writes that he invented the Gothic letters and translated the entire Holy Scripture into Gothic, except for the books of Kings, which treat warlike matters.⁸⁵⁰ The above-mentioned historians state that he fell into the Arian heresy together with all his people. The famous Marshall affirms that it is likely that this apostasy took place towards the end of his lifetime and after he had finished his translation of the Bible, since nothing of that kind can be

⁸⁴⁸ Socrates of Constantinople (c. 379–440), Theodoretus of Cyrrhus (c. 393–466) and Sozomen (c. 400–443) continued the Church history of Eusebius from the time of Constantine the Great up to the 430s. These continuations were first published by Robert Estienne, *Authores historiae ecclesiasticae*, Basel 1544. Stiernhielm probably relied on Thomas Marshall's references to them in his critical observations on the Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels: "Observationes de versione Gothica" in *Quatuor D. N. Jesu Christi Euangeliorum versiones perantiquae duae, Gothica scilicet et Anglo-Saxonica*, Dordrecht/ Dortrecht 1665, where on p. 386 he refers to Socrates, *Eccl. hist.* IV: 33, Theodoretus, *Eccl. Hist.* IV: 33, and Sozomen, *Ecc. hist.* VI: 37. Marshall himself used Robert Estienne's edition. For an English translation of these passages, see *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, second series, vol. 2 (Socrates and Zozomen) and vol. 3 (Theodoretus).

⁸⁴⁹ Wulfila (in Latinized form Ulphilas, Ulfilas or Urphilas), bishop of Moesia, lived circa 311–383.

⁸⁵⁰ Referring to Wulfila in the Latin form Urphilas, Philostorgius states, *Epitome of the ecclesiastical history* (as translated by Edward Walford, Oxford 1835), chapter 2,5: "Accordingly he took the greatest care of them in many ways, and amongst others, he reduced their language to a written form, and translated into their vulgar tongue all the books of holy Scripture, with the exception of the Books of Kings, which he omitted, because they are a mere narrative of military exploits, and the Gothic tribes were especially fond of war, and were in more need of restraints to check their military passions than of spurs to urge them on to deeds of war." However, Philostorgius adds: "But those books have the greatest influence in exciting the minds of readers, inasmuch as they are regarded with great veneration, and are adapted to lead the hearts of believers to the worship of God."

observed in it.⁸⁵¹ This Moesia, which was inhabited by the Goths at that time, was Lower Moesia and it is called by Jordanes Scythia Minor, modern day Walachia.⁸⁵² Here Ovid passed his exile. The inhabitants were called Minor Goths and were the same as those who defeated the Emperor Valens in battle and burned him alive when he hid himself in a cabin. They were the same Goths who occupied Greece, Pannonia and Italy some time after that.

(2) If we now make a digression to inquire into the origin of the Gothic language, I do not think that this will be disagreeable to any reader who is eager to learn. In such an inquiry it is first suitable to deal with the source language in general, and after that to inquire into specific languages as branches⁸⁵³ and derivatives.

There are two principal impediments that prevent talented people from attaining truth and firm knowledge, namely the prejudiced opinion and the authority of great scholars. These impediments clip the wings of ingenious people, however sharp-minded they may be, when they strive towards the heights, and compel them to creep along the ground on trodden pathways. This is what breaks asunder and knocks down the hope and the attempt to reach further and what disarms and extinguishes the strength and heavenly force of talented people. This is mainly what exerts tyranny in the Republic of Letters. How many have the majesty of the Stagyrte⁸⁵⁴ and the arrogance of his champions in the course of already too many centuries not prevented from undertaking a further study of true philosophy?⁸⁵⁵

⁸⁵¹ Stiernhielm relies on Thomas Marshall (1621–1685), “Observationes”, p. 388: “Hanc tamen huius Episcopi qualemunque defectionem verisimile est evenisse circa vitae eius scenam extremam atque post traductiones Biblicas demum confectas.” Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical history*, VI, 37, argues that Wulfila “originally held no opinion at variance with those of the Catholic Church”, but after the Council of Constantinople in 381 “entered into communion with the Arians and separated himself and his whole nation from all connection with the Catholic Church.”

⁸⁵² Walachia was situated in the region along the northern bank of the Danube in what is today southern Romania, while Moesia Inferior was actually the region on the southern bank of the Danube, northern Bulgaria. Stiernhielm is thus mistaken.

⁸⁵³ branches] Literally: “rivers”.

⁸⁵⁴ Stagyrte] Aristotle, a native of the city of Stagira in northern Greece.

⁸⁵⁵ This passage on the impediments for creating unprejudiced knowledge forms the first part of what Johan Nordström called Stiernhielm’s scientific declaration of independence (“vetenskapliga självständighetsförklaring”, which he paraphrased in *Stiernhielm. Filosofiska fragment*, vol. 1, p. CCCIII and edited in vol. 2, p. 89, but earlier biographers such as Hagberg (*Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhjelm*, 1839: 17; see Section 12.5 below) and Swartling (1909: 5) had already called attention to these lines. Stiernhielm was here inspired by Johan Heinrich Alsted’s post-Ramist didactics and Francis Bacon’s scientific methodology. His criticism is directed against the sway of neo-Aristotelism. – In the treatises on natural philosophy,

How many languages and what a great chaos of languages have the reputable authority of some Church Fathers not brought into the world from the Confusion at Babel?⁸⁵⁶ Who have not been kept, by the mocking, unrestrained annoyance and disgusting anger of otherwise great men,⁸⁵⁷ from a more open-minded inquiry into languages? While we confer on them exceptional brilliance, divinity and the heights of knowledge, we consider ourselves (blind) moles and blockheads, completely ignorant of every possible subject, and, except to the extent that we let ourselves be led by them, we linger in our own dung as servile cattle and unworthy of bearing the name of human beings. (3) For such is the reverence which orders us to be lulled asleep in long-established beliefs and comments of other people. Being instructed by and accustomed to them from our tender childhood, we neglect⁸⁵⁸ to investigate matters in a deeper way.

Peplum Minervae and *Monile Minervae*, Stiernhielm's anti-Aristotelian positions were also guided by his adherence to hermetism and neo-Platonism (see Helander, *Neo-Latin literature in Sweden*, pp. 447–449). – The contents of this first passage are related to Bacon's struggle with tradition "to overcome intellectual blockades" (as Jürgen Klein puts it in his article "Francis Bacon" in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, see section 2 on Natural philosophy: struggle with tradition). Bacon opposed deference to ancient and modern authority. In *The Advancement of Learning* (1605) in the edition of Kitchin (1915, reprinted 1954, p. 30) he states:

As for the overmuch credit that hath been given unto authors in sciences, in making them dictators, that their words should stand, and not counsellors to give advice, the damage is infinite that the sciences have received thereby, as the principal cause that hath kept them low at stay without growth and advancement. [...] For as water will not ascend higher than the level of the first springhead from whence it descendeth, so knowledge derived from Aristotle and excepted from liberty of examination, will not rise higher than the knowledge of Aristotle.

Bacon especially criticized the reliance on Aristotle in scholastic philosophy. He calls Aristotle the dictator of the schoolmen. Furthermore, in his doctrine of idols Bacon identified the danger of prejudices to the progress of sciences (designating them as the idols of the mind, of the tribe, of the cave, and of the market-place); see *Novum organum* (1620), book 1, §§ 39–68, and compare the similar discussion in *De augmentis scientiarum* (1623) and the briefer discussion in *The Advancement of Learning*, in Kitchin's edition of 1954, pp. 132–134.

⁸⁵⁶ The Church Fathers, and particularly Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, XVI, 6 (see the last paragraph) assumed that 72 languages arose at Babel based on the genealogical table of nations descending from the sons of Noah (Genesis 10).

⁸⁵⁷ From the draft of *Runa Suethica* (F.d. 6, 68r) it is clear that this attack is directed against two classical scholars: Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) and someone of the two Scaligers, either Julius Caesar (1484–1558) or Joseph Justus (1540–1609). In another text, Stiernhielm referred to both of the Scaligers as "the most great and most prominent tyrants of the Republic of Letters" (Nordström 1924, II: 93).

⁸⁵⁸ we neglect] For the phrase *insuper habere*, see the commentary (Section 12.5)

To return to the languages, who thinks there is anything left in this kind of learning that scholars have not already gone through? Who is not persuaded that there are different language principles, which were introduced by the Confusion at Babel? Who does not have religious scruples about questioning the pre-eminence of the Hebrew language over the others and its firstborn-right? And who does not think that it would be a crime to believe that it has ever undergone any change from Adam until the Babylonian Captivity. Who does not think that the Latin language emerged from Greek? Who does not assert that the frequent and old words that Goths, Swedes and Germans have in common with the Romans are derived from Latin? Who does not regard the Latin language as older than these? And who has ever counted them among early languages except the unsuccessful Goropius. His footsteps have up to this day frightened everyone away from venturing something similar, because he has been so badly received. Who considers himself allowed to add or remove anything from the etymologies and derivations of the great scholars of this age? Who is as insane and bold as to dare to open his mouth against their conclusions and authority? You see, this would be to wish to render the crow's eyes powerless,⁸⁵⁹ which is not done without great damage to oneself. In the topic of languages, everyone regards almost everything as clear, elaborated, analysed, certain, and agreed upon.

I think (4) that the state of matters is completely different. I argue that one should pursue philosophy freely and without any anxious consideration.⁸⁶⁰ I look up to the famous men who are equipped with diverse learning and I revere them as the ornaments of our age, as much as I am able to. However, I do not grant that everything – whatever may be accessible to human beings – is obvious only to them, and that it is completely closed and denied to us others. For we also have a God, and my innermost being glows by the inspiration of Apollo.⁸⁶¹ Why should we pay attention to others and doubt our own ability? Or shall we always be little boys and never break out of the habit of wearing splints? Shall we never eat anything except what has been chewed in advance? Can we not learn to talk about anything else than what others have talked about before us? We gratefully acknowledge the efforts of most learned men and always commend

⁸⁵⁹ to render the crow's eyes powerless] For the different possible meanings of this proverbial saying, see the commentary (Section 12.5).

⁸⁶⁰ one should pursue philosophy freely] Comenius' preface to *Physicae reformatae synopsis* (which is quoted by Nordström, *Stiernhielm. Filosofiska fragment*, vol. 1, p. CCLXXVIII) may have served as a source of inspiration. Comenius declares: "sed philosophandum esse libere ad sensuum, rationis Scripturaeque dictamen."

⁸⁶¹ For these two classicizing phrases, see the commentary (Section 12.5).

them by worthy praises, but let us do this in such a manner that we retain the liberty to make known what is our own opinion and that we admire, follow and embrace the truth above all.⁸⁶²

To briefly express the point and to arrive at my purpose, I argue that *it seems that all languages that have existed and still exist today are derived from one and the same one and may be restored to one*. I only wish to remind the fair reader of one thing, namely that I here do not refer to other languages than those that derive from the Adamic or the Noachic ones and are in use, or have been in use, in the known world, that is, Asia, Africa and Europe. By this delimitation I exclude the American languages⁸⁶³ and the languages of the islands of the West Indies,⁸⁶⁴ such as they are nowadays, as I do not find any trace of rational system, coherence or kinship among

⁸⁶² This passage is the second part of what Nordström (1924, vol. 1, p. CCCIII) conceived as a scientific declaration of independence (transcribed by him in vol. 2, p. 89f. and paraphrased in vol. 1, p. CCCIII). In this passage, Stiernhielm relies on the post-Ramist emphasis on freedom in the search for knowledge and on truth as opposed to tradition. On the Ramist ideal of *libertas philosophandi* ('liberty to pursue philosophy') see Erland Sellberg, *Filosofin och nyttan. Petrus Ramus och ramism*, Göteborg 1979, and this ideal as combined with the principle of truth as the only authority, see Petrus Ramus, *Aristotelicae animadversiones* (1543, fol. 21r, where he concludes: "utamur igitur Aristotelis consilio et unicam veritatem (ut iubet) habeamus pro omni autoritate" (cf. Jenny Ingemarsdotter, *Ramism, rhetoric and reform*, p. 125). Ramus refers to *Nicomachean Ethics* 1096a11–15, in which Aristotle claimed his right to be independent of Plato. Alsted, *Encyclopaedia* (1630, p. 90), book IV on didactics, ch. 2 on the impediments of studies, rule 2, developed this principle: "Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, amicus Aristoteles, sed magis amica veritas", that is, "Socrates is dear to me, as are Plato and Aristotle, but dearer still is truth." On post-Ramist didactics, see Howard Hotson, *Commonplace learning: Ramism and its German ramifications 1543–1630*, New York 2007. The topic of submission to tradition vs. the continuous discovery of truth is discussed by Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning*, ch. III, 3 γ (Kitchin's edition, p. 31):

[...] for disciples do owe unto masters only a temporary belief and a suspension of their own judgement until they be fully instructed, and not an absolute resignation or perpetual captivity, and therefore, to conclude this point, I will say no more, but so let great authors have their due, as time, which is the author of authors, be not deprived of his due, which is further and further to discover truth.

Hotson argues that Bacon continues the post-Ramist tradition of Alsted. See *The Reformation of Common Learning. Post-Ramist method and the Reception of the New Philosophy 1618–c.1670*, Oxford 2020, p. 284 f.

⁸⁶³ the American languages] Stiernhielm means the indigenous languages of both North and South America (*America Septentrionalis* and *America Meridionalis*).

⁸⁶⁴ the languages of the islands of the West Indies] This is probably what the phrase *in Indiis Insulanas*, "the insular ones in the Indies", refers to, since Stiernhielm had in view the languages of the New World. Thus, he aims at the languages of the Caribbean Archipelago (Haiti, Cuba, Jamaica, Antilles etc.). Another possibility is that he intends the languages of the East Indies spoken on the Malay Archipelago.

them.⁸⁶⁵ Hence, some people, albeit thoughtlessly, suspect that these kinds of humans came into being or emerged in their own lands rather than deriving from the offspring of Adam.⁸⁶⁶

(5) However, as regards the proposition itself, it is not a new one. Apart from the fact that great scholars nowadays defend it, some Church Fathers worthy of highest respect also once defended it by laying down that Hebrew is the mother of all languages and that all others derive from it. They saw the manifest agreement between all languages, but assigned precedence to Hebrew, because it had obtained the name of the Holy language and perhaps was better known to them than other languages. They did not even think of primordial Scythian and the languages that descend from it, viz. Gothic and German, and of others that are known under the name of the Celtic languages. Nor they did think that these were worth taking into consideration. The Church Fathers assume that these languages arose in a miraculous way at the Confusion at Babel and therefore, if some word seems to sound like a Hebrew word, they believe it to be a remnant of Hebrew or that it has been borrowed due to contact in subsequent times, although the majority are those who assert that all now existing and formerly existing languages are derived from the one and first language, namely Hebrew. Foremost among these is Saint Jerome, who in his Letter to Pope Damasus, number 146 writes: “All antiquity has handed down the tradition that the beginning of language and of our common speech and of everything that we speak is the Hebrew language, in which the Old Testament was written.”⁸⁶⁷ In his commentary on Zephaniah, ch. 3, the same author states: “We are able to know that Hebrew is the mother of all languages.”⁸⁶⁸

⁸⁶⁵ Stiernhielm here argues that the indigenous languages of the Americas and the West Indies (or less likely the East Indies) are of another stock than those deriving from Adam and Noah. He was cautious, so he changed *non immerito*, “justly; not unright”, in his draft of *Runa Suethica*, to *licet temere*, “albeit thoughtlessly”.

⁸⁶⁶ The idea of men before Adam was developed by the French theologian Isaac la Peyrère in his treatise *Prae-Adamitae*, which was written in 1642–43 and circulated in manuscript in France and the Netherlands before it was published in Amsterdam in 1655. Dutch historians were acquainted with the pre-Adamite hypothesis before the publication, and Stiernhielm probably got to know it during his official journey to the Netherlands, since he refers to it in his his draft of *Runa Suethica* (c. 1651).

⁸⁶⁷ Jerome, *Epistula* 18,6. The letter was written in Constantinople 381 AD.

⁸⁶⁸ Jerome, *Commentarii in Sophoniam prophetam*, the remark on Zephaniah 3:18. On Jerome’s identification of Hebrew with the primeval language, see my article “The primeval language and Hebrew ethnicity in ancient Jewish and Christian thought until Augustine” in *Revue d’études augustinienes et patristiques* 60:2 (2014), p. 317. In his draft of *Runa Suethica*, Stiernhielm also quotes from one of

On this point, Jerome certainly appears to be opposed by those who claim that, apart from Hebrew, more than seventy new languages with new (lexical) roots originated from the Confusion. If this is true, (6) we have to believe that when the work on the Tower had ceased they soon fell out of use and into oblivion. In his treatise *De Hellenistica*, into which I ask the reader to look,⁸⁶⁹ the famous Salmasius argues that this⁸⁷⁰ happened on the wonderful day of Whitsun, when the Apostles spoke different languages.⁸⁷¹ However, our hypothesis remains firm and holds its ground, supported by the consensus of everyone or at least of the most prudent ones. This is that all languages originate from one and the same one, and consequently may be retraced⁸⁷² to one.

The fact that one language was infused by the Creator into the first man together with his intellectual ability and was handed down to all humankind and was preserved in its lexical stock until the Babylonian Confusion and beyond, we learn both from biblical history and from reason, and it is confirmed by the evidence of reality. Experience itself teaches us that from this many others originate and will yet originate, as long as the world remains, and that nothing else can happen according to the course of nature.

I define “derived languages” as those which agree with the mother language as well as with each other in their root and basis, but which differ from each other in pronunciation, inflection, accent, phrases and other accidental features to such a point that speakers cannot mutually understand each other. I refer to such languages as derived from the one first and general language, which always will continue in its derivations and will never perish in its substance. In this regard, it is similar to the primordial substance that is capable of adopting all possible forms, one after another, a substance that does not pertain to

Origen’s homilies on the book of Numbers (XI, 4, 4). On Origen’s opinions about the primeval language, see Eskhult, *ibidem*, pp. 314–316.

⁸⁶⁹ Claudius Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, Leiden 1643, pp. 252–253, argues that the linguistic miracle (*miraculum linguarum*) told in Acts 2:1–11 was only a temporary one, which lasted as long as “the tongues as of fire” remained with the Apostles. The gift of speaking other languages was not a permanent one. He concludes: “When the igneous tongues were removed, the miracle ceased, and they ceased to speak other languages” (*Ablatis linguis cessavit miraculum, et desierunt loqui linguis*).

⁸⁷⁰ this] that is, “something similar”, implying “such as transient linguistic miracle”.

⁸⁷¹ Stiernhielm here interprets the Confusion of Languages (Gen. 11:1–9) in analogy with the linguistic miracle at Whitsun (Acts 2: 1–11). Since antiquity, these events had been interpreted in a scheme of typological relationships as type and anti-type.

⁸⁷² The Latin verb form “reduci” may be translated ‘be retraced’ and ‘be restored’.

any of these forms forever and that survives immobile and immortal in the basis itself.

This is my straightforward (7) opinion about languages. If someone thinks that they are exempted from the common vicissitudes of everything, he will have reason, history, and experience itself against himself. On reason the axiom is built: “Nothing beneath the sun is stable and human matters are the most unsteady of everything.”⁸⁷³ Customs, habits, laws, postures and rites change from day to day. What about that which pertains to speech – namely word, accent, pronunciation, inflection, form, expression, and trope⁸⁷⁴ – will these persist for ever and everywhere remain fixed and immobile? What is more changeable than the nature of man? What is more disdainful? That which it now approves, it soon condemns. That which yesterday was agreeable, is today old-fashioned and smells ill. And indeed we find out that Aesop’s answer to a question about God, “He is not doing anything else than breaking old jars into pieces and reshaping new ones,” very well fits the actions of nature and in particular those belonging to human nature. An infinite and insatiable eagerness for innovation governs all humans. Choice eloquence, ornamented style, embellishment, rhetoric, and poetry provide assistance in this, as do on the other hand negligence, oblivion, usage that perishes with the humans themselves, and the ensuing ignorance of earlier words and phrases now obsolete and doomed to everlasting night.⁸⁷⁵ All this corrupts speech, and thus, gradually and without anyone perceiving it except after centuries,

⁸⁷³ The principle of everything’s changeability is evident in different maxims in the Biblical and Classical traditions, such as Eccl. 1:9 “There is nothing new under the sun”, on which Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* 20,3, remarks: “He (Solomon) mentions the vanishing course of time, where nothing solid or stable is retained” (*commemorans [...] vanescentes temporum lapsus, ubi nihil solidum, nihil stabile retinetur*). Ovid, *Met.* 15, 165, encapsulates the doctrine of Pythagoras as follows: *Omnia mutantur, nihil interit*, that is, ‘Everything is changing, nothing ceases’. In *Met.* 15, 177–182, he makes Pythagoras say: “Nihil est toto, quod perstet, in orbe / cuncta fluunt omnisque vagans formatur imago / ipsa quoque adsiduo labuntur tempora motu / non secus ac flumen; neque enim consistere flumen / nec levis hora potest.” The phrase *cuncta fluunt* alludes to the maxim attributed to the philosopher Heraclitus: πάντα ῥεῖ, ‘everything flows’, which captures the continuous change of everything.

⁸⁷⁴ A trope is the use of a word in a transferred sense, different from the proper one through metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, or irony.

⁸⁷⁵ In his treatise on the common principles of all languages and letters, Bibliander discussed external and internal causes for language change. In the latter category, he mentions factors in language learning, such as laziness, negligence and bad imitation on the one hand, and diligence, elegance and cultivation on the other hand (*De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum*, Zürich 1548, p. 61 and p. 143).

languages are renewed and transformed into others than the first language.

Time is needed for such a destruction and birth of languages. (8) When one people is scattered into many over different regions on the earth, what do not the distances of space and the migrations of nations effect? If violent causes are added to them – wars, the fall of empires, captivities of nations, deportations, dispersions, mixings, overflowings of foreign peoples – what such causes have affected and affect, all histories of all times and daily experience teach us.⁸⁷⁶ I observe that languages change thoroughly in two regards. In one (internal) regard it occurs, when any language, which continues to be unmixed and undamaged by others, successively assumes, while remaining itself, one form after another only by the vice or virtue of a long passage of time.

To pass over other languages, everyone who has looked into the Gospel of Otfrid, written in rhyme seven hundred years ago in the time of Charlemagne, learns that this has happened to German. What do you think the language in use in the time of Julius Caesar looked like? Do you suppose that a speaker of German who lives today would recognize this as his own language? Not to mention the language used by the Cimbrians who captured Rome⁸⁷⁷ or by the first originators of this (Cimbrian) people.

Concerning our old and new Swedish, I appeal to my countrymen. Few people comprehend our law codes, though they are not written in the most ancient language, but were revised only more or less four hundred years ago.⁸⁷⁸ The stories, which are one or two hundred years older still, no one would be able to read or understand, if he has not learned this old language as a foreign and exotic one.⁸⁷⁹ Everyone who hears someone reading them will swear that it is Arabic idiom

⁸⁷⁶ Cf. Jean Bodin, *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*, Paris 1566, chap. 9, pp. 414 f, where three causes for linguistic change are distinguished: (1) the course of time, (2) the mixing of peoples, and (3) the climate of the region: p. 414: Sed mutationes linguarum tribus potissimum de causis. [...] Una est in ipso decursu temporum, quibus non modo linguae sed etiam res omnes immutantur ac tota rerum natura senescit. [...] p. 414: Altera causa est in coloniarum ac populorum inter ipsos confusione. [...] p. 415: Postrema linguae mutandae causa in ipsa regionis natura versatur.

⁸⁷⁷ The Cimbrians did not capture Rome, as the Gauls once sacked Rome (390 BC), but invaded northern Italy in 102 BC. The Cimbric army was totally destroyed by Marius at the battle of Vercellae on 30 July 101 BC.

⁸⁷⁸ The Swedish provincial laws are here correctly dated to the 13th century.

⁸⁷⁹ Carl Ivar Ståhle, *Vers och språk i Vasatidens och stormaktstidens svenska diktning*, Stockholm 1975, p. 419 identifies “the stories” with the Icelandic sagas, particularly the sagas of Saint Olaf (that is, Olaf Haraldson), of Diderick, and of Balaam and Josaphat.

rather than Swedish. What about our Dalecarlians? (9) Because of their old simplicity⁸⁸⁰ they speak Swedish purely and genuinely without mixing foreign impurities into their idiom. Nevertheless, those Swedes who are born in another province understand not even the shortest sentence. And if someone wishes to commit the words to writing in letters that exactly correspond to their pronunciation, there would hardly be anyone who upon reading will be able to think that the language is Swedish, although it is pure Swedish and not corrupted by the smallest foreign word. The same is to be found in other dialects such as Smalandian, Angermannian and the like. The Germans may consult their dialects. Let Swiss people, Schwabians, Saxonians, Pomeranians, Silesians and Dutchmen meet in a banquet and you will see what kind of verbal communication there will be! Everyone will nonetheless be speaking German, and undoubtedly pure German.

In order not to be long-winded, everyone who has learned Latin knows its celebrated ages.⁸⁸¹ Anyone who has read the fragments of (the law of) the Twelve Tables⁸⁸² and has heard some remnants of the

⁸⁸⁰ old simplicity] In the 17th century, this quality was together with endurance, bravery and strength regarded as characteristic for the inhabitants in the province of Dalecarlia. See Helander, *Neo-Latin literature in Sweden in the period 1620–1720*, pp. 347–348, where he refers to characterizations of the Dalecarlians by Laurentius Paulinus Gothus, Johannes Schefferus and Samuel Terserus.

⁸⁸¹ Stiernhielm is thinking of the age-of-life periodization of Ancient Latin. It is first attested in Juan Luis Vives, *De disciplinis libri XX* (1531), vol. 1, chapter 3. It was developed by Gerard Vossius in *De vitiis sermonis et glossematis Latino-barbaris libri quatuor* (1645), a treatise well known to him. In the preface, Vossius divides the history of Latin language and literature into five ages, viz. (1) *pueritia* (i.e. childhood) as the time of the Salarian songs, the laws of the twelve tables, the annals of the priests, (2) *adolescentia* (i.e. youth) between Livius Andronicus and Terence, (3) *vigor* (i.e. vigorous age) from the time of Cicero and Caesar until the time of Tacitus and Suetonius, (4) *viridis senectus*: (i.e. blooming old age) from the reign of Titus to the reign of Caracalla, and (5) *decrepita senectus* (i.e. decrepit old age) from the reign of Severus Alexander, 222 AD, to the fall of the Western Roman empire, 476 AD, and the invasions of “the nations that the Romans called barbarians”. Stiernhielm may also have known about the periodization of Latin into *prisca*, *Latina*, *Romana* and *mixta* by Isidore of Sevilla, *Orig.* IX, i, 6, which was the periodization of Ancient Latin that Roman grammarians handed down before Renaissance scholars devised others. He knew it from Gesner’s *Mithridates*, 2nd ed. (1610), pp. 65r–65v. A metal-scale periodization with a golden period (220 BC–14 AD), silver period (–68 AD), a bronze period (–138 AD) and iron period (–395 AD) was introduced by the German philologist Caspar Schoppe (or Scioppius, 1576–1649) in his *Observationes linguae Latinae* (1609).

⁸⁸² The Twelve Tables are edited with translation by E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin*, vol. 3, Cambridge 1938. See also M. H. Crawford, *Roman statutes*, London 1996, no. 40.

Saliar songs and expertly scratched the dunghills of Ennius,⁸⁸³ the fragments of Pacuvius, the Oscan verses of Titinius,⁸⁸⁴ and the old remains of Livius Andronicus will agree with me on the matter of fact that languages undergo old age, become obsolete and die off, and are again reborn, grow, become young and strengthen into a vital maturity. It is a matter of fact brighter than sunlight itself that languages become old, alter, change, and pass into different forms, one after another not only through violent actions and because of foreign influence, but also by their own nature by the intervals of time and space.⁸⁸⁵

Let us now consider what one ought to think about the emergence of languages from the Babylonian Confusion. I declare that *it seems that no new languages arose from the Babylonian Confusion, and if anyone did, (10) it soon disappeared as a momentary one*. In declaring this, experience and historical truth inspire me. However, common opinion, which dates back to the decree of some Church Fathers, blocks my way again. By this, they wished to authorize that no less than seventy-two languages arose according to the number of the heads of the families. I will myself not answer to this fabrication, but I call as witness against it André Rivet, an outstanding theologian of this time, who explains it in his *Exercises on Genesis* (number 68) as follows:

But the foundation on which the idea of a definite number of seventy-two languages is based turns out to be quite light and weak. What they (i.e. those scholars) assumed is indeed probable, namely that there were as many languages as there were divisions of peoples. On the other hand, if the number of peoples and nations, of which one commonly boasts, is submitted to a re-examination, it not only proves to be uncertain, but also mistaken. They say that in Genesis, chapter 10, fifteen peoples are numbered in the posterity of Japheth, thirty-one in the branch of Ham,

⁸⁸³ The fragments of Ennius (239–169 BC), Pacuvius (220–130 BC) and Livius Andronicus (who flourished 240–207 BC) are edited with English translation in E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin*, vol. 1 (Ennius and Caecilius) and vol. 2: (Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Pacuvius, Accius), London 1935–1936).

⁸⁸⁴ [Oscan verses of Titinius] Titinius (first half of the second century BC) was one of the principal author of dramas in toga (*fabulae togatae*), a type of comedy in Rome in the second century BC. His works only survive in fragments – 180 lines and 15 titles are known. As a playwright he was praised for his representation of characters. See *The Oxford Classical dictionary*, 3rd revised edition, Oxford 2003, s.v. Titinius and togata, pp. 1532 f.

⁸⁸⁵ [through the intervals of time and space] That is, through temporal separation and geographical distances between regions.

twenty-six in the offspring of Shem, which in all make up the number of seventy-two, but if we thoroughly analyse this number, the matter, which they consider certain, turns out to be highly uncertain. For in the first place, in the previous enumeration (in Gen. 10), the descendants of Noah are only seventy. If Shem and Japheth are added, they would be seventy two. Why is Ham omitted in that case? Secondly, if the Confusion of Languages took place in the year when Peleg was born, who was the first-born of Eber, which is clear from the Scriptures, the brothers Peleg and Joctan should be excepted, and so the thirteen sons of Joctan. After these have been exempted only fifty-five remain out of the number seventy. Furthermore, if, as we ought to do, we exclude from the number of nations those (11) whose descendants are mentioned by Moses, two more are to be taken away from the posterity of Japheth, namely Gomer and Javan, four in the branch of Ham – Cush, Mizraim, Canaan and Regma, and four among the descendants of Shem – Arphaxad, Aram, Eber, and Jectan (i.e. Joctan). That all these are to be removed from the number of peoples that Moses surveys is proved by the fact that

1. Parents cannot constitute a people in themselves and apart from their children.

2. Since, if this is done, Noah, Shem, Ham and Japheth are to be counted apart from their children as well, and in that way there would not be seventy-two, but seventy-six families.⁸⁸⁶

After these ten ancestors have been removed, yet ten others should be joined to them among those who are to be removed, namely every separate son of each parent. Otherwise, they would not have anyone with whom they would be able to communicate in their language and they would be like the deaf.

To those who should be exempted, I consider that Japheth with all his descendants can be added, in view of the following reasons:

1. The northern and western regions were allotted by God to Japheth and his posterity and doubtless assigned by Noah, his father, just as he gave the oriental and southern tracts to the other brothers. Accordingly, when Japheth after the cessation of the Flood had dwelt with his father in the valleys of Mount Gordiaeus⁸⁸⁷ at least 100 years (the Samaritan Bible counts 340 years, Isaac Vossius 531) and had

⁸⁸⁶ Andreas Rivet(us), *Theologicae et scholasticae exercitationes CXI in Genesin ex publicis eius praelectionibus in celeberrima Batavorum Academia*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1633, Exercitatio LXVIII, p. 328 (in the left-hand column, lines 4–1 from the bottom of the page and in the right-hand column, lines 1–28 from the top). This passage is excerpted in ms. F.d. 6, fol. 3v, Royal Library, Stockholm.

⁸⁸⁷ Mount Gordiaeus] that is, Mount Ararat.

undertaken to cultivate fields and grow vines in a country that already was his own, and had let his sons and grandchildren live there, I do not see any reason why he would abandon his parents, who were tired by old age, and his certain and own dwelling place, and hasten into exile on the plains of Shinaar together with his sons and family – in another country that was already occupied by the descendants of Ham (12) and ruled by Nimrod, where he had no share in the sowing or the harvest.⁸⁸⁸ The fact that Noah settled around Mount Ararat, which Josephus calls Gordiaeus,⁸⁸⁹ can be concluded from the Holy Scripture, Gen. 9,20: *And Noah, the farmer, began to plant a vineyard.*⁸⁹⁰ This also agrees with profane history, from which Samuel Bochart, the brightest star of learning in our time, in *Phaleg*, book 1, p. 19 and 20, proves that Noah, with his sons, built a city by name *Themanin*,⁸⁹¹ that is, “of the eight”, namely (the number) of the persons who were saved in the Ark. As long as it stood, it is not plausible that Japheth with his own people left his old Father alone, when Ham and Shem migrated to the plains of Shinaar. They were forced to depart out of necessity to take into possession the countries assigned to them. Is there any doubt about this? Nimrod had already begun to be mighty on the earth. He was a king. Over which subjects? In what place? In Chaldaea⁸⁹² or Assyria. In order that there would be a number great enough to appoint a king, it is necessary that Shem and Ham, whose posterity this crowd was, had already long ago occupied these and the neighbouring countries. In order not to abandon the old man Noah alone in the wilderness around Mount Gordaeus, it follows that Japheth was left just for the sake of safeguarding him.

2. The phrase מִקְּדָם (*miqqædæm*) “from the east”. Some people wrestle miserably with it to form a sense that the Holy Scripture hardly intends. This phrase, I affirm, clearly implies that those who had joined together for the construction of the Tower (of Babel) did not come from the north, where the mountains of Gordaeus are situated with regard to its location in relation to Babylonia, but met and united themselves in journeying from the east, from Bactria and

⁸⁸⁸ no share in the sowing or the harvest] This is a proverbial saying in Latin, see the commentary (Section 12.5).

⁸⁸⁹ Josephus, *Antiquitates Iudaicae* 1, 93, has the name form Κορδουαίων. Gordene was a region in Armenia, where *Gordaei* lived (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 6,27,31). This geographical name probably refers to the land of the Kurds!

⁸⁹⁰ Stiernhielm here follows the Latin Bible translation of Santes Pagninus (*Biblia*, 1527), see further the commentary (Section 12.5, remark on p. 12).

⁸⁹¹ Samuel Bochart, *Geographia sacra*, part 1: *Phaleg*, p. 20 and p. 21; see further the explanatory notes (Section 12.5).

⁸⁹² Chaldaea] that is, south-western Babylonia.

Persia and the lands between them. That these districts at that point in time **(13)** were cultivated and inhabited more than others is something that is reasonable to assume.

3. The Scripture itself, which regards the Japhethites as living aside and separated from contact with the others, does not mention them after the venture of building the tower. For after Moses has surveyed their genealogies in chapter 10, he adds in verse 5: *From these the islands of the Gentiles were separated into their lands, everyone according to his language, according to their families, into their nations.*⁸⁹³ This is straight to the point the same, as if you would say: “They were separated in the island of the Gentiles.” By this Moses left them in their countries as it were by a last “Farewell”. It is to be interpreted in its own place, not at all by the figure of hysteron proteron as the majority do, being seized by an unnecessary conjecture.⁸⁹⁴ After he had left them in their places, Moses goes on to survey the generations of Ham and mentions the cities they built in the land of Shinaar, Babel, Erech, Accad, Calneh, and similarly the cities which Assur built, Niniveh, Rehoboth, Calah, Resen, as well as mentioning the peoples who were their founders and originators. Moses continues his narrative on them in chapter 11, verse 2: *And it came about, when they journeyed from the east that they found a plain in the land of Shinaar and settled there.* After that he completes his narrative by describing their ungodly enterprise and the dispersion. Counting the descendants of Shem and in a continuous series down to Abram and beyond, he does not mention the Japhethites again with as much as a single word. From this I consider it as clearly shining forth that Japheth was content with the regions allotted to him on divine initiative. And why would he leave his old father and his certain and fixed dwelling place and in vain migrate to another and **(14)** foreign country, in which he knew that he would have no share for himself and his own? From this it can infallibly be concluded that Japheth and those descending from him, who were fifteen heads of families, were not present at the building of the tower. If these fourteen are also subtracted (for Japheth has already been exempted by Rivet) only thirty-one languages remain out of the seventy-two. Moreover, in his *Phaleg* Bochart even excepts Nimrod,

⁸⁹³ This does not agree with the Vulgate, since Stiernhielm follows Pagninus.

⁸⁹⁴ The connection between Genesis 10 and 11 through hysteron-proteron – that is, reversal of the natural or logical order by putting the latter past before the former – or recapitulation as a narrative technique is proposed by Augustine in *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* (419 AD), book 1, § 20, and *De doctrina Christiana*, book 3, ch. 35, § 122, § 127 and § 128. Chapter 35 was written in 426 AD.


despite the fact that he is held as the author of that insane advice. Hence, merely thirty new languages would remain.

However, since I find that no one has hitherto explored and analysed this subject matter in a way commensurate with its dignity, I have considered it worthwhile to penetrate into the roots themselves, so that what lies at the bottom of this may at last be spread about to everyone. In order not to entangle myself in the various disputes and mistakes of different people in the determination of countries and languages, I have chosen to follow Bochart, whom I always ought to praise, as a trustworthy leader in this forest. Under his guidance I exhibit the present diagram of the migration of peoples and languages.

(14 b)

The numbers show the degrees or generations descending in right line.


SHEM the eldest according to Scaliger
the second-born according to Bochart



the Arabic dialect, but according to common opinion they founded different peoples (and therefore also dialects) in India.

8. And Terah brought Abraham and Lot out of the Ur of the Chaldeans, that is, Chaldaea, towards the land of Canaan, For Abraham and his ancestors were Chaldeans. Gen. 11:31.

1



Furthermore, it is to be noticed that the pure Syrian language is the same as that called Assyrian⁸⁹⁵ and Chaldaic.⁸⁹⁶ Both are comprised under the name of Aramaic. However, Syriac, into which Hebrew was corrupted during the Babylonian Captivity, and which was used by the Jews in the time of Christ, is different, being a mixture of Syriac and Hebrew or of Chaldaic and Judaic.⁸⁹⁷

⁸⁹⁶ Chaldaic, a misnomer for Aramaic, often refers to Biblical Aramaic.

273

The Hebrew language draws its name either from Eber or from the word עבר *beyond* (*mē‘ebār*) and *cross, pass* (*‘ābar*) or עברָא (*‘ābārā*) *crossing* or *passage* as ‘from the other side of the river bank’, ‘trans-Euphratean’. It was called thus, because it was specific to Abraham, who lived in Chaldaea before he crossed the River Euphrates.⁸⁹⁸ If it is drawn from Eber, it was common to all of Syria, all of Arabia and perhaps also to India by the sons of Jectan.⁸⁹⁹ All of these were Eber’s offspring.⁹⁰⁰ And in that case it did not belong exclusively to Abraham’s descendants. If it began with Abraham, it is a new term and younger than the others, namely Chaldaic, Syriac, Arabic, Egyptian and also Ethiopic. Choose whichever of the two you wish and look up Vossius, who agrees with me.

(15 b)		HAM		According to Scaliger the middle, according to Bochart the youngest son.	
1.	CUSH	According to Bochart ancestor of Arabia, according to others of Ethiopia.		MIZRAIM	PUT CANAAN Father of Egypt. Father of Libya.
2.	Seba,	Hevilah,	Sabtha,	Raamah,	Sabtechah, Nimrod
3.			Sheba Dedan		According to Bochart he did not partake in the Confusion at Babel. Thus, he retained the primeval language, and the same was called Assyrian, Chaldaic or Babylonian.

Bochart places all these peoples along the shore of the Persian Gulf in Arabia. Accordingly, they all spoke Arabic.

1.	MIZRAIM. the Egyptians.				PUT. the Libyans.	
2.	Ludim,	Anamim,	Lehabim,	Naphtuhim,	Pathrusim,	Casluhim,
					are Colchians,	Caphtorim
					colonists of the	are Cappadocians,
					Egyptians	also colonists of
					the Egyptians	
					From these the Philistines originate.	

⁸⁹⁸ Since the Latin source text here has a failure, the translation relies on one of the proposed emendations in the critical apparatus of the textual edition.
⁸⁹⁹ In Bible interpretation, India was according to one tradition assumed to have been peopled by the descendants of Iectan or Ioctan.
⁹⁰⁰ This counter-argument was already proposed by Bishop Theodoretus of Cyrrhus (393–457). See my above-mentioned article “The primeval language and Hebrew ethnicity in ancient Jewish and Christian thought until Augustine”, p. 326.

All these peoples including the Libyans, Ammonians, and Marmoricans are colonists of the Egyptians.

Bochart states that the Ethiopian language originates from Egyptian. Almost no traces survive of the latter. We know that Ethiopian is similar to Hebrew, from which I gather that Egyptian was even closer, as Ethiopic derived from it. No sensible man will convince himself that Coptic was the old language of the Egyptians, as Kircher suggests.⁹⁰¹ Bochart thinks the language of the Philistines was an intermediate between Egyptian and Hebrew.

It is to be observed that the names of Mizraim, Ludim, Aramim etc. not are the names of men, but of places and peoples who inhabited these places. For Mizraim was a term for Egypt, Ludim for Ethiopia and Leabim for Libya. Mizraim begot Ludim, which means that the Ethiopians are colonists of the Egyptians, According to Bochart, the production of peoples and of languages is the same.


1. Canaan

2. Sidon,	Heth,	Jebusites,	Amorites,	Girgashites,	Hivites	Arkites
Sinites,	Arvadites,			Zemarites,	Hamathites	

All these were Canaanites, who used the language of Canaan or Phoenician. They were called Syrians, Assyrians, Phoenicians and

⁹⁰¹ Athanasius Kircher (1601–1680) was a German Jesuit, scientist and polyhistor, first professor of mathematics, Hebrew and Syriac in Würzburg (1628–1631) and then from 1638 professor of mathematics, physics and Oriental languages in Rome. Kircher founded egyptiology by his *Prodromus Coptus sive Aegyptiacus* (1636, a work possessed by Stiernhielm; see Section 15.2.2, A 3) and *Lingua Aegyptiaca restituta* (1643), where he treated the origin, antiquity and decline of ancient Egyptian. He also presented his views on Egyptian scripts and language in *Turris Babel sive archontologia* (1679, book III, section 1, ch. 9, pp. 173–183 on the writing systems of hieroglyphs and Coptic script; book III, section 2, ch. 8, p. 204 f. on the language). In these treatises, he identified Coptic with ancient Egyptian, which he called *Pharaonic* and which he thought lasted until the conquest of Egypt by the Persian king Cambyses, son of Cyrus I. As a written language ancient Egyptian is now periodized into four stages: Old Egyptian (3000–2000 BC), Middle Egyptian (2000–1300 BC), Late Egyptian (1300–650 BC) and Demotic (650–400 BC). Kircher argues that the Persian Empire staged a period of decline for Egyptian culture, script, and religion, but that the Egyptian language recovered during the Ptolemaic rule (323–30 BC), when it under the name of Coptic was restored in its grammar, although it borrowed many words from Greek. In so far as Coptic is the latest stage of Egyptian (from 250 AD to the present; from Kircher’s time only as the liturgical language of the Christian Egyptian Church), Kircher was actually on the right track. Coptic became important in the decipherment of the hieroglyphs and demotic script. See further Douglas J. Brewer and Emily Teeter, *Egypt and the Egyptians*, 2nd ed., Cambridge 2008 pp. 128–131.

Sidonians. From the last ones come the Punic and the Punic language in Africa. The Canaanite language is very close to Hebrew. Therefore, it is clear that the use of Hebrew continued among the posterity of Ham after the Confusion. More specifically the Assyrians were another nation as sons of Assur. They are even confused with the Chaldeans beyond the rivers Tigris and Euphrates. On the confusion of these names, see Vossius, *On idolatry*, book 2, ch. 55.⁹⁰²



⁹⁰² Gerard Vossius, *De theologia gentili et physiologia Christiana sive de origine et progressu idololatriae*, book 2, chapter 55, p. 611, where the author makes a distinction between two geographical concepts of Syria, the narrow and the wide. The former is only Western Upper Mesopotamia (Aram as used in the Bible), while the latter corresponds to the Roman province of Syria including Phoenicia.

⁹⁰³ That is, the Aramaic Bible translation of the Prophets (called Targum Jonathan).

⁹⁰⁴ Garpar and Garphatar] In Old Swedish, *garper*, “braggart, a person who boasts”, was an invective for referring to the merchants of the Hanseatic League who stayed in Scandinavia. *Garp-* is found in Swedish place names, for instance *Garphyttan*. See Elof Hellquist, *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*, 3rd ed., vol. 1, s.v. Garp-, p. 271.

And these are those who were called Scythians as the primordial humans.

(16) Behold! These are the genealogies of the peoples and of the languages. Let us now draw the conclusions. In the entire genealogy of Shem you will not, except for Hebrew, find any new language save the dialects that without doubt arise in the course of time and that are designated according to the name of peoples rather than according to the distinctions between specific languages. These are Assyrian – which is the same as Chaldaic – and moreover Syriac and Arabic. The Scripture mentions these. I have nothing to say about what nations Elam and Lud were the ancestors of, since nothing is clear from the Scripture. Conjectures from the allusion of names have as much value as the amount of trust each individual happens to grant them. If they are Persians and Lydians, or Phrygians, they will obtain their place (of discussion) below.

If we turn equal attention to the descendants of Ham, we will find nothing new apart from Egyptian and Ethiopic. Regarding the affinity of the latter to Hebrew, no one is unaware of it with the exception of the plain beginner in Oriental languages. And since Egyptian is intermediate (between Hebrew and Ethiopic), reason dictates that it is still closer to Hebrew. Scholars want to make the Colchians and the Cappadocians colonists of the Egyptians, and accordingly the colonists will share the same language with them. About the Colchians, Eustatius testifies to this assumption in his commentary on Dionysius.⁹⁰⁵ The descendants of Canaan used the proper Hebrew language and the difference consists only in the name of the people.

Above I have already given an explanation of the fact that the aforementioned dialects had, after an interval of several hundred years, departed a long way from the common trunk or primeval unity, so that peoples were not able to understand each other. Everything **(17)** is exposed to the ravages of time. Nothing lasts for ever. Languages rise, change, are differentiated, become young and grow old along with humans. The law of nature has made all earthly things subject to motion. Time measures the motion.⁹⁰⁶ The longer something moves away, the farther it diverges from its beginning.

⁹⁰⁵ During the reign of Emperor Hadrian (117–138 AD), Dionysius Periegetes wrote a description of the inhabited world, on which Eustathius (1115–1195) Archbishop of Thessalonica and a Byzantine scholar, commented. Henri Estienne published Dionysius' work with his own Latin translation and Eustathius' commentary in 1577. Stiernhielm possessed Estienne's edition (see Section 10.3).

⁹⁰⁶ Time measures the motion] Stiernhielm writes in Latin: *Motum tempus metitur*. This expression is Aristotle's definition of time, to be found in his *Physics*, book 4, chapter 12: "time is a measure of motion and of beings moved and it measures the motion" Augustine deals with the issue in *Confessiones*, book 11. He arrives at

I have already declared Japheth's progeny free,⁹⁰⁷ since there is no mention of him in the ill-advised tower-building. Moses had by then already left them with their islands and peoples, each with his own language. Therefore, by the reasons adduced, I consider them on this point justly exempted from the Confusion. I reserve them for a special investigation after I have completed what remains to be said about the above-mentioned languages or dialects. If someone, who is deaf and stubborn to all reason, nevertheless wishes to mix the Japhethites in with the Confusion, he may have his opinion. I do not forbid it. Let us only not allow them to have been subjected to a worse and longer punishment than their relatives, the Hamites and the Semites. For after they ceased to build the tower, they were no longer oppressed by a new language, as we learn from what has been demonstrated so far.

The Hebrew language of course returned to the descendants of Shem, as is clear from the diagram. The same Hebrew returned to the posterity of Ham. It followed the people themselves to their colonies, after which the dialects were named in the subsequent centuries, while gradually differentiating themselves from Hebrew. It is fair to assume that the same thing happened to the descendants of Japheth, if we grant that they took part in that foolish enterprise.

(18) When people returned to a sound mind, the punishment ceased and the language returned to their understanding. It had been confused and upset only for a short while in order that they would be forced to abandon the work and scatter into different regions, as long as they were unable to understand each other. That the Confusion has such a purpose is obvious from the words of the Lord himself. After it was achieved, it is likely that their previous language and mind returned to them. I do not see any other reason by means of which the truth of the sacrosanct Scripture can be saved, considering the fact that highly evident experience and biblical history itself gainsay the common opinion, and the latter does not mention any new languages soon after the Flood, except for those already discussed, Chaldaic, Canaanitic, Egyptian, Arabic, and Ethiopic. It is well known to every moderately learned person that they differ from Hebrew only slightly as dialects and that they received designations other than Hebrew only after empires and nations had been founded in subsequent centuries. Furthermore, the term "Hebrew" itself, which began to be used some centuries later, does not draw up any boundaries between

another conclusion stating in ch. 24, § 31 "non ergo tempus corporis motus". As regards Augustine's position, see Kurt Flasch, *Was ist Zeit? Augustinus von Hippo, das XI. Buch der Confessiones*, Frankfurt am Main 1993 (2nd ed. 2004).

⁹⁰⁷ declared ... free] that is, from participation in the tower-building at Babel.

languages in primordial times. Hebrew, Chaldaic, Arabic, Egyptian, etc. were all the same and were not designated by any specific terms. All were one language that was assigned different names after the nations were given different names.⁹⁰⁸ Therefore, I shall not be afraid of declaring that:

Hebrew is a dialect in no lesser degree than Phoenician, Chaldaic, Syriac, Arabic, Egyptian, and Ethiopic, etc.

(19) Here we first have to learn how language differs from dialect. Languages differ from each other in substance as their underlying matter, but dialects differ in accident. Languages are distinguished by matter, dialects by form. To propose this in a more explicit manner: Every language is defined by its own words and verbal roots, which are unknown and foreign to any other language. A dialect is a deviation of one language into the specific variety of a certain nation, a variety that does not differ in the identity of roots and words, but in the formation of accidents, cases and endings, and in the addition, removal, transposition and permutation of letters and syllables. In addition to these features there are differences in compounds and diverse (homonymic) uses of the same words, as well as accent, varieties of aspiration, and above all pronunciation, when it changes from the common one.⁹⁰⁹

If we consider all this, there will be no other difference between the above-mentioned languages than those which belong to dialects. They all have one and the same words at bottom, although some words are no longer used and have become antiquated in some dialects, while they are still in use in others. The roots and the primitive word sounds have been retained by some dialects, but have fallen into oblivion and come into disuse in others, despite the fact that derivatives and composites remain that in turn are not at all or

⁹⁰⁸ Stiernhielm, without acknowledging it, follows the main points of the linguistic theory of Christian Ravius of Berlin (1613–1677) in his comparative Hebrew grammar *Orthographiae et analogiae (vulgo etymologiae) Ebraicae delineatio*, Amsterdam 1646 (see particularly p. 15, § 9, and p. 42, §§ 6–14) and *A discourse of the Orientall tongues, viz. Ebrew, Samaritane, Calde, Syriac, Arabic and Ethiopic*, London 1649 (see particularly pp. 38–46), which was published together with his grammar in English, viz. *A generall grammer for the Ebrew, Samaritan, Calde, Syriac, Arabian and Ethiopic tongue*, London 1648.

⁹⁰⁹ Stiernhielm conforms to Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius* (1643), in his views on the nature of dialectal difference. See Eskhult, “The concept of dialect in three seventeenth-century linguistic theorists” in Raf Van Rooy (ed.), *Essays in the history of dialect studies. From ancient Greece to modern dialectology*, p. 93 and p. 100.

infrequently used in the other dialects. Those who are skilled in these languages know about this. There is one and the same vocabulary in all the above-mentioned languages. They are derived from the same source (the aforesaid conditions are to be observed) and they return to the same source. I hope there will be no disagreement about this.

The problem, (20) and the difficulty, is rather to put Hebrew on an equal footing with the others. The majesty of the Hebrew language is confirmed and surrounded by so many defences of various opinions, and is enclosed by the walls of so many prominent authorities,⁹¹⁰ that it will be extremely hard to break through and demolish them. Let us nonetheless attempt; may the truth win. The language of Noah is the primordial one. After the Confusion of Languages, it was bequeathed to the descendants of Shem. This is beyond controversy. It was also left to some of the descendants of Ham, namely those who originated from Canaan. This cannot be denied either. Thus, the Semites and the Canaanites had one language which was not yet called Hebrew. How did this appellation come into being? From Eber or from עבר [*'ebær/ 'ābar*], עברא [*"bārā*] i.e. ‘on the other side, to pass over, a passage’? It arose with Abraham, when he had crossed the Euphrates during his migration from the land of the Chaldeans to Canaan, because Abraham used a language from the other side of the bank or from the other side of the Euphrates.

If it is derived from Eber, it would be common not only to all of Syria – whose inhabitants were in fact all descendants of Eber – but also to Arabia and doubtless to a great part of India as well, which the sons and descendants of Jectan occupied. Accordingly, it would not matter if it was called Hebrew, Jectanean, Phalegean, or Hebrew, or Syriac, Arabic, Indian, or, in addition, Canaanitic, Assyrian, or Phoenician. For they are all still one, and the name “Hebrew” does not lend it any distinction among the others.⁹¹¹ It was a general one

⁹¹⁰ For an exploratory account of the opinions and authorities in favour of the idea that Hebrew was the primeval language of humankind, see my article “Augustine and the primeval language in early modern exegesis and philology, *Language and history* 56:2, pp. 98–119. See further my monograph *Schultens as the innovator of Hebrew etymology and lexicography* (f.c. 2022/ 2023), chapter 7.

⁹¹¹ This is an elaboration of a central linguistic idea of Christian Ravius, who in *A discourse concerning the easterne tongues*, London 1649, p. 45, states:

Because that the root is the same, therefore all Ebrew roots are Arabic, Ethiopic, Caldaic, Syriac and Samaritic, and again all the Arabic or Ethiopic, Syriac, Samaritic, and Caldaic roots are Ebrew, whether extant in this or that book, in the Ebrew Bible or not, where I find the same letters (because letters make the root and not the significations). So then Arabic roots are Syriac and Ethiopic and Ebrew roots, and the Arabic tongue is the Ebrew, Calde, Syriac, Samaritic, and Ethiopic tongue, no diversity at all under heaven in the substance and essence, only all the difference is in accidents, and that small too.

and was the same and common to all its speakers. Arabic (called thus after a long stretch of time) was Hebrew; Syriac was Hebrew. Canaanitic cannot be called Hebrew, because Canaan did not descend from Heber. However, in fact it is the same and older than Hebrew, as far as the term is concerned. For Canaan is only in the second generation removed from Noah, while Heber is in the fourth generation. So far it is clear **(21)** that even from this origin no advantage in relation to the other dialects can be granted to the mere name of Hebrew, since it is one language (with the others).

Let us return to Abraham, assuming that he and his family spoke a language that was distinguished from the common dialect of the Canaanites, and he was called a Hebrew, not after Heber, but because he crossed the River Euphrates as “the man from the other side of the river” and his distinctive language was called Hebrew on the same grounds and with the same meaning from the point of view of the Canaanites, to whom, however, he was a foreigner and a guest, not with regard to the Chaldeans, among whom and from whom he was born. His father Terah brought him with Lot and their wives out of Ur of the Chaldeans to the land of Canaan. Accordingly, they were Chaldeans and used the Chaldaic language, that is, just the language that the Canaanites called “that from the other side of the river.”

Is Chaldaic thus older than Hebrew? Well, in name, but not in matter. For it is one (with Hebrew). Accordingly, why do they dispute and argue that Hebrew is older than Chaldaic, that the former is primordial, but the latter is spurious and derives from the Babylonian Confusion, although both were one, and although it is clear that the name Hebrew by many centuries is younger than Chaldaic? If Chaldaic is a dialect of the primordial language of Noah, then Hebrew is also a dialect, since it is one and the same.

However, they object: “With the progress of time, Chaldaic diverged from Hebrew and became almost another language.” For my part, I declare that both of them diverged from the original state and stage, and two particular languages or dialects came into being from one language. The same condition given by nature is valid for both. One also cannot believe that one of them was exempted from the laws of nature more than the other. Furthermore, scholars say that Hebrew was preserved **(22)** in the posterity of Abraham because the Holy Spirit condescended to speak in this language. In this language the covenant was made with the posterity of Abraham. In this language God revealed himself to his Church and entrusted his words to the faithful. In this language the promise of the Messiah was made and therefore it was called the Holy language. Accordingly, it

deserved to continue and flourish immovable and unchangeable without any interruption for all time.

Such is the human judgement and it would agree with reason, if historical facts agreed with it. But they do not agree. Hebrew would have been worthy of being the language which the Messiah himself spoke, when he came in human nature.⁹¹² But he did not speak it, since it had already been lost after having undergone the same fate as other profane languages. After many vicissitudes it was finally ruined, although some of its people survived. After the ten tribes were deported by Salmanassar to Assyria and to the bordering regions and mixed with other nations, the whole form of the Hebrew language vanished. It was also entirely removed from its land after different nations settled in the former land of the ten tribes. And the Hebrew language could not continue to survive for any longer time within the narrow borders of the Judaic kingdom, which still subsisted. For after the course of some hundred years, the Hebrew language was expelled from there into the Babylonian Captivity, where it was so corrupted in the course of seventy years,⁹¹³ that together with its form it also lost its name which, changing from Hebrew, was now called Syriac. It differentiated into three dialects, namely Jewish, Galilean, and Samaritan, after which it divided into numberless varieties and forms among the Jews, who are scattered among nations of every kind.

(23) Such was in reality the immunity of the Holy tongue from corruption! From this it is clearer than daylight that it underwent the same vicissitudes as the other dialects, and that it is not to be regarded as more primordial than Chaldaic, Assyrian or Syriac. These names were once contained within the comprehensive term Aramaic. I am not speaking about New Syriac, into which Hebrew decayed, and which the Jewish people spoke at the time of Christ, but

⁹¹² Dante Alighieri, *De vulgari eloquentia* (c. 1304), I, vi, 6 and vii, 8, argues that the primordial and sacred Hebrew language (*Hebraicum idioma; sacratum idioma; antiquissima locutio*) was not confused among those who had not joined the tower-building and thus remained intact among the Hebrews, “in order that our Redeemer, who was to descend from them according to his human nature, would not speak the language of confusion, but of grace” (ut Redemptor noster, qui ex illis oriturus erat secundum humanitatem, non lingua confusionis, sed gratie frueretur).

⁹¹³ The idea that Hebrew was almost lost in the Babylonian Captivity traces back to the 16th-century Jewish scholar Elias Levita in the preface to his Biblical Aramaic dictionary, titled *Meturgeman* in Hebrew, *Lexicon Chaldaicum* in Latin. See further Mats Eskhult and Josef Eskhult, “The language of Jesus and related questions – a historical survey”, *KUSATU: Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, vol. 15 (2013), edited by Reinhard G. Lehmann, p. 320 f.

about the Syriac that was spoken by the entire posterity of Canaan and of Shem in Syria and Assyria, which was the same language as Hebrew, as was demonstrated above.

Aramaic had (as nature requires) its subdivisions, or so to speak, sub-dialects. The land of Aram was divided into six regions: (1) Paddam Aram, i.e. the mountainous region of Aram in Upper Mesopotamia; (2) Aram Tsobah, i.e. Lower Syria; (3) Aram beth Rechob; (4) Aram Damesech, i.e. Aram-Damascus or Syria Coele,⁹¹⁴ i.e. the so-called Hollow Syria between Lebanon and Antilebanon; (5) Aram Mangachah; and (6) Syria-Commagene or Antiochian Syria. Aramaic had equally many dialects [as these regions].

Nor can anyone doubt that the Hebrew language also had dialects distributed among the twelve tribes. This is plainly evident from the pronunciation of the word *shibboleth*, by which the Ephraimites betrayed themselves. They were accustomed — and they were unable to do otherwise — to pronouncing similar speech sounds with 'w' 's', and thus said *sibboleth* instead of *shibboleth*.⁹¹⁵ Moreover, a great difference is seen in the Holy Writings themselves. The Pentateuch is in one style, while Isaiah wrote in another, and Job, Daniel and Zechariah etc. each wrote in still other styles. From this it is clear that the Holy language no less than the others was liable to its own (24) vicissitudes.

I wonder all the more why everyone is persuaded and maintains as firmly established the position that *the Hebrew language remained unchanged from Abraham to the time of Salmanassar*. The course of nature and the above-mentioned reasons cannot possibly favour this opinion. Nature never ceases to move natural things and to make them different. The first age is never similar to the last. In nothing is there perpetual youth.

Adopting the same opinion in his *Phaleg*, book 1, chapter 15, the famous Bochart says that he wonders why the Hebrew language was changed in the Babylonian Captivity, while it did not undergo any corruption or alteration in the Egyptian Captivity, which lasted much longer. He goes on to enquire as to whether this depended on the fact

⁹¹⁴ Coele is a transliteration of the Greek adjective κοῖλη 'hollow, lying in a valley' (κοῖλος, -η -ον).

⁹¹⁵ Stiernhielm expresses himself a little unclearly. The sense is that the Ephraimites were accustomed to pronouncing the variants of the similar speech sounds *śin* and *shin* in the same way, namely with one of them, /ś/, here transliterated as /s/. In his draft of *Runa Suethica*, Stiernhielm refers to the book of Judges, chapter 12, the famous passage, where the Ephraimites, after the Gileadites had defeated them in a battle, were requested to say *Shibboleth* as a password. They could not pronounce the speech sound /ś/ (w, *śin*) right, but pronounced it with /ś/ (*śin*) as *Sibboleth*.

that the step from the Hebrew language to Egyptian was not an easy one to make, because Egyptian differed from Hebrew more than Syriac or Chaldaic differed from Hebrew, of which these were dialects that were not more distant from Hebrew than his common (vulgar) tongue, namely French, is from Latin, or whether, as de Grentemesnil⁹¹⁶ observes in his learned manner, because the Jews lived crowded together in Egypt, while in Babylonia they lived scattered among their lords, whose language they were compelled to use. So Bochart argues.

This careful and sensible man takes for granted that which is uncertain and questionable, viz. that in Egypt Hebrew did not undergo any change or even any modification. How does Bochart know this? Who has ever seen any writing or document of archaic Hebrew, which he can compare with the specific language of Moses to assess whether it is completely the same or if it has changed in at least some respect? Apparently, Bochart gives reasons for a matter that is still not certain, and therefore they are not compelling.

(25) As regards the first reason, that Egyptian was more distant from Hebrew than Syriac was, something doubtful is here claimed as certain. Bochart affirms that the Egyptian language had an intermediate position between Hebrew and Ethiopic. The latter (i.e. Ethiopic) originated in a group of colonists who emigrated from Egypt. Now it is obvious that Ethiopic is not as distant from Hebrew as French is from Latin. Accordingly, Egyptian was still much closer to Hebrew, especially at the point in time when the dialects were younger and had diverged less far from each other due to the shorter interval of years. Granted that Egyptian was related to Hebrew to a less degree than Syriac was related to Hebrew, it was nevertheless actually related to it and was able to join with and influence it, if not in its entirety, at least in part. Old Gaulish, or Celtic, to get straight to the point, had no closer relationship with Latin. By means of contact, however, the latter was influenced by the former and, conversely, the former by the latter, and this took place within much shorter span of time than 215 years⁹¹⁷ and under conditions of a greater freedom⁹¹⁸

⁹¹⁶ Jacques de Paulmier (in Latin, Jacobus Palmerius) de Grentemesnil (1587–1670) was a French classical philologist.

⁹¹⁷ This is the number of years that the Israelites stayed in Egypt before the Exodus according to the shorter chronology. The Hebrew Bible (Gen 15:13–16 and Exod. 12:41) states that the Egyptian sojourn lasted either 400 or 430 years. The Septuagint and Flavius Josephus (Jewish historian of the first century AD) divides the 430 years into two equal parts, with the patriarchs staying 215 years in Canaan and the Israelites as many years in Egypt. In the *Runa Suethica* manuscript draft, Stiernhielm follows the longer chronology (430 years).

⁹¹⁸ a greater freedom] that is, a greater freedom than the Egyptian bondage.

so that a Roman born in ancient Gaul was no longer able to speak Latin and a Gaul was no longer able to speak Gaulish. I pass over Spain and Rome itself and the Goths that became natives of Rome. I also keep silent about the fact that the more languages are separated from each other, the greater the need to adopt words previously not understood into the respective languages to facilitate mutual communication. By this practice, it happens that they diverge further from their original purity than if they had been mixed up with idiosyncrasies closer to or almost identical with their own vernaculars.

To the second reason, which he takes from the observation of de Grentemesnil – that in Egypt the Israelites lived crowded together, (26) but in Babylonia they instead each lived scattered around among their lords – I answer: in the beginning, when Jacob came to Egypt, the land of Goshen was given to him to settle with his sons. However, within a short period it was peopled and after that they made the land of Egypt cramped for the Egyptians because of their multiplication, as Moses himself testifies in Exod. 1:7, where he expresses the matter with a great number of synonymous expressions: *But the sons of Israel were fruitful and were born in multitudes and multiplied and became exceedingly mighty and the land was filled with them*, and in verse 9, *The King said to his people: Look! The people of the children of Israel are great and mightier than us*, and most obviously in verse 12, *and they, the Egyptians, were affected by anguish and anxiety*⁹¹⁹ *because of the children of Israel*. Hence, it is not unclear that they had spread all across Egypt; see verse 13, *And they enslaved the children of Israel harshly*. Verse 14: *And they made their life bitter with hard bondage, in clay and in bricks and in all kinds of work in the field and in all their service, by which the Egyptians hard-heartedly took advantage from their work*.

Now I ask: Where were these fields of the Egyptians situated, in the land of Goshen or in other parts of Egypt? If in Goshen, the Egyptians lived mixed with the Israelites, and the Egyptians owned properties and fields there, but if it was in other parts of Egypt, the Israelites lived mixed with the Egyptians, in whose fields they performed their work. In order not to leave any doubt about this question, see chapter 3 (of Exodus), the final verse [22]: *But every woman will ask her neighbour and her who dwells near her house for vessels of silver, vessels of gold and clothing, which you will put on your sons and your daughters and so you will plunder the Mizraim*,

⁹¹⁹ were affected by anguish and anxiety] The Latin phrase *angustiis afficiebantur* is difficult to interpret. Another possible interpretation is: “got into tight straits and troubles”.

i.e. the Egyptians. From this it is clearer than the midday sun that the Israelites were distributed across all of Egypt and lived together with (27) their masters and landlords whose lands they cultivated.

Now that these obstacles have been removed, I am inclined to argue in this way: in the Babylonian Captivity they had writing, books, prophets, wise men and synagogues. Even so, the Hebrew language changed so much within one generation, namely in the course of seventy years, that it completely decayed into another language, while the former one fell into oblivion. If this happened under such circumstances, it seems impossible by nature that after and beyond four generations, i.e. four hundred years – so God himself defines a generation in Genesis, chapter 15, verse 6 – the Hebrew language could remain pure and undamaged like at the beginning of the sojourn. In this interval of time, the people of Israel lived in darkness and in barbarism without writing, books, without wise and learned men and without prophets, and mixed with a ruling people.

Thus, it seems credible and highly compatible with reason that the language in which Moses wrote and which the returnees from Egypt commonly used, and which we still today call Hebrew, in many respects had diverged far from the language that Abraham and Jacob spoke before the Israelites went to Egypt, and accordingly it ought in the best sense to be counted among the dialects to no less of an extent than the others that decayed from the primordial tongue.

By the intervals of time and space languages turn into dialects.

(28) This transformation is continuous: one language deviates into different dialects, and again each dialect consolidates into a language by the long course of time.

I define “dialect” as a major variety of a particular language that diverges in a different direction from an original language. The difference consists in the sometimes dissimilar use of substantial or radical words, and in their distortion into other senses, furthermore in their syntax, phraseology, declension, conjugation, pronunciation, and accent. If these are so varied that they constitute a significant difference, yet nonetheless are understood, albeit in some cases with difficulty, they constitute a new dialect, even though it has not been mixed up with any other foreign language. In this way, all languages have their own specific dialects: Italian has the Tuscan, Lombardic, Venetian and Neapolitan dialects; French has the Parisian, Toulouse, Picard, Norman and Provençal dialects; German and Swedish have their varieties – and what languages do not have as many dialects as

the country has provinces? Each particular language has its own varieties.

As separate languages I consider, on the other hand, those that are separated by such an interval that the substantial words and the accidental forms have become foreign to the point that those who usually talk with one another cannot mutually understand each other in any way except with an interpreter. Languages grow to be such by the duration of a long time during which they diverge farther and farther from each other. In this process, it is necessary that the character of a natural progress becomes clear, as with all natural phenomena. The fact is that when two entities, which once were one, are diverging from their unity, the farther they proceed and across the more boundaries through this greater (29) rupture they turn out to be distant both from their unity, their primordial state, and from one another.

In order not to tire the benevolent reader with my little treatise, let us listen to beyond doubt the most learned man, my friend as long as he lived the most famous Salmasius, who deals with this subject-matter excellently in his *Treatise on the Hellenistic language*, p. 18:

Such languages or dialects (namely those which as their basis have some ethnic group of people, in which they are situated and fixed) have the nature that they grow and decline like living beings and consequently undergo many changes. Old words fall away and die off. New words grow up, by which the whole language is changed and renewed as they gradually replace the old-fashioned ones and those that have come into disuse.⁹²⁰ As long as the external form remains, the same name of the language is kept, but when the old form breaks down and passes into another shape, as it were, after the fundamental features of the previous form have been wiped out, then another language arises and gets a new name. In his time, Quintilian writes that the entire Roman language had changed.⁹²¹ Thus it was another in the time

⁹²⁰ New words ... into disuse] Cf. Horace, *Ars Poetica*, lines 60–62: Ut silvae foliis pronos mutantur in annos / prima cadunt, ita verborum vetus interit aetas, / et iuvenum ritu florent modo nata vigentque; i.e. “As the forests shed their leaves, as the year declines, and the oldest fall, so the former generation of words perishes, while the latest, like infants, is born and flourishes”; lines 70–71: Multa renascentur quae iam cecidere, cadentque / quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula [...], i.e. “Many words that have already fallen will be reborn, many now well-regarded will fall.”

⁹²¹ Cf. Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* VIII, 3, 26: “Totus prope mutatus est sermo”, “The language has almost changed entirely”; cf. IX, 3, 1: “Verborum vero figurae et mutatae sunt semper et utcumque valuit consuetudo, mutantur. Itaque, si

of Ennius and Pacuvius. The even more ancient people had still another tongue. Rome also used yet another at the time when the city was founded, namely the language that Romulus and Remus spoke. After the age of Quintilian it underwent changes, one following another, however always retaining the same name of the Latin or Roman language,⁹²² as long as it retained the basic features and character of the previous language. Conversely, when the Roman Empire disintegrated through the attacks and migrations of the barbarians, **(30)** the Roman language also underwent the same destruction, and together with the disintegration of the empire it decayed into different languages that kept neither the form nor the name of the Roman language. Thus three languages arose from one, French, Italian and Spanish. Their origin is evident in them. Their form points to the mother whose daughters they are. These languages differs from Latin just as daughters usually differ from their mother. The daughter may be as similar as ever; still she is another. So far Salmasius.⁹²³

I wish with all my heart to enquire into whether the language that flourished at the time of Quintilian was the same as that which Romulus spoke and whether it had the same character and external form. Salmasius says that Romulus and Remus spoke another language, but at the same time the language remained the same until the destruction of the Empire. Quintilian admits that the Roman language had completely changed from the earlier one. In what way is it called or understood as another and the same at once? Salmasius answers:

This mother, although she was first a child, right afterwards a maid, then a woman in her prime, and finally an old decrepit

antiquum sermonem nostro comparemus, paene iam quidquid loquimur figura est.” That is: “Figures of speech have always been liable to change and are continually in process of change in accordance with the variations of usage. Consequently, when we compare the language of our ancestors with our own, we find that practically everything we say nowadays is figurative.” I here follow the English translation by Harold Edgeworth Butler in his edition of *Institutio oratoria* in Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA, 1961–1966).

⁹²² Latin and Roman language] For the use of Latin and Roman as glottonyms, see Johannes Kramer, *Die Sprachbezeichnungen Latinus und Romanus im Lateinischen und Romanischen*. Berlin 1998. For an overview, see my article “Vulgar Latin as an emergent concept in the Italian Renaissance (1435–1601)” in *Journal of Latin linguistics* 17:2, p. 198.

⁹²³ Claudius Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius, controversiam de lingua Hellenistica decidens et plenissime pertractans originem et dialectos Graecae linguae*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1643, pp. 18–19.

woman, has remained the same person throughout so many changes; she has carried the same body and has retained the same name. The child is not so much dissimilar to another child with regard to its shape and appearance, as it is from itself when it becomes a man. The face of the wrinkled old man is neither so unlike the face of another old man of the same age, as it is different from itself, if a picture is shown depicting the face such as it was in his childhood.⁹²⁴


This is exactly what I wanted to prove, namely that languages gradually pass into dialects, and these dialects are transformed through a continuous sequence of changes (31) into other languages, which are completely dissimilar to the former one in their form and external appearance, but which in their substance are completely the same and not different, even if they have received very different names. The German language can serve as example. It has today another form than it had at the time of Charlemagne and the vigour of that age differs from that during the childhood of Tuisco.⁹²⁵ Compare the last with the first: you will not find anything that is like itself – not one – everything is different. Is the entire language consequently different? Yes, it is different, because it is not understood, nothing sounds alike, and it has neither the form nor the external appearance of the previous language. Accordingly, it is different. However, I claim that it is the same, because it is German⁹²⁶, because it has continuously lasted from the same origin, because it has always persisted intact and undamaged from all foreign mixture until this age – identical in its root and substance, dissimilar to its youth in its face,

⁹²⁴ See *De Hellenistica commentarius*, pp. 19–20. This passage is an application of the aforementioned age-of-life periodization of Ancient Latin to conceptualize the problem of continuity and change of languages in general.

⁹²⁵ In *Germania* (98 AD) Tacitus refers to Tuisco, or Tuisto, as the ancestor of the Germans. Tuisco was claimed to be the fourth son of Noah by the Italian historian Annius of Viterbo (1432–1502) in *Commentaria super opera diversorum auctorum de antiquitatibus loquentium* (1498). Annius represents Tuisco as the primordial ruler of Germany, or European Scythia, and his son Mannus as his successor. Annius pretended to have discovered the lost books of the Babylonian historian Berossus (early third century BC), but his quotations from it were a forgery, as was realized already by 16th-century Western historians. In his *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sveonumque regibus*, Johannes Magnus employed Annius of Viterbo (with his forged texts) as one of his sources. The history of Johannes Magnus was used as an important text in Swedish historiography until the late 17th century. On the reception of Annius of Viterbo in Swedish historiography until the end of the 17th century, see Marianne Wifstrand Schiebe, *Annius von Viterbo und die schwedische Historiographie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, Uppsala 1992.

⁹²⁶ The Latin adjective *Germanica* could of course also be rendered Germanic here.

sound and outlines. It is logically consistent to pass the same judgement regarding its multiple offshoots, namely the various dialects that spring forth from it. And why do I employ the word *offshoot*? What seems to be strange is that here the offshoot is the same as its mother. The dialects Austrian, Misnian,⁹²⁷ Swabian, Swiss, Pomeranian, Dutch, Frisian, Flemish and innumerable more are no others than the one German. They are branches that extend from one and the same trunk. If the single branches are cut away, the tree itself will not be found anywhere. All these dialects are thus one language. However, some of them can be combined so that an entirely new language arises. See the diagram below for an overview:



If men who use these dialects come together in a city, it is necessary that all three dialects in the passage of time will merge into one, which is very unlike each of them and is not understood by any inhabitant of Swabia, Mecklenburg and Brabant. Nonetheless it will be a German dialect. At the end of his *Treatise on the Hellenistic language* Salmasius elegantly says:

How many languages there might be in the world and among mankind cannot be determined by any calculation or number, since they can be countless and almost as many as there are single groups of ten humans.⁹²⁸ For if ten men would be brought on a desert island served and assisted by deaf people right from

⁹²⁷ Misnian] In German "Meissnisch", a dialect in Upper Saxony (Meissen) in the area around Dresden. Cf. Helander, *Neo-Latin literature in Sweden*, p. 262.

⁹²⁸ According to statistics in the Ethnologue for 2020 there are 7,097 living languages in the world, 50% of which are spoken by populations of less than 10,000 people. Salmasius cites the fact that there are very small language communities (*decuriae hominum*, i.e. divisions of ten humans) as a reason to leave the exact number of languages as an open question. He argues that the possibility of language multiplication is endless because of the ongoing geographical separation of ethno-linguistic groups. The Ethnologue of 2012 counted 133 languages spoken by less than 10 persons each and 399 languages spoken by between 10 and 99 persons each.

childhood to adult age, out of the things they could learn and use, they would form a language of their own dissimilar to every other one. If ten other men would be brought up in the same way on a neighbouring island, and never had any communication with the former ten nor any other access to them, they too would invent another form of speech – quite unlike it. This can be pursued without limit.⁹²⁹

From this we can form an opinion of the natural production of all languages **(33)** and their youth, flourishing, decline and death. That which is the fate of humans, states, and empires, it is the fate of languages as well.⁹³⁰

I think that I have dealt enough with the oriental languages that originate from Hebrew and its cognates. Now the outline of my treatise requires me to address the Japhetic language. All the posterity of Japheth were called Scythians and thence comes the Scythian language. The first settlements of the Japhethites or the Scythians were at Mount Ararat, which Flavius Josephus and others call Mount Gordiaeus. From there they went down to adjacent places and then gradually to more distantly situated areas and occupied the vast regions of Asia and Europe and were given different names; in Asia Bactrians, Indo-Scythians, Parthians or Persians, Phrygians, Lydians, Bithynians and so on; in Europe Thracians, Getae or Goths, Dacians, Germans, Gauls – by a comprehensive name Celts – and Cimbrians, Huns, Alans, Herulians, Franks, Burgundians, Normans, Vandals, Suebians, Langobards (Lombards) and many others,⁹³¹ names to which the histories of that time testify.

⁹²⁹ See Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, pp. 463–464.

⁹³⁰ Compare Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 37f. “Omnium linguarum conditio est, ut corporum et aliarum rerum, quae crescunt et decrescunt, ubi ad summum adolescendi cacumen venerunt, postea retro ferri ac sublabi solent, donec plane decidunt atque intereant. Infantia est dialectorum et senium. Inter utrumque tempus quasi virilis earum aetas statui debet, qua velut in flore sunt et ἀκμῇ.” “Every language has the same condition as bodies and other things that grow and decrease, namely that when it has reached its highest point of growth, it usually is brought back and glides down, until it entirely falls down and dies. Dialects have a childhood and an old age. Between both these ages a time ought to be set up like manhood, in which they are in flower and at their culminating point.”

⁹³¹ In this argument Stiernhielm used Meric Casaubon’s treatise *De quatuor linguis commentationis pars prior, quae de lingua Hebraica et de lingua Saxonica* (1650) The former part is divided into two main sections, one of which is on the Hebrew language, pp. 1–125, the other on the Anglo-Saxon, pp. 127–418. On page 134, Casaubon states about the ancient Germanic peoples: “variis illi quidem nominibus et tribus [...] distincti, sed eiusdem aut certe simillimi sermonis commercio coniuncti: Hunni, Gothi, Ostrogothi, Wisigothi, Heruli, Franci, Burgundiones,

All these peoples were Scythians by descent and used the Scythian language – each having its own dialect. The opinion of the most learned men is that Thracian, Phrygian, Persian or Parthian, and German were Gothic in origin, that is to say, Scythian. Among them is the most famous Salmasius, who in his first book on the Hellenistic language says: “Persian or Parthian, a language which itself has the Scythians as its originators, is the carrier of innumerable words that are to be found in the Greek dialect and German as well.”⁹³² In the preface to the Arabic translation of the Table of Cebes,⁹³³ when speaking about Elichmann,⁹³⁴ who was very skilled in Persian, the same Salmasius declares:

(34) He had found out what is hidden to most of the scholars until this time, namely that German and Persian have flowed forth from the same origin — a conjecture he was led to make not only because of the unlimited number of words that are common to both languages, but also because of the similar endings of the verbs and everything that is constructed in the same way and by many other arguments.⁹³⁵

Normanni, Wandali, Alani, Swevi, Langobardi aliiquae plures, quorum nominibus istorum temporum historiae refertae sunt.” In his private copy of this treatise (at UUB, inventory nr. 58. XI. 3), Stiernhielm underlined the names of the nations and wrote “adde Suedos seu Suethos” in the margin.

⁹³² Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 378. Casaubon quoted the same passage in the above-mentioned treatise on Old English (1650), pp. 135 f., where Stiernhielm in his private copy here underlined the key words.

⁹³³ The Table of Cebes draws its name from a painting that pictured the human life in an allegorical manner and the author of the writing claims to explain that image, and the alleged author – Cebes of Thebes (430–350 BC), a philosopher, a disciple of Socrates – is a pseudonym. The work in question dates from the first half of the 2nd century AD. Salmasius published Elichmann’s edition of an Arabic version of the Table with the original Greek, of which he provided a Latin translation.

⁹³⁴ Salmasius describes a recent discovery by Johannes Elichmann (c. 1601–1639), namely the conjecture that German and Persian derives from a common origin. Elichmann was a Silesian physician and Arabic philologist. After sojourns in Regensburg and Liège, he settled in Leiden. As a physician he saved the life of Salmasius (whom other physicians had already abandoned). See Toon Van Haal, “On ‘the Scythian theory’: reconstructing the outlines of Johannes Elichmann’s planned *Archaeologia Harmonica*”, *Language and history*, 53:2 (2010), p. 72 f. on Elichmann’s life; pp. 74–75 on his theory of linguistic kinship with the Scythian language as a common source of German(ic), Persian and Greek.

⁹³⁵ *Tabula Cebetis Graece, Arabice, Latine ... cum praefatione Cladii Salmasii*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1640, see the preface, p. 3, but Stiernhielm most likely quoted the above passage from Casaubon’s treatise *De quatuor linguis* (1650), in the book on Old English (*De lingua Anglica veteri seu Saxonica*), p. 136, where this passage is underlined in Stiernhielm’s copy, see Figure 20b. Casaubon omitted Salmasius’ passage on the Persian-Greek linguistic kinship.

Moreover, Philipp Clüver demonstrates well enough in *Germania antiqua*⁹³⁶ that Illyrians, Germans, Gauls, Spaniards and Britons once had one and the same language, namely Germanic, which is identical with Gothic.⁹³⁷ He proves it by several arguments; for instance he tries to prove it from the most ancient words for all kinds of things. Add early Italic to these languages!

It is superfluous to speak much about our Sweo-Gothic, since everyone agrees that it has remained genuine and uncorrupted right from its primordial beginning and is still pure and free from foreign influences and in no respect has distanced itself from its first origin except through the passage of time. As regards its old age, Abraham van der Myl expresses his sentiments against this language in a treatise on the Dutch language.⁹³⁸ He writes that the Swedish language (which he calls *Suedana*) has suffered some damage from its contact with the neighbouring Finns and Muscovites, but in this matter the good Mylius judges like a blind man about colour, because he was ignorant of Swedish. Finns and Muscovites, whose languages are entirely dissimilar to Swedish, have never had such contact with the Swedes that they have been able to contaminate our language even by the smallest single word. Perhaps he would have done better for himself and his own language, if he had turned to Andreas

⁹³⁶ Stiernhielm possessed the second edition of Philipp Clüver's *Germania antiqua* Leiden 1631 (first edition Leiden 1616).

⁹³⁷ In the section on Old English "De lingua Anglica veteri seu Saxonica" of his above-mentioned treatise *De quatuor linguis commentationis*, 1650, p. 136, Casaubon also refers to Clüver for the identity of these languages: "Iam Illyriorum, Germanorum, Gallorum, Hispanorum, Britannorum, unam olim eandemque fuisse linguam (quae utique Germanica fuerit, ut ex priscis plurium rerum vocabulis capite VIII evincere satigit) pluribus argumentis adstruere Phil. Cluverius, Germaniae suae lib. primo, cap. V. et aliquot sequentibus. Gallorum certe [...] linguam non aliam fuisse quam Germanicam, quamquam dialecto diversam, receptissima opinio est." In the margin of his private copy, Stiernhielm underlined the names of the peoples referred to, and comments on German(ic) as a collective name: "Quid ni Gothica?" that is, 'Why not Gothic?' For a photograph of this page with Stiernhielm's marginal note, see Figure 20b. This explains his addition that Gothic is the same as German.

⁹³⁸ Abraham Mylius (Milius), or van der Myl, (1563–1637), *Lingua Belgica sive de linguae illius communitate tum cum plerisque aliis, tum praesertim cum Latina, Graeca, Persica [...]*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1612, p. 118. In ms. F.d. 14a, fol. 3v, Stiernhielm quotes this passage, but disapproves of Mylius' presumptions. See Section 13.2.2.

Mylius says as follows, chap. 26, p. 118: "Et quamvis Suedanorum uti et illis finitimorum Danorum aliorumque dialectus sit multum mutata a vera Teutonica, id factum est, quod cum Moschis, Lapponibus similisque barbarae linguae populis mutuum commercii ipsis fuerit. Tum et Windi a Germanis et Saxonibus expulsi in eas oras confugientes secum simul linguae corruptelam intulêre."

Helwig in his preface to the *Origins of the German language*,⁹³⁹ where in evaluating different languages (35) he is so bold as to write on Dutch:

Do not ask about Dutch! It is adulterated or, to use a gentler expression, the foam of our German, as it was introduced by crowing and babbling children by means of mutual agreement and convention and adopted by the crowds of this people, in a bout of fever so to speak, except for the fact that it has intermixed many semi-Latin words by imitation of their neighbouring Spaniards⁹⁴⁰ and Gauls.

You have to admit this, my dear Mylius! This is also the language that you, Becanus,⁹⁴¹ claim and assert to be the primordial one and the mother of Hebrew and of all languages that have ever existed and are now found in the world.

Since we are dealing with the Japhetic language and with languages and dialects that descend from it, we turn to Greek, which itself is also a Japhetic language originating from Javan. Thus, it ought even to be Scythian and is consequently a sister of Gothic. In noticing this, the learned Meric Casaubon writes in his treatise on the Saxon language: “it either is an offshoot of Greek, but then from the most remote origin, or certainly from the same origin as Greek,”⁹⁴² which he afterwards proves in the whole of the book by comparing a good deal of Saxon words with Greek. Mylius does the same with the same good sense and reliability when arguing that the Celts are much more ancient than the Greeks. Franciscus Irenicus agrees with them in his *Exegesis Germaniae* (Description of Germany).⁹⁴³ In the preface to his Wulfila edition, Franciscus Junius says that Gothic differs from Greek only as a dialect and has emerged from the same

⁹³⁹ Andreas Helvig(ius) (1572–1643), *Etymologiae sive origines dictionum Germanicarum ex tribus illis nobilibus antiquitatis eruditae linguis Latina, Graeca, Hebraea derivatarum*, Francofurti/ Frankfurt am Main 1611. See the preface.

⁹⁴⁰ The Spaniards were neighbours of the Dutchmen in the sense that they ruled the Spanish Netherlands.

⁹⁴¹ Johannes Goropius Becanus (1519–1572) proposed that *lingua Cimmeriorum* or *lingua Cimbrica*, Dutch as spoken in Flanders and the Netherlands, is the first language of mankind. See his *Origines Antwerpianae* (1569), p. 551 and p. 557.

⁹⁴² Meric(us) Casaubon(us) (1599–1671), *De quatuor linguis commentationis pars prior, quae de lingua Hebraica et lingua Saxonica*, Londini/ London 1650. See p. 139. Stiernhielm underlined the quoted passage in his private copy.

⁹⁴³ Franciscus Irenicus or Franz Friedlieb (c. 1495–1559), *Germaniae exegeseos volumina duodecim*, Hagenau or Nürnberg 1518. For an analysis of this work, see Günter Cordes, *Die Quellen der Exegesis Germaniae des Franciscus Irenicus und seine Germanenbegriff*, Tübingen 1966.

origin as Greek.⁹⁴⁴ In his treatise on the Hellenistic language (1643), Salmasius says:

I do not argue that the languages of the Greeks and of the Getae or Thracians and of the Teutones or Germans were quite the same, but that they had many words in common **(36)** that come from the same origin. Persian or Parthian, whose ancestors were the Scythians, also displays a great number of words that are found to be the same in Greek and in German. The conjugations of verbs are the same in these three languages, similarly the declensions of nouns⁹⁴⁵ and many other things.

Furthermore, he says on page 384, about German, Greek and Persian:

It is not easy to determine which of these languages is the most ancient one, and which has passed on these words to the two others, other than that it seems safer to claim that the Greeks got them from the Scythians. This can be assumed as all the more certain from what I taught previously, namely that the first men who peopled Greece and who are the ancestors of the Greek language arrived there from the northern and Scythian tract. Thus, all the words that are the same in German, Greek and Persian have the same origin as well.

I wish to add what our Salmasius writes on p. 427:

Before the Greeks lived in Greece, it was inhabited by various barbarian peoples. The Greeks or Hellenes, who came from Thessalia, occupied one region after another in Greece, or Hellas,

⁹⁴⁴ Franciscus Junius (1589–1677) *Quatuor Evangeliorum versiones perantiquae duae, Gothica scil. et Anglo-Saxonica*, p. 4 (referring first to his collation of the proofs of Gothic e.g. of the Lord's Prayer published by Bonaventura Vulcanius in *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum*, Leiden 1597), Junius says: "Collatis quoque speciminibus istis cum Alemannorum Anglo-Saxonumque dialecto ita bene prospereque videbatur mihi processisse negotium, ut beatulorum omnium vicos et prata prae hac mea opera pro nihilo ducerem, veluti clarissimis argumentis signisque iam perductus ad ipsum caput fontemque linguarum septentrionalium: Francicam enim Anglo-Saxonicamque ex vetere Gothica promanasse, ipsam vero Gothicam, ut quae sola dialecto differat a Graeca vetere, ab eadem origine cum Graeca profluxisse judicabam."

⁹⁴⁵ *Compositiones nominum* is an ambiguous expression. Although it is possible to understand it as meaning the syntax of words in general, here it cannot but refer to the grammar of case – the inflectional forms that indicate the function of the nouns, or words, in a clause or sentence.

as the country was called by themselves. They did not drive out the earlier barbarian inhabitants, but lived mixed together with them and taught and civilised them. Thucydides, too, clearly hands this down.

In consequence of this, it is easy to conclude where the agreement and, as it were, the identity of our languages⁹⁴⁶ has begun. Our Salmasius writes on page 405:

The Greeks had a language that was proper and particular to them in such a way that nonetheless it borrowed many words from the Phoenicians and still more from the Getae and the Thracians. But there has never been any language that has suffered more changes (than Greek).⁹⁴⁷

I am convinced that I have dealt adequately with Greek and its relationship with our languages. Now, I turn over to the Slavonic or Illyrian language. It is common to many nations: (37) the Poles, the Russians, the Bohemians etc. You have a list of these nations in the *Mithridates* written by Gesner.⁹⁴⁸ The Illyrians were once considered to be Celts and to have spoken a Celtic language, which later degenerated into Slavonic by mixture with Greek. This is what Ovid actually refers to when writing:

*Graecaque quod Getico mixta loquela sono,*⁹⁴⁹

⁹⁴⁶ The languages designated as "our" cannot but refer to Swedish and German.

⁹⁴⁷ Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 403 (not p. 405). In my translation I follow the reading *pertulerit* in the original text, not *protulerit* in the quotation.

⁹⁴⁸ Conrad Gesner, *Mithridates de differentiis linguarum, tum veterum, tum quae hodie per totum terrarum orbem in usu sunt*, Tiguri/ Zürich 1555, see fols. 54^v–55^r. In his list (*enumeratio alphabetica populorum qui Illyrica lingua utuntur*), Gesner enumerates sixty-nine Slavic-speaking peoples: eastern, western and southern. As a matter of fact, Gesner includes peoples speaking Baltic languages under the ethno-linguistic concept of Slavonic: Prussians, Kurs or Curonians, and Lithuanians, about whom he says: *sed et Litواني iam Sclavonizant*, likely inferring that they use Slavic as a common second language. In Slavic-speaking peoples he also includes the Livs or Livonians speaking Livonian, a Balto-Finnic language of the Uralic family. The *Mithridates* of Gesner has been re-edited with an introduction, translation and notes: Conrad Gesner, *Mithridates (1555): Introduction, texte latin, traduction française, annotation et index* by Bernard Colombat and Manfred Peters, Genève (Droz) 2009.

⁹⁴⁹ See Ovid, *Tristia* 5.2.68. In the context, Ovid complains about the disadvantages of his exile. In the previous verse he tells what torments him: *nesciaque est vocis quod barbara lingua linguae / Graecaque quod Getico mixta loquela sono est*, i.e. "that this barbarous language is ignorant of Latin and that the Greek language is mixed with sounds of Getic". Some readings in the verse are uncertain; *cum*

i.e. ‘that the Greek language is mixed up with Getic sounds’.

Likewise: *Mixta sit haec quamvis inter Graecosque Getasque / a male pacitis plus trahit ora Getis*,⁹⁵⁰

i.e. ‘although this people⁹⁵¹ is mixed up by Greeks and Getae / they draw their language⁹⁵² more from the scarcely pacified Getae’.

Similarly: *Hic quoque sunt urbes Graiae (quis credere posset) / inter inhumanae nomina barbariae.* /

*Huc quoque Mileto missi venere coloni / inque Getis Graias constituere domos.*⁹⁵³

i.e. ‘Also, here, there are Greek cities (who could believe this) among the place-names of the savage barbarians.

Also here colonists came, sent out from Miletus, and founded Greek home districts among the Getae’.

These colonists actually were those who merged Getic and Greek into the Sarmatian language, which is the same as Slavonic.

Now I shall turn to dealing with Latin. I have learnt that the Latin language is composed of four languages: first that of the aboriginal inhabitants, which comprises the Etruscan, Oscan and Sabinian languages, which coalesced into one Latin-like (*Latiaris*)⁹⁵⁴ language. Add to this the Greek language brought in by Evander⁹⁵⁵ and Phrygian by Aeneas! Join to these Gothic or Celtic, which does not claim a small part of the Latin language as its own. The Etruscan, Phrygian, and Celtic languages are related, all being derived from one source. Greek is not distant either. They are all Japhetic, and consequently so is Latin itself. It is thus not surprising that the

alternates with *quod*, and modern editions prefer *victa* to *mixta*, while some manuscripts have *iuncta* or *vincta* here instead of *mixta*.

⁹⁵⁰ See Ovid, *Tristia*, 5.7.11–12.

⁹⁵¹ The subject of the sentence occurs in a preceding verse: the people in the region of the city Tomis (*Tristia* 5.7.9: *turba Tomitanae ... regionis*). The Sarmatic people (*Sarmaticae ... frequentia gentis*) are mentioned in *Tristia* 5.7.13.

⁹⁵² If the noun *os* (gen. *oris*) is the object, it refers either to the speech and language of the Sarmatic people or to the lineaments of their faces. Stiernhielm obviously interpreted it in the former sense. Still another possibility is that the subject is *ora* (gen. *orae*): ‘the region draws more from the scarcely pacified Getae’.

⁹⁵³ Ovid, *Tristia*, 3.9.1–4.

⁹⁵⁴ The *lingua Latiaris* probably refers to the language of the inhabitants of Latium that preceded the formation and development of Archaic Latin and Old Latin (600–240 BC).

⁹⁵⁵ According to the ancient tradition, before the destruction of Troy Euandros (Gr.) or Evander (Lat.) migrated from Arcadia in Greek to Latium accompanied by a group of colonists and introduced the alphabetical letters into Latium.

mentioned languages share a great number of words with Latin. In the preface to his work *De vitiis sermonis*⁹⁵⁶ even Gerard Joh. Vossius claims this same origin to the Latin language. (38) He is forgetful of his own assertion in his etymological dictionary⁹⁵⁷ and unhappily and contrary to the bent of his genius derives quite many words from Greek that easily and without compulsion could have been deduced from Celtic.

What I have said so far may be sufficient concerning the primary and cardinal languages. Because many others have originated from these and arisen by mixture, they are innumerable and partly known, partly unknown to us. The origin of the unknown languages is completely unexplored. Among the known, I will at least say something about two of them, Finnish and Hungarian, whose origins no one has yet been able to reveal. They cannot in fact be traced back to either Slavonic or any other language known to us. What surprises me most is that I have found quite many Hungarian words in Molnar's dictionary⁹⁵⁸ that are common to Finnish, although there is a vast distance between these nations. Furthermore, it is incredible how many Greek words that can be found in Finnish. From this it has crossed my mind that the Finnish people many centuries ago originated from a people mixed with Greek colonists. Estonian and Lappish are dialects of the Finnish language.⁹⁵⁹

I was going to finish here. However, I now recall that some of our own, learned men complain in their writings that our Swedish language is corrupted every day, because it adopts more and more French and semi-Latin words.⁹⁶⁰ This is a rightful complaint.

⁹⁵⁶ The full title is: *De vitiis sermonis et glossematis Latino-barbaris libri quatuor, partim utiles ad pure loquendum, partim ad melius intelligendos posteriorum seculorum scriptores*, Amsterdam 1645, second edition in Frankfurt am Main 1666.

⁹⁵⁷ Gerard J. Vossius, *Etymologicon linguae Latinae; praefigitur eiusdem tractatus de permutatione literarum*, Amsterdam 1662, published by Isaac Vossius.

⁹⁵⁸ The Hungarian scholar Albert Scenczi Molnar (Albert Molnar Ungarus, 1574–1639) compiled Latin-Hungarian dictionaries, first a bilingual one: *Dictionarium Latino-ungaricum*, Nürnberg 1604, and after that a trilingual one: *Lexicon Latino-Graeco-Ungaricum*, Hanau 1611, with an extent of 915 pages. It was reprinted in Heidelberg 1621 and in Frankfurt am Main 1645 with some additions (1030 pages), in the last case with the inclusion of the shorter *Dictionarium* (approx. 345 pages). Stiernhielm refers to the trilingual one, since he had it in his library, though it is unclear exactly which edition (Section 15.2, beneath the heading A 1, p. 343).

⁹⁵⁹ Cf. ms. F.d. 7:1, the first loose folio: "Finnonicam et Esthonicam, quae dialecto sunt proximae, Scythicam esse et in iis quae ex Scythia habet Graecia convenire cum Graecis. Esthones probabile est fuisse, qui apud Herodotum Issedones."

⁹⁶⁰ It is uncertain what writings Stiernhielm here refers to. Perhaps he alludes to the complaints about the contempt for the Swedish language by the pseudonym author Skogekär Bergbo, who commonly has been identified with the lawyer, official, and poet Gustaf Rosenhane (1619–1684), in the poem *Thet swenska språketz klagemål*,

However, I now request that they be calm, since the most famous Chancellor of the Realm⁹⁶¹ perceiving what outcome there would be of this has trodden down the tares⁹⁶² among the plants by forbidding any secretary to insert even the slightest foreign word in his drafts.⁹⁶³ (39) Through his precaution and watchfulness it is effected that every scribe at the Government Offices is diligent in adapting his linguistic usage to the ancient purity of our language.⁹⁶⁴ In this manner, I

which was published in Stockholm in 1658 (and later re-edited by Per Hanselli, *Samlade vitterhetsarbeten af svenska författare från Stjernhjelm till Dalin*, vol. 1, pp. 293–308). The author regrets the high esteem of Latin, French and German as compared with the low regard for Swedish. He states (lines 69–84):

Romaren är försvunnen, / doch talas romerskt mål / rätt som man vore bunden / till thess beröm och prål. Thet måste alt beskrifvas / nu medh latinske ord, / som intet kunde gifvas / och ingen blifva spord / igenom migh, som både / så gammal är och rijk. In English translation: “The Romans have disappeared / but the Roman language is spoken / as if one is obliged / to the praise and ostentation of it. / Everything must now be represented with Latin words / as if nothing can be expressed / and no one can be taught / through me, I who am both / so ancient and so rich.”

He continues (lines 121–129):

Hvad samqväm här anställes / är som thet vore skam / I hvad taal hälst ther fälles / medh svenska komma fram. / Nu hälsas intet mehra / ey bjudes fara väl / om thet ey skeer etthera / med tyske ord man stäl / eller ock kanske medh franske. That is: “Regardless of the party here arranged / it is like a shame / in whatever talk that is undertaken / to speak Swedish. Now no one is being greeted any more, / neither bidden farewell, / unless it is done either / with German words, which are stolen, / or also perhaps with French.”

Moreover, the author mentions a Swedish king (likely John III) who is said to have issued a prohibition against mixing Swedish with foreign words (lines 1197–1198). At the end of the poem, the author predicts that Swedish in the future will be used to a greater extent than Latin and not be mixed with foreign words (lines 1210–1214 and 1217–1218): “Thet kommer snart en tijdh / på hvilken man skal höra / migh kring om värden vidh. Mehr än latin nu öfvas / iagh en gång brukas skal. [...] En gång skal ingen blanda / the nyie orden in.” For an English translation of the entire prophecy of the Swedish language (lines 1213–1252), see Einar Haugen, *The Scandinavian languages: an introduction to their history*, London 1976, p. 423.

⁹⁶¹ Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie (1622–1686) held the office of Chancellor of the Realm between 1660 and 1680.

⁹⁶² Stiernhielm here uses a Greek loan-word in Latin, *zizania*. In Greek the singular of the word is ζιζάνιον, a weed that grows in wheat, probably darnel in English and *lolium temulentum* in Latin. The word occurs in the parable of the wheat and the tares in Matthew 13:25, which has clearly inspired Stiernhielm here.

⁹⁶³ The Latin word *conceptus* is here used in a sense unattested in ancient texts. In late Medieval Latin the word could occur in the sense ‘draft’ or ‘abstract’, a sense that continued to be used in European vernaculars: French *concept*, English *concept*, German *Konzept* and Swedish *koncept* (*Svenska Akademiens ordbok*, s.v. *koncept* 2).

⁹⁶⁴ This is important evidence of deliberate language planning and policy at the Government Offices in the latter half of the seventeenth century. For a discussion

boldly claim that our language has not diverged from its first origin any more than an old woman has from her childhood, who has one and the same body, although the face and the outward form and lineaments have changed.

It remains to inquire somewhat into the letters and script of the Goths. The letters of our ancestors were called runes from the verb *röna*, ‘to learn, to experience, to be informed’. In this sense, a soothsayeress or prophetess is called *Alruna*, that is, ‘omniscient’.⁹⁶⁵ Icelanders call them *Fiol-kunni*, i.e. ‘multiscious’, today *Wis-quinna*, i.e. ‘a wise woman’. For the same reason the small images that are shaped from the roots of the Mandragora fruit are called Alrunes, which vain and superstitious people misuse as omniscient things and by a remarkable form of worship revere as oracles, whose answers they stupidly and impiously believe will disclose hidden and future things.

Now, if you ask when and among whom the runes primarily originated, there will be some who say they were invented by Wulfila, Bishop of the Goths in Moesia,⁹⁶⁶ and there will be others who claim that they are more ancient. Among the latter is Bonaventura Vulcanius, who thinks that the use of Getic letters flourished among the Getae long before the time of Wulfila, but that these letters first were made known to the Romans through Wulfila.⁹⁶⁷ The same author says it is probable that they were invented long before the Latin letters, and that the Getae had their letters long before Carmenta and her son Evander arrived from

of the standardization of the Swedish public and printed language in the 17th and 18th centuries, see Ulf Teleman, *Ära, rikedom och reda: svensk språkvård och språkpolitik under äldre nyare tid*, København 2002, pp. 65–81.

⁹⁶⁵ Alruna] In discussing the etymology of the word “Rune”, Stiernhielm continues the reasoning of Conrad Gesner, *Mithridates de differentiis linguarum* (1555), where Alruna is rendered as a female magician or soothsayeress (“maga vel saga”). Gesner states that he is ignorant of the etymolog, but explains the verb “runen” as “to whisper; to speak secretly in the ear of anyone” (insussurare vel secrete et in aurem colloqui). In his own copy of the second edition of this treatise (*Mithridates exprimens differentias linguarum*, Tiguri/ Zürich 1610, p. 32v, Uppsala University Library), Stiernhielm writes in the margin: “al-runā, omni-sciens, al-kunā et fiol-kunna, id est multi-sciā, proma et fatidica”. For a photograph, see Figure 14b.

⁹⁶⁶ Socrates of Constantinople, *Ecclesiastical history* IV, 33, states that Wulfila invented the Gothic letters: “Ulfilas, their bishop at that time, invented the Gothic letters, and translating the Sacred Scriptures into their own language.” Many early modern philologists, such as Bonaventura Vulcanius, confused the Gothic letters with the runes.

⁹⁶⁷ Bonaventura Vulcanius, *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum*, Leiden 1597, dedicatory letter, p. 3r: “ego vero pace horum authorum Geticarum literarum usum apud Getas longe ante Gulfilae tempora viguisse existimaverim, sed per Gulfilam Romanis primum innotuisse.”

Greece at the mouth of the river Tiber and on Roman soil and taught this uncultivated nation customs and letters **(40)** after the aboriginal inhabitants had been expelled.⁹⁶⁸ About the origin of the Etruscans, p. 42 and passim, Postel asserts that the Etruscan and Gothic letters are the most ancient.⁹⁶⁹ Similarly, he claims that the Gauls received their letters from Gomer long before the Greeks received theirs from Cadmus,⁹⁷⁰ and that the Latins got their letters from the Gauls and Spaniards, who had theirs 1,300 years earlier.⁹⁷¹ With what reliability and by what authority he claims this I cannot conjecture.

The Germans did not have any letters in the age of Caesar or in the time of Tacitus, but they are said to have used Greek letters to write the German language before the time of Charlemagne. In his commentary on the Germania of Tacitus,⁹⁷² Jodocus Willich testifies that the Germans wrote their business documents in Greek letters until the time of the Emperor Rudolph, who succeeded to the imperial throne about the year 1273. Speidelius agrees with him on page 858 in my copy. In the preface to his observations⁹⁷³ Wehner writes that during the imperial reign of Conrad IV, in the year 1251, the German language began to be represented by letters and written by means of Latin characters.

⁹⁶⁸ Bonaventura Vulcanius, *ibidem*, dedicatory letter, p. 2v: [...] “adeo ut verisimile sit longe ante inventas literas Latinas et, antequam Carmenta e Graecia ad ostia Tiberis et Romanum solum cum Evandro pervenisset expulsisque aboriginibus gentem illam rudem mores et literas docuisset, Getas literas suas habuisse.” In mytho-history (Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 1, 7, 8; Ovid, *Fasti* I, 619–620; Isidore, *Etym.* 4, 1, 5; 5, 39, 11) Carmenta was a prophetess who taught the aboriginal inhabitants of Latium writing. In folklore she was a nymph, who probably was connected with divine incantation (*carmen*) and identified with the forest-goddess Camenae. See *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, third revised edition (2008), s.v. Carmentis or Carmenta, p. 293.

⁹⁶⁹ Stiernhielm’s reference is misleading. He does not refer to Guillaume Postel, *De Etruriae regione, originibus, institutis, religione et moribus*, Florentiae/ Florence 1551, but to Postel’s *De originibus seu de varia et potissimum orbi Latino ad hanc diem incognita aut inconsyderata historia, quum totius Orientis, tum maxime Tartarorum, Persarum, Turcarum et omnium Abrahami et Noachi alumnorum origines* [...], Basileae/ Basel 1553, p. 42, cf. pp. 18–19.

⁹⁷⁰ Postel, *De originibus* [...], p. 33.

⁹⁷¹ Postel, *De originibus* [...], p. 34. In the Greek mytho-historical tradition, Cadmus (Kadmos), a Phoenician prince, was credited with having introduced the Phoenician letters (the Phoenician alphabet) to the Greeks. Herodotus claims that Cadmus lived 1,600 years before his time, that is around 2 000 BC.

⁹⁷² Jodocus Willich (1501–1552), *In Cornelii Taciti Equitis Romani Germaniam commentaria*, Francofurti ad Viadrum/ Frankfurt an der Oder 1551, reprinted in Strasbourg in 1670.

⁹⁷³ Paul Matthias Wehner (1583–1612), *Alte und erneuerte Ordnung und Reformation der Römischen Kayerlichen Mayestät, Keyserlichen Hoffgerichts zu Rotwell*. Part 2: Notae et observationes. Frankfurt am Main 1610.

I surmise that the Greek letters to which they here refer were either the same as, or not much different from, our runes, since the runes are nothing other than Greek letters, and from them the Latin ones have originated, as being fashioned in a barbarous and unskilled manner and mutilated. This can be seen in our common runes as well as in the runes of Wulfila and furthermore, as stated, in the Latin letters themselves, most of which are distorted versions of the Greek ones.

Finally, I cannot but exceedingly wonder what (41) entered in the mind of Olaus Wormius. In his treatise on the runic alphabet,⁹⁷⁴ chapter 6, he contends that the Gothic language and letters are called Danish. There he is not also ashamed to write that Wulfila arranged the Danish alphabet to agree with the order of Latin, and after having increased it by some characters Wulfila was the first to spread it to foreigners. What kind of insolence is this? Where was the Danish name in the time of Wulfila? It was not heard of in the entire world before Jordanes. However, Jordanes lived around 530 AD, whilst Wulfila lived in 360 AD or about that time. Where was the Danish name by then? It was not made known until about one hundred and seventy years later.

To prove my assertions in the treatise on languages about the origin of new languages, behold, benevolent reader, I provide samples of seven new languages, which were born of the one Latin. You may judge the other languages in the same manner. Make use of these samples and farewell!

First we have the mother LATIN

Pater noster qui est in coelis. Sanctificetur nomen tuum. Adveniat regnum tuum. Fiat voluntas tua, sicut in coelo, et in terra. Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie. Et remitte nobis peccata nostra, sicut et nos remittimus debitoribus nostris. Et ne nos inducas in tentationem, sed libera nos a malo. Quia tuum est regnum, potentia et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen.

(42)

ITALIAN

Padre nostro che sei ne cieli. Sia santificato il tuo nome. Venga il tuo regno. Sia fatta la tua volonta, si come in cielo, cosi ancora in terra. Dacci hoggi il nostro pane cotidiano. E rimettici i nostri debiti, si come ancor noi gli rimettiamo à i nostri debitori. E non ci

⁹⁷⁴ Stiernhielm refers to Ole Worm, *Literatura Runica: Runer seu Danica literatura antiquissima, vulgo Gothica dicta luci reddita*, Hafniae/ Copenhagen 1651. This was part of his work *Antiquitates Danicae. Literatura Runica. Lexicon Runicum. Monumenta runica. Additamenta. Fasti Danici*, Hafniae/ Copenhagen 1642–1651.

indurre in tentatione. Ma liberaci dal male. Percioche tuo è il regno, la potentia, é la gloria in sempiterno. Amen.⁹⁷⁵

SPANISH

Padre nuestro, que estás en los cielos. Sea santificado tu nombre. Venga tu reyno. Sea hecha tu voluntad como en el cielo, ansi tambien en la tierra. Da nos oy nuestro pan quotidiano: y suelta nos nuestras deudas, como tambien nosotros soltamos a nuestros deudores. Y no nos metas en tentacion: mas libra nos del mal. Porque tuyo es el reyno, y la potencia, y la gloria, por todos los siglos. Amen.⁹⁷⁶

FRENCH

Nostre pere, qui es és cieulx. Ton nom soit sanctifié. Ton regne viene. Ta volonté soit faicte ainsi en la terre comme au ciel. Nostre (43) pain quotidien donne nous aujourdhuy. Et pardonne nous noz offenses, ainsi que nous pardonnons à ceulx, qui nous ont offensé. Et ne nous induy point en tentation: mais nous delivre du maligne. Car a toy est le regne, la puissance, la gloire aux siecles de siecles. Amen.⁹⁷⁷

RHAETO-ROMANCE

Pap noass, tu quell chi ésch in Is tschéls. Fatt saingk vennga ilg teis nuom. Ilg teis raginam véng naun proa. La tia voellga dwain taschkoa in tschéł, uschè eir in terra. Noass paun d'minchiady daa a nuo hoátz. E parduna a nuo ils noass dabits, schkoa eir nuo pardunain als noass dabittaduors. E nun ans manar in prowamaint, moa ans spendra da lg maal. Parchiai chia teis ais ilg raginam é la pussauntza, é lg laud in etern. Amen.⁹⁷⁸

SARDINIAN⁹⁷⁹

Pare nostre, che ses en los cels. Sia sanctificat lo nom teu. Venga lo regne teu. Fasase la volunta tua, axicom en lo cel, i en la terra. Lo pa nostre cotida dona a nos altres hui. I dexia a nos altres les

⁹⁷⁵ Gesner, *Mithridates*, 2nd ed. (1610), p. 64v “Oratio Dominica Italice”.

⁹⁷⁶ Gesner, *Mithridates*, 2nd ed. (1610), p. 55v “Oratio Dominica Hispanice”.

⁹⁷⁷ Gesner, *Mithridates*, 2nd ed. (1610), p. 29r “Oratio Dominica in Gallica lingua communi et tersiori”.

⁹⁷⁸ Gesner, *Mithridates*, 2nd ed. (1610), p. 72v “Oratio Dominica in vernaculo Rhaetorum sermone, quem ipsi vulgo Romanum appellant”.

⁹⁷⁹ Sardinian] This designation here refers to a local variety of Catalan in Alghero in northwestern Sardinia, the dialect Algherese, which goes back to a colonization of Alghero by speakers of Catalan in the late Middle Ages (1372 AD), when Sardinia was subjugated under the Crown of Aragon.

deutes nostres, axicomi nos altres dexiam als deuoís nostres. I no nos induescas en la tentatio: mas liura nos del mal. Perche teu es lo regne, la gloria i lo imperii en los sigles de le sigles. Amen.⁹⁸⁰

(44) VULGAR SARDINIAN

Babu nostru sughale ses in soschelos. Santufiada su nomine tuo. Bengiad su renno tuo. Faciadsì la voluntade tua, comentì in chelo et in sa terra. Su pane nostru dogniedie dona a nos ateros hoae. Et lassa a nos ateros is debitus nostrus, comentè e nos ateros lassaos a is debitores nostrus. Et no nos portis in sa tentatione: impero libera nos da su male. Poiteo tuo esti su rennu, sa gloria, su imperiu in los seculos de los seculos. Amen.⁹⁸¹

WALACHIAN (i.e. ROMANIAN)

Paerinthele nostru cela ce esti en cheri. Svintzas cæse numele teu. Vie enpertzia ta. Facæse voe ta, cum en tzer ase si præ pæmentu. Pæne noastre tza sætzioace, dae noaæ astezi. Si lase noaæ datorii le noastre, cum si noi se læsæm datornitzilor nostri. Si nu dutze preno i la ispiture: tze ne mentueste prenoi de viclianul. Amen.

12.5 Commentary

The below commentary provides miscellaneous notes to explain the origin and meaning of different phrases, the sources of inspiration and realia. It supplements the explanatory notes, where literary references, translational matters and scholarly contexts are explained.

page 2

Duo praecipua ingeniorum obstacula etc.] Stiernhielm distinguishes tradition and authority as the main impediments to the advancement of learning. He criticizes excessive reliance on authorities as follows at the end of this introductory harangue: “While we confer on them exceptional brilliance [...], we consider ourselves dull persons and blockheads, completely ignorant of every possible subject and [...] we linger in our dung as servile cattle and unworthy of bearing the name of human beings.” As stated above, Nordström was not the first to call attention to this passage as a plea for independent research. In his biography of Stiernhielm (1839), the linguist, poet and translator C.A. Hagberg (1810–1864) maintains that Stiernhielm here displays

⁹⁸⁰ Gesner, *Mithridates*, 2nd ed. (1610), p. 74 “Oratio Dominica in Sardorum oppidanorum lingua”. A photograph of the entire text is provided as Figure 14c.

⁹⁸¹ Gesner, *Mithridates*, 2nd ed. (1610), pp. 74r–74v, “Eadem in Sardorum communiori lingua extra civitates”. A photograph of the text until the beginning of the 5th petition is found in Figure 14c.

an independent spirit and a huge contempt for deference to scholarly authorities. The introduction to the treatise on the origin of languages is Stiernhielm's manifesto of the scholarly challenges in his own time and deserves to be read as a reminder of scholarship in all times.⁹⁸²

page 3

insuper habemus] In the sense 'to take no account of, to neglect', the phrase *insuper habere* is recorded by some postclassical Latin writers, e.g. Fronto, *Epist.* 59,4 and 210,12; Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 1,19,8; 4,1,18; Apuleius, *Metamorph.* 4,25,6; Paullus Papinianus, *Digest.* 11,7,43 and 39,9,17; Symmachus, *Epist.* 14,1.

cornicum oculos velle configere] Literally, 'to wish to hit the crow's eyes'. According to Erasmus, *Adagia* (1.3.75, nr. 275), this is a proverbial saying with the purport "to find fault with and revise the learning and knowledge of the ancient". Erasmus refers to Cicero, *Pro Murena* 11,25 and *Pro Flaccio* 20,46, and Jerome, *Adversus Rufinum* 2, 27. In his Roman gnomology, Otto states:

Because the crows have a very sharp sight and are particularly cautious, a great shrewdness is needed to deceive them. The saying consequently aims at those who are able to go behind the most cautious.⁹⁸³

page 4

namque et nobis Deus est. Et nostra calescunt pectora Phoebō] Invoking inspiration for his scholarly topic of language origins and kinship, Stiernhielm employs a couple of poetical phrases attested in ancient Latin, but developed in Neo-Latin poetry. In doing so, he continues his plea for independent linguistic research free from neo-Aristotelian authorities.

Invoking divine inspiration for his poetry, Ovid writes in *Fasti* 6,5: *Est deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo*, and in *Ars amatoria* 549f. *Est deus in nobis et sunt commercia coeli / sedibus aetheriis spiritus ille venit*. The expression *pectus calet* is found in Silius Italicus, *Punica*, XII, 769f. *similique cupidine rerum / pectora nostra calent*.

⁹⁸² Hagberg, "Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhjelm" (unpublished manuscript in the Archives of the Swedish Academy, *Svenska Akademiens samlingar*, vol. 291), p. 17: "Stjernhjelm uppenbarar en sjelfständig anda, hugstort förakt för att efter andra släpa sig i stoftet och med ytterst lifliga färgor målar ej mindre dem som svärja på sin mestares maktspråk, än dem som förhäfva sig af lärdomens högfärd, allt ord i sinom tid och för alla tider." Hagberg then quotes the passage referred to above.

⁹⁸³ A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen redensarten der Römer* (1890/1962), s.v. *cornix*, p. 93.

These Ovidian passages were imitated by Helius Eobanus Hessus (1488–1540), professor of eloquence and poetry in Erfurt and known as the Christian Ovid (*Ovidius Christianus*).⁹⁸⁴ Having joined the Lutheran Reformation, he composed among other things at Luther's instigation a versified paraphrase of the Psalms in Latin.⁹⁸⁵ In his disapproval of the stylistic paganism of a contemporary poet who invoked Apollo, Eobanus adopts Ovid's phrases and combines them with the above expression occurring in Silius Italicus. He writes:

Imbuimus trino carmina nostra Deo. /
 Est Deus in nobis, non qualem Naso canebat. /
 Christo, non Phoebo, nostra pectora calent. /
 Est Pluto in vobis, agitante calescitis illo, /
 sedibus infernis spiritus iste venit.⁹⁸⁶

Regardless of the fact that Stiernhielm (contrary to Eobanus) invokes Apollo, he uses almost the same classicizing phrases. *Et nobis Deus est* is an adaptation of Ovid, while *nostra calescunt pectora Phoebo* appears to imitate Eobanus. Stiernhielm writes these words as in a hexameter.

Finally, there is a parallel to Stiernhielm's famous poem *Hercules*, 372–374:

*Är nu vår siäl utan skäl? eller äre wij fänad och bestar? / Släckie
 wij sielf vår eld, och dämpa det andlige liuset, / ded som oss
 Skaparen i vårt bröst hafwer eldat och uptändt?*

In English translation: “Now, is our mind without reason? Or are we dumb cattle and beasts? Do we ourselves quench our (intellectual) fire and damp down the mental light, that which our Creator has ignited and kindled in our breast?”

The reference to dumb cattle and beasts (*fänad och bestar*) agrees with Stiernhielm's attack on non-liberal and authoritative philosophy at the outset of his preface. The reference to fire (*eld*) and light (*ljus*) as an innate function of the human mind agrees with his natural philosophy, according to which light is the second transcendental principle of being.

⁹⁸⁴ See Leonard Grant, *Harvard theological review*, vol. 52, 1959, p. 208.

⁹⁸⁵ See Mechthild Fuchs, *Helius Eobanus Hessus. Psalterium universum*, Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Berlin, 2009, see the editor's introduction.

⁹⁸⁶ Helius Eobanus Hessus, *Silvarum libri IX*, in *Operum farragines duae*, Halle 1539, see book 1, the last section. For a discussion of this passage, see Volkhard Weis, *Der Begriff der Dichtung in der frühen Neuzeit*, Berlin 2009, p. 264.

page 6

qua pronounciationem, flexiones, accentus, phrases et alia accidentia] i.e. “in pronunciation, inflection, accent, phrases and other accidental features”. In Neo-Latin, *qua* can be used a preposition governing the accusative in the sense of “concerning, regarding, with regard to”.⁹⁸⁷

page 8

quirit] This is probably a contracted form of the perfect subjunctive of *queo*, and it has a potential sense: “would be able to”.

page 12

nec serebatur nec metebatur] This is a proverbial phrase for implying “to not benefit or profit or draw advantage” and for referring to things that does not matter. The expression is drawn from Plautus, *Epidicus* 265: “mihi istic nec seritur nec metitur.”

Coepit autem Noah agricola plantare vineam] This is a biblical verse, Gen. 9:20. Stiernhielm here consistently quotes from a 16th-century Latin translation of the Bible, namely that of Santes Pagninus (1470–1536), published in Lyon in 1527 under the simple title *Biblia*, Pagninus was a Dominican biblical humanist and Hebraist from Lucca (Italy) who was the first to accomplish a complete Latin translation of the Bible after Jerome.⁹⁸⁸

Thesmanin] Stiernhielm plausibly drew this place name from Samuel Bochart, *Geographia sacra*. Relying on the history of the Muslims by Jirjis ibn al-’Amid al-Makin (13th century), Bochart writes that Noah built the city of *Themanin* after the Flood. In relating the actions of the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius (who reigned from 610 to 641), al-Makin according to Thomas Erpenius’ Latin translation⁹⁸⁹ states:

⁹⁸⁷ For instances of this prepositional use of *qua* in scholarly Neo-Latin prose, see the introduction to my thesis: *Andreas Norrelius’ Latin translation of Johan Kemper’s Hebrew commentary on Matthew*, Uppsala 2008, p. 228 f. For a couple of examples in the Swedish etymologist Johan Ihre, see Östlund, *Johan Ihre on the origin and history of the Runes*, Uppsala 2000, p. 63.

⁹⁸⁸ For an account of Pagninus’ Latin Bible version, see my article “Latin Bible versions in the age of Reformation and post-Reformation”, *Kyrkohistorisk årsskrift*, ed. by Anders Jarlert, Malmö 2006, pp. 43–45.

⁹⁸⁹ The Dutch Arabist Thomas Erpenius (1584–1624) translated al-Makin’s history of the Muslims into Latin and his successor to the chair of Arabic in Leiden, Jacob Golius, published it under the title *Historia Saracenicæ, qua res gestæ Muslimorum ... explicantur*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1625.

Heraclius deinde abiit in פִּי כְרִיָּה תְּמִינִין in pagum *Thsemaninum*,⁹⁹⁰ quem extruxit Noe, super quem pax, postquam ex arca exgressus est, et ascendit גִּבְלֵי גֹרְדִי ad montem Gudi (lege גֹּרְדִי Gordi) et vidit locum arcae, qui eminent super omnem illam regionem; est enim valde excelsus.⁹⁹¹

In English translation: “Departing to the village *Thsemanin*, which the blessed Noah built, after he had went out of the Ark, Heraclius climbed Mount Gudi – read Gordi⁹⁹² – and saw the site of the (stranded) Ark, a site that rises above all the surrounding district and is extremely high.”

Bochart explains the proper name of the city or village as deriving from the Arabic word for eight (*thamaeniya*) as a reminder of the eight persons saved in the Ark.⁹⁹³ To confirm that this village was named after the number eight in Arabic,⁹⁹⁴ he cites the Greek historian Agathias Scholasticus (6th cent. AD),⁹⁹⁵ who also calls it the village of Thamani, *pagus Thamanorum*, which was situated near Mount Gordaeus, i.e. Mount Ararat.

page 18

liberali causa iam manu asserui] This phrase, *liberali causa manu asserere*, is derived from Plautus, *Poenulus* 4, 2, 83.

⁹⁹⁰ Thsemamin] This is an alternative transcription of the place name *Themamin*. The Arabic voiced fricative dental (ð/ ḍ), written ذ, was in early modern grammars of Arabic transcribed as either *th*, *ths* or *dhs*.

⁹⁹¹ Bochart, *Geographia sacra*, part 1: Phaleg, p. 20. Because of the general lack of Arabic types in early modern Europe, Bochart according to the practice of his time transliterates Arabic letters to Hebrew script. To represent the six Arabic graphemes that are lacking in Hebrew writing, Western scholars and typographers adopted the method to mark the closest Hebrew letters with a diacritic dot above (see further my forthcoming monograph on *Albert Schultens as the innovator of Hebrew etymology and lexicography*, Section 11.1.4).

⁹⁹² Gordi] Mount Gordaeus is a designation of Mount Ararat near the boundary between Turkey and Armenia, close to River Araxes in the Caucasus region. See further the explanatory notes on the English translation.

⁹⁹³ Bochart, *Geographia sacra*, part 1: Phaleg, p. 21: “Arabice תְּמַאֵן, octo. Itaque pago nomen ab octo illis qui ex arca exierunt.”

⁹⁹⁴ Bochart, *ibidem*, p. 21: “Pagum Themanin, id est τῶν ὀκτῶ, ab illis octo qui ex arca exiverant etiam Graeci memorant.”

⁹⁹⁵ Bochart quotes from the edition and Latin translation of Agathias Scholasticus by Bonaventura Vulcanius, *Agathiae historici et poetae eximii de imperio et rebus gestis Iustiniani imperatoris libri quinque*, Lugduni Batavorum 1594 (book 4, p. 135).

pages 19–20

Hebraeam vero reliquis parem facere, hoc opus hic labor est] The phrase *hoc opus, hic labor est* was very common in Neo-Latin prose. It derives from Virgil's *Aeneid*, book 6, 128–129, where the Cumaean Sibyl tells Aeneas how he would manage to descend to his deceased father Anchises in the underworld and return thence again; the way to the lower regions is an easy one, but the problem (*opus*) and the difficulty (*labor*) will be to escape from there: *sed revocare gradum superasque evadere ad auras / hoc opus, hic labor est*.

page 24

eidem sententiae adhaerens clarissimus Bochartus ... Haec Bochart.] Stiernhielm paraphrases Samuel Bochart, *Geographia sacra: Phaleg*, book 1, chapter 15 (on the Confusion of Languages), p. 52, Bochart considered the Babylonian Captivity to be responsible for the end of Hebrew as a vernacular. Twice in world history Babel has led to the fall of Hebrew, Bochart argues, first at the Confusion (at the Tower of Babel), when Hebrew ceased to be the language of all humankind, and secondly during the Captivity, when the Hebrews ceased to use Hebrew as their national vernacular after it had flourished during 3,400 years.⁹⁹⁶ Bochart thinks this is strange, considering that the Egyptian Captivity did not affect Hebrew. Below I have quoted the passage that Stiernhielm reworded or summarized in its context (with the paraphrased passages in italics):

Lingua haec, cum a creatione mundi usque ad captivitatem Babylonicam florisset fere per annos ter mille quadringentos desiit esse vulgaris aut saltem a prisca puritate plurimum degeneravit. Judaei enim e captivitate reduces partim Chaldaei, partim Syri, partim Philistaei idiomatis admistione illam infecerunt: *quod quis miretur non immerito cum Aegypti captivitas, quae multo fuit diuturnior, linguam illam non corruerit aut ullo modo alteravit. An quia ex Hebraea lingua in Aegyptiam non tam proclivis erat lapsus? quia Aegyptia ab Hebraea multo magis differebat quam Syra aut Chaldaea; quae Hebraeae linguae sunt dialecti, ab ea non remotiores quam a Latina nostra vulgaris. Aut quod erudite observat D. de*

⁹⁹⁶ Bochart held the common world chronology, that is, that the Creation took place around 4 000 AD. The Deporation of the Jews to Babylonia occurred by turns in 597 BC and 587 BC. Thus, Hebrew held sway during about 3,400 years (at first during 1,757 years as the primeval language of all humankind and then as the vernacular of the Patriarchs, the Hebrews, and the Jews).

Gretemesnil, quia Iudaei in Aegypto conferti habitabant, in Babylonia dispersi singuli apud dominos suos, quorum lingua uti cogeantur. Ut sit eadem Babylonia, ubi caeterae linguae natae sunt, semper Hebraicae fuit fatalis, semel in Confusione linguarum et rursus cum Iudaei ibi captivi patrium sermonem dedidicerunt.

page 33

devergior] Stiernhielm employs the word *devergium* in the sense of ‘decline’. It is probably a Neo-Latin neologism from the verb *devergere* ‘to incline downwards’. The verbal noun *devergentia* ‘an inclining downwards, declivity, a slope’ is recorded in post-classical Latin, e.g. Gellius. In this context, *devergium* cannot possibly be an alternative spelling of *divergium*, which in ancient Latin is attested only in the plural form, *divergia*, often with the genitive attribute *aquarum*, and thus refers to ‘the separation of water’, that is, the point at which a river divides into two branches. It occurs in authors who discuss land-surveying: Frontinus, Balbus, and Siculus Flaccus, all in the second century AD. It is kindred with *divergentia*, which means ‘divergence, departure from each other onto two paths or courses’, but is not to be confused with *devergentia*.

page 39

Runae dictae sunt a rōna] Stiernhielm derives the Swedish noun *runa* ‘runic letter’ (Old Swedish *run*, *runir*, or *runor*, pl. *runor*) from the Swedish verb *rōna*, ‘to experience, to observe’. This derivation was one century later explicitly rejected by Johan Ihre in his etymological Swedish dictionary,⁹⁹⁷ where the noun *runa* is derived from the verb *runa* ‘to whisper’.⁹⁹⁸ However, Stiernhielm’s etymology was shared by Olof von Dalin. In his Swedish history, he proposes the same derivation of *Alruna* as Stiernhielm: “*Alruna är efter ordet en Altrōnande, alt-förfarande, alt-vetande.*”⁹⁹⁹ Moreover, Adolf Noreen, *Urgermanische Lautlehre*, p. 82, in a similar way as Stiernhielm – though perhaps unconsciously of him – connects the noun *runa* with

⁹⁹⁷ *Glossarium Suiogothicum*, vol. II, col. 474, s.v. *runa* (as a noun): “*Alii vero [...] runae vocabulum vel a rōna, experiri, derivant auctore Stiernhielmio, vel a rinna, sulcus, quod Wormio placuit, vel etiam a rya, evellere, quum stilus litterae figuram velut evellat, quae ultima coniectura est Gudmundi Andreae in Notis ad Runa Capitule. Sed traduntur haec fere ab illis, qui veterum dialectorum cognatae originis suffragia susque deque habent et et prima quaeque obvenientia temere arripiunt.*”

⁹⁹⁸ Ihre claims that the noun *runa* derives from the verb *runa*, which properly means ‘to whisper’ and metaphorically ‘to communicate secrets’ by whispers at councils. Thence it was transferred to magic in the sense ‘to murmur incantations’.

⁹⁹⁹ *Swea rikes historia*, vol. I, Stockholm 1747, pag. 183.

Swedish *rön* and Icelandic *raun*, “trial, experience, proof”, and with the Greek verb ἐρευνᾶω, “search after, inquire into, investigate”. Elof Hellquist, *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*, s.v. *runa*, however dismisses this etymology, arguing that the words referred to by Noreen belong to another word group. Referring to the meanings of related Germanic words (Gothic *runa* ‘secret’, Icelandic *rúnar* ‘runic character, magical sign’, Middle Low and High German *rûne* ‘secret whisper, secret council’, and Old English *rún* with the same meanings) he claims that the use of runic letters probably originates from magic. He asserts that the noun *runa* is related with the Old Swedish verb *runa* ‘to whisper’, which he identifies as a loanword from Low German *rûnen*, in turn deriving from Old Saxon *rûnôn*. These views are shared by *Svenska Akademiens Ordbok* (SAOB), “The Dictionary of the Swedish Academy”,¹⁰⁰⁰ and *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. *rune*, n. 2.

page 41

Quae haec frons?] i.e. What kind of insolence is this? Stiernhielm here employs the word *frons* (properly forehead), in a metonymical sense. In post-classical Latin, it could be used in the sense of either shame or impudence, boldness. The sense of insolence or impudence is attested in Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 3,30: “Qua igitur fronte, quo corde, qua impudentia, qua insipientia vel potius amentia, illa diis suis non imputant et haec nostro imputant Christo?”¹⁰⁰¹

In 17th-century English front could also take the sense of effrontery and impudence (see *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. front 4), just as the word ‘forehead’ could do (OED, s.v. forehead 2. b). This sense occurs in the English poet John Dryden’s (1631–1700) *Mistaken husbands* VIII, 599: “With what forehead darest thou call me so?”

¹⁰⁰⁰ SAOB, s.v. *runa*, sid. R 2948, also refers to Old Norse (i.e. Old Scandinavian) *rûnô*, ‘knowledge, magic sign’.

¹⁰⁰¹ This is: “By what kind of insolence, by what mind, by what impudence, by what foolishness or rather madness do they not impute those earlier misfortunes to their own gods, yet attribute the more recent ones to our Christ!”

13. Stiernhielm in dialogue with contemporary scholars

13.1 Correspondence with David Blondel

13.1.1 Blondel's remarks on the conspectus of *Runa Suethica*

(1) Source, dating and contents

Source: David Blondel's letter to Georg Stiernhielm, published in *Acta literaria Sveciae*, Uppsala 1725, pp. 29–33, after a copy of a now lost original possessed by Andreas Anton Stiernman: *Davidis Blondelli epistola ad Georg Stiernhielmium. Ex autographo Andr. Antonii Stiernmanni*. The letter was republished by Per Wieselgren in his collection of letters to Stiernhielm: *Brev till Georg Stiernhielm*, Stockholm 1968, pp. 209–211, and translated into Swedish by him, *Stiernhielm. Samlade skrifter* 3:2 (1957), pp. 134–137.

Dating: 18 July 1651 according to Stiernhielm (F.d. 6, fol. 71r, see Section 13.1.2). The date of the print, 18 July 1645, is a mistake.¹⁰⁰²

Contents: David Blondel (1591–1655) comments on some theses in the conspectus of *Runa Suethica*, numbers 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11. Blondel was a French Huguenot theologian, Church historian and classical scholar. He served as a vicar of Houdan and Roucy (northern France) until 1650, when he succeeded Gerard Vossius as professor of history at the high school of Amsterdam. Regarding the sixth thesis in the conspectus of *Runa Suethica* about the derivation of eastern, northern and western languages from Scythian, Blondel argues that the idolatry or polytheism of the Scythians does not

¹⁰⁰² The mistaken date is either a misprint or due to incorrect copying of the original by Anton Stiernman. The dating has been much discussed in earlier research (see Swartling, *G. Stiernhielm*, p. 71, Nordström, “De yverbornes ö”, *Rudbeckstudier*, p. 294, Ståhle, *Vers och språk*, p. 60; Wieselgren, *Samlade skrifter av Stiernhielm*, 3:2, 133 f.; *Brev till Georg Stiernhielm*, p. 211), the last of whom summarizes the discussion. In addition to Stiernhielm's dating, pieces of circumstantial evidence suggest that the letter was written in 1651: (1) the fact that the conspectus of *Runa Suethica* is to be dated between 1650 and 1651, (2) because the titles by which Stiernhielm is addressed, antiquarian and archivist of the realm, are positions that he attained in 1648 and 1649 respectively, as Ståhle observes. Wieselgren further notes that (3) the place from which the letter was sent supports 1651 as the date. Blondel would not have written his letter in Amsterdam if he wrote it in 1645. Not until 1651 he moved to Amsterdam for his professorship in history.

makes it plausible that they were more careful to retain “the true syllables” than the true religion. The French Huguenot scholar Estienne Morin also exploited the argument of the uncultivated Scythians to refute Boxhorn’s Scythian hypothesis.¹⁰⁰³

(2) Text

Clarissime et Celeberrime Vir, Domine observande

Magno me a te beneficio affectum dixerim, quem magni tui operis destinata idea ad maximas spes vocare dignatus es. Ad reverendum BOCHARTUM alterum ex transmissis exemplaribus deferri curavi, utut enim eum iam in procinctu esse, ut ad vos contendat, conjiciam. Nolui diem de die trahere, ne desiderium tuum fraudasse viderer. Ille (quod cupio et voveo) coram se totum in sinum tuum effundet. Clarissimo etiam BOXHORNIO tertium exemplar misi, nec tantum misi, sed meam ei operam obtuli, ut quidquid tibi responsi destinaverit, sine mora accipias. Quod ad me adtinet, cum ex nuda tua *σκιταγραφία* totam aedificii tui molem nemo pro merito aestimare possit, ego vero, qui quantum sit mea curta suppellex novi, de cuiusquam clari viri laboribus iudicium mihi non assumam. Pauca quae in tanto opere mihi difficultatem pariant, pro ea quam dedisti potestate, imo pro eo quod a me exegisti obsequio, temet ipso affectum puro et benevolenti iudice fretus aperiam hac spe, ut quidquid non capiam, excusatum velis, quidquid a tua sententia discedere videbitur, non vitilitigandi, sed proficiendi studio imputes et meliora discere paratum credas.

Ad cap. 2. Gen 11.1 Cum (Deo ipso auctore) ad annum usque mundi 1750, et quod excurrit, unius labii et verborum eorundem terra universa fuerit nec ante desierit illa labii unitas, quam Dominus turris structorumque colluvie confuderit, ne labium proximi quilibet eorum exaudiret,¹⁰⁰⁴ necessitatem, quam notas, omnimodam ex una lingua in multas deflectendi non video. Deflexus ille non natura est,¹⁰⁰⁵ quae per 1750 annos primaevae conditionis modum non excesserat, sed poena; non primigenia Dei optimi maximi institutio, sed iudicium, quo superbas mortalium mentes ad propriae imbecillitatis¹⁰⁰⁶ confessionem retraxit et quodammodo infra se deiecit. Ex qua

¹⁰⁰³ Morin(us), *Exercitationes de lingua primaeva*, Utrecht 1694, p. 120: “Constat etiam Boxhornium non exiguam famae suae iacturam fecisse, cum Scythicismum doctae antiquitatis interpretem constituere satagit et linguam Scythicam supra caeteras conatus est efferre atque ab ipsa acceptas gentium, urbium ac deastrorum ignarissimis Scythis nunquam cognitorum denominationes retulit.”

¹⁰⁰⁴ exaudiret] So quoted by Stiernhielm, F.d. 6, 71r. The print 1725 has *exaudirent*.


¹⁰⁰⁵ est] Thus quoted by Stiernhielm, F.d. 6, 71r. The print 1725 has *sed*.

¹⁰⁰⁶ propriae imbecillitatis] So quoted by Stiernhielm, F.d. 6, 71r. The print 1725 has *propriam imbecillitatis*.

divisione labii genus humanum punitum est,¹⁰⁰⁷ necessarium evasit quod antea penitus non erat. Sic natura filii irae ab utero sumus et naturae vitium necessitas (ut sic dicam¹⁰⁰⁸) factum est. Si mecum sentis, palam et pluribus ad maiorem lucem, quod spero facies, edissere; si dissentis doce.

Ad 6. Primam linguam, quae communis universorum fuerat, a singulis Noae posteris depravatam nec penes ullum absolute puram mansisse crediderim, minus tamen quam reliquas Hebraeam dialectum corruptam suadet, quod a puri cultus retinentioribus culta fuerit quodque eam Dominus prae aliis omnibus eligerit, qua ipsemet oracula sua fundens et paterna συγκαταβάσει humanae infirmitati se accommodans uteretur. An probabile dixerimus Scythas, quos nemo ex antiquis nisi gentes πολυθείας assertores novit quorumque magna pars, quae nunc numina colit, quae natura Dii non sint, abiecto quod pretiotissimum esse debuerat verae religionis deposito, verarum syllabarum religiosiores ceteris hominibus custodes evasisse? Certe qui res non curant, quarum vocabula signa arbitraria sunt, de vocabulis ipsis per se indifferentibus quaeque aetas sensim deterere solet, vix curaverint.

Ad 7 et 8. Haec Scripturae verba sunt, quae fundamenti inconcussi instar nobis esse debent: *Filii Japhet, Gomer et Magog et Madai et Javan et Thubal et Mesech et Thiras.* <Gen. 10:2> Pono filii Gomer Aschenas et Riphath et Togarma, filii autem Javan Eliza et Tharsis, Chittim et Rodanim. Hinc diagramma tale exurgit:



¹⁰⁰⁷ est] Thus quoted by Stiernhielm, F.d. 6, 71r. The print 1725 has *esse*.
¹⁰⁰⁸ dicam] Thus quoted by Stiernhielm, F.d. 6, 71r. The print 1725 has *dicamus*.

Ad 10. Ex his videtur sequi aliis Graecos, Hispanos, Italos, Gallos parentibus quam Scythis natos.

Ad 11. 1. Cum Scandinavia sit remotissima septentrionem versus Europae pars et coelo inclementiori utatur, non videtur probabile primum eorum qui in Germaniam colonias deduxere domicilium fuisse, sed Germaniae primos incolas secundum Danubium versus occidentem progressos eam paulatim replevisse factamque dum se latius ad septentrionem diffudissent, vaginam gentium omnem tum pene Scandinaviam fuisse, eam autem veteris moris, linguae, cultus tenaciorem fuit, plurima in Germaniam et Sarmatiam vicinas examina fecerit, quae nunquam in patrias sedes reversa sunt, sed aliis gentibus permixta paulatim et linguam et morem mutarunt.

2. Cum coloniae a Japheti posteris ex Babylonis vicinia in occidentem magna ex parte ductae sint, crediderim eius posteros Gomer, Jawan, Thiras recto tramite in Syriam, exinde in Asiam Minorem transmisso Bosphoro in Traciam cecidisse, in qua pedem fixit Thiras cum suis, Jawan vero ad laevam deflexisse Hellada, Illyricum, Dalmatiam, Italiam, Galliam Rhodano vicinam Galliam Narbonnensem et tandem Hispaniam per Tarraconensem provinciam penetrasse. Ex Gallia Narbonensi colonia in Celticam ac tandem in Belgicam transiisse hinc probabile sit, quod Gallia Belgica Caesaris aetate ac longe post, saltus fere continuus fuerit, et serius ad fidem pervecta. Inde etiam adducor, ut Gallias per Alpes Cottias adiisse primos incolas et Hispaniam per Narbonensem Galliam credam, quod navigiis caruerint et ex regione in regionem, prout vicinitas et invadendi commoditas suasit, transiverint.

Deorum et sacrorum vicinitas non necessario evincit alium populum alius propaginem esse, sed cognatos utrisque vel commercia inter se exercuisse vel foederatos fuisse. Id ipsum docent vocabula cum Scythicis sive inter Gallos sive inter Thuscus sive inter Cambros sono eadem. Sunt enim communis originis indicia.

De iis, quae linguae Scythicae genium, copiam, antiquitatem spectant, dicere nihil possum, cum ea mihi prorsus ignota sit. Optime de ea et patria mereberis, si conditos et altius defossos eius thesauros in apertum aethera pandas reliquisque gentibus invidiam facias.

Quod ex animo opto teque in Domino semper bene valere. Scribebam Amstelodami raptim 15 Kal. Aug. ann. 1645.

Claritudine tua addictissimus

DAVID BLONDELLUS.

Inscriptio:

Clarissimo et Celeberrimo Viro, Domino GEORGIO STIERNHIELMIO, Antiquitatum et Archivi Regii Custodi fidelissimo et vigilantissimo.

Holmiam.

13.1.2 Stiernhielm's reply to Blondel

(1) Source, dating and contents

Source: the concept draft is extant in F.d. 2:7:2:2 at Royal Library, Stockholm. In his collection of letters from Stiernhielm, Wieselgren edited this letter (*Stiernhielm, Samlade skrifter*, 3:1, pp. 136–141). In his commentary (*Stiernhielm, Samlade skrifter*, 3:2, pp. 138–147), he provides a Swedish translation with critical and explanatory notes. In transcribing the text, I have used Wieselgren's textual edition and critical notes, but also inspected the original.

Dating: Stiernhielm states that he received Blondel's letter on 7 August (1651) in Stockholm before he left for Ingria and apologizes for his reply being delayed, explaining that he was busy with legal matters regarding his Ingrian estates. The letter contains a number of passages that are similar to those in Chapters 2 and 4 in the drafts of *Runa Suethica*. The letter reflects an earlier stage of elaboration. Since Stiernhielm began working on *Runa Suethica* on 11 September 1651, this letter ought to have been written after that date and before the completion of Chapters 2 and 4, which most likely took place during October and December 1651.

Contents: Stiernhielm here defends some theses in the conspectus of *Runa Suethica* about the nature of the Confusion of Languages at Babel, and then comments on the internal and external causes of linguistic change, arguing that geographical isolation contributes to preserving any language.

(2) Text

(1r) Literas tuas, admodum reverende Domine Blondelle, sinceri affectus non minus quam rarae eruditionis plenas, Stockholmii¹⁰⁰⁹ circa 7 Augusti st. v. cum iam in procinctu essem suscipiendi in Ingriam itineris, quod iam favente Deo feliciter expedivi, mihi ex animo de tanti viri oblata amicitia gratulabundus, accepi. Rescribere ob infinitas, quae me tunc turbabant occupationes non potui. Nunc licet minus forte commodum sit inter lites et actiones forenses, quas contra (commune malum) malos vicinos suscipere cogor, et novas insolitasque curas rusticas, silentibus plane, imo longe fugientibus Musis. Ne tamen officio meo deesse deprehendar, aliquid saltem reponere non morabor. Nihil vero hac vice polliceor, quo tuas robustissimas machinas emoveam aut refringam. Eam etenim curam ad tempora huic negotio magis apta mihi reservatam cupio. Interim ut aliqua saltem emicet quo, quem proposuerim operi meo scopum,

¹⁰⁰⁹ Stockholmii] The ms. has the so-called /i/ *longum*, which implies a double /i/.

paucis, quae pro tempore fortassis in buccam magis, quam in mentem veniunt, ad eas, quas mihi difficultates objicis, me explicabo.

Ad destinati operis cap. 2 moves ex Gen 11.1 ad annum usque mundi 1750¹⁰¹⁰ unius labii et verborum eorundem universam terram fuisse nec ante desiisse illam labii unitatem, quam Dominus Turris structorum colluvie¹⁰¹¹ confuderit, ne labium proximi quilibet exaudiret. Nullam itaque videri necessitatem omnimodam ex una lingua in multas deflectendi etc.

Primam difficultatem emoveo 1. negatione illationis, 2. ratione, 3. experientia.¹⁰¹² Hanc ego difficultatem facile, certo, evitaverim, si, quod puto plurimos Mosis interpretes facere, negem, aut saltem non liquere dicam, Mosen hoc loco loqui de iis, qui ante diluvium vixerunt. Toto enim capite 10 praecedenti exequitur generationes Noachidarum et propagationem novi mundi, nulla prorsus mentione facta seculorum ante-diluvianorum usque dum ad historiam Turris progreditur. Ibi ait de universa terra, de qua scilicet iam locutus erat, nunc existente et nuper populata (hoc est filiis et nepotibus Noae) eam unius fuisse labii etc. Vix itaque puto ex hoc loco evinci ante-diluvianos omnes non nisi una usos fuisse lingua ideoque naturae illam, quam statuo, necessitatem aut nullam aut nihil in illis operatum fuisse tanto scilicet 1750, et plus, annorum spatio.

Sed ut quam necessaria sit haec necessitas, quam aio ex una multas linguas producere,¹⁰¹³ pateat, consideremus ea quae ad illius necessitatis inductionem¹⁰¹⁴ concurrunt: tempora, loca, oblivionem, ignorantiam, vitia linguae, vicissitudines rerum et imperiorum, migrationes, dispersiones,¹⁰¹⁵ commixtiones populorum, vastationes, renovationes, temporum et locorum vices et intervalla,¹⁰¹⁶ abolitiones, antiquationes, novos cultus, peregrinas elegantias, deflexiones tropicas et multa, ut certo certius liceat concludere: si nihil sub sole unquam extitit, quod mutationis necessitati non sit obnoxium, sermo certe hominis minime eximetur.

Experientiam accerso. Quid solum tempus efficiat in una eademque lingua, imo dialecto, pura, non aliis linguis intermixta

¹⁰¹⁰ 1750] After the date 1750 the phrase *et quod excurrit* has been crossed out. The phrase means “and what went beyond”, “approximately”. According to the common world chronology the year of the Confusion of Languages was reckoned to have occurred 1756 and 1757 years after the Creation.

¹⁰¹¹ colluvie] The ms. mistakenly reads *colluviem*.

¹⁰¹² *Primam ... experientia*] This has been added in the margin.

¹⁰¹³ pateat] *paulo* has been crossed out on the line before *pateat*.

¹⁰¹⁴ necessitatis inductionem] *constitutionem* has been crossed out; *necessitatis inductionem* has been added in the margin.

¹⁰¹⁵ dispersiones] This has been added above the line.

¹⁰¹⁶ *Temporum et locorum vices et intervalla*] This has been added in the margin.

docebunt nos Evangelia ab Otfrido Monacho Sancti Galli ante 760¹⁰¹⁷ annos lingua Germanica, dialecto Francica conscripta. Ea si conferas cum Francica moderna, videberis Turcica magis conferre cum Germanicis, quam Germanica.

Locorum intervalla quid faciant, vide eandem Germaniam: dispice provincias Bavariam, Misniam, Pomeraniam, Belgium, omnes pure Germanice loquentes, ea tamen differentia, ut nemo aut pauci, idque aegre, invicem se intelligant.¹⁰¹⁸ Pererra Gallias tuas. Linguas credo,¹⁰¹⁹ ne dico dialectos, diversissimas offendes sola vicissitudinum necessitate factas et firmatas, imo currentes et crescentes, et indies in novas formas se transformantes.

Populares mei, natio Dalekarlorum, Suetice loquuntur, si qui alii, pure et nullo exotico admixto, sincere. Sed quos nec ego nec ullus alius Suecus sine interprete intellexerit. Aliam prorsus a vulgari linguam dixeris. Et certe, si phrasin, si flexiones, si pronunciationem adeoque vocabula ipsa spectes, quorum bene multa in lingua populari desita et amissa ipsi retinent, alia omnino lingua a communi censi debet¹⁰²⁰ eaque antiqua, quam ipsi homines rustici et inculti in secessu convallium inter solitudines montium sub ipsis alpihus Septentrionalibus, revera Hyperboreis (quos Seuonem montem vocant Plinius et Solinus),¹⁰²¹ inaccessi fere degentes ab omni mixtura et cultu integram et incorruptam in haec usque tempora¹⁰²² conservarunt.

(1v) Ecquid ipsa lingua Sancta? Nunquid illa a fatali hac necessitate exempta fuit? An vero non obscurae temporum et locorum notae, hoc est dialectorum differentiae, in plerisque hagiographis occurrunt? Aliter Hiob, aliter Moses loquitur, aliter Esaias, aliter alii. Et quid tandem Hebraeam in Syram totaliter convertit? Ut de aliis taceam, an tempora, loca, translatio in alienas terras, dispersio in exoticas gentes, destructio regni etc. hanc necessitatem induxit? Iam, si secula ante-diluviana, si homines huiusmodi mutationibus obnoxii non fuerunt, si omnes qui intra tot annorum curriculum vixerunt, uno in loco, nullo marium aut montium occurso seiuncti cohabitarunt gens una,¹⁰²³ uno sub rege,

¹⁰¹⁷ 760] *octingentos paulo plus* on the line has been crossed out and replaced by 760 in the margin.

¹⁰¹⁸ omnes ... intelligant] This has been added in the margin.

¹⁰¹⁹ credo] *profecto* has been crossed out and replaced by *credo* above the line.

¹⁰²⁰ debet] *potes* has been crossed out and replaced by *debet* above the line.

¹⁰²¹ Plinius et Solinus] See Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis historia* 4, 96, and Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* 20, 1.

¹⁰²² in haec usque tempora] In the ms. *propemodum* has been crossed out above the line and replaced by *in haec usque tempora*.

¹⁰²³ gens una] This has been added above the line.

uno imperio, pace perpetua, uno rerum statu semper¹⁰²⁴ stante et immobili,¹⁰²⁵ facile induci me patiar, ut credam linguam primaevam Adamaeam unam et invariatae universae terrae¹⁰²⁶ usque ad tempora insanae structurae perdurasse.¹⁰²⁷

Verum cum homines, suboles Adamaea, nunquam et nusquam non sint et fuerint homines, putarim eos, qui ante Diluvium vixerunt omni sorti humanae non minus¹⁰²⁸ quam nos posteriores subiectos fuisse ideoque omnia, quae nobis accidunt, ipsis necessario accidere debuisse, nisi ad miracula confugas et extraordinarium aliquem Numinis favorem. Quem si mihi probaveris,¹⁰²⁹ possim non difficulter tibi largiri locum allegatum etiam de universa terra antediluviana intelligendum. Cui alias reclamata videtur¹⁰³⁰ ipsa veritas, experientia certa et infallibili fulta et¹⁰³¹ confirmata. In miraculis cessat natura, quamvis in quibusdam (scilicet quae contra naturam non currunt) idem efficere possit natura, si tempus concedas,¹⁰³² quod miraculum. Hoc¹⁰³³ aperte liquet in Confusione Linguarum¹⁰³⁴ Babylonica, quae miraculosa fuit. Idem progressu temporis, locorum divisione, et aliis causis iam dictis intercurrentibus efficit natura, idque necessario.

Quod dixi nos docere experientiam adeo, ut inconcussa stet thesis: *etiamsi nulla unquam facta fuisset Confusio linguarum miraculosa, natura tamen necessarium fuisse, ut ex una prima multae diversae orirentur*. Ecquis dubitat plurimas ortas et interdum interiisse linguas quas nunquam edidit Babylon. Latinam certe scio Babylonem nunquam audivisse nec Gallicam nec Italicam nec Hispanicam modernam nec alias innumeras. Ortae tamen sunt, non per miraculum et subito, sed ductu naturae sensim et successive, ut alia omnia.

Docet autem saepius advocata experientia duplici omnino ratione corrumpi sermonem. Una, cum lingua aliqua simplex et ab aliis illibata fluens et perennans solo temporis tractu sensim et nemine fere advertente alteratur, consenescit et obsolescit, vetustis vocabulis

¹⁰²⁴ semper] This has been added above the line.

¹⁰²⁵ immobili] After *immobile*, the expression *et similibus* has been crossed out.

¹⁰²⁶ universae terrae] This has been added above the line.

¹⁰²⁷ perdurasse] *perdurasse* replaces *mansisse*, which has been crossed out after *invariatae*.

¹⁰²⁸ non minus] This has been added above the line.

¹⁰²⁹ mihi probaveris] *mihi probaveris* above the line replaces *tibi persuaseris* on the line.

¹⁰³⁰ videtur] This has been added above the line.

¹⁰³¹ fulta et] This has been added above the line.

¹⁰³² si tempus concedas] This clause has been added above the line.

¹⁰³³ Hoc] Before *Hoc*, the following sentence has been crossed out: *Sic voco actiones extraordinarias et a summo Numine immediate inductas*.

¹⁰³⁴ Linguarum] This word has been added above the line.

paulatim in desuetudinem abeuntibus, adscitis indies¹⁰³⁵ novis novaque forma indutis, aliis atque aliis flexionibus additis etiam tropis et ornamentis, ut post secula aliquot, si veterem linguam contingat repetere,¹⁰³⁶ omnino deprehendas aliam esse ab ea, quae hodie viget, ut exempla supra allegata manifestant.

Altera ratione, linguae per confusionem corrumpuntur, cum ex mixtione duarum vel plurium fit una. Quod Gallicae vestrae, quae ex Cambrica,¹⁰³⁷ Francica potissimum et Latina; Italicae ex Gothica et Latina; Hispanicae ex Iberica antiqua,¹⁰³⁸ Gothica, Latina et Punica conflatis contigit.

Eandem puto esse rationem sermonis, quae est naturae universi. Aeternum materia et elementis,¹⁰³⁹ utut varie misceantur, temperentur, et alterentur,¹⁰⁴⁰ manentibus in basi iisdem, in singula momenta mutantur formae, perpetuae necessitatis lege invicem sese trudentes et perimentes. Sed ne nimis prolixus sim, sufficiant pro tempore isthaec ad obiectionem primam.

Secunda, quam mihi proponis, difficultas est: contra cap. 6, quo statuitur *ex Scythica ortas linguas primas, non minus Orientales, quam Septentrionales et Occidentales*, hic indignaris Scythis, gentilibus, veri Dei cultus desertoribus, barbaris et agrestibus improbis et omnis cultus expertibus plus tribui qua excellentiam linguae, quam Hebraeis, electo Dei populo, cuius lingua oracula sua fudit et mundo se patefecit etc. Tritum hoc est et patribus linguae Hebraeae assertoribus frequentatum argumentum nec minus tritum responsum: facere haec quidem ad sanctitatem et venerationem linguae Hebraeae, nihil autem ad antiquitatem et primaevitatem.

Scythas quod attinet, credibile est illos multis seculis retinuisse verum Dei cultum a Iapheto et eius posteris acceptum. Sed nihil confert ad linguarum sive puritatem sive antiquitatem cultus divinus qualiscunque. Quod patebit, si ad singulos respicias. Barbaries etiam et simplicitas sui amans,¹⁰⁴¹ suis assueta, minime miratrix alienorum, fidissima et tenacissima est custos morum et sermonis. Quid enim linguas magis corrumpit et abducit a suis fontibus quam cultus? Studium elegantiae? Rhetorica? Poesis? Verum hisce, ut tritis et

¹⁰³⁵ in dies] *quotannis* has been crossed out and replaced by *indies* above the line.

¹⁰³⁶ repetere] *legere* has been crossed out and replaced by *repetere* above the line.

¹⁰³⁷ Cambrica] This name has been added above the line

¹⁰³⁸ Iberica antiqua] This designation has been added above the line.

¹⁰³⁹ materia et elementis] Stiernhielm first wrote *materia manente et elementis iisdem* and crossed out *manente* and *iisdem*, when adding the clause *manentibus in basi iisdem* in the margin.

¹⁰⁴⁰ utut ... iisdem] This clause has been added in the margin.

¹⁰⁴¹ simplicitas sui amans] Stiernhielm first wrote *simplicitas praesertim sui amans*. but then crossed out *praesertim*.

vulgatis, quamvis proba sint et valida,¹⁰⁴² pro defensione thesis meae non utar. Quam explicabo saltem¹⁰⁴³ et omnia patebunt.

(2r) Linguam Iapheticam ego omnino eandem crederim cum Noachica, etiam post Confusionem Babylonicam. Cui interfuisse Iaphetum aut Iaphetidas nusquam probabitur ex Sacra Scriptura. Et si interfuerunt, dic mihi quae lingua omnium, quarum meminit Sacra Scriptura ipsis competat. Scio posse adduci versum <quintum>¹⁰⁴⁴ generationes Iapheti¹⁰⁴⁵ distributas in insulas et linguas suas, sed nihil inde eruitur, quod faciat ad stabiliendum linguam aut linguas aliquas peculiares ex Confusione Babylonica ortas.¹⁰⁴⁶ Videatur in exercitationibus ad Genesin doctissimus Rivetus.¹⁰⁴⁷ Possem pro me adducere Sacram Scripturam, quae ait eos, qui campos Sinhear convenerunt, עִנְיָא, ex Oriente, venisse. Noah vero et Iaphet cum suis ad Septentrionem resederunt in convallibus Armeniae. Quae loca ipsis divinitus assignata erant, posteris ipsorum longe lateque¹⁰⁴⁸ replenda, unde per septentrionalia climata occidentem versus ipsis demum migrandum erat.

13.2 Abraham Mylius: commented excerpts

13.2.1 On the antiquity and origin of Dutch and Hebrew

Source and contents: *Discursus philologicus*, F.d. 14a, p. 46. This text consists of commented summaries of Mylius' discussion of the great antiquity of the Dutch language.

In the first passage, Mylius, *De lingua Belgica* (chapter 20, pp. 86–87) argues that old Germanic (*lingua Germanica aut prisca Celtica*), specifically Dutch (*Belgica*), certainly is younger than Hebrew, but is older than both Greek and Latin, because it has a greater number of monosyllabic words than the latter languages. Stiernhielm remarks that Greek and Germanic rather are sister languages derived from a Japhetic origin, while Latin came into being through Greek and Celtic language mixing.

In another passage, Mylius (chap. 26, p. 135) discusses the reasons behind Goropius Becanus's claim that Dutch (*Cimbro-*

¹⁰⁴² quamvis proba sint et valida] This clause has been added above the line.

¹⁰⁴³ Quam explicabo saltem] The original wording was *Explicabo saltem thesin*. The word *Quam* was then added in the margin and *thesin* was crossed out.

¹⁰⁴⁴ versum quintum] In the ms., a void space of seven letters is left after *versum*. The word *quintum* is to be supplemented, since Stiernhielm here aims at Gen. 10:5.

¹⁰⁴⁵ generationes Iapheti] Stiernhielm first wrote *progeniem Iapheti*, then changed it to *generationes Iapheti* by crossing out *progeniem* and reversing the word order by adding numbers above the line.

¹⁰⁴⁶ ex Confusione ... ortas] This precision has been written above the line.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Rivetus] *vester* has been crossed out after *Rivetus*.

¹⁰⁴⁸ longe lateque] This phrase has been added above the line.

Belgica) is the mother-language of Hebrew. Stiernhielm states that rather Scythian, or Japhetite, is the common origin of both Dutch and Hebrew.

Ex Abrahami van der Mylii de lingua Belgica observata et cum meis comparata.

Cap. 20. Linguam Celticam, hoc est Gothicam, esse antiquiorem Graeca et Latina. Ego vero aio Gothicam esse Graecae coevam et eiusdem originis, a Iapheto scilicet, et commixtione utriusque gentis abiisse in diversas. Ex iis conflata esse Latinam.

Cap. 26. p. 135. Refert opinionem Becani asserentis linguam Belgicam esse antiquiorem Hebraea atque eiusdem esse matrem. Ego aio non Belgicam, sed Scythicam, hoc est Iapheticam, esse utriusque matrem et ex hac ortam utriusque convenientiam. Confer ea quae dicit Mylius p. 233.

13.2.2 On the impact of foreign languages on Swedish

Source and contents: *Discursus philologicus*, F.d. 14a, fol. 3v, where Stiernhielm opposes Mylius, who in his work on the history of Dutch, *De lingua Belgica*, chap. 26, p. 118, claimed that the Swedish and Danish languages (*Suedanorum et Danorum dialecti*) have borrowed much from old German (*Teutonica*), because the Swedes and Danes carried on trade with the Russians and the Lapps, and because the Wends, after being expelled from their homelands by the Germans, migrated to Scandinavia and thus introduced a corruption into the indigenous (Swedish) language. Stiernhielm reviews these claims and dismisses them as based on ignorance.

Abrahamus Mylius, *de lingua Belgica*, cap. 26, p. 118, ait linguam Suedanam multum mutata a vera Teutonica idque factum esse, quod cum Moschis, Lapponibus etc. mutuum commercii ipsis fuerit etc. Vide locum, in quo prodit ignorantiam suam turpiter: 1. In eo quod existimat linguam Suethicam ortam a Teutonica, 2. Lapponum et Moschorum commercii, 3. De Windorum in Sueciam immigratione.

13.3 Claudius Salmasius: commented excerpts

13.3.1 On the historical origin of Greek


Source: *Runa Suethica et alia miscellanea*, F.d. 5, fol. 31r (cols. 1–2). Size: 210 x 324 mm. Dating: around 1650–1651.

Contents: systematization of ethnographic mythology concerning the origins of the Greeks and Pelasgians on the basis of Salmasius, *De lingua Hellenistica* (Leiden 1643) with page references.

(31v, col. 1) Salmasius, *Hellenistica*, cap. 1. p. 24 et p. 271. 273 etc.
 Prometheus, primus generis humani plastes, p. 284
 | et 308. Ergo ante illum nullus homo
 | extitit.¹⁰⁴⁹ Prometheus an Scythia?
 Prorsus, p. 323.

Deucalion, aut Phtius, ut alii volunt, in Thessalia.

|
 Hellen vicit et immutavit linguam Pelasgorum,
 | primorum Graeciae incolarum, quae
 | Barbara fuit.




(31v, col. 2) Pelasgi Barbari Graeciam incolebant ante ipsum
 Deucaliona, p. 283. Obiectionem vide ibidem. Prometheus, Deus, sed
 hominum primus factor. Deucalion primus homo est.

¹⁰⁴⁹ extitit] After *extitit* the sentence *et ad illum ut primum omnes homines debent reduci* has been crossed out.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Between *Attis* and *Dorus*, the name *Ion* has been crossed out.

¹⁰⁵¹ The name *Aecheus* p. 288 and the remark *in Thessalia regnavit* have been crossed out.

¹⁰⁵² Between *Attica* and *Dorica*, the word *Ionica* has been crossed out.



♀ Pelasgi cum Evandro et Carmeta ex Arcadia venerunt in Italiam, usi lingua Aeolica, p. 316. Sed Pelasgica non fuit Graeca, sed barbara. Aeolica enim ab Hellenis filio, qui author fuit Graecae, introducta fuit, destructa Pelasgica.

NB. *ot* in *Suediot*, *Swediod* non est nomen aliquod peculiare, sed saltem est terminatio insinuans locum aut regionem, quam incolebat gens aliqua. Eademque eadem cum Graeca ὠτις, unde φθιῶτις, πελασγιῶτις etc. Hinc et gentes ipsae eam regionem incolentes dictae sunt *Phthiotae*, ut *Suedioter*, *Swedioder*, *Suediotae*.¹⁰⁵³ Suithones Σίτονες iidem. Sithoniae nives, *svenska sniön*.

(31v, col. 1) Pelasgos Graecorum omnium antiquissimos secundum Strabonem, Graece loquutos, quamvis eos Barbaros faciat Herodotus, p. 314.¹⁰⁵⁴ Hoc probare nititur Salmasius dicto loco¹⁰⁵⁵ a voce Graeca χαῖρε. Eam ego dico Barbaram esse nostrum *käre*, *kär*, unde Latinum *charus*, idem quod amatus, cui bene cupio, quem salvum volo. Secundo vide sub signum ♀. Tertio a nominibus Graecis fluviorum, montium, virorum etc. p. 317. ubi vide de Ἴω, Ἴων ab Ἴος, Ἴα, ‘solus’, *a: jen, ein, eon, ea, a, ja*. Summa argumenti est omnes fere totius Graeciae urbium etc. appellationes prius in Thessalia extitisse et inde tractas easque Graecas esse. Sed ex etymologia nihil probat. Ergo nugae! Quid ergo? Revera ex olim

¹⁰⁵³ In F.d. 5, 34r, Stiernhiem rightly remarks: *Piod*, i.e. *populus*. Suea – *Suiapiod*.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Salmasius, *De Hellenistica*, p. 314: “Pelasgi ipsi, quo nomine et Graeco olim nuncupati sunt quosque ἀρχαιοτάτους τοῦ ἐλλάδος fuisse aliquot locis pronunciavit Strabo, Graece locutos liquet, quamvis eos barbaros Herodotus facit.”

¹⁰⁵⁵ dicto loco] In the ms., these words have been abbreviated *d.l.* Salmasius, ibidem, p. 315, deals with the Greek greeting χαῖρε as used among the Pelasgians.

Barbara facta est, cultu et temporum lapsu, eadem, quam deinceps Graecam vocitarunt. Barbara olim, Graeca deinceps facta et dicta.

Pag. 319 concludit in Thessalia natos Graecos, Pelasgos, 'Ellenas, Peloponnesios. In ea Musas habitasse. Ultimo totam horum progeniem ex Prometheo ex Scythia educit. Vide capitis secundi summarium, p. 330.

13.3.2 On the etymology of the numbers nine and ten

Source: *Collectanea philosophica*, F.d. 4:4:1, 41r. The below passage is drawn from a text that is headed *Axiomata et dicta de numeris et figuris* (fols. 40r–41v).

Dating: most likely 1652.

Contents: The text supplies etymologies for the numbers nine (in Swedish *nio*) and ten (in Swedish *tio*).

Salmasius, *Hellenist.* 389, dicit ἐννέα Graecum non videtur esse primitivum nec originarium, sed ex Scythico sumptum, quod brevius est et proinde magis antiquum et nativum. Germanice *neun*, Danice *ni*, Persice *ai noh*. Vide Martin. <*Lexicon philologicum*> in novem.

Salmasius: Nemo dixerit Parthicum *Deh* ex Graeco δέκα effectum Contra est. Vide p. 390, ubi haec: Certum quippe est linguas omnes, quae monosyllabis constant esse coeteris antiquiores. etc.

13.3.3 On the internal Latin permutation of F and H

Sources: *Runa Suethica et alia miscellanea*, F.d. 6, fol. 8r (original). *Miscellanea etymologica*, 7:3, fol. 1r (copy).

Literarum permutationes doctissimis viris observatae.

Salmasio in *Exercitationibus Plinianis*, p. 1262.¹⁰⁵⁶

H. et F. Horctum, forctum. Horda, forda. Haedus, faedus. Fariolus, fariolus. Hostia, fostia. Hostis, fostis. Folus, holus. F posteriori aetate in H mutata. Ita **Forba* ex Gr. φορβή. Post *Herba*.

C. et H. Copia, *hoop*. Cupio, *hoppas*. Cumulus, *humpel*. *hol*. Celo, *håla*. Hasta, *kast*, *kast-spiut*, ut *Schaft* vel *Skakt*, *Schäkta*, Sagitta.

13.3.4 On the Greek digamma

Source: *Miscellanea etymologica*, F.d. 9:6, fol. 1v, col. 1.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Claudius Salmasius, *Plinianae exercitationes in Caji Julii Solini polyhistora*, p. 1262, col. 2 E: Haec omnia ab eadem origine *Forcti*, quod etiam *Horctum* dixere. Festus: Horctum et Forctum pro bono dixeant. Sic *Forda et Horda*; *Faedus et Haedus*; *Hariolus et Fariolus*; *Fostia et Hostia*; *Fostis et Hostis*; *Holus et Folus*. Illud antiquius, hoc posterioris aetatis. Ita *Forba* antiquis Latinis, quae Graecis φορβή, recentioribus *Herba*.

Salmasius, *Hellenistica*, 387, docet Graecos pro digammate Aeolico usurpasse quosdam *vau*, alios simplex *gamma*, nonnullos *sigma*, Atticos aspirationem *H*. Item certum esse illud digamma aliquando sonum habuisse duplicis *gamma* et ex eo nomen. Postea mutato sono in *vau*, *V*, nomen retinuisse priscum. Exemplo est vox *ἐκατόν*. Lacones *γεκατόν*. Aeoles *φεκατόν*. Attici *Ηεκατόν*, alii *βεκατόν*, nunnuli *Σεκατόν*.

Ego aliter sentio. Non enim puto usquam reperiri digamma *F* sonuisse *G* nec ex sono, sed ex figura duplicis *Γ* (*F*) inversi $\neg$ ¹⁰⁵⁷ nomen obtinuisse. Deinde dico Graecos non usurpasse dictas literas *G*. *H*. *B*. *S*. loco digammatis, sed¹⁰⁵⁸ pro se quamque prout ferebat cuiusque dialectus. Harum enim literarum et plurium capax est fere omne vocabulum a vocali incipens et inde obscurata radice prima, quae semper incipit a vocali, ortae sunt omnes voces a consonante incipientes.

Dabo exempla: Suetic. sunt *yra*, *öra* et inde *orva*,¹⁰⁵⁹ id est circumferri. Ex hoc factum *horva*, id est *härva*, *werva*, *huerva*, *querva* (unde *quera*, mola), *sverva*, unde nomen *sverm*, i.e. tus, et hinc iterum verbum *sverma*. Omnia in una dialecto. His adde quae ex eadem radice pullularunt, Latine *gyro*, *girgil*, *curro*, *verto*, *furo*. Radix est *öra*, *yra*, *irra*, unde *sijra*, *syra*, *sorra*, *hurra*, *surra*, *wirra*, *swirra*.¹⁰⁶⁰

Aliud: Radix *al* lucem et sonum denotat. *älla* consonare, vociferari, miscere sermones. Hinc per similem consonantium praepositionem fiunt novae quasi voces: *G*[ermanice] *hall*, Suet[hice] *skall*, resonatio, *kalla* vocare (*καλέω*), *galma* et hinc *glamma* (Lat. clamo), *skall*, sonus, *skälla*. **Ball*, unde *G*[erm.] *Bälle*, Suet. *biälla*, *bäla* (balo) et *G*[erm.] *ballen*; *bullra*, *böla*, *brullen*. Ultra *skalra*, *sqallra*. Item *skråla*, *skrälla*, *frälla*, *jåla*, *jällra*, *klaffa*, *klaga*, *klanka*, *klacka*, *klinga*, clango, etc. Item *knulla*, *knullra som een duva*.

Et in his scite inveniendis et recte distinguendis consistit maximum novae huius scientiae monumentum.

13.4 Georgius Hornius: a commented excerpt

Source: *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, F.d. 6, 45r.

Dating: 1655. Stiernhielm states below that he came to Livonia

¹⁰⁵⁷ $\neg$ I] In the ms. the letter *F* has been inverted and turned upside down.

¹⁰⁵⁸ sed] In the ms. *sed* is mistakenly repeated. The first occurrence is found at the end of the line. I have left out the second *sed* at the beginning of the next line.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Suetic. sunt *yra*, *öra* et inde *orva*] Stiernhielm first wrote *Suethic[um] est orva*, and then added *yra*, *öra* et *inde* above the line. After the addition of these words the grammatical congruence requires the form *sunt* (instead of *est*).

¹⁰⁶⁰ *swirra*] In F.d. 7:1, fol. 44r, the verb *swirra* is explained in Latin as meaning *vertere*, *gyrare*, that is, “to turn, rotate”.

with Johan Skytte 25 years ago. They arrived in March 1630.

Contents: In 1652, the German-Dutch historian and geographer Georg Horn published his work on the ethnic origins of America, *De originibus Americanis* (in the Hague) in four volumes. Rejecting the hypotheses of Norwegian and Phoenician colonizations of America, he argues that America was peopled by Scythian nations: the Huns, the Khitayans, *Kithae*, of Manchuria (*Chataia*), and the Chinese, *Sinae*, of Quinsai (Hangzhou) province; see idem, pp. 143, 225 and 233. Stiernhielm mainly quotes from the third book on the Huns, mentioning that the Persians called the Scythians Sacae (p. 137 f.), that the Huns is a collective term for many nations, that the Saberi are the Siberians (p. 147) and that the Massagetae were the ancestors of the Parthians (p. 144). He tells that when he came to Livonia in 1630 he asked an Estonian by what name the Estonians called themselves. Learning that it was *Ogrus*, Stiernhielm wrote it down without then directly understanding its historical ethnolinguistic implications.

(F.d. 6, 45r) Adversaria quotidiana

Ex Georgii Hornii de Originibus Americanis. [...]

Persae universos Scythas, Sacas a proxima gente appellarunt. Diodor. Sicul. lib. 2. *Scythae* antiquis *Aramaei* dicti. Plin[ius].

Fenni haud dubie Sarmatica gens. Et lib. 3, cap. 4, p. 144: Hunni magna gens complexa nomine suo Alanos, Avares, Saberos, Ungros, Turcas, Tataros, Fennos, Lucumores, Tingoosios, Molgomios et, quotquot glaciale mare accolunt, barbaros. [...] Saberos Siberios esse putat, p. 147. **[Stiernhielm remarks]** Sabaria in Hungaria est. Ungri, Uniguri, Iuhri sunt, Siberiis vicini. Inde Hungari Slavis dicuntur, qui nobis Hungari. Notabile sane est, quod cum anno abhinc 25^o cum illustris memoriae Domino Ioh. Skytte in Livoniam venissem et indigenam quendam senem interrogassem, quo nomine incolae Esthones se ipsos indigetarent, respondit *Ogrus*, quod quidem mox annotavi, sed quo tenderet, non intellexi. GS. Sunt autem Fenni et Esthones Issedones, una eademque gens, eadem utens lingua. [...]

Parthi iidem cum Persis, quando a Scythis conditi. pulchre, p. 146. Et Massagetas eorum autores putat, quia utrique et Massagetae et Persae soli equos immolarunt celeri Deo celerem hostiam (*häst* ab *hasta*).¹⁰⁶¹ **[Stiernhielm remarks]** Iam quia manifestum est linguam Persicam affinem esse Germanicae, imo Suethicae, patet utriusque gentis eandem esse originem Scythicam et per consequens linguam

¹⁰⁶¹ *häst* ab *hasta*] Stiernhielm derives the Swedish word *häst*, “horse”, from the Swedish verb *hasta*, “to hasten, hurry”. Elof Hellquist, *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*, 3rd ed, p. 390, derives it from proto-Scandinavian **hāhistaR*, a variant form of old German *hahingsta*, “stallion”, in Swedish *hingst*, the origin of which is disputed.

Scythicam fuisse Germanicam, et Massagetarum, Getarum, Gotorum speciem. Et Norvagos equos sacrificasse Odino, qui ipse sol est, claret ex Chronico Norvagico. Quin et Upsalienses 9^o quoque anno 9 genera animalium diis Thoroni, Odino et Freiae, i.e. Iove, Soli et Veneri (id est Menti, Luci et Telluri) immolarunt. GS.

13.5 Hugo Grotius: commented excerpts

Source: *Discursus philologicus*, F.d. 14a, fol. 3v.

Dating: in the mid-1660s.

Contents: Stiernhielm quotes from a letter by Hugo Grotius on the topic of Greek dialects to the correspondent Nicolas de Peiresc. It is dated Paris, 18 April 1622, and was edited in the collection of Grotius' letters, *Epistolae ad Gallos* (first edition, Leiden 1648), where the passage quoted is found in letter 56, p. 143. Stiernhielm claims that Grotius is mistaken when he excludes the possibility that Phrygian is related to Greek and when confining the origins of Latin only to the Greek dialects of *Magna Graecia*. Rather, Latin has a great number of word roots in common with Germanic languages, which are related to Phrygian.

Hugo Grotius Epist. ad Gall. 56 ad Nic. Peirescium

Sermo nobis inciderat de linguae Latinae origine. Dixi quod res erat, nihil ferme in ea esse barbarum, Phrygium puta, aut Etruscum, sed Graeca pene omnia a Pelasgis, qui primi Italiam Magnae Graeciae nomine cum adiecentibus insulis tenuere etc. Vide totam!

Sed fallit et fallitur vir doctissimus nescius forte Phrygium (forte et Etruscum) eandem esse Germanicam vel Gothicam, quarum radicibus constat plus quam dimidia Latina, ut videre est ex meis etymologiis; ex nominibus partium corporis humani etc.

13.6 Gerard Vossius: a commented excerpt

Source: *Discursus philologicus*, F.d. 14a, fol. 3v.

Dating: in the mid-1660s.

Contents: Stiernhielm calls attention to the discrepancy between G. Vossius' etymological principles, laid down in the preface to the anti-barbarus dictionary *De vitiis sermonis et glossematis latinobarbaris* (1645), and those applied in his Latin etymological dictionary entitled *Etymologicon linguae Latinae* (published by Isaac Vossius in 1662).

Gerard Ioh. Voss. In Praefatione ad de vitiis sermonis fatetur linguam Latinam coalitam ex Graeca, Celtica, Getica seu Gothica, Teutonica, Primigenia Italica (quae Tusca est, seu Aboriginum) et hoc causae

esse, cur in plerisque vocabulis Latina lingua florente Roma, imo ante eam conditam, convenerit cum Germanica. Miror itaque cur hoc sciens Vossius in suo Etymologico plane praeterit haec Germanica et unicuique non reddiderit linguae sua vocabula propria, et vocabulis cur non attribuerit suos natales proprios.

13.7 Christian Ravius: an excerpt

Sources: F.d. 6, *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam*, fol. 48r, and *Observationes de permutatione literarum*, F.d. 7:3, fol. 4r. Dating: around 1650–1655.

Contents: Stiernhielm quotes a passage from the phonological part of Christian Ravius' Hebrew grammar, *Orthographiae et analogiae (vulgo etymologiae) Ebraicae delineatio* (Amsterdam 1646, p. 16; see explanatory notes 11–15), where Ravius argues that spoken Arabic is characterized by regional variability in the pronunciation of vowels, a diversity that he contrasts with the mutual intelligibility of Arabic as a written language. For this reason speakers of Arabic understand their neighbours' dialects within a reach of 40–50 miles, but find the dialects at a distance of 100–300 miles to be unintelligible. However, he underlines that the users of Arabic across Asia and Africa have the same writing of consonants, including the diacritical marks, though with the exception of vowel points. Stiernhielm probably excerpted these observations to serve as evidence of the dialectal diversification of Arabic.

(F.d. 6, 48r) Christianus Ravius in *Delineatione orthographiae Ebraicae* hypomnematē 11. Nemo, inquit, Arabum pronunciat uti vocales sunt scriptae.

12. Et Arabes diversimode pronunciant iuxta suam quisque provinciam aut urbem pagumque, non iuxta vocales.

13. Hinc fit ut Arabes ab invicem aliquot miliaribus, puta 40, 50, difficulter, at vero 100, 200 etc.¹⁰⁶² miliaria dissiti nullo modo se possint mutuo intelligere.¹⁰⁶³

14. At scriptura sine¹⁰⁶⁴ punctis vocalibus, sed non διακριτικοῖς, ubique per totam Asiam ad Chinas usque et per totam Affricam¹⁰⁶⁵ observatur.

15. Hinc ii, qui mutuo se non intelligunt pronunciatione, tamen scriptione, qua omnes conveniunt, intelligunt.

¹⁰⁶² 100, 200 etc.] Ravius, *Delineatio* (1646), has: 100, 200, 300.

¹⁰⁶³ possint mutuo intelligere] Ravius has another: *mutuo intelligere possint*.

¹⁰⁶⁴ sine] Ravius has *absque*.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Affricam] In agreement with his dittography of this name, Stiernhielm doubles the letter *f*, though Ravius spells it *Africa* with a common haplography.

14. Stiernhielm vs. Terserus: the public dispute in 1653

14.1 Programme of the public dispute

14.1.1 Preliminaries

On the 16th of November 1653, a public dispute took place between Johannes Terserus¹⁰⁶⁶ and Georg Stiernhielm in Uppsala at one of the lecture halls of the university building (*Auditorium Gustavianum*) on the interpretation of the first book of Moses (Genesis, chapters 5–11), concerning among other things the primeval and unchangeable status of Hebrew. This dispute was graced by the presence of the Queen, on whose initiative it was arranged. Between October and December 1653 (or perhaps January 1654), the court was residing in Uppsala because of a plague in the capital. In 1649, the Queen had commissioned Terserus to perform a new critical edition of the Old Testament with a Latin translation. In 1652, Terserus had finished his work on the book of Genesis,¹⁰⁶⁷ and wished to expose his exegetical work to public scrutiny. Stiernhielm was considered an apt opponent. The public dispute was announced in a pamphlet programme entitled *Disputatio publica Mosaico philologica*. Terserus acted as chairman and his student Jordanus Edenius¹⁰⁶⁸ as respondent, while Georg Stiernhielm served as an opponent to the chairman.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Johannes Elai Terserus (1605–1678), son of a vicar in Leksand, was promoted to lecturer in Greek at the high school of Västerås in 1632 and in theology in 1639. When the University of Åbo was founded the next year, in 1640, he was invited to become third professor of theology. In 1647, he was a deputy in the session of the Swedish Parliament in Stockholm and also taught Queen Christina Hebrew. The same year he was appointed second professor of theology at Uppsala University. Later, in 1658, during the reign of Charles X Gustav, he became bishop of Åbo, and finally during the reign of Charles XI the Bishop of Linköping (1671–1678). He advocated a Philippistic and humanistic form of Lutheranism rather than the orthodoxy. For this reason, he resisted the acceptance of the Lutheran Formula of Concord (1577) as a confessional document of the Swedish Church.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Tengström, *Minne öfver Johannes Elai Terserus* (1795), p. 176. The work was published in Uppsala in 1655: *Genesis et Exodus cum nova versione Latina, ad mandatum Christinae Augustae serenissimae Svecorum reginae adornata*, with notes: *Annotationes in Genesin* (1655) and *Exodus et in eam annotations* (1660).

¹⁰⁶⁸ Jordanus Nicolai Edenius (1624–1666) received his MA in 1652, was after an educational journey 1654–1655, when he met J. H. Hottinger, promoted to lecturer at the Faculty of Philosophy in 1656, and became professor of theology in 1661.

A copy of the printed programme of *Disputatio publica Mosaico philologica* and Edenius' record of the dispute titled *Discursus in praesentem disputationem* are preserved.¹⁰⁶⁹ The programme contains five theses on exegetical matters from Genesis, chapters 5 to 11. Among the topics at issue, the thesis on the identity of the primeval language, and the primacy and unchangeability of Hebrew is devoted the most attention and space. Below, the title page and Terserus' thesis on Genesis 11:1 in the programme pamphlet are transcribed.

14.1.2 The title page of the programme

AUSPICE DEO
Creatore coeli et terrae, Patre, Filio et Spiritu Sancto

habebitur
DISPUTATIO PUBLICA
MOSAICO PHILOLOGICA V.
ex cap. V. Geneseos et sequentibus,
qua
in praesentia
SERENISSMAE REGINAE
DOMINAE NOSTRAE CELEMNTISSMAE
difficiliora eorundem capitum loca,
sicuti in Annotationibus uberius exposita sunt
SUB PRAESIDIO
Rev. Dn. JOHANNIS ELAI TERSERI,
SS. Theologiae Doctoris et Professoris ordinarii
in Academia Upsaliensi,
Doctis viris,
hospitibus et domesticis,
eventilanda humiliter exhibet
JORDANUS EDENIUS,
SS. Theologiae studiosus,
in Auditorio Gustaviano,
Die XVI Novemb. Anno MDCLIII,
horis a septima matutinis.

Upsaliae. Excudebat Johannes Pauli, Acad[emiae] Typogr[aphus].

¹⁰⁶⁹ See *Palmskiöldska samlingen* (Palmskiöld's collection) at Uppsala University Library, vol. 336, fols. 43–53.

14.1.3 Terseus' opinions about the primeval language

Ex Cap. XI

Vers. 1. *Erat enim terra universa linguae unius et sermonis eiusdem*] Statuimus hic contra Philastrium ante turrem Babylonicae aedificationem prorsus unam tantum fuisse linguam, nulli obnoxiam mutationi eamque adferimus fuisse illam, quae post Heberum, Pelegi patrem, in cuius scilicet familia haec lingua mansit, a posteris HEBRAEA dicta est, sicut et ipsa gens inde nomen est sortita, et ideo Moses cap. 10,21 Semum, Heberi atavum, *patrem vocat omnium filiorum Heber*, i.e. Hebraeorum.

Non negamus quin lingua haec Hebraea inde a Confusione Babylonica usque ad Mosis tempora nonnihil forte fuerit immutata. Nam etiam in ipsis Heberi familia Patriarcharum adhuc tempore in varias linguam hanc dialectos abiisse, vel inde colligi potest, quod tumulum testimonii, quem Iacobus Gen. 31,47 Hebraica lingua vocabat *Galed*, Laban sua, i.e. Chaldaica appellavit *Iegar Sahaduta* eodem plane sensu, sed dictionibus prorsus diversis, quae tamen originem suam Hebraeae linguae debent. At Hebraeam linguam magnae variationi fuisse obnoxiam, id vero pernegamus.

Huic sententiae firmandae non necesse est multa coacervare argumenta. Palmarium est quod ex nominibus propriis hominum atque locorum petitur: Nominum *Adam*, *Hevah*, *Seth*, *Noach*, *Peleg*, *Abraham*, *Isac*, *Iacob*, *Israel*, omnium filiorum eius sicut et ipsius *Mosis*, manifesta traditur in ipsis sacris literis etymologia et origo ab Hebraeis vocibus, quae etiamnum in sola hac lingua usitatae sunt, a quibus mirum quantum distant. *Adam* ab *adamah*, terra. *Heva*, hebraice *chavvah*, a *chajah*, vixit. *Set* a *sath*, posuit. *Noah* a *nuach*, quiescere. *Peleg* a *pilleg* dividere. *Abraham* ab *abh*, *ram* et littera *h* nota multitudinis, quasi excelsus pater multitudinis. *Iischak* a futuro *Iischak*, ridebit. *Jaacob* a futuro *Iaacob*, supplantabit. *Jisrael* a *Iisreh* et *el*, vincet Deum. Caeterorum XII patriarcharum nomina cap. 29 et 30 Geneseos a suis primitivis, quae adhuc in usu sunt, manifesto derivantur, sicut etiam vox *Moscheh*, Exod. 2, a *Maschah*, extraxit. Sic etiam locorum nomina quamplurima manifestam habent ex Hebraeis vocibus derivationem, unde quam minimum deflectunt.

Hugo Grotius in annotationibus suis ait primaevam linguam nullibi amplius puram extare, sed reliquias eius remansisse in linguis omnibus, nomina autem *Adam*, *Eva* et caetera quae indicavimus, a Mose in gratiam Hebraeorum Hebraico sermone expressa esse, cum tamen a primaeva illa, quam fingit, lingua fuerit aliena.¹⁰⁷⁰ Sed haec

¹⁰⁷⁰ Hugo Grotius ... aliena] See H. Grotius, *Annotata ad Vetus Testamentum*, Paris 1644, p. 20: "Quare verius primaevam linguam nullibi puram extare, sed reliquias eius esse in linguis omnibus. Nomina autem propria Adami, Evae et caetera

dicit doctissimus vir, non probat, nec ullus credo mortalium unquam probabit.

Contra vero manifestum est translatore et rerum gestarum scriptores nomina propria, hominum praecipue, imo etiam locorum plerumque non immutare sed invariata reliquere, nisi quod ea accommodent ad linguae, qua utuntur, genium atque inflectionem. Exempla nobis suppeditat ipse Moses, qui nomina propria peregrina non mutat nec Hebraico sermone exprimit, sed plane eodem modo refert, sicut in linguis earum gentium erant usitata, sicut *Iethro*, *Bileam*, *Potiphar*, *Zophnat Paneach* et id genus alia. Imo translatore omnes quotienscunque ratio etymologiae in Scriptura redditur ineptire malunt, quam nomina propria ista variare, sicut exempli causa, ubi Moses 29 cap. Gen. ait: הפעם אודה את יהוה על כן קרא את שמו יהודה manifesta derivatione: nomen enim *Iehudah* est ab יהודה, *hodah*, coniugatione hophil, ‘laudavit’, quasi ‘filium laudis’ dicas praeposito, sicut in propriis nominibus apud Hebraeos fieri amat. Hic Graeci verterunt: ἐξομολόγησμαι κυρίῳ, διὰ τοῦτο ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰούδαν. Vulgatus: *modo confitebor Domino, ob hoc vocavit eum Judam*. Nostrates: *Nu will jagh tacka Herranom; therföre kallade hon honom Juda*, et sic interpretes caeteri in sua quique lingua.

Alteram ergo illam sententiam ut falsam et a novatoribus nuper excogitatam rejicimus et amplectimur sententiam veterum omnium tam Hebraeorum quam Christianorum suffragio comprabatam. De istis testatur Ephodeus ca. 3 sicut verba eius allegata et translata sunt a Buxtorf., dissertatione de linguae Hebraeae antiquitate. *Vidi, inquit, interpretes Legis omnes consentientes in hoc, quod illa lingua creata et a consensu Dei profecta, sit lingua hebraea a Prophetis dicta judaica.*¹⁰⁷¹ De scriptoribus in communi testatur Fr. Junius ad hunc ipsum locum: *Hanc, inquit, Hebraeam fuisse linguam consentione omnium ostenditur et argumentis probat Augustinus, lib. 16 de Civitate Dei, cap. 11.*¹⁰⁷²

Hebraico sermone a Mose expressa Hebraeorum causa eodem significatu, qui in primaeva lingua fuerat.” In English translation: “Therefore, it is more true that the primeval language does not exist in a pure form anywhere, but instead there are remnants of it in all languages. In behalf of the Hebrews Moses translated the proper names of Adam, Eve and the others into the Hebrew language with the same meaning as they had in the primeval language.” Grotius consequently rejected the common etymological argument in favour of Hebrew as the primeval language.

¹⁰⁷¹ The Swiss Hebraist Johannes Buxtorf the Younger (1599–1664) published a comprehensive study of the primacy of Hebrew in the first three dissertations of *Dissertationes philologic-theologicae*, Basel 1644, 2nd ed. 1662. The first treatise is titled *De linguae Hebraeae origine et antiquitate*, “On the origin and antiquity of the Hebrew language”. The quotation is found on p. 21 in the 1662 edition.

¹⁰⁷² Franciscus Junius the Elder (1545–1602), a Reformed philologist, professor of theology in Heidelberg and Leiden, was Immanuel Tremellius’ collaborator in his

Theodoretus equidem quaest. 59 in Genesin¹⁰⁷³ Syrorum linguam primaevam esse ait, de cuius autoritate magnopere sibi gratulantur, qui Hebraice linguae antiquitati quocunque modo detractum volunt. Sed manifestum est Theodoretum ibi ipsam Hebraeam linguam intelligere, a qua Syra non nisi dialecto differt.

Haec est nostra de de Hebraea lingua eiusque antiquitate sententia.

14.2 Record of the public dispute on Gen. 11:1

14.2.1 Preliminaries

The dispute between Terserus and Stiernhielm was recorded by the formal respondent Jordan Edenius. His record is entitled: *Discursus in praesentem disputationem institutus et obiter quantum memoriae ex ipso mandari poterat, privatim in Musaeo calamo comprehensus annotatusque*, that is, “The discussion of the present dispute is written down and notated as much as could be retained in memory privately in the library.” Under the heading he has added: *opposuit Stiernehielm*, “Stiernhielm acted as opponent”.

From the outset of this record, it is clear that Stiernhielm opposed Terserus as chairman and Edenius as respondent.¹⁰⁷⁴ From the record of the dispute on Genesis 11,¹⁰⁷⁵ it may be inferred that Stiernhielm opposed Terserus’ thesis on Gen. 11:1 (as written in the programme pamphlet of the dispute) on the primordial status of Hebrew. Terserus answered Stiernhielm’s criticism. Stiernhielm thereupon defended his position.

Latin translation of the Old Testament, *Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra sive libri canonici praeae Iudaeorum ecclesiae*. In the revised editions, Junius added many notes. In the marginal note of the 3rd edition, Saint Gervais 1607, he remarks on the expression ‘one language’ in Gen. 11: “this language was Hebrew according to the consensus of the scholars and Augustine proves this in the *City of God*, XVI, 11.” On Junius the Elder’s and other biblical expositors’ reception of Augustine’s view on this topic, see further my article: “Augustine and the primaeval language in early modern exegesis and philology”, *Language and History* 56:2, pp. 110 f.

¹⁰⁷³ Theodoret of Cyrrhus (393–460), *Questions on the Octateuch*, edited by John F. Petruccione and translated by Robert C Hill, Washington D.C., 2007. Question 60: Which language is the most ancient one? The names make it evident, as Adam, Cain, Abel and Noah belong to the language of the Syrians. The Syrians usually refer to the read earth as “adamtha”. So Adam means either “the earthly” or “the one made by dust”. Cain means “acquisition”, for Eve said this singing: “I have aquired a man by help of God.” Abel means “grief”, since he was the first dead to be seen and the first to cause his parents grief. Noah means “rest”.

¹⁰⁷⁴ Stiernhielm addresses both the chairman and the respondent in his introductory statement concerning the title of the programme: “Quod inscriptionem vestram, Rev. Domine doctor praeses eximie ut et clariss. Magister respondens, ea sic habet: *Disputatio publica Mosaico-philologica*.”

¹⁰⁷⁵ Palmskiöldska samlingen, vol. 336, fols. 52–54, Uppsala University Library.

14.2.2 Textual edition of the debate on the antiquity of Hebrew

[...] **[52]** Ad cap. XI, not. 1, ubi de antiquitate linguae Hebraeae mentem suam initio exponit thesium author.

[Stiernhielmus dixit:]¹⁰⁷⁶ Quoniam in thesi hac conceditis linguam Hebraeam magnam subiisse mutationem tempore Captivitatis Babylonicae, adeo ut in dialectos varias abierit, utique verisimile est eam longe plus variatam fuisse tempore captivitatis et mansionis Aegyptiacae, quia haec 300 fere annis duravit, illa vero septuaginta tantum. Namque quod brevi tempore tantum fuit immutata, nemo negabit id magis longiori spatio contigisse posse, adeo ut verisimile sit Hebraeam linguam non amplius esse quamque vocant Hebraeam nihil minus esse, quam Hebraeam.

Hoc enim facere potuit nemini ignota vis aevi, quae omni tempore in omnia valet, praesertim vero linguas hominum, concediturque hic breviori temporis spatio multum efficisse, ideo et plus longiori valuisse putabitur.

Deinde in causa esse potuit Hebraeorum dispersio per varias Aegypti oras. Nihil enim quidquam causari videbatur linguae corruptionem in Babylonia tantum, quantum id quod passim essent dispersi et homines Hebraei ab invicem seiuncti inter Babylonios versantes.

Talis autem dispersio facta fuit in Aegypto, quod confirmari potest partim ex captivorum conditione, quae non alia solet esse, quam ut distrahuntur huc illucve ad subeunda servitutis onera; tum etiam inde, quod iussi fuerint Hebraei, dum abitum parabant, quivis ex hospite suo mutuo sumere vasa argentea, quod indicat maximam dispersionem ab invicem, ut potioem cum hospitibus habuerint conversationem, quam secum ad invicem.

Responsio¹⁰⁷⁷ 1. Quod tota haec argumentatio ex probabilitate et coniectura dependeat proindeque nihil certi ex se concludere possit. 2. Videtur quidem haec ratio procedere a minori ad maius, dum evincere videtur ex diuturnitate temporis maiorem quemquam mutationem subivisse linguam Hebraeam. Nobis autem hoc non placet; neque enim tempus linguam tantopere mutare <potest>, **(53)** sed potius circumstantiae quaedam aliae.

Distinguimus autem inter captivitatis tempus et afflictionis in ipsa captivitate. Et hoc respectu servitus Babylonica fuit multo longior servitute Aegyptiaca in afflictione. In Babylonia Hebraei abducti statim afflictione miserrima patiebantur usque ad finem captivitatis idque per annos septuaginta. In Aegypto permanserunt Judaei annis

¹⁰⁷⁶ Stiernhielmus dixit] The first four paragraphs are an account of Stiernhielm's opposition to Terserus' theses in the programme for the dispute.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Responsio] Here follows Terserus' response.

210, sed primo, quum advenerunt, felicissime cum Aegyptiis vixerunt sub Pharaone et tempore Josephi per multos annos. Et verisimile est post Josephi mortem non statim affligi cepisse, neque enim is novus exsurgens Pharaon tuto putabitur fuisse primi Pharaonis successor immediatus. Sub hoc coepit afflictio. Et cum consilia non procederent quibus prohibere conabatur, ne multitudo Hebraeorum in immensum excresceret, tandem de proicienda prole mascula in fluvios praecepit, ubi et Moses eiectus est. Is autem 40 fuit annorum, cum profugeret. Cum itaque additur ad hos annos tempus illud quod inter fugam et exitum vel liberationem per ipsum factam intercesserat, facile putabitur afflictionem hanc non fuisse priori diuturniorem.

Quod autem dispersionem attinet, quae linguam mutare poterat, hic non negamus Hebraeos gravissimis oneribus pressos fuisse, ipsa¹⁰⁷⁸ tamen non aequiperamus afflictioni isti, quam in Babylonia pertulerunt. Deinde patet facile non magnam adeo fuisse dispersionem illorum, dum videlicet Angelus peragravit Aegyptum et necavit omne primogenitum, dum domos Hebraeorum praeteriit. Patet ergo fuisse complures et quidem integras Hebraeorum societates in Aegypto, quae linguam conservare poterant. Multi quidem poterant esse dispersi, maxima tamen pars sociata mansit, ut linguae nihil posset officere.

(54) Obiectio:¹⁰⁷⁹ Sed palmarium dicitis esse argumentum, quo Hebraeae linguae integritatem mansisse creditis postquam ex Aegypto redirent Hebraei, quod nomina propria habuerint, quorum etymologia manifeste ex vocibus Hebraeis deducitur.

Probabo autem aequae esse ea nomina ex Suecana lingua deducta, quam ex Hebraea linguaque, quam tum habebant Hebraei et qua Mosis libri nunc scripti continentur. Non minus dicendum esse Suecanam, quam Hebraeam. Faciamus periculum:

אדם ab אדמה i.e. terra. Quid aliud significat Suecicum *dam* quam pulverem terrae, ut homo aequae pulvereus denominari possit a lingua Suecica ac ab Hebraea?

Chava a *chaja*, vixit. Belgice *kaje* significat viventem, ut *kaitman* homo vividus. Hinc ergo vivens dicitur Eva aequae ac ab Hebraea.

Seth a *sath*, posuit. Suetice: *Han satte*, a *sättia*; inde *säte*, sedile.

¹⁰⁷⁸ ipsa] This is my emendation of *ipsos* in the manuscript. This pronoun refers to the neuter substantive *onus* in the ablative plural *oneribus* in the preceding clause.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Obiectio] Stiernhielm here replies to Terserus' objections. He points out the fallacy of the etymological argument by demonstrating the possibility of Swedish etymologies of some proper names in the book of Genesis.

Noach a *nuach*, quiescere. Suetice: *nöja*, unde *den som låter sigh nöja*, “is videtur acquiescere, qui satisfactus est ei.”

Peleg a *pilleg*, dividere. Suetice: “*den som plöijer*, is dividit et findit,” unde Peleg *divisor*. Suetice: *plugg*, quo dividi solent res.

Ischah a radice *schakach*, risit. Suetice: *den som leer, han skakar sigh*.

Jacob a *achav*, supplantare, detrudere. Abiecta prima litera Suet. est *skuffun* [?], qui deprimitur.

Israel, [...?] [...?], ab *El*, deo, proprie a virtute ac fortitudine. Quid autem est fortius eo, quod Suetice dicimus *eld*, ignem.

Ad haec cum nihil responderetur, facete discursus desinebat.

15. Stiernhielm's catalogues of linguistic literature

15.1 Libri rariores huic instituto inservientes

Source: *Lexicon Gothicum philologicum*, F.d. 10, fol. 1r and the inside cover.

Dating: On the title page Stiernhielm states that his dictionary was begun on the 12th of July 1626 and was presented to the Lord High Cancellor in Örebro on the 5th of March (1639) and retained until the 7th (of March) in 1639. The below list contains items published in 1631 and 1632. Stiernhielm refers to Clüver's *Germania antiqua* with a reference to a page that agrees with the second Leiden edition of 1631 (but not with the first edition, 1616). Stiernhielm possessed a copy of the second edition (surviving at Uppsala University Library).

(1r) Libri rariores huic instituto inservientes:

Leges Canuti Regis, meminit Cluver. p. 103, lin. 23.¹⁰⁸⁰

Hucbaldus et Nithardus. *ibid.*¹⁰⁸¹

Adrianus Schrickius, *De originibus Celticis*,¹⁰⁸²

Wolfgang Lazius,¹⁰⁸³

¹⁰⁸⁰ Philipp Clüver, *Germaniae antiquae libri tres*, 2nd edition, Lugduni Batavorum/Leiden 1631, p. 103, line 23: In legibus Canuti regis dicuntur *Aethelinge*.

¹⁰⁸¹ Clüver, *ibidem*, p. 103, line 24: "apud Hucbaldum et Nithardum *Edlinge*."

¹⁰⁸² Adriaan van Schrieck, *Van t'beghin der eerster Volcken van European, in-sonderheyt van der oorsprunck ende saecken der Nederlandren XXIII boecken* (in Latin designated as *Originum rerumque Celticarum et Belgicarum*), T'Ypres 1614; 560 pages in Flemish with two comprehensive indices, "Index geographicus" on ancient place names with Flemish etymologies and "Index miscellus" on ancient Hebrew, Greek and Latin proper names with Flemish etymologies. This publication was followed up by two companions, the first of which is *Monitorum secundorum libri V, quibus originum rerumque Celticarum et Belgicarum opus suum nuper editum, altius et auctius e fontibus Hebraicis, ipsaque rerum origine deducit, probat, firmatque [...]. De vera et falsa origine monumentum sive Europa rediviva*, Ypris Flandrorum 1615; 63 pages with a lexicographical "Index tertius" that aims to prove the close kinship between Hebrew and Flemish. The second companion is *Adversariorum libri IIII. His argumentis: Linguam Hebraicam esse divinam et primogeniam. Linguam Teutonicam esse secundam et dialecto tantum ab Hebraea distare* (112 pages), Ypris Flandrorum 1620.

¹⁰⁸³ Wolfgang Lazius, *De gentium aliquot migrationibus, sedibus fixis, reliquiis, linguarumque initiis et immutationibus ac dialectis, libri XII*, Basileae/ Basel 1555.

Isaac Pontani *Origines Francicae*;¹⁰⁸⁴
 Joh. Martini *Lydii Glossae Latino-Barbarae*.¹⁰⁸⁵
 Nicolaus de Clemangis in operibus adiectis.
 Willeramus.¹⁰⁸⁶
 HADRIAN. JUNII *Batavia*;¹⁰⁸⁷
 Pontani *Dania*;¹⁰⁸⁸
Leges Canuti Regis AngloSaxonicae;
Dictionarium Belgicum. NB. opera Ast. Tychon.
 item *Anglicum*. *Perfectum*. Tib. Mat. Nicolius.

(front cover, inside) Hisce adiunge:
*Archaeologiam Henrici Spelmanni Angli*¹⁰⁸⁹
 et *Archaeonomiam nescio cuius Angli*;¹⁰⁹⁰
Kiliani Lexicon Belgico-Germanicum;¹⁰⁹¹
Lexicon Ungaricum, Polonicum.
 Besold, *Tractatus de linguarum varia mutatione*.¹⁰⁹²
 Knichen, *De super[iore] territorii iure*.¹⁰⁹³

¹⁰⁸⁴ Johannes Isacius Pontanus, *Originum Francicarum libri VI*, Hardervici/ Harderwijk 1616.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Johannes Martini Lydius (1577–1643), vicar of Oudewater (south-Holland), “*Glossarium Latino-Barbarum*”, which is an exposition of obscure Latin words in the writings of French theologian and philosopher Nicolas of Clémange’s (1363–1437). The expression “*Ioannis Lydii Glossae Latino Barbarae*” is found in the title of the glossary attached to Clémange’s *Opera omnia*, Lugduni Batavorum 1613.

¹⁰⁸⁶ *Willeramii Abbatis in Canticum Canticorum paraphrasis gemina. Prior rhythmis Latinis, altera veteri Lingua Francica [...]*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1589.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Hadrianus Junius, *Batavia, in qua praeter gentis et insulae antiquitatem, originem, decora, mores, aliaque ad eam historiam pertinentia, declaratur quae fuerit vetus Batavia, quae Plinio, Tacito et Ptolemaeo cognita*, published in Leiden in 1588. A second edition appeared in Dortrecht in 1652.

¹⁰⁸⁸ Johannes Isaacus Pontanus, *Rerum Danicarum historia*, Amsterdam 1631.

¹⁰⁸⁹ Henricus Spelmannus, *Archaeologus in modum glossarii ad rem antiquam posteriorem continentis Latino-barbara peregrina, obsoleta et novatae significationis vocabula [...]*, Londini/ London 1626.

¹⁰⁹⁰ *Archaionomia sive de priscis Anglorum legibus*, Londini/ London 1568. This work on Old English laws is anonymous, but should be attributed to the English antiquarians Lawrence Nowell (1516–1576) and William Lambarde (1536–1601). The work was republished in Cambridge in 1644 and 1654.

¹⁰⁹¹ Cornelius Kilianus (Cornelis van Kiel, 1529–1607), *Etymologicum Teutonicae linguae sive Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum*. 1st ed. appeared in 1574, 3rd revised and expanded edition was published in Antwerp in 1599, and further editions in Alkmaar 1605 and 1613, in Amsterdam 1614 and in Utrecht 1623, 1632 and 1777.

¹⁰⁹² Christoph Besold, *De natura populorum eiusque pro loci positu, ac temporis decursu variatione et insimul etiam de linguarum ortu et immutatione*, Tubingae/ Tübingen 1632.

¹⁰⁹³ Andreas Knichen (1560–1621), *De sublimi et regio territorii iure synoptica tractatio*, Frankfurt am Main 1600 (1st ed.) and 1603 (2nd ed.).

15.2 Libri conducentes ad origines linguarum

15.2.1 Preliminaries

Source: F.d. 5, fols. 33v–34r (with the size 212 x 325 mm). Under the heading of “Books that contribute to Georg Stiernhielm’s language origins” these pages contain Stiernhielm’s catalogue of his actual and virtual library. For a photographic image of fol. 33v, see Figure 15.

Dating: Many books that Stiernhielm possessed can be dated to the first half of the seventeenth century. The two latest publications listed are from 1654 and 1655 (Boxhorn, *Originum Gallicarum liber* and Junius, *Observationes*; see books in group C). This provides a *terminus post quem* for this catalogue. After fleeing from his estate Wasula on 6 June 1656 Stiernhielm arrived at Vaxholm on 13 August 1656.¹⁰⁹⁴ At the end of December Stiernhielm and his family were given accommodation at Bengt Skytte’s estate Marby on Oknön (in Lake Mälaren), south of Enköping. In January and February 1657 he sent some books on loan to Bengt Skytte (Section 15.3). Several items that have been crossed out in the catalogue of his linguistics library are books later sent to Skytte. The fact that Stiernhielm marked a couple of items as books lent to Skytte provides a *terminus ante quem*. By way of conclusion, Stiernhielm drew up an inventory of his linguistics library in the autumn of 1656.

Contents: In his bibliographical inventory, Stiernhielm catalogues both his actual and his virtual library: books he considers useful for his enquiry into the origin and kinship of languages, whether or not he possessed them. In his inventory he indicates the status of the books: (A) books possessed by himself, (B) books not possessed, (C) additional books possessed by himself, (D) books that he wishes to buy, (E) books probably in his possession, and (F) books that he recently has added to his holdings.

Books of the first group (A) can be classified internally into four categories according to genre: (1) dictionaries, (2) language samples with textbooks and Bibles in different translations, (3) treatises either on the origin and kinship of languages or on linguistic topics in general, and (4) grammars. Stiernhielm himself catalogued books of this kind in a sequence more or less corresponding to this sequence of four categories (1–4).

Books in the remaining groups (B–E) belong to one or several of the above-mentioned categories. B comprises categories 1–3, C

¹⁰⁹⁴ At the end of his copy (Uppsala University Library, inventory number 58.XI.3) of Meric Casaubon’s *De quatuor linguis commentationis pars prior, quae de lingua Hebraica et de lingua Saxonica*, Londini/ London 1650, Stiernhielm wrote: “In portu prope Waxholm[iam] die 13 Aug. 1656. GS”, ‘In the port close to Vaxholm, 13 August 1656. Georg Stiernhielm’.

consists of books in category 2–3, D encompasses categories 1–2, E comprises mainly works in category 2, and F includes categories 1–2.

In contrast to the preservation of Stiernhielm's own manuscript writings, his library of printed books was dispersed. A catalogue of it was drawn up by Johan Markvard Stiernhielm during his father's lifetime, probably in 1671. After Stiernhielm's death, an inventory was made, and the library was stored more or less intact in different places, first in Stiernhielm's house on Drottninggatan until 1677 and then in the house of the deceased commerce mayor Peter Trotzig, (Trotzenfelt), on Drottninggatan until 1688, when the descendants issued a printed programme inviting the public to an auction of "Stiernhielm's little selected library" by lottery-drawing. The auction was apparently not held. Christina Stiernhielm asserts that the library was for some time stored in the Archives of the Royal Castle.¹⁰⁹⁵ According to another source, King Charles XI bought the library in its entirety and it remained undispersed in Uppsala until 1737.¹⁰⁹⁶

Otto Walde traced almost one hundred books which once were in the possession of Stiernhielm, identifying them by their signature on title pages and handwriting in marginal annotations or by information given by later owners. He argues that Stiernhielm's library comprised several hundreds volumes in the fields of "theology, philosophy, mythology, linguistics, history, antiquities, jurisprudence, political science, mathematics, astronomy, and mechanics".¹⁰⁹⁷

As far as the linguistic works are concerned, Walde refers to the books sent to Bengt Skytte (Section 15.3), but did not know about the more extensive catalogue below. He still managed to trace some important linguistic treatises that, according to the below catalogue, Stiernhielm owned. These include Theodor Bibliander's *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum* (1548), Conrad Gesner's *Mithridates* (1555) in the edition of 1610, Hieronymus Megiser's *Thesaurus polyglottus vel dictionarium multilingue* (1603), Adriaan van Schrieck's *Originum rerumque Celticarum et Belgicarum libri XXIII* (1614), Meric Casaubon's *De quatuor linguis commentations pars prior de lingua Hebraica et de lingua Saxonica* (1650), and Boxhorn's *Originum Gallicarum liber* (1654), all of which are now in the holdings of Uppsala University Library.¹⁰⁹⁸

¹⁰⁹⁵ Walde, "Om Georg Stiernhielms bibliotek: några anteckningar" pp. 139–141.

¹⁰⁹⁶ Anna Catharina Cronstierna (who was married to Erik Stiernhielm) claims that Charles XI bought her father-in-law's father Jöran Stiernhielm's library for 7,000 imperial thalers ("riksdaler"), but since he did not pay the price, the library remained in Uppsala. See the biographica-collection, vol. 79, s.v. Georg Stiernhielm, National Archives of Sweden.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Walde, "Om Georg Stiernhielms bibliotek", pp. 107 and 140.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Walde, *ibidem*, pp. 121, 122 and 124.

Other items identified by Walde as formerly owned by Stiernhielm are Athanasius Kircher's *Prodromus Coptus* (1636) in the Library of the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, Histories and Antiquities in Stockholm, Johann Scapula's *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum* (1614) in the Diocese Library of Karlstad, a *Dictionarium Armeno-Latinum* (1633) formerly in the dispersed library of the Ihre family at Ekebyhov in Stockholm, Andreas Helwig's *Etymologia sive origines* (1611) in the Library of Jamtlandia in Östersund, and Ole Worm's *Monumenta Danica* (1643) in the City Library of Gothenburg (Göteborgs Stadsbibliotek), a copy that contains two autograph Latin epigrams by Stiernhielm against Worm,¹⁰⁹⁹ whose *Monumenta Danica* was the target of this criticism. Stiernhielm also possessed Worm's smaller treatise on runes (1636; Section 15.2.2, below A 3).

Walde also identified Johannes Passeratius' *De literarum inter se cognatione et permutatione* (1606) as a book owned by Stiernhielm in the Diocese Library of Linköping (Linköping Stiftsbibliotek), but it does not appear in the catalogue below.¹¹⁰⁰

15.2.2 Books in Stiernhielm's possession

(33v, col. 1)

Libri conducentes ad origines linguarum Georgii Stiernhielmii.

Sequentes ipse habeo:

[A 1. Dictionaries]

Lexicon Chaldaicum Buxtorfii. in fol. regal.¹¹⁰¹

Lexicon Pentaglotton Schindleri. in fol.¹¹⁰²

Harmonie etymologique Guichardi. 8^o.¹¹⁰³

Lexicon Graecum Scapulae. in 4^o.¹¹⁰⁴

Cadmus Graeco-Phoenix Martini. 8^o.¹¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁹⁹ Walde, *ibidem*, pp. 122 (Kircher), 124 (Helwig) and 125 (the rest).

¹¹⁰⁰ Walde, *ibidem*, p. 125.

¹¹⁰¹ Johannes Buxtorf the Elder, and Johannes Buxtorf the Younger (completer), *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum*, Basileae/ Basel 1639.

¹¹⁰² Valentin Schindler (1543–1604) prepared a comparative Semitic dictionary, *Lexicon Pentaglotton Hebraicum, Chaldaicum, Syriacum, Talmudico-Rabbinicum et Arabicum*, posthumously published in Frankfurt am Main and Hanau in 1612.

¹¹⁰³ Étienne Guichard, *L'harmonie étymologique des langues hébraïque, chaldaïque, syriaque, grèque, latine, française, italienne, espagnole, allemande, flamande, angloise etc.* Paris 1606.

¹¹⁰⁴ Johannes Scapula (1540–1600), *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum*, first published in Basel in 1580 and reprinted in twenty editions before 1665. According to Walde (*ibidem*, p. 125), Stiernhielm possessed the Basel-edition of 1614.

¹¹⁰⁵ Matthias Martini (1572–1630), *Cadmus Graecophoenix*, Bremae/ Bremen 1625. The title is explained as follows: *id est Etymologicum in quo explicantur et ad suas origines tandemque ad Cadmeos seu orientales fontes reducuntur*

Origines linguae Latinae Becmanni. 8^o.¹¹⁰⁶
 Thesaurus polyglottus Megiseri. duo tomi. 8^o.¹¹⁰⁷
 Lexicon Anglo-Saxonicum. in fol. MS.¹¹⁰⁸
 Lexicon Anglicum. in 4^{to}.¹¹⁰⁹
 Lexicon Teutonicum Kiliani. in 8^o.¹¹¹⁰
 Lexicon Alemanicum Pictoris. in 4^{to}.¹¹¹¹
 Lexicon Polonicum. in 4^{to}.¹¹¹²
 Lexicon Ungaricum Molnari. in 8^o.¹¹¹³
 Lexicon Italico-Turcicum. 8^o.¹¹¹⁴
 Lexicon Armenicum. in 4^{to}.¹¹¹⁵
 Lexicon Germanico-Letticum Mancelii. 8^o.¹¹¹⁶

principes voces Graecae et eae, quae cum alibi tum maxime in Veteris Testamenti paraphrasi LXX seniorum aliorumque quaeque in Novi Testamenti codice videntur obscuriores, multae quoque notabiles dictiones, vulgo a lexicographis praetermissae et in Glossariis alibique latentes luci dantur et emaculantur.

¹¹⁰⁶ Christian Becman, (1580–1648), *De originibus Latinae linguae, et quod ex illis eruatur germana significandi proprietas*, Wittebergae/ Wittenberg 1609: Gorman.

¹¹⁰⁷ Hieronymus Megiser (1554–1619), *Thesaurus polyglottus vel dictionary multilingue*, Francofurti ad Moenum/ Frankfurt am Main 1603; the title continues: *ex quadringentis circiter tam veteris quam novi (vel potius antiquis incogniti) orbis nationum linguis, dialectis, idiomatibus et idiotismis constans incredibili labore summaque diligentia, tum vero ipsa experientia et diuturno multarum peregrinationum usu suggerente, [...] fideliter collectum et concinnatum.*

¹¹⁰⁸ Probably the same as the Old English dictionary in the Stiernhielm collection at Royal Library, Stockholm, ms. F.d. 1 *Lexicon Anglo-Saxonicum-Latinum*, fols. 16r–123r, which was catalogued as *Lexicon Anglo-Saxonicum* by Carl Reinhold Berch, *Förteckning öfwer Antiquitets Archivi handskrifter* (c. 1758, ms. U 93).

¹¹⁰⁹ Probably the first English dictionary by Robert Cawdry, *A Table Alphabethical or the English expositor, containing or teaching the true writing and understanding of hard usuall English words borrowed from the Hebrew, Greeke, Latin or French*, etc. London 1604, reprinted 1616 and 1617.

¹¹¹⁰ Cornelius Kilianus (Cornelis van Kiel, 1529–1607), *Etymologicum Teutonicae linguae sive Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum*, the 3rd revised and expanded edition Antverpiae/ Antwerp 1599. This etymological dictionary on Dutch was reprinted in Amsterdam 1607, 1614, and 1640, in Alkmaar 1605 and 1613, in Utrecht 1632, 1757 and 1777. All editions are in octavo except for that of Utrecht 1777.

¹¹¹¹ Josua Maaler, *Die Teütsch spraach: alle wörter, namen und arten zuo reden in Hochteütscher spraach [...]. Dictionarium Germanico-Latinum, hoc est linguae Teutonicae, superioris praesertim, thesaurus [...]*, Tiguri/ Zürich 1561.

¹¹¹² Jan Maczynski, *Lexicon Latino-Polonicum ex optimis Latinae linguae scriptoribus concinnatum*, Regiomonti Borussiae/ Königsberg (Królewiec) 1564.

¹¹¹³ Albert Scenczi Molnar, *Lexicon Latino-Graeco-Ungaricum*, Hanau 1611, and revised editions in Heidelberg 1621 and Frankfurt am Main 1645, all in octavo.

¹¹¹⁴ Giovanni Molino, *Dittionario della lingua italiana-turческа*, Roma 1641.

¹¹¹⁵ Francisco Rivola, *Dictionarium Armeno-Latinum* (c. 400 pages), Lutetiae Parisiorum/ Paris 1633.

¹¹¹⁶ Georg Mancelius (1593–1654), *Lettus, das ist Wortbuch sampt angehängtem täglichen Gebrauch der Lettischen Sprache* with the title *Phraseologia Lettica, das ist: Täglicher Gebrauch der Lettischen Sprache*, Riga 1638.

Lexicon Germanico-Estheticum Sthalii 8^o.¹¹¹⁷
 Lexicon Sueo-Germanico-Finnonicum Schroderi. in 12^o.¹¹¹⁸
 Lexicon veteris linguae Germanicae Keronis. fol.¹¹¹⁹

[A 2. Language samples]

Evangelia Germanica Otfridi. 8^o.¹¹²⁰
 Canticum Canticorum veteris linguae Teuthonicae Willeramii. 8^o.¹¹²¹
 Rhythmi veteris linguae Germanicae in Annonem. 8^o.
 Parentheses veteris linguae Germanicae Goldasti. 4^{to}.¹¹²²
 De veteri lingua Gothica Bonaventurae Vulcanii. 8^o.¹¹²³
 Biblia Islandica,¹¹²⁴ Biblia Finnonica.¹¹²⁵ in fol.
 {Multi et varii libri Islandici. ex Archivo.¹¹²⁶

¹¹¹⁷ Heinrich Stahl (c. 1598/ 1600–1657), *Anführung zu der Esthnischen Sprach. Observationes grammaticae circa linguam Esthonicam*. Reval (Tallinn) 1637, printed in octavo.

¹¹¹⁸ Ericus Schroderus, *Lexicon Latino-Scondicum, quo quatuor celebriores totius Europae linguae atque idiomata orbis, scilicet Latinum, Suecicum, Germanicum et Venedicum seu Finnonicum parvulis Musarum alumnis methodice inculcantur* [...], Holmiae Sueonum/ Stockholm 1637.

¹¹¹⁹ A glossary on Old High German words compiled by the Benedictine monk Kero in St. Gall about 790, sometimes referred to as *Glossae Keronis*.

¹¹²⁰ Between 860 and 870 Otfrid von Weissenburg (800– after 870 AD) compiled a Gospel harmony in rhyme in Old High German. This text was edited by Matthias Flacius Illyricus in the sixteenth century under the title *Otfridi Evangeliorum liber, veterum Germanorum grammaticae, poeseos, theologiae praeclarum monumentum*, Basileae/ Basel 1571, in 8^o, 574 pages. The subtitle reads: „Evangelien Buch in altfrenckischen reimen durch Otfriden von Weissenburg, Münch zu S. Gallen, vor sibenhundert jaren beschriben: jetzt aber mit gunst des gestrengen ehrenuesten herrn Adolphen Herman Riedesel, Erbmarschalck zu Hessen, der alten teutschen spraach und gottsforcht zu erlernen, in truck verfertigen.”

¹¹²¹ *Willeramii abbatis in Canticum Canticorum paraphrasis gemina: prior rhythmis latinis, altera veteri lingua Francica, Addita explicatio, lingua Belgica et notae quibus veterum vocum Francicarum ratio redditur*. Lugduni Batavorum 1598. Williram of Ebersberg (1020–1085) wrote a commentary on the Song of Songs in Old High German. It was published by the Leiden librarian P. Merula (1558–1607).

¹¹²² Melchior Goldast, *Paraeneticorum veterum pars I*, Hannover 1604.

¹¹²³ Bonaventura Vulcanius, *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1597. For an overview, see Kees Dekker “Vulcanius and his network of language lovers *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum* (1597)” in *Bonaventura Vulcanius: Works and Networks Bruges 1538 – Leiden 1614*, Leiden: Brill, 2010, pp. 387–388.

¹¹²⁴ Probably the first complete Bible translation in Icelandic made by Guðbrandur Þorláksson: *Biblia, Það er, öll heilóg ritning, vtlógd a norrænu*, Hólar 1584.

¹¹²⁵ He likely possessed the first complete Finnish translation of the Bible: *Biblia: ee on: coco pyhä ramattu suomexi, pääramattiuden hebrean ia grekan iälken*, Stockholm/ Stockholm 1642.

¹¹²⁶ Stiernhielm had access to Icelandic manuscripts in the Royal Archives. For an account of Icelandic law codes in the Archives of Antiquities in the middle of the

Archivo {Enarrationes Biblicae vetere lingua Westgothica. MS. fol.¹¹²⁷
 Psalterium Anglo-Saxonicum. in 4^{to}.¹¹²⁸
 Lexicon Italicum Gallicum Hispanicum ex Crusca. in 4^{to}.¹¹²⁹
 Lexicon Gallicum Nicod. 4^{to}.¹¹³⁰

[A 3. Treatises on the kinship of languages and language samples]
 Origines linguae Gallicae du Menage. 4^{to}.¹¹³¹
 Mithridates Gesneri. 8^o.¹¹³²
 Origines Francicae Pontani. 4^{to}.¹¹³³
 Runa Danica in fol. Olai Wormii.¹¹³⁴
 Islandia Arngrim Jonae. 4^{to}.¹¹³⁵
 Vossii de vitiis sermonis. 4^{to}.¹¹³⁶
 De confusione linguarum Crinesii. 4^{to}.¹¹³⁷
 Leges veteres Suecorum et Gothorum. fol.¹¹³⁸ Leges
 Westgothicae.¹¹³⁹

18th century, see Carl Reinhold Berch, *Förteckning öfver Antiquitets Archivi handskrifter* (c. 1758), pp. 82–106, ms. U 93, Royal Library, Stockholm. Compare Vilhelm Gödel, *Katalog öfver Kongl. bibliotekets fornländska och fornnorska handskrifter*, Stockholm 1897–1900.

¹¹²⁷ Probably the medieval Swedish translation of the Pentateuch, preserved as Cod. Holm. A 1, Royal Library, Stockholm, and published as *Fem Moseböcker på fornsvenska enligt Cod. Holm. A 1*, by Olof Thorell (Uppsala 1955–1959). In his *Philologus Celto-Gothicus* (F.d. 2:7:1:2, fol. 3r), dated 1 Nov. 1636, Stiernhielm states that he has seen and read this translation (MS. Enarratio Biblica in 4:o) in the house of “his relative and friend” (affinis et amicus) Johannes Bureus. Later, he had access to it in the Royal Archives.

¹¹²⁸ John Spelman (ed.), *Psalterium Davidis Latino-Saxonicum vetus*, London 1640.

¹¹²⁹ *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*, Venezia: Giovanni Alberti 1612.

¹¹³⁰ Jean Nicot (1530–1604), *Le grand dictionnaire François-Latin*, Geneve 1593, printed in 4^{to}. Stiernhielm crossed out this and the next item after sending them to Bengt Skytte, whose name has been written in the margin.

¹¹³¹ Gilles Ménage, *Les origines de la langue françoise*, Paris 1650. Stiernhielm crossed out this item after lending it to Bengt Skytte.

¹¹³² Conrad Gesner, *Mithridates Gesneri experimens differentias linguarum tum veterum, tum quae hodie, per totum terrarum orbem in usu sunt*, Tiguri/ Zürich 1610 – the second edition published by Caspar Waserus with a commentary.

¹¹³³ Johannes Isaacus Pontanus, *Originum Francicarum libri sex*, Hardervici 1616.

¹¹³⁴ Olaus Worm, *Runir seu Danica literatura antiquissima, vulgo Gothica dicta*, Hafniae/ Copenhagen 1636.

¹¹³⁵ Arngrimur Jónsson, either *Brevis commentarius de Islandia*, Hafniae 1593, or *Crymogaea sive rerum Islandicarum libri III*, Hamburgi 1610.

¹¹³⁶ Gerard Johannes Vossius, *De vitiis sermonis et glossematis latino-barbaris libri quatuor, partim utiles ad pure loquendum, partim ad melius intelligendos poster-iorum seculorum scriptores*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam 1645.

¹¹³⁷ Christoph Crinesius, *Babel sive discursus de confusione linguarum tum orientalium [...] tum occidentalium*, Noribergae/ Nürnberg 1629; less likely *Disputatio de confusione linguarum*, Wittebergae/ Wittenberg 1610.

(33v, col. 2) Leges antiquae Scothicae. Leges Anglicae apud Bedam, Leges Islandicae, Leges Norvegicae, Leges Frisiorum.

(33v, col. 1) Codex legum antiquarum cum Glossario Lindenbrogii. fol.¹¹⁴⁰

Prodromus Copticus Kircheri de lingua Aegyptiorum. 4^{to}.¹¹⁴¹

NEHALENNIA Boxhornii. 4^{to}.¹¹⁴²

[A 4. Grammars and a polyglot dictionary]

Grammatica Finnonica D. Aeschilli Petri. 8^o.¹¹⁴³

Grammatica Lapponica MS.

Dictionarium Harmonicum Biblicum Hutteri. 4^{to}.¹¹⁴⁴

Grammatica Islandica. in 4^{to}.¹¹⁴⁵

15.2.3 B. Books not possessed by Stiernhielm

(33v, col. 2) Libri et authores huic operi utiles, quos non habeo:

¹¹³⁸ Probably the publications of medieval Swedish law codes, such as the Law of Upplandia (1607), the Law of Eastgothia (1607), the Law of Helsingia (1609), the Country Law of Christopher (1609) and the City Law of Magnus Eriksson (1618).

¹¹³⁹ Probably the older law code of Westrogothia, Cod. Holm. B 59 (Royal Library, Stockholm), on which Stiernhielm based his edition (1663) and which is published as *Äldre Västgötalagen och dess bilagor* (Skara 2011) by Per-Axel Wiktorsson.

¹¹⁴⁰ Friedrich Lindenbrog (ed.), *Codex legum antiquarum, in quo continentur Leges Wisigothorum, Edictum Theodorici Regis, Lex Burgundionum, Lex Salica, Lex Allamannorum, Lex Baivariorum, Decretum Tassilonis Ducis, Lex Ripvariorum, Lex Saxonum, Lex Angliorum, Werinorum, Frisionum, Langobardorum, Constitutiones Siculae, Capitulare Caroli M(agni) et Hlodovici imp(eratorum) etc.* Francofurti/ Frankfurt (am Main) 1613, 1342 pages, with an attached dictionary “Glossarium sive interpretatio rerum vocomque difficilium et obscuriorum, quarum mentio in Codice legum antiquarum” pp. 1343–1499.

¹¹⁴¹ Athanasius Kircher, *Prodromus coptus sive Aegyptiacus, in quo cum linguae Coptae sive Aegyptiacae, quondam pharaonicae, origo, aetas, vicissitudo, inclinatio, tum hieroglyphicae litteraturae instauratio ... exhibentur*, Romae 1636.

¹¹⁴² Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn, *Bediedinge van de tot noch toe onbekende afgodinne Nehalenni, over de dusent ende ettliche jaren onder het sandt begrafen, dan ontlanxx ontdeckt op het strandt von Walcheren in Zeelandt*, Leiden 1647; and idem, *Antwoort van Marcus Zuerius van Boxhorn, gegeven op op de Vraaghen, heem voorgesteldt over de Bediedinge van de afgodinne Nehalennia, onlanx xuytghegheuen, in welcke die ghemeine herkomste van der Gricken, Romeinen ende Duytschen Tale uet den Scythen duydelijk bewesen, ende verscheiden Odheden van dese Volckeren grondelijk ontdekt ende verklaert worden*, Leiden 1647.

¹¹⁴³ Aeschillus Olai Petraeus (1593–1657), *Linguae Finnicae brevis institutio*, Aboae/ Åbo (Turku), 1649.

¹¹⁴⁴ Elias Hutter, *Dictionarium harmonicum biblicum: Ebraeum, Graecum, Latinum Germanicum, Noribergae/ Nürnberg* 1598.

¹¹⁴⁵ Runólfur Jónsson’s Icelandic grammar: *Recentissima antiquissimae linguae Septentrionalis incunabula, id est Grammaticae Islandicae rudimenta*, Hafniae/ Copenhagen 1651. The National Library of Sweden possesses Stiernhielm’s private copy (shelfmark Acc1975/128) with his underlinings and a few marginal notes.

Lexicon Cambricum. Boxhornius habuit a Jean de Laet.¹¹⁴⁶
 Lexicon Ibericum Romae impressum.¹¹⁴⁷ Golius habet.¹¹⁴⁸
 Teutonista Gerardi van Schueren, Coloniae edit. 1477.¹¹⁴⁹ Jacobus
 Revius theologus habet.¹¹⁵⁰
 Scaliger de Phrygum antiquitate.¹¹⁵¹
 I. Buraei Tabulae Runicae¹¹⁵² et cippi sepulchrales Runici.¹¹⁵³
 Proverbia Frisica.
 Dictionarium Herlovianum.¹¹⁵⁴
 Bedae Historia Ecclesiastica veteri lingua Anglo-Saxonica. Item
 leges Alfredi.¹¹⁵⁵
 [Lexicon philosophicum Goclenii.]¹¹⁵⁶
 Reinerus Reineccius de Mysorum origine.¹¹⁵⁷
 Lipsii Syntagma de Vesta.¹¹⁵⁸

¹¹⁴⁶ Lexicon ... de Laet] John Davies' Welsh–Latin dictionary in *Antiquae Linguae Britannicae, nunc vulgo dictae Cambro-Britannicae, a suis Cymraecae vel Cambricae, ab aliis Wallicae, et linguae Latinae dictionarium duplex; prius, Britannico-Latinum [...] Posterius, Latino-Britannicum*, Londini/ London 1632. This item has been crossed out in the manuscript, which probably implies that Stiernhielm acquired it later.

¹¹⁴⁷ This item ought to be identified with *Alphabetum Ibericum sive Georgianum*, with the subtitle *cum oratione Dominicali, salutatione angelica, symbolo fidei, praeceptis Decalogi, ecclesiae sacramentis et operibus misericordiae Latina et Iberica lingua compositis et caractere Georgiano impressis*, Romae/ Roma 1629.

¹¹⁴⁸ Golius is to be identified with Jacob Golius, a famous professor of Arabic and mathematics at the University of Leiden from 1625 to 1667, mainly known as the author of an Arabic–Latin dictionary (*Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, Leiden 1653).

¹¹⁴⁹ *Vocabularius qui intitulatur Teuthonista* 1477 by the German official Gert van der Schuren (1411–1497). It was republished in the early 19th century.

¹¹⁵⁰ Jacobus Revius (1586–1658) was professor of theology in Leiden from 1641 and director of the State College of theology. He was also a poet and anti-Cartesian.

¹¹⁵¹ According to Laevius Torrent (Bishop of Antwerp) Joseph Justus Scaliger prepared a treatise on the antiquity of the Phrygians: “Interim quae de Phrygum antiquitate parat Scaliger expectabimus, opus haud dubie tam illustri ingenio dignum.” See Torrent’s preface to Goropius Becanus’ *Hermathena, Opera hactenus in lucem non edita*, Antverpiae 1580, p. 12.

¹¹⁵² Johannes Bureus, *Monumenta Sveo-Gothica hactenus exsculpta*, 1624.

¹¹⁵³ Johannes Bureus, *Monumenta Runica aenea*, engravings of runic inscriptions completed 1647–1652, but unpublished. See, further, under Section 15.2.7 below.

¹¹⁵⁴ Paul Jensen Kolding’s Danish–Latin dictionary, *Dictionarium Herlovianum, desumptum ex etymologico Latino*, Havniae / Copenhagen 1626.

¹¹⁵⁵ *Historiae ecclesiasticae gentis Anglorum libri V [...] Quibus accesserunt Anglo-Saxonicae leges Cantabrigiae*/ Cambridge 1643.

¹¹⁵⁶ Lexicon philosophicum Goclenii] This item, which has been crossed out in the ms., is Rudolph Goclenius’ *Lexicon philosophicum, quo tanquam clave philosophiae fores aperiuntur*, Francofurti/ Frankfurt (am Main) 1613.

¹¹⁵⁷ Reinerus Reineccius, probably “De Misenorum origine” in Georg Fabricius (ed.), *Rerum Misnicarum libri VII*, Jena 1597.

15.2.4 C. Other books possessed by Stiernhielm

The list of Bible translations does probably not belong to the previous heading, but are book in Stiernhielm's possession. Since he possessed an edition of the Hebrew Bible from 1635 and had access to the Swedish Bible in the 1618 edition as a gift to his wife in 1634, the list below ought to refer to items he already possessed.

Biblia Hebraica,¹¹⁵⁹ Chaldaica, Syriaca, Graeca, Latina, Italica, Gallica, Germanica, Danica, Polonica,¹¹⁶⁰ Bohemica.

Biblia Suethica.¹¹⁶¹

Biblia Finnonica.¹¹⁶²

Biblia Anglica. Biblia Islandica.

Evangelia Lithuanica.

Evangelia Lettica seu Churlandica.

Evangelia Esthonica.

Novum Testamentum Ungaricum.

Et hos habeo:

Minshaei Lexicon etymologicum linguae Anglicae in fol. regal.¹¹⁶³

Bibliandri de ratione communi omnium linguarum. in 4^{to}.¹¹⁶⁴

¹¹⁵⁸ Justus Lipsius, *De Vesta et vestalibus syntagma*, Antverpiae/ Antwerp 1603.

¹¹⁵⁹ Stiernhielm possessed the edition by Manasseh ben Israel (ed), *Biblia Hebraica elegantii characterē impressa. Editio nova. Ex accuratissima recensione doctissimi ac celeberrimi Hebraei Menasseh Ben Israel*, Amsteldami/ Amsterdam 1635. Stiernhielm's copy with his signature (Nunc Georgii Stiernhielmii Anno 1641) survives at Uppsala University Library (UUB).

¹¹⁶⁰ Polonica] This word has been crossed out in the ms.

¹¹⁶¹ *Biblia thet är all then helgha scrifft på swensko. effter förre bibliens text, oförandrat*, Stockholm 1618. This is a revised edition of Gustav Vasa's Bible by Johannes Rudbeckius and others. This copy, which was the Stiernhielm family Bible, is today preserved at Uppsala University Library under shelfmark "Sv. Rar. st. fol. 10:98".

¹¹⁶² Probably Guðbrandur Þorláksson's Icelandic Bible translation (Hólar 1584), see books listed in Section 15.2.2, category A 2 above.

¹¹⁶³ John Minsheu, Ἡγεμὼν εἰς τὰς γλῶσσας, *id est, Ductor in linguas / The guide into the tongues, cum illarum harmonia et etymologiis, originationibus, rationibus et derivationibus in omnibus his undecim linguis, viz. 1. Anglica. 2. Cambro-Britanica. 3. Belgica. 4. Germanica. 5. Gallica. 6. Italica. 7. Hispanica. 8. Lusitanica seu Portugallica. 9. Latina. 10. Graeca. 11. Hebraea. = The guide into the tongues with their agreement and consent one with another, as also their etymologies, that is, the reasons and derivations of all or the most part of wordes, in these eleven languages, viz. 1. English. 2. British or Welsh. 3. Low Dutch. 4. High Dutch. 5. French. 6. Italian. 7. Spanish. 8. Portuguez. 9. Latine. 10. Greeke. 11. Hebrew.* London 1617.

¹¹⁶⁴ Theodor Bibliander, *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum commentarius*, Tiguri/ Zürich 1548. Stiernhielm's annotated copy is extant at UUB.

Harmonia 4 linguarum Hebr. Germ. Lat. Graec. Georgii Cruciger.¹¹⁶⁵
Hellenistica Salmasii.¹¹⁶⁶
Merici Casauboni de lingua Hebraica et Saxonica seu Anglica veteri
etc.¹¹⁶⁷
Liberti Aliquonii de Danicae linguae cum Graeca mistione diatribe.
in 8^o.¹¹⁶⁸
Origines dictionum Germanicarum M. Andreae Helvigii in 8^o.¹¹⁶⁹
Francisci Junii Observationes ad Willeram. 8^o.¹¹⁷⁰
Grammatica Islandica.¹¹⁷¹
Boxhornii Origines Gallicae et Dictionarium Cambricum.¹¹⁷²

15.2.5 D. Books desired and proposed for acquisition

Desidero: Antiquae linguae Britannicae, nunc vulgo Cambro-Britannicae etc. Dictionarium duplex etc. Londini 1632.¹¹⁷³
Isaacii Pontani Glossarium Prisco-Gallicum¹¹⁷⁴ citatum a Voss. p. 282.

¹¹⁶⁵ Georg Cruciger, *Harmonia linguarum quatuor cardinalium Hebraicae, Graecae, Latinae et Germanicae, in qua praeter summum earum consensum acceptionumque propriarum, perpetua unius ab altera, origo perspicue deducitur*, Francofurti/ Frankfurt (am Main) 1616.

¹¹⁶⁶ Claudius Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius controversiam de lingua Hellenistica decedens et plenissime pertractans originem et dialectos Graecae linguae*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden 1643.

¹¹⁶⁷ Meric(us) Casaubon(us), *De quatuor linguis commentationis pars prior, quae de lingua Hebraica et de lingua Saxonica*, Londini/ London 1650 (in 12mo).

¹¹⁶⁸ Bertel Knudsen Nordrup, who Latinized his name as Cornelius Aquilonius, but also called himself Libertius Aliquonius, *De Danicae linguae cum Graeca mistione diatribe*, Portuae/ Copenhagen 1640.

¹¹⁶⁹ Andreas Helvigi, *Etymologiae sive origines dictionum Germanicarum ex tribus illis nobilibus antiquitatis eruditae linguis Latina, Graeca, Hebraea derivatarum*, Francofurti/ Frankfurt (am Main) 1611.

¹¹⁷⁰ Franciscus Junius, *Observationes in Willerami Abbatis Francicam paraphrasin Cantici Canticorum*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam 1655.

¹¹⁷¹ Likely: Runólfur Jónsson, *Recentissima antiquissimae linguae Septentrionalis incunabula, id est Grammaticae Islandicae rudimenta*, Hafniae/ Copenhagen 1651.

¹¹⁷² Marcus Zuerius Boxhornius, *Originum Gallicarum liber, in quo veteris et nobilissimae Gallorum gentis origines, antiquitates, mores, lingua et alia eruuntur et illustrantur. Cui accedit antiquae linguae Britannicae lexicon Britannico-Latinum cum adiectis et insertis eiusdem authoris Adagiis Britannicis sapientiae veterum Druidum reliquiis et aliis antiquitatis Britannicae Gallicaeque nonnullis monumentis*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam 1654.

¹¹⁷³ John Davies and Thomas Williams, *Antiquae linguae Britannicae, nunc vulgo dictae Cambro-Britannicae, a suis Cymraecae vel Cambricae, ab aliis Wallicae, et linguae Latinae, dictionarium duplex. Prius Britannico-Latinum plurimis venerandae antiquitatis Britannicae monumentis respersum; posterius, Latino-Britannicum*, Londini/ London 1632.

¹¹⁷⁴ Johannes Isaacus Pontanus, *Glossarium prisco-gallicum, sine loco, sine anno*.

15.2.6 E. Books probably in Stiernhielm's possession

Habeo: Institutiones religionis Catholicae lingua Timuquana.¹¹⁷⁵ in
8^o. Indic. Oriental.

Institutiones Cathecheticae lingua Iberica seu Hibernica.¹¹⁷⁶

Grammatica	{ ¹¹⁷⁷	Anglica	Hebraea	} ¹¹⁷⁸	variorum authorum
		Hispanica	Graeca		
		Italica	Chaldaica		
		Gallica	Syriaca		
		Germ.	Latina		
		Polonica	Lettica		
		Finnonica	Estonica		
		Laponica			
		Islandica			

Remaines concerning Brittain. 4^{to}.¹¹⁷⁹

15.2.7 F. Recent acquisition of new books

(fol. 34r) Addo libris:

Joh. Burei Tabulam Runicam.¹¹⁸⁰

Eiusdemque librum Alphabeticum Runicum. 8^o.¹¹⁸¹

Eiusdemque Cippi sepulchrales Runici.¹¹⁸²

Olai Wormii Monumenta Danica. fol.¹¹⁸³

¹¹⁷⁵ Most likely: Francisco de Pareja, *Catechismo y examen para los que comulgan en lengua castellana y timuquana*, en Mexico/ Mexico City 1628.

¹¹⁷⁶ Perhaps Theobald Stapleton's *Catechismus, seu doctrina Christiana, Latino-Hibernica, per modum dialogi inter magistrum et discipulum*, Bruxellis 1639.

¹¹⁷⁷ In the ms. there is a curved line from *Anglica* to *Islandica*. See Figure 15.

¹¹⁷⁸ In the ms. there is a curved line from *Hebraea* to *Estonica*. See Figure 15.

¹¹⁷⁹ William Camden (1551–1623), *Remaines concerning Brittain, but especially England, and the inhabitants thereof. Their languages, names, surname, allusions, anagrammes, armories, monies, empreses, apparell, artillerie, wise speeches proverbs, poesies, epitaphes*, London 1623 or a later edition (1629, 1637 or 1657). This treatise was originally published as *Remaines of a greater worke concerning Britaine*, London 1605.

¹¹⁸⁰ Johannes Bureus, *Runakenslones lerespan*, 1599. That is, “Rudiments of Runic knowledge”, a table which is a copperplate engraving by Bureus himself.

¹¹⁸¹ Johannes Bureus, *Runa: ABC-boken*, Uppsala 1611, reprinted in 1624.

¹¹⁸² Johannes Bureus, his *Monumenta Sveo-Gothica hactenus exsculpta*, sine loco, 1624, or his printed, but unpublished, collection of engravings of Swedish Runes *Monumenta Runica aenea*, 1647–52, with depictions and textual interpretations. The latter work survives in six copies, of which the most extensive is preserved in Royal Library, Stockholm, and two others at Uppsala University Library.

¹¹⁸³ Ole Worm, *Danicorum monumentorum libri sex, e spissis antiquitatum tenebris et in Dania et Norvegia exstantibus rudibus eruti*, Hafniae/ Copenhagen 1643. It contains 139 runic inscriptions (of which 59 are from Norvegia, 29 from Scania

Eiusdem Fasti Danici. fol.¹¹⁸⁴
 Fasti Suetlici MS. 4^{to}.¹¹⁸⁵
 Norsk Hird-skraa 8^o.¹¹⁸⁶
 Norsk Glosebog. 8^o.¹¹⁸⁷
 Dictionarium Latino-Danicum Stephani. 8^o.¹¹⁸⁸
 Lexicon iuris Suio-Gothici Loccenii. 12^o.¹¹⁸⁹
 Glossarium Islandico-Danicum.¹¹⁹⁰ 4^{to}.
 Catechesis Finnonica literis Russicis.¹¹⁹¹
 De literis earundemque potestate et pronunciatione. Ioh. Mallincrot.
 4^{to}.¹¹⁹²
 Historia Haymonis, cui accedunt Rudimenta religionis Christianae
 vetustissima Alemannorum et Saxonum lingua conscripta.
 Boxhornii. 12^o.¹¹⁹³
 Leges antiquis linguis scriptae Svecorum et Gothorum: Uplandicae,
 Ostrogothicae, Helsingicae.¹¹⁹⁴ Item: Fragmenta legum
 Westrogothorum.

and four from Gotlandia). Stiernhielm's copy is preserved at Göteborgs University Library, Snoilskysamlingen (shelfmark G RAR-saml. 4:o 88.)

¹¹⁸⁴ Ole Worm, *Fasti Danici universam tempora computandi rationem antiquitus in Dania et vicinis regionibus observatam libris tribus exhibentes*, Hafniae 1643.

¹¹⁸⁵ Fasti Suetlici] Probably chronicles in rhymed prose, so-called "rim-krönikor" on the actions of Swedish kings in the High and Late Middle Ages.

¹¹⁸⁶ *Den norske Hirdskraa eller Gaards ræt ... udset aff gammel Norske paa Danske*, edited by Arild Hvitfeldt (1546–1609), Kiøbenhaffn/ Copenhagen 1594.

¹¹⁸⁷ Christen Jenson, *Den norske dictionarium eller Glosebog*, Copenhagen 1646.

¹¹⁸⁸ Stephan Hansen Stephanius (1599–1650), *Nomenclatoris Latinodanici libri IV, omnium rerum appellationes una cum selectis loquendi formulis complectentes, in usum scholarum Daniae et Norvegiae conscripti*, Hafniae/ Copenhagen 1634.

¹¹⁸⁹ Johannes Loccenius (1598–1677), *Lexicon iuris Sveo-Gothici, quanta fieri potuit industria collectum et concinnatum*, Holmiae/ Stockholm 1651.

¹¹⁹⁰ Glossarium Islandico-Danicum] I have not identified this item. Stiernhielm first wrote: *Termini legum Danic. Iuthicarum explicati Danice*, which has been crossed out.

¹¹⁹¹ Martin Luther's Small Catechism in Finnish, printed in the Cyrillic script: *Katechismus eli se christilinen oppi meiden uskom päe kappalegista nuorel ia yxikertaisel kansal sangen tarpelinen. Prentety somenkelen*, Stukkolmis/ Stockholm (Peter van Selow) 1644.

¹¹⁹² I have not been able to identify any treatise with this title and author name. Berhard von Mallinckrodt (Latinized Berhardus a Mallinkrot) is the author of *De ortu et progressu artis typographicae dissertatio historica*, Coloniae Agrippinae/ Cologne (Köln) 1640.

¹¹⁹³ Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn (editor), *Haymonis Haberstatensis episcopi historiae ecclesiasticae, script. circa Anno Domini. DCCC. Accedunt prima religionis Christianae rudimenta, vetustissima Alemannorum et Saxonum lingua scripta*, Lugduni Batavorum / Leiden 1650.

¹¹⁹⁴ The provincial laws of Upplandia, Eastgothia and Helsingia were published by Johannes Bureus: *Uplandz laghen*, Stockholm 1607; *Östgötha laghen*, Stockholm 1607; and *Hälsinge laghen*, Stockholm 1609.

Codex legum antiquorum Wisigothorum etc. cum Glossario vocum antiquarum Gothicarum, Saxonicarum, Francicarum etc. Lindenbrogii. fol.¹¹⁹⁵

Leges antiquae Anglo-Saxonicae. Alfredi Regis etc. apud Bedae Hist. Ecclesiastic. fol.¹¹⁹⁶

Leges antiquae Scotthiae. fol.

Leges antiquae Frisiorum 4^{to}. Siccarnae.¹¹⁹⁷

Leges Norwegicae ex Archivo.

Leges Islandicae MS. 12^o

Leges Iuthicae. Leges Scanicae.¹¹⁹⁸

15.3 List of books sent to Bengt Skytte in 1657

15.3.1 Preliminaries

Source: Runa Suethica, F.d. 5, fol. 1r–1v.

Contents: On the front page of this volume, Stiernhielm catalogues dictionaries, treatises and manuscripts of his own that he sent to Bengt Skytte with the latter's librarian Hans Hansson. Most of the printed books coincide with those catalogued above.

Dating: Stiernhielm himself dates the first shipment to 12 January 1657 (the first twelve books). The second and third shipments took place on 1 and 10 February 1657. The first sentence means: "The books listed below have been sent to Stockholm to Mr. Bengt Skytte at his request with his librarian Hans Hansson."

15.3.2 Text

Dhessa underskrifne böcker sändes till Hr. Bängt Skytte till Stokholm effter hans begäran medh hans bokhållare Hans Hansson:

(fol. 1r) Dictionarium Armeno-Latinum. Item manuscriptum literis Latinis 4.¹¹⁹⁹

¹¹⁹⁵ Friedrich Lindenbrog (ed.), *Codex legum antiquarum*, Francofurti 1613, 1342 pages, with the attached dictionary "Glossarium sive interpretatio" pp. 1343–1499.

¹¹⁹⁶ *Historiae ecclesiasticae gentis Anglorum libri V [...] Quibus accesserunt Anglo-Saxonicae leges* Cantabrigiae/ Cambridge 1643.

¹¹⁹⁷ Sibrandus Siccarna, *Lex Frisionum sive antiquae Frisiorum leges* (edited with explanatory notes), Franekerae/ Franeker 1617.

¹¹⁹⁸ Probably manuscripts of the Law of Scania in the Royal Archives, perhaps Cod. Holm B 89. Cf. Cod. Holm B 69 and B 88. According to Carl Ivar Ståhle (1951: 67), Stiernhielm also used Arnold Hvitfeldt publication of Archbishop Anders Sunesen's Latin paraphrase, *Leges provinciales Scaniae ante annos 400 latinae redditae per Andream Sunonis*, Hafniae/ Copenhagen 1590.

¹¹⁹⁹ The printed Armenian dictionary is Francisco Rivola's *Dictionarium Armeno-Latinum* (Paris 1633). The manuscript Armenian dictionary is probably the volume that is preserved as ms. F.d. 22, Royal Library, Stockholm. It was a gift to Stiernhielm from Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn.

Athanasii Kircheri Prodigium Coptus sive Aegyptiacus. 4.
 Harmonia linguarum cardinalium Georgii Crucigeri. Fol.
 Thresor de l'histoire des langues de c'est universe. 4.
 Antword van Marcus Zuerius van Bockshorn gegeven op de
 Vraaghen van de afgodinne Nehalennia. 4.
 Dictionarium Norrenum ex Damascaeni Barlaamque, ad K. 4.
 Dictionarium Norrenum ex Damascaeni Barlaam, ad K usque ad
 finem. 4.
 Evangelia Littuanica.
 Dictionarium della lingua Italiana Turchesca. 8.¹²⁰⁰
 Parte del Catechismo en lengua Timuquana y et Castellana. 8.
 Mithridates Gesneri. 8.
 Vocabularium Latino-Suethico-Finnonicum. 8.
 Datum Maarby, d. 12. Januarii anno 1657.

MS. G. Stiernhielmii Adelruna Sueogothicum
 MS. Miscellanea etymologica. G. Stiernhielmii. sammanbunden.
 Megiserus, missus 1 Febr. 1657.
 Martinii Lexicon etymologicum¹²⁰¹ in fol. missum 10 Febr. eodem
 anno.
(fol. 1v) Thusci. Tyskar. Lubinus in sepulchro Remi.
 Hotoman, Observationes, lib. 13, cap. 15.

¹²⁰⁰ Giovanni Molino, *Dittionario della lingua italiana-turchesca con l'indice delli vocabuli Turcheschi e brevi rudimenti di detta lingua*, Roma 1641. This book has been republished with introduction and commentaries by Elżbieta Świącicka (ed.), *Dictionary of Italian-Turkish language (1641) by Giovanni Molino: transcribed, reversed and annotated*, Berlin (de Gruyter) 2020 (Studien zur Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der Turkvölker, Band 23).

¹²⁰¹ Matthias Martini, *Lexicon philologicum praecipue etymologicum; in quo Latinae et a Latinis auctoribus usurpatae tum purae, tum barbarae voces ex originibus declarantur* [...], Bremae/ Bremen 1623.

PART 4. PROGRAMME FOR LANGUAGE RENEWAL AND PURITY

16. Statements for the renewal of Swedish

16.1 *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*: preface

Source: *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, Stockholm 1643, the preface to the benevolent reader (“Til min gustige läsare”), where Stiernhielm proposes a programme for Swedish language renewal. The inside of the titlepage, where the Latin title of this dictionary is given together with a list of sources, is reproduced in Figure 16a.

At the beginning (p. 2r), Stiernhielm complains about mistaken moral and aesthetic judgements, without expressly referring them to language, though this seems to be what he primarily is aiming at. He also expresses regrets about the scarcity of research on ethnic origins in general. After this, he comes to the main object of criticism – the lack of cultivation of the vernacular, especially Swedish. He declares:

(2v) Wij talom, wij skrifwom och wete icke hwad. Wetom intet hwad mål wij talom, om dät är vårt eller annars. Hållom och för fåfängia fråga däreffter och lee åt om någon däropå wil läggia någon tancka.¹²⁰²

“We speak, we write and we do not know what. We do not know the language we speak, whether it is ours or whether it belongs to other people. We hold it as vanity to enquire into it and laugh if anyone wants to apply any thought thereupon.”

After reflecting on the nature of speech and writing as a divine gift and miracle (Vol. 1, Section 9.2.3.1), Stiernhielm argues that “the Swedish language of our dear fatherland” is worth cultivating as much as French and Italian. However, it is dishonoured and despised by the native Swedes themselves, allegedly “because of its plainness and poverty”,¹²⁰³ at the same time as French, Spanish and Italian are admired “as they are rich in many words and lexical properties, splendid in ornamentation, gleaming in beauty and flowing with sugar and sweetness.”¹²⁰⁴ Stiernhielm compares these qualities with

¹²⁰² Stiernhielm, *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, prteface, p. 2r.

¹²⁰³ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, p. 3v: “för dess släthet och fattigdom skull”.

¹²⁰⁴ Stiernhielm, *ibidem* p. 3v: “lika som rijke aff myckla ord och orda-ägendomar, härlige aff prång, glimmande aff fagerlek och flödande aff sucker och sötma.”

what he conceives as the greater age and purity of Swedish. In doing so, he represents Swedish as an old reputable mistress: “How did it happen, how did it come about that you honest, old, unblemished Gothic matron, who has made all these young ladies rich, yourself have become so poor?”¹²⁰⁵ In the preface, Stiernhielm replies in general that the Swedes have forgotten the lexical richness of their old native language.

In this personification of languages as ladies there are parallels to Stiernhielm’s poem *Hercules*. In it Stiernhielm represents Virtue as a lady “clean in her dress, white as snow, of silver-shining clothing, simple, correct and pure, according to the old honest manner.”¹²⁰⁶ In contrast, Desire is described as a lady wearing “a multicoloured dress, gleaming in pearls and gold, and sparkling in precious stones, beautiful in her face, but (as it appeared) made up and painted.”¹²⁰⁷ Stiernhielm also depicts them as speaking differently to the hero at the crossroad. Lady Virtue uses “serious words” that abound in archaisms, while Lady Desire addresses Hercules “with a sweet speech”.

Stiernhielm argues that it does not befit a venerable matron to dress herself “now with one, now with another torn, fringed, ruffled and gold-rimmed fashionable garment.”¹²⁰⁸ Therefore, it is necessary to restore her honest apparel from her ancient storehouse (*fatebur*).¹²⁰⁹ Continuing with the clothing-language metaphor he goes on to describe his method of language renewal. The surviving clothes in the storehouse are of varying quality, so the clothes must be re-knitted, remade and altered to restore the once rich and splendid dress. He states:

(4r) Därruthi iagh hafwer funnet mycket off-gammalt, möglot och utnött, myckit bortkastat, halfnött, myckit af gott yrke, men aff elake, nu länge sedan aflagde mönster, hwilke om det blefwe lagat och omskurit skulle kläda och skryda wäl.¹²¹⁰

¹²⁰⁵ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, p. 3v: “Ach, huru går thet så, huru kommer thet til, at du ährliche, gamble, obefläckiande Götha Matröna, som hafwer giort alle thesse unge damer rijke, nu sielfwer äst so fattigh worden?”

¹²⁰⁶ Stiernhielm, the poem *Hercules* in *Musae Suethizantes* (1668), lines 280–281.

¹²⁰⁷ Stiernhielm, *Hercules*, lines 6–8.

¹²⁰⁸ Stiernhielm, *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, preface, p. 4r: “här medh ett och ther medh annat, sönderhackat, franssat, krusat, gull-brämat *alla-modisk* plagg.”

¹²⁰⁹ The clothes-language metaphor is common in Classical rhetoric treatises, for instance Cicero, *De orat.* 1, 31, 142 *ea vestire atque ornare oratione*; Cicero, *Brutus* 95, 327 *vestitus orationis*; 75, 262 *omni ornatu orationis tamquam veste detracta*.

¹²¹⁰ Stiernhielm, *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, preface, p. 4r.

“In this storehouse I have found much that is very old, mouldy and worn out, much that is thrown away and half-worn, much of good quality but with bad, now long outdated patterns, which if they were repaired and recut would suit and become us well.”

He continues:

(4r) Ibland annat hafwer iagh och hittat ett tämmeligt förråd aff smijde, sölf och gull, gammalt starckt arbete, men bätter af stick och korn, än nu alment förarbetas. Finnas och ibland dyrbare pärlor och kosteliga ädelestenar. Hwilka alle, om de kommo i ens sinnerijk konstnårs mästerlige hand, som weet och förstår huru och hwar hwart bör sättias, skickas och stiftas, twijkar iagh intet man ju skulle komma en rijk och prydhligh skrudh till wägha igen.

“Sometimes I have also found a rather sizable store of metalwork in silver and gold, old strong work, moreover a store of knitwears and pieces of embroidery that are better than the ones commonly prepared today. There are also a store of precious pearls and valuable gemstones. If all this came into the masterly hand of an ingenious (dressmaking) artist who knows and understands how and where everything should be put, fitted and fastened, I do not doubt that rich and beautiful attire would be brought about.”

At the end of the preface, Stiernhielm expounds the contents of his programme for antiquarian and purist language renewal:

(4r) Summan på saken är denne. Jag hafwer rönt vårt Svenska tungomåls feel och fattigdom. **(4v)** Orsaken ther til hafwer iagh funnet at det gamble målet är nederlagt och kommet i förgätenheet, ja i så tiock förgätenheet at nästan ingen mehr fins som thet förstår. Thet doch är fult af allehanda märckelige betydande ord och ordasätt, hwilke alle eller mästendels kunna optagas och förnyas och så maakeliga föras i bruk igen. Hwilket icke allenast skulle göra vårt måål flödigt och rikt, uthan och ljust, fagert och prydeligt. Och thetta hafwer nu warit mitt förnämste måål och upsåt i thette werket.¹²¹¹

“To sum up, the point is as follows. I have experienced the deficiency and poverty of the Swedish language. The reason for that is that the ancient Swedish language has been forgotten and fallen into oblivion, yea into such great oblivion that there is no one who

¹²¹¹ Stiernhielm, *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, preface, pp. 4r–4v. The last page of the preface (4v) is reproduced as a photograph in Figure 16b.

understands it. Still it contains plenty of remarkable and significant words and phrases, all or most of which can be adopted again and revived and gradually re-integrated into common linguistic usage. This would not only make our language fluent and rich, but also bright, beautiful, and elegant. This is the principal aim and goal of this dictionary.”

16.2 *Baculus Carolinus*: preface

16.2.1 Preliminaries

Source: F.d. 19:d, fols. 1r–3r. The treatise *Baculus Carolinus*, that is “Carolean measuring-staf”, proposes a new more uniform system or standard for measures and weights in the Swedish realm based on the decimal system.¹²¹² It is dedicated to King Charles XI: *G. Stiernhielmi Baculus Carolinus serenissimo Regi Suethiae Carolo XI consecratus anno 1663*.

Earlier editions: Lorenzo Hammarsköld, *Georg Stjernhjelm samlade vitterhetsarbeten* (1818), pp. 285–287: “Företal till avhandlingen kallad Baculus Carolinus et Carl-stafven,” where the orthography is modernized according to 19th-century standards;¹²¹³ Per Hanselli, *Samlade vitterhetsarbeten* (1871), vol. 1, pp. 182–184; Harald Heyman, *Stiernhjelm s skrifter om mått och vikt* (1921), pp. 326–328, where the orthography of the autograph in F.d. 19:d is followed); Stig Nilsson, *Terminologi ooh nomenklatur* (1974), pp. 169–171; and Rolf Ohlson, *Från Stiernhjelm s Carl-Staf till metern* (1989), pp. 45–47.¹²¹⁴

Dating: in the dedication to the king the date is “in the year 1663”. At the bottom of the page there is a note dated 7 September 1663.

Contents: In the preface, Stiernhielm defends his choice to write about a geometrical topic not in Latin, but in Swedish, and explains his methods and programme for Swedish language renewal. The most central passages on this topic are quoted with English translation by Einar Haugen.¹²¹⁵ In his programme for replacing Latin mathematical terms with Swedish, Stiernhielm received inspiration from Johannes Kepler, who laid the basis for the German geometrical terminology in his improvement of Archimedes’ geometry (*Ausszug auss der uralten MesseKunst Archimedis*, 1616), but in his actual terminology he was

¹²¹² See the analysis of Rolf Ohlson, “Stiernhielm as metrolog och skapare av det svenska måttssystemet” in Ohlsson and Olsson, *Stiernhielm 400 år*, pp 191–195.

¹²¹³ Hammarököld, *Georg Stjernhjelm samlade vitterhetsarbeten*, Stockholm 1818, pp. 285–287.

¹²¹⁴ The entire treatise *Baculus Carolinus* is here published in the transcription from the original in F.d. 19:d made by the archivist Torgny Bondestam, see pages 41–76.

¹²¹⁵ Einar Haugen, *The Scandinavian languages: an introduction to their history*, London 1976, pp. 421–422.

apparently independent of Kepler.¹²¹⁶ Stiernhielm did not carry out the explanatory list that he promised at the end of his preface. For that reason his geometrical terminology did not have any impact, all the more so as Åke Rålamb (1651–1718) returned to the international Latin terminology.¹²¹⁷

16.2.2 Stiernhielm's key statements on language renewal

Following Cicero's reasoning in *De Finibus malorum et bonorum* (III 4–5)¹²¹⁸ Stiernhielm in the first part of his preface maintains that there are technical terms for designating the tools proper to every practical trade (such as painters, carpenters, smiths, carvers, weavers, tailors and shoemakers) and to the arts of grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, mathematics, music, geometry, statistics and architecture. Since the technical terms of geometry are in Latin (with many naturalized Greek loanwords), it would not be difficult to discuss a geometrical topic in Latin. By choosing Swedish as vehicle, he aimed to cultivate it, to prove its functionality as a scientific language, and to facilitate the understanding of the subject matter among people not educated in Latin. Regarding the first two goals and his method for achieving them, he states:

(F.d. 19:d, 2r) Men effter som dässe wetenskaper hærtildags anten litet eller intet äre blefue handlade och beskrefne i vårt Swea-måål och mig nogorledes äre kunnige dess fördolde, sinn-rijke egenskaper och bemärkelser, så hafver mig tykts sämligit wara och lända vårt ur-gamle, hærtildags obeblandade¹²¹⁹ tungomåål til prijs och effterkommandom til en synnerbar nytta och lätta, om man opfunne och i bruk satte i ställe för latin och grekeske någre swänske bequäme och af sig sielf förständlige, konst-mätige märkis-ord, huilke ehuruval the i förstone skulle endeels synas

¹²¹⁶ Wieselgren "Germanismer hos Stiernhielm", *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, vol. 77 (1962), p. 213.

¹²¹⁷ Harald J. Heyman, *Stiernhielms skrifttyper om mått och vikt*, Uppsala 1921, p. 321, quoted by Stig Nilsson, *Terminologi och nomenklatur: studier över begrepp och deras uttryck i matematik, naturvetenskap och teknik. I*, Lund 1974, pp. 156, at the end of chapter 6: "Georg Stiernhielms matematiska terminologi på svenska."

¹²¹⁸ In *De finibus* III, 4 Cicero refers to the terminology of dialecticians, physicians, geometricians, musicians, grammarians and rhetoricians. Stig Nilsson, *Terminologi och nomenklatur*, Lund 1974, p. 172, calls attention to Cicero's *De finibus* as the source of inspiration.

¹²¹⁹ [obeblandade] Stiernhielm first wrote *oförblandade* and then changed it to the word in question by crossing out *-för-* and adding *be* above the line.

sälsame och orijmlige, lijkväl framleds småningom och oförmärkt med tiden skulle vinna genom häfd sin ojäflige bördsrätt.¹²²⁰

“But as these arts and sciences so far have been treated and described in our Swedish language either to a little extent or not at all, and as their hidden and ingenious qualities and significance are somewhat known to me, I have considered it suitable and commendable to our exceedingly ancient and until now unmixed language, and very useful and helpful for posterity, if instead of Latin and Greek one were to invent and put to use some Swedish technical terms that are convenient, understandable in themselves and artful. Though at first they would appear to be somewhat strange and unreasonable, they would nonetheless through usage gradually and imperceptibly in the future claim their uncontested birthright.”

Stiernhielm made use of loan translation as his primary means to invent geometrical terms in Swedish. In so doing, he says that he follows the principle and audacity of Cicero with express reference to the latter’s rendering of *analogia* as *proportio* (Cicero, *Timaeus*, 4).¹²²¹ He argues that Cicero’s exhortation *audendum est*, “one has to dare”, is his example.¹²²²

In creating a Swedish geometrical terminology Stiernhielm only advocated a moderate purism, since he argues that naturalized Latin words should not be eliminated: “They have long been acknowledged as Swedish, endowed with citizenship and adopted as native”.¹²²³ Cicero’s, Harsdörffer’s and Schottelius’ views served as a model.¹²²⁴ Stiernhielm exemplifies this kind of Latin loanwords by *natur*, *form*, *flor*, *pur*, *just*, *materia*, *figur*, *tractat*, *habit*, *intent*, *sentens*, *summa*, *action*, *passion*, *process*. He also refers to French and Italian

¹²²⁰ Stiernhielm, *Baculus Carolinus*, preface, ms. F.d. 19:4, fol. 2r.

¹²²¹ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, fols. 2r–2v.

¹²²² Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, fol. 2v: “Thetta Ciceronis Audendum est, man måste våga, tager iag migh til efterdöme.”

¹²²³ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, fol. 2v. “som länge sedan äre för svenske gode erkände, med borgerlig tätt begåfvade och som infödde antagne och privilegerade wordne.” Cf. Telemann, *Ära, rikedom och reda*, Copenhagen 2002, p. 45.

¹²²⁴ According to Cicero, Greek loanwords in Latin (e.g., *philosophia*, *grammatica*, *dialectica*, *rhetorica*, *geometria* and *musica*) that have been established by usage and are easily understood should be retained, though they could be expressed in Latin by Latin morphemes (*De finibus* III, 5). Harsdörffer and Schottelius defend the use of loanwords – “Bastardworte” – that lack equivalents in German or are difficult to imitate by the coinage of new words or have been used as long that they are understood by everyone. See Stig Nilsson, *Terminologi och nomenklatur*, Lund 1974, p. 172, where he quotes Gunhild Bergh, *Litterär kritik i Sverige under 1600- och 1700-talet*, Stockholm 1916, p. 10.

loanwords, such as “maner, nett, scars, passera”. However, faithful to his general language purism he admits that “we should not make a show of foreign words, when we possess equally good ones ourselves.”¹²²⁵ In his drafts on a Swedish linguistic and philosophical terminology, he proposes equivalents of some words that he regards as naturalized above (*natura, forma, materia, habitus, sententia* and *actio*).¹²²⁶

In his preface to *Baculus Carolinus*, Stiernhielm moreover turns out to be a moderate linguistic purist, insofar as he proposed German as a source of Swedish neologisms, certainly both in form and sense. He justifies this method of language renewal by the close relationship between German and Swedish, which he describes as “sisters that originate from one very ancient, primordial Japhetic Scythian mother.”¹²²⁷ He goes on arguing that they do not differ in their descent, though they may seem to be somewhat different in their external form and dialect (*bonad och mun-lagh*).¹²²⁸ For this reason German words may be borrowed or adapted:

(F.d. 19, 2v) Kunne därföre otalige många tyska ord uptagas, därmed vårt tungomål at rikta och bepryda, allenast at the blifua lämpade och lagade till vårt måals wijs och muns-art.¹²²⁹

“Therefore a countless number of German words can be taken up to enrich and embellish our language, provided that they only are adjusted and adapted to the manner and particularity of our language.”

Stiernhielm himself employed this method in his Swedish poetry.¹²³⁰

At the end of the preface, Stiernhielm emphasizes that his intended readership is not Latin scholars, but soldiers and unlearned people, whom he hopes will be able to grasp and learn these arts and

¹²²⁵ Stiernhielm, *Baculus Carolinus*, ms. F.d. 19:4, fol. 2v: “Ändock jag intet skall gerna pråla med eens annars, om iag äger så godt sielf.”

¹²²⁶ See Sections 17.2 and 17.3 below. As regards the Swedish loanword *sentens*, Stiernhielm in a list of philosophical terms in Swedish and Latin (not edited below) proposes the following substitutes: *minnesord, lär-språk, klook-tal* and *wijs-ord*. See F.d. 9**, fol. 96r (p. 141 in the pagination of the manuscript).

¹²²⁷ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, fol. 2v: “så är thesse bägge språken, tyska och swenska, två fullbördige systrar af een moder, den ur-ålde förste Japhetiske Skythiske moderen födde.” Stiernhielm first wrote *Europeiske* instead of *Japhetiske*.

¹²²⁸ [bonad och mun-lagh] In the margin, these words are explained by their Latin equivalents, *habitus, ornatus*, and *idioma*.

¹²²⁹ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, fol. 2v.

¹²³⁰ Per Wieselgren, “Germanismer hos Stiernhielm”, *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, vol. 77 (1962), pp. 198–213.

sciences with only their mother tongue as quickly as “an old academic thoroughly steeped in Latin”.¹²³¹

16.3 *Wäst-Götha lagbok*: preface

Stiernhielm studied the old law codes of northern Europe and edited the oldest Swedish code: *Äldre Västgötalagen*, “the Older Law of Westrogothia. His edition is titled *Väst-Götha Laghbok* (Stockholm 1663). He based it on a parchment manuscript, Cod. Holm. B 59 (Royal Library, Stockholm) and also took some parts of the Younger Law of Westrogothia into consideration (those parts that are found in Cod. Holm. B 6). In the preface he underscores that he considers the primary value of this law to be twofold: as evidence of the great antiquity of the Gothic jurisdiction and as linguistic sample of an older stage of Swedish. On the first page of the preface he states:

Orsaken hwarföre Wästgötha lagen nu af trycket utgår / är egentligen thenne at man hafwer funnit henne wara et af vårt Fäderneslands och tungomåls äldste och ädlste klenodier. At hon är urgammal / betygar målet och ordalaget: hwilket i anseende til vårt Tungomål som nu öfligt är / i mång rum inthet skal synas wara thet samme wij nu kalla Swea- eller Götha-måål.¹²³²

“The reason why the law of Westrogothia is being published now is actually that it has been found to be one of the most ancient and precious treasures of our fatherland and language. The fact that this code is extremely old is exhibited by the language and formulations. In relation to the language that is in use nowadays, it will in many places not appear the same as what we now call Swedish and Gothic.”

Stiernhielm argues that the Westrogothic laws dates back to the time of the oldest known chief judge of Westrogothia, by name Lumber, who he thinks lived before Christianity was introduced into the country (“i hednom tima”) and who greatly contributed to this law so that it was called Lumber’s law (“Lumbs-lag”).¹²³³ He also contends that the ancient Ostro- and Westrogothic laws served as the pattern of the Visigothic Laws in Spain and Lombard Laws in Italy.¹²³⁴ He then turns to the linguistic value of the document in question:

¹²³¹ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, 3r: “som en gammal uti latin genom-kokad Academicus”.

¹²³² Stiernhielm (ed.), *Wäst-Götha Laghbok* [...] *uthaff ett offgammalt MS.to som fins in Archivo Regni utskrifwin och i wisse balkar, flockar och §§ sammanfattat av Georg Stiernhielm*, Stockholm 1663, preface, p. 1.

¹²³³ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, p. 1.

¹²³⁴ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, p. 1.

Thetta länge i mörkret fördolde och nu snart förmurknade forne
 tjdens pryde [...] är wärdt at komma i werldennes känsl och
 kunskap i synnerhet för sin styls och ordlämpas arts / och
 underlige Laconiske korthets skul tillijka / och riksinnige
 begreps skul / ther uthi thenne Lagen synes wara icke annat än
 som itt sambund af snälle eftertänklige ord / och ord-kynde och en
 summa / såsom i tyske tungomålet Otfridus, Willeram och andre
 slijke gamble skriffter til språksens gamble kundskap och
 förnyande: så bör och thenne vår Västgöthlagh hoos oss / för
 bem:¹²³⁵ orsaker skuld / hållas som ett klenod i prijs och tilbörigit
 wärde.¹²³⁵

“This jewel of ancient times, long hidden in the dark and
 nearby decayed [...], deserves to come into the awareness and
 knowledge of the world in particular because of its style, its
 lexical appropriateness, its wonderful Laconic conciseness and its
 copious notions that in this law appears like nothing other than a
 series of decent, thoughtful words and formulations and like a
 summary, as in the German language the writings of Otfrid and
 Williram¹²³⁶ and other such writings are to the knowledge and
 renewal of the old language. In the similar way, for the above-
 mentioned reasons this law of Westrogothia ought as a gem to be
 held in esteem and due value.”

¹²³⁵ Stiernhielm, *ibidem*, p. 1 (lines 15–5 from the bottom of the page).

¹²³⁶ [Otfrid and Williram] The monk Otfrid of Weissenburg translated the Gospels into Old High German in the 9th century. The Benedictine abbot Williram of Ebergsberg (–1085) wrote a commentary on the Song of Songs in his vernacular, Old High German.

17. Swedish counterparts of Latin technical terms

17.1 List of grammatical and rhetorical terms

17.1.1 Dating

Source: F.d. 9:8, fols. 4v–5r. Size: 215 x 330 mm. Dating: likely in the first half of 1651, since Stiernhielm's memorandum for requests to the Swedish Government is contained on a loose folio in the same folder (F.d. 9:8, 22r. Cf. Vol. 1, Section 2.4.4). The titles of some set phrases of variation in this text and the listing of the same categories as in the circle diagram of the treatise *Coelum Musarum seu Proteus rhetoricus* makes a dating to the first half of 1651 probable.

17.1.2 Contents

Stiernhielm proposes Swedish linguistic terms as counterparts of the Latin ones. He was not the first one. Bureus had attempted the same for the main terms of grammar.¹²³⁷ Later, the German grammarian Justus Georg Schottelius (1612–1676) was to create a German linguistic terminology, which he used consistently in *Ausführliche Arbeit von der Teutschen Haubtsprache* (Braunschweig 1663).¹²³⁸ Bernt Olsson calls attention to Stiernhielm's proposal of a Swedish linguistic terminology and relates it to his plans to demonstrate linguistic variability in Swedish, because in his letter to Axel Oxenstierna Stiernhielm refers to his forthcoming *Proteus rhetoricus* as being in both Swedish and Latin (*Suethice et Latine*).¹²³⁹ The text

¹²³⁷ *Petrus Lagerlöfs collegium 1691 angående vårt swenska språks cultiverande*, edited by Hans H. Ronge, Börje Tjäder and Gun Widmark, Uppsala 1999, p. 119 and p. 177. In this passage, Lagerlöf gives samples of Johannes Bureus' Swedish counterparts of Latin grammatical terminology. Bureus translated *grammatica* into Swedish as *talekonst*, *orthographia* as *rijtemåål*, *etymologia* as *ordastafwa kynne*, *vocales* as *sielflydingar*, *consonantes* as *medlydningar* and *prosodia* as *låtomåhl*.

¹²³⁸ At the end of his *Ausführliche Arbeit* (pp. 1462–1466), Schottelius catalogues German counterparts of Latin linguistic terms, e.g., *Sprachkunst* for *grammatica*, *Wortforschung* for *etymologia*, *Wortfügung* for *syntaxis*, *Stammwort* for *radix* or *primitivum*, *Zeitwort* for *verbum*, *männliches*, *weibliches*, *unbenamtes Geschlecht* for *masculinum*, *femininum* and *neutrum genus*, *selbstendiges* and *beystendiges* *Nennwort* for *substantivum* and *adiectivum nomen*, *Ableitung* for *derivatio*, *Grund* or *Grundwort* for *subiectum*, *Mundart* for *dialectus*, *Gleichrichtigkeit* for *analogia*.

¹²³⁹ Olsson, *Den svenska skaldekonstens fader* (1974), pp. 208 and 211, endnote 22. For the letter in question to Oxenstierna, see Wieselgren 1937–48: 109–111.

in question was first edited by Stig Örjan Ohlsson (2000: 203–207), but his readings are in several places mistaken. An improved edition is therefore necessary. A photographic picture of the central part (fol. 5r) is made available in Figure 17.

With one exception (*homoioteleuton, similiter finiens*), the list of rhetorical figures of repetition are the same as in the circle diagram in *Coelum Musarum seu Proteus rhetoricus* (Stiernhielm's linguistic writings, Vol. 1, Chapter 11) and the first six figures of speech occur in the same order as in the diagram. Similarly, the list of figures of thought mainly coincides with the selection and order in the diagram. This portion is an attempt to create Swedish counterparts of the most central terms in his treatise on linguistic variability.

In the middle of the list, Stiernhielm has written down some of the set phrases which he used as themes of linguistic transformability in *Proteus seu instrumentum rhetoricum* (1635) and *Coelum Musarum seu Proteus rhetoricus* (1650–1651).¹²⁴⁰ Though Bernt Olsson observed that the topics of these phrases are central to the themes of Stiernhielm's Swedish poetry,¹²⁴¹ he did not notice that they form an integral part of his grammatical-rhetorical treatises on the variability and transformational productivity of language.

17.1.3 Textual edition

(F.d. 9:8, 4v)

Abwächselung der Rede. Variatio orationis.

Verbum. G[ermanice] *Sagwort.* Ord.

*Ett ord genom fyre åtskillige wijs bögia
til personer, taal, sätt och tijder.*

Coniugatio. *Bögnings-wijs.*

Declinatio. *Länkning.* G[ermanice] *Veränderung.* Bögia.

Declinare. *Länkia.* Casus. *Fall.* Erstfall. *Zweytfall.* Drittfall. *Viertfall.*

Derivatio. G. *Ankunfft.*

Species. *Ableitung.*

Ursprunglich. Primitiva.

Herentsprungen. Derivatio s[implex].

Compositio. *Theilbetrachtung.* Figura.

Einfach. Simplex.

¹²⁴⁰ These phrases are *Omnia mutantur*, “Everything is changing” (Ovid, *Met.* 15, 165), *Virtus post nummos*, “Virtue after the gaining of money” (Horace, *Epist.* I, 1, 54), *Probitas laudatur et alget*, “Honesty is praised and is still left in the cold” (Juvenal, *Sat.* 1, 74) and *Honos alit artes*, “Honour nourishes the arts” (Cicero, *Tusc. disp.* I, 2, 4). For my textual edition of the variability of these classical Latin quotations, see Vol. 1, Sections 10.6, 10.1–10.5, 11.2.6 and 11.3, respectively.

¹²⁴¹ Olsson, *Den svenska skaldekonstens fader*, p. 208.

Zusam[m]engesetzt. Composit[um].
Absönderlige parter. Separabiles.
Unabsonderlige [?]. Particulae inseparabiles.
Numerus. Zahl. Singularis. Einige. Pluralis. Merfaltige.
Genus. Slächte. Manlig. Quinlig.
Mänlich. Masc[ulimum].
Weiblich. Fem[inimum].
Unbenant. Neutr[um].
Beyderley. Com[m]une.
Allerley. Omnis generis.

(F.d. 9:8, 5r, col. 1)

RHETORICA *Taalkonst. Är een konst til at wäl och prydiligen tala.*
Repetitio. Epizeuxis. Återkall.
Anaphora. Börian-lijk
Epistrophe. Ände-lijk.
Symploce. Börie-börian. Ända-ändeljk.
Epanalepsis. Börian ände-lijk.
Anadiplosis. Ändan-börie-lijk.
Epanodos. Börian och ändan; midio midia lijk.
Mediana. Midio-lijk.
Polyptoton. Marg-fälle. Mång-fällig.
Similiter cadens. [Lijk-fällig.]¹²⁴²
Similiter fin[iens]. Lijk-lydig taal-ändning, -måål.
Paronomasia. Ord-leek.
Climax. Opstegh. Stege.

Exclamatio. Anroop.
Interrogatio. Frågan.
Occupatio. Ingrep.
Concessio. Bock-språng.
Communicatio. Heemställning.
Sermocinatio. Samtaal.
Praeteritio. Bijgång. Förbijgång.
Aversio. Afvändning.
Correctio. Ord-boot.
Reticentia. Ord-hoot.
Ratiocinatio. [Begrundning.] Öfuerläggning, öfuerlag.¹²⁴³
Congeries. Samning. Hopkast. Flodh. Öfuerflöd. Öfuerhopning.

¹²⁴² *Lijk-fällig*] This Swedish counterpart of *similiter cadens* has been crossed out, though it is an appropriate calque.

¹²⁴³ *öfuerläggning, öfverlag*] These two words have been added above the line to replace *begrundning*, which has been crossed out on the line.

Prosopop[eia]. *Man-dicht*.

Expolitio. *Stoffering*.

Inversio. *Återkast*.

Hypotyposis. *Afmålning. Afbildning*.

Observatio. Consideratio. *Anmark*.

Capere ad considerationem. *Hugfästa, animo infigere*.

(F.d. 9:8, 5r, col. 2)

THEMATA 1. Omnia mutantur.

2. Virtus post nummos.

3. Virtus laudatur et alget.

4. Honos alit artes.

Tropus. *Ord-wändning, -byte*.

Affectio tropi.

Affectio entis.

Allegoria. *Lijknings-taal*.

Catachresis. *Missbruk*.

Metalepsis.

Hyperbole. *Öfuerslag*.

Axioma. (gemein Bekantnuß.) *Allbekänt. Det är et albekänt*.

Metaphora. *Ord-lijkning*.

Metonymia. *Omsättning. När ett ord, ett fäst-ord, blifver omsätt med ett infästes-ord, och twert om. Item. När ett orsaks-ord blifver satt för det som förorsakat är. Werkaren för werket. Ämne för afgärden*.

Definitio. *Måålskedning*.

Definire. *Måålskeda*.

Terminus. *Måål. Målsked. Målskeel*.

Terminus artis. *Konst-mäle*.

Quantitas. *Mägne. Mätenheet*.

Potentia. Vis. Virtus. *Mägne*.

Qualitas. *Häti. Hätte. Lynde*.

Concretum. *Samband. Samwäxt*.

Abstractum. *Serskilt*.

Substantivum. *Eenständigt namn*.

Adiectiv[um]. *bijfogigt. Bijnamn*.

Synecdoche. *Understånd. Begrep. När under ett slächt-ord förstås eller begripes et kön, et contra. Under ett heelsord, en deel*.

(F.d. 9:8, 5r, col. 3)

Figura. *Figur. Mäld. Efftermäld. Afmäld. Afmålning. *Mynd. Afbildning*.

Figurate loqui. *Förbloma sitt taal.*
 Figurata locutio. *Förblomat taal.*
 Figura. Tropus. *Blomering. Blom-werk.*
 ord-bloma, -blomster, -fägring. Elegantia.
 ord-fager. Elegans. liuf-talig. Suavi-loquens.
 Figura. *Språk-bild, -biläte.*
 Tropus. *Ord-läte. Ord-biläte.*
 Ornatus. Exornatio. *Utprydning. Ordpryde. Språkprydning. Ord-prål,*
 -stååt. Tala ståtliga. Ord-prång, -pracht.
 Modus. *Sätt. Wijs.*
 Vectis. *hävel. (veho, aha, häva; vehen, vegen, bevegen.)*
 Universus. *almen.*¹²⁴⁴
 Universum, -sitas. *det almena.*
 Unitas. *Monas. Ett.*
 Affectum. *Ofulbordat. Ofulgiort.*
 (Börda?, boa, böria?)
 Alterne. *Ymst.*
 Analysis. *Oplösning.*
 Affirmare. *(bejahren, be-ichten) jata. jaka.*
 Author. *Ophovsman. Mestare. Böriare.*
 Autoritas. *Myndigheet.*
 Forma. *Skap-lynde, inde Schamplun.*
 Qualitas. *Kynne.*
 Qualitas. *Art. Artas videtur prope esse: eandem qualitatem induere.*
 (ab är. est.)
 Genus. *Slagh. Slächte.*
 Species. *Kön.*
 Forma. *form (a för, föрма, praefigurare, praedestinare, prae-*
 disponere. Ideam rei futurae (fiundae) prae-concipere.
 Generare. *Köna.*
 Sexus. *Man- eller Quin-kön.*
 Forma. Species exterior. *Läti. Stald. G. gestalt a ställa.*
 Primitivum. *Stam-ord. Grund-ord.*
 Derivatio. *Aflednings-ord. Afsprungs-[ord].*

17.2 List of rhetorical, logical, and linguistic terms

Source: *Miscellanea etymologica*, F.d. 7:1, fol. 84r–84v (a loose leaf between pp. 137 and 138). Size: 210 x 325 mm. Dating: c. 1652.

(137 [b] recto, col. 1)

Belg[ice] *Stoffe*, id est. materia. Stevin¹²⁴⁵ ducit ab *stof*, atomus.

¹²⁴⁴ almen] that is, allmän, i.e. “universal, public, that which comprises everyone”.
 See further Elof Hellquist, *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*, (3rd ed. 1980), s.v. allmän.

Species. εἶδος. *het. hit. Kön. Afkomst.*
 Individuum. Belg[ice] *Oneseydelik.*
 Sexus. *Kön.*
 Genus. *Slag. Slächte. haat. häte. ædle. att. ast. ab äga, aha.*
 Qualitas. *Natura. Indoles. Ingenium. Ädli.*
 Affectus animi. *Hugränningar. Honom ran hug til sinne, i.e. affectus est (amore) erga illam.*
 Affectio. Affectus. *Benägenhet. an-negd. tilnägd. Til-bögsł.*
 Bene affectus erga etc. til-bögd etc.
 Ironia. *Omeent. Blatt-ord. Bläntz-ord.*
 Tropus. *Förväntd ordsätt. Wänd-ord.*
 Affectio tropi. *Ord-vändning. tilnägd. tilbögsł.*
 Allegoria. [*Blom-taal.*] *Blomering.*
 Hyperbole. *Öfuerslag.*¹²⁴⁶
 Catachresis. Abusus. *Hårdfällig.*
 Metalepsis.
 Metaphora. *Ordlijkund. Lijkord. Lijka-ord. Liknels-ord.*
 Metonymia. *Ordwexel. Ord försättning.*
 Metonymia causae. Orsaken för thet som förorsakat är.
 Orsaken för wercket. Göranden för gerningen.
 Metonymia effecti. Wercket för orsaken,
 <Wercket> för wärkanden. Gerningen för göranden.
 Metonymia subiecti. Fäste för infäste.
 <Metonymia> adiuncti. Infäste för fäste. Ämne, örke för wercket.
 Metonymia materiae pro materiato. Ämne för tinget.
 <Metonymia> signi pro signato. Märcke för thet bemärkte.
 Metonymia contentis pro contento. Innehållande för innehåldet.
 Synecdoche. *Ordbegrep.*
 Totum pro parte. Heelt för en deel. Mer för wercken.
 P[ars] p[ro] t[oto]. Deel för heelt. Mindre för mer.
 Räknat för oräknat.
 Genus pro specie. Slaget för arten.
 Species pro genere. Arten för könet, för slächtet.

(137 [b] recto, col. 2)

Substantia. *Understand. Underständig ting. Sielfstand. Siälfständig warelse.*
 Subiectum. *Underlag. Fäste.*
 Accidens. *Inwarelse. Inwarande warelse. Infäste. Infästad warelse.*

¹²⁴⁵ Stevin] The Flemish-Dutch scientist Simon Stevin (1548–1620) was also a linguistic purist who had an impact on the Dutch language. See further Stig Nilsson, *Terminologi och nomenklatur*, Lund 1974, pp. 163–168.

¹²⁴⁶ öfuerslag] Stiernhielm first wrote *öfuerkast*, then replaced *-kast* by *-slag*.

Adiunctum. *Tillaga. Anhang. Anbehör.*
 Praedicabile. *Säyeligt.*
 Praedicamentum. *Ting-balck. Ting-sked.*
 Medius terminus. *Midel-måål.*
 Materia. *Tyg. Materia pro materiato. Tyge för thet som tygat är.*
 Instrumentum. *Tyg. Wercktyg.*

(137 [b] verso, col. 1)

Necessitudo. *Skylldskap. a "Necesse est". thet skal.*
 Necessarius. *Skyld. Skyldman.*
 Habitus. *Häfd. Hamn pro specie vel forma.*
 Disputare. *Disputatio.*
 Logomachia. *Ord-kämp. Ord-strijd.*
 Dialectica. *Bewijs-konst.*
 Quid. Aliquid. Belg[ice] yet. *Ett.*
 Hoc. *Het. Hit. Illud. Hiut.*
 Ratio. *Skäl. Reeda.*¹²⁴⁷ *Redlighet.*
 Animal rationalis. *Redeligt djur. a daa, dian. vigere, vivere.*
 Forma. Species. Qualitas. *Läti.*
 Proprie. *Egentlig.*
 Improperie. *Oegentlig.*
 Causa per accidens. *Tilfällig orsak.*
 Quantitas. *Mågne, id est magnitudo, multitudo, et potentia a må.*
 Capacitas. *Rymd.*¹²⁴⁸ *Skröfd de corpore.*
 Corpus. *Skrof.*

(137 [b] verso, col. 2)

Causatio. *Orsäkt.*
 Descriptio. *Bescriffning.*
 Distributio. *Fördeelning.*
 Comparatio. [*Förlikning.*] *Jämförs.*
 Contrapositio. *Gen-sättning. Gen-stand.*
 Disiunctio. *Ser-skilning. Afsondring.*
 Incrementum. [*Up-ökning.*] *Ord-wäxt.*
 Congeries. [*Hoop-wijs.*] *Up-hoopning. Flock. Hoop-mal.*
 Ratiocinatio. *Skäl. Reeda. Utreedning.*
 Prosopopeia. *Taal-dikt.*
 Expolitio. [*Ut-fijlning.*] *Polering.*
 Circumstantia. *Omstände.*

¹²⁴⁷ reeda] In the preface to *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, this word is used in the sense of "notion, opinion, thought". In *Archimedes Reformatus* it means "proportional relationship". See Nilsson, *Terminologi och nomenklatur*, pp. 185 f.

¹²⁴⁸ Rymd] Cf. Nilsson, *Terminologi och nomenklatur*, pp. 208–215.

Inversio. *Omvänding. Byte. Ombyte.*
 Accidens. al[iter] *Tilfall. Inesse. Inne wara. Inwarelse.*
 Subiectum. *Fäste. Grund. Underlag.*
 Accidens. [Lätu.] *Inward. Inwäsen. Infäste.*
 Quantitas. *Skröfd. Corpus. Skrof. Krop.*
 Qualitas. *Lätu. [Skap-lynd.] hurudanheet. daande. ädli.*
 Relatio. *Genförsl.*
 Argumentum. *Bewijs.*
 Refutare. *Återdrijva. Hinder-driva.*
 Refutatio. *Gen-drifft.*
 Argumentari. *Andraga bewijs. Förläggia.*
 Forma. *Form. Häte. Skap. Formare. Skapa. Forma.*
 Materia. *Ämne. Äfne.*
 Definitio. *Mäle. Definitum. Mält. Måål-satt.*
 Definire. *Mäla. Sättia måål. Måål-sättia.*
 Terminus. *Måål. Måls-ord.*
 Syllogismus. *Skäl-samna. Collectio rationis. Skäl-begrep.*
 Finis. *Ända. Änd-orsak.*
 Genus. *Slächte.*
 Species. *Art.*
 Efficiens <causa>. *Wärkande, görande orsak.*
 Effectus, -um. *Wärck. Gärd.*
 Perficere. *Fullgöra. Perfectio. Fullgärd. Perfectus. Fullgiord.*
 Proprium. *Egn. Egenskap.*
 Forma specifica. *Artigheet. Artskap.*
 Animus. *Modh.*
 Inclination. *Benägenhet. Lynd a lehnén.*
 Extremum. -itas. *Nägd.*
 Indoles. *Natura. Ädli. Äldi. ab ala.*
 Ingenium. idem. Item: *Inälde. Lynd.*

17.3 List of philosophical terms and common words

Source: F.d. 9**, 37r–v. In the manuscript, this text is titled *Georgii Stiernhielmii χειρόκμητα*, “Wrought by hand by Georg Stiernhielm”.

Dating: Stiernhielm likely drew up the list some days before leaving his estate Wasula in early June 1656. The next leaf (fol. 38r) is dated 6 June 1656.

In editing the text, I have arranged the text in columns, italicizing Swedish words, and capitalizing initials, unless capital letters are used in the ms. Moreover, I have generally retained the same order of words as occurs in the ms., but have slightly adapted the order of Latin and Swedish counterparts. I have included marginal additions of such counterparts, but have excluded some etymological notes.

(37r) Mens. <i>Sinne.</i>	In actu. <i>I wercket. I</i>	Promovere. <i>Fordra.</i>
Mens divina. <i>Guds</i>	<i>driften. I warelsen.</i>	<i>Främia.</i>
<i>sinne.</i>	Actus. <i>Wäsende.</i>	Utile. <i>Froma. frui.</i>
Ratio. <i>Skäl.</i>	In actu. <i>I sitt wäsende.</i>	Prosperitas. <i>Dägu, a</i>
Lux. <i>Lius.</i>	Operatio. <i>Drifft.</i>	<i>dija, diga, vegescere,</i>
Materia. <i>Äfne.</i>	Impotentia. Impossibil-	<i>valescere.</i>
Materia prima. <i>Ur-äfne.</i>	itas. <i>Omegne.</i>	Successus. <i>Framgång.</i>
Elementum. <i>Almen-</i>	Potestas. <i>Wald. Bälde.</i>	Progressus. <i>Framsteg.</i>
<i>äfne. vet. Skepur.</i>	Posse. <i>Bälla.</i>	<i>Fortgång.</i>
Essentia. <i>Väsende.</i>	Valere. <i>Gälla.</i>	Fortuna. <i>Lycka.</i>
Existentia. <i>Varelse.</i>	Valor. <i>Gäld.</i>	Casus. <i>Slump. Fall.</i>
Natura. <i>Edli ab a, esse.</i>	Fortitudo. Audacia.	Sors. <i>Ohappd</i> [?].
Indoles. Ingenium. <i>Eldi,</i>	<i>Bälde.</i>	Fatum. <i>Öde.</i>
<i>Inäldi, ab ala,</i>	Fortis. Audax. Potens.	Prædestinatio. <i>Skepna.</i>
genere, generare.	<i>Bäld.</i>	<i>Förseende. Tilämne.</i>
Qualitas. <i>Hätte.</i>	Tyrannis. Öfverbälde.	<i>Tiläfne.</i>
Habitus. <i>Häfd.</i>	<i>Öfverbild. Öfverwäld.</i>	Formare. <i>*aforma, i.e.</i>
Habitus. <i>Hädde.</i>	Impotentia. <i>Abild.</i>	<i>præfigurare,</i>
Habentia. <i>*Aud.</i>	<i>Obälde. Omägne.</i>	<i>designare, a för,</i>
Privatio. <i>Ode, aan,</i>	Possibilis. <i>Möglig, etc.</i>	Idea, præfiguratio.
<i>oond.</i>	Agere. <i>Drifva. Wercka.</i>	<i>aform.</i>
Malus, i.e. bono	Facere. <i>Göra.</i>	Formare. Performare.
privatus. <i>Ond.</i>	Opus. <i>Werck.</i>	Destinare. <i>Skapa.</i>
Vacuum. <i>Waan. Toom.</i>	Actus. <i>Drifft.</i>	<i>Föreskapa.</i>
<i>מחל.</i>	<i>Wärckning.</i>	Forma. <i>Form. Skap.</i>
Amplitudo. <i>Widd, a</i>	Actio. <i>Gärd. Gärning.</i>	T[eut.] <i>Skaplös Zimmer,</i>
<i>wea, wia, ducere,</i>	Movere. <i>Röra. Beväga.</i>	<i>i.e. Materia informis.</i>
extendere, ampliare.	Motus. <i>Rörsl. Bewägs.</i>	Indoles. Ingenium.
Cogitare. <i>Tänkia.</i>	Motio. <i>Bewägning.</i>	Natura. <i>Skap-lynde.</i>
(37v) Terminus. <i>Måål.</i>	Inclinare. <i>Negia. Nijga.</i>	A Goth. <i>skaplunde</i>
Numerus. <i>Taal.</i>	Inclinatio. Propensio.	factum est Belg.
Mensura. <i>Måål. Måt.</i>	<i>Benägenhet.</i>	<i>Schampelwen, vulgo</i>
Modus. <i>Måtta.</i>	<i>Bewägenhet.</i>	<i>Skamplun.</i>
Mos. <i>Sätt. Sed.</i>	Substantia. <i>Sielfstand.</i>	Vultus. Species
Vis. Robur. <i>Afl.</i>	<i>Understand.</i>	exterior. <i>Läti.</i>
Vis. Robur. <i>Krafft.</i>	<i>Sielfständig warelse,</i>	Facies. Vultus. <i>Anläte.</i>
Ars. <i>Konst. Scientia.</i>	<i>wäsende.</i>	Imago. <i>Bi-läti.</i>
Scire. <i>Känna, Veta.</i>	Accidens. <i>Tilfall.</i>	Gestus, species. <i>A-läti.</i>
Distinguere. <i>Skillia.</i>	<i>Tilfälligt wäsende.</i>	Gestus, mos, species.
Distinctio. <i>Skilna.</i>	Subiectum. <i>Underlag.</i>	<i>Laut.</i>
Violentia. <i>Öfveraf.</i>	<i>Underkast.</i>	Forma, vultus, modus,
Potentia. <i>Mägne. Megd.</i>	Obiectum. <i>Förelag.</i>	indoles. <i>Lynde.</i>
<i>Mägd.</i>	Genus. <i>Ätt.</i>	Inclinatio. Propensio.
Potens. <i>Megne. Mycken.</i>	Sexus. <i>Kön.</i>	<i>Lynde, a lända et</i>
<i>Mickel a må, posse.</i>	Genus. Generatio. Idem.	<i>lunda, inclinare.</i>
In potentia. <i>I mägne.</i>	<i>*kunni. Hinc cunnado.</i>	Ligna declinantia.
		<i>Lundar.</i>

PART 5. STUDIES OF THE HISTORICAL AND
HISTORIOGRAPHICAL RECEPTION

18. Preliminaries

18.1 Scope of the studies

18.1.1 *Stiernhielm's legacy: outline of the enquiry*

There is no earlier study on the historical reception of Stiernhielm as a historical linguist. Stig Örjan Ohlsson certainly observed that Stiernhielm “was internationally recognized as a scholar, and not least as an expert in language history,”¹²⁴⁹ but he does not prove this statement. The present exploratory account of Stiernhielm’s reception as a linguistic theorist and renewer of the Swedish language will demonstrate that this observation is justified.

Chapter 19 inquires into continental and Swedish scholars who discussed Stiernhielm’s historical linguistic theory. Chapter 20 turns the attention to the views on Stiernhielm as a historical linguist and lexicographer held by some lexicographers of Germanic languages.

The introductory part of chapter 21 maps out the literary criticism of Stiernhielm by Johann Arckenholtz and Frans Michael Franzén. The bulk of the chapter explores the views on Stiernhielm’s linguistic ideas by his Swedish biographers. Two of them, namely Samuel Gagnerus and Carl Gustaf Nordin, lived in the Gustavian era (1772–1809), but developed different perspectives on Stiernhielm – the former from a patriotic viewpoint,¹²⁵⁰ the latter from a utilitarian aspect.¹²⁵¹ The others, Lorenzo Hammarsköld and Eric Gustaf Geijer, represent the age of Romanticism (1800–1850) in their views on Stiernhielm.¹²⁵² All of them to a greater or lesser extent discuss Stiernhielm’s merits and failures as both a historical linguist and a Swedish poet and language innovator. I will touch upon Atterbom’s biography of Stiernhielm, mainly because it evaluates Stiernhielm’s linguistic programme.

¹²⁴⁹ Ohlsson, “Outline of research on Nordic language history before 1800” in *An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, vol. 1 edited by Oskar Bandle, Kurt Braunmüller, Ernst Hakon Jahr, Allan Karker, Hans-Peter Naumann, Ulf Teleman, Lennart Elmevik and Gun Widmark, Berlin, p. 64.

¹²⁵⁰ Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar*, pp. 120–122, argues that Gagnerus followed a late Gothicist patriotic current in depicting Stiernhielm as a patriotic hero.

¹²⁵¹ Sigbrit Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar*, p. 133 and 135.

¹²⁵² Hammarsköld and Geijer evaluated Stiernhielm’s Swedish poetry in relation to the criteria of individuality and nationality. Swahn, *ibidem*, pp. 291, 312 and 323.

I have not included the biographies by the Swedish literary historians Carl Julius Lénström and Ewert Wrangel,¹²⁵³ because they chiefly discuss Stiernhielm in his capacity as a Swedish poet, notably called by the former “the father of Swedish poetry”.¹²⁵⁴ Likewise, I have not taken into account the unpublished biographies of Stiernhielm that were submissions to an essay contest in eloquence held by the Swedish Academy in 1836–38 to honour the memory of Stiernhielm. The authors of these entries usually confine themselves to account for Stiernhielm’s life and assess his Swedish poetry, but the essay submitted by the linguist and poet Carl August Hagberg has a broader scope.¹²⁵⁵ It is extant in two submissions, the first of which was recorded as received on 4 October 1838 (no. 4), and the other was registered on 7 October 1839 (no. 2).¹²⁵⁶ The final essay was rewarded with the prize of eloquence in 1839.¹²⁵⁷ Two submissions in 1836 are extant. One of them – the one recorded as received on 6 October (no. 4) – can be attributed to C.J. Lénström, because it turns out to be a draft of his above-mentioned portrait of Stiernhielm as a poet. The other submission was registered on 8 Oct. 1836 (no. 7). Except for Hagberg’s first submitted version, two other submissions from 1838 are extant. One of them is dated 28 Sept. (no. 2, incoming from Malmö) and the other 1 Oct. (no. 3, incoming from Gävle).

18.2 Earlier research

The first enquiry into the reception of Stiernhielm as a scholar was done by the critic and author Lorenzo Hammarsköld (1785–1827). In the last chapter of the biographical introduction to his edition of Stiernhielm’s belletristic works (1818), he argues that Stiernhielm’s

¹²⁵³ C. J. Lénström, *Stiernhielm. Ett litterärt skaldeporträtt* (an academic thesis in five parts submitted between 24 and 28 March 1838), Uppsala 1838; E. Wrangel, *Det Carolinska tidevarfvets komiska diktning*, Lund and Växjö 1888, pp. 32–59.

¹²⁵⁴ Lénström, *ibidem*, p. 41.

¹²⁵⁵ Hagberg’s final essay, *Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhjelm*, comprises 101 pages (size 250 x 300 mm) and has the following outline: introduction on Stiernhielm’s ability as a Swedish poet (pp. 1–11), his linguistic research: its semiotic, comparative and etymological bases (pp. 12–27), his poetry and its metrics (pp. 27–55) with a digression on different 19th-century views on the nature of poetry (pp. 30–41), his language renewal (pp. 56–58), his jurisprudence (pp. 59–66), his mathematics (pp. 66–74), and course of life (pp. 75–99), in compiling which Hagberg used Columbus’ *Mål-roo*, Gagnerus’ Swedish biography of Stiernhielm, and the biographical collections of Magnus von Celse and Nils Hufwedsson Dal.

¹²⁵⁶ Hagberg’s final submission is extant in the Archives of the Swedish Academy, *Svenska Akademiens samlingar*, vol. 291. His first submitted version is preserved among the other entries in the Archives of the Swedish Academy, where the draft of it also is found after it was conferred by K. A. Hagberg (1865–1944) in 1922.

¹²⁵⁷ Per G. Berg, *Svenskt konversationslexikon*, Stockholm 1845–51, vol. 3, p. 817.

reputation as a scientist and scholar has undergone a similar fate as his renown as a poet. To begin with, Åke Rålamb (1651–1718), officer at the Royal Life Guards and an encyclopaedist, summarized Stiernhielm's measuring rod, *Carl-stav* or *Baculus Carolinus* (1663), in his *Adelig öfning*, del 1: Matematisk öfning, that is, "Exercise for noblemen, part 1: Mathematical exercise" (Stockholm 1690). The national economist Edvard Fredrik Runeberg (1721–1802) presented Stiernhielm's system of weights and measures to the Academy of Sciences in 1757, the same year that he was elected a member of this society. In his study of the reception of Stiernhielm, Hammarsköld states that Runeberg did so "with expertise" ("sakkunnigt").

In the latter half of the 18th century, a time of empiricism, when the catchwords were experience and practical knowledge, Stiernhielm's works fell into oblivion and were covered by dust in the collections of the library.¹²⁵⁸ Hammarsköld maintains that the librarian and censor librorum Gustaf Benzelstierna (1686–1746) argued on utilitarian grounds that Stiernhielm's etymologies and antiquarian studies did not meet the requirements of practical life: "in common life they bring no utility with themselves"¹²⁵⁹ and thus people began to despise them as outdated. He contrasts this attitude with the fact that it was Stiernhielm's scholarly and scientific works that first attracted the attention of learned foreigners. In so doing, he refers to Blondel's letter to Stiernhielm in 1651 (Section 13.1.1) and to the great interest in Stiernhielm and his writings that Leibniz demonstrates in his correspondence (Section 19.4.3). As further evidence of an appreciative reception Hammarsköld cites the references to Stiernhielm's works in foreign journals, such as *Acta eruditorum* and *Monatliche Unterredungen von neuern Büchern*. He attaches a list of references to Stiernhielm and his work as an antiquarian, poet and scientist by foreign scholars in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries.¹²⁶⁰

In her doctoral thesis *Ryktets förvandlingar*, "The transformations of fame" (1974), Sigbrit Swahn explores the forms and shifts in the reception of Stiernhielm in the 18th century and in the early to middle 19th century. The contents are specified in its more accurate subtitle: *Stiernhielm, Lucidor och Runius bedömda av 1700-talet – en studie*

¹²⁵⁸ Hammarsköld, "Anteckningar till Georg Stjernhielms lefvernesbeskrivning" in idem, *Stjernhjelms Svenska Vitterhets-arbeten*, Stockholm 1818, p. 59.

¹²⁵⁹ Hammarsköld, ibidem, p. 59.

¹²⁶⁰ Hammarsköld, ibidem, pp. 60–64. He refers, for instance, to Jäger's treatise *De lingua antiquissima Europae*, Wittenberg 1686, Johan Arckenholtz's *Memoires concernant Christine Reine de la Suède*, vol. 1, Amsterdam and Leipzig 1751, pp. 334–335, and Christoph Wilhelm Lübeck's *Allgemeines schwedisches Gelehrsamkeits-Archiv*, erster Theil, 1780, pp. 248–249.

av den litterära kritikens utveckling i Sverige, that is, “Stiernhielm, Lucidor and Runius as assessed by the 18th century: a study of the development of literary criticism in Sweden.” She discusses the views on Stiernhielm as a philosopher, poet, patriot, scholar and official¹²⁶¹ and the opinions about Lasse Lucidor (1638–1674) and Johan Runius (1679–1713) as poets. The criticism itself was guided by the pattern of French literary criticism, defined as having the duty to determine the rank, class and character of the poet within the art of poetry and his or her position on “Mount Parnassus” as compared to other poets.¹²⁶² Swahn argues that the early stage of the reception of Stiernhielm as a poet was occasioned by censure of “northern” poetry in general by the French historian and literary critic Dominique Bohours in 1671 and of Stiernhielm’s unrhymed Swedish poetry in particular by the German scholar Johann Fr. Cramer in 1694.¹²⁶³ She investigates how their disapproval was refuted by Haquin Spegel,¹²⁶⁴ Eric Benzeliuss the Younger and Johan Arckenholtz, and explains how the views on Stiernhielm’s merits were transformed when new Swedish poets appeared on the Swedish Parnassus. Moreover, Swahn shows how the comparison between Stiernhielm and other Swedish poets was influenced by the Enlightenment idea of progress, a criterion by which Stiernhielm finally was banished to a long ago surpassed past.

¹²⁶¹ Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar*, Lund 1974, pp. 105–183 and 194–223

¹²⁶² Sigbrit Swahn, *ibidem*, pp. 11–13.

¹²⁶³ Swahn, *ibidem*, pp. 46–48. In his treatise *Entriens d’Artist et d’Eugene* (1671) Dominique Bohours (1628–1702) expressed an unfavourable opinion of northern languages and literature, including German, which he characterized as barbarous and lacking any examples of literary talents, and praised French as the exclusive vehicle of literary cultivation. Through the many editions of his treatise, this view spread widely. Bohours’ attack on German was refuted by the German jurist and statesman Johann Friedrich Cramer (1664–1715) in *Vindiciae nominis Germanici contra quosdam obtrectatores Gallos* (i.e. Justification of the German nation and reputation against some French critics), Amsterdam 1694 (republished in 1739). He argued that there is a great difference of rank between German, on the one hand, and Swedish, Danish and Russian on the other. Bohours had allowed these latter nations to write in Latin, as long as their own national languages remained uncultivated. Cramer objected that the Swedes and Danes, in their rare non-Latin versifications, mainly used the German language, and the few authors who had written in their vernaculars had not achieved anything worthwhile. As an example, he refers to Stiernhielm’s *Hercules* and argues that the author tried to abolish end-rhymes in a classicizing attempt to imitate Greek and Roman hexameter. Cramer defined end-rhymes as equal rhythms at the end of lines. Cramer’s criticism was summed up by Georgius Pasch in *Tractatus de novis inventis* (Leipzig 1700).

¹²⁶⁴ Swahn, *ibidem*, pp. 47–48. Spegel rebutted Bohours’ and Cramer’s assessments in the preface to his poem *Thet öpna paradis* (“Open Paradise”, 1705).

19. Historical reception in the Republic of Letters

19.1 Contemporary reception

19.1.1 Complimentary poems by Loccenius and Gezelius

In Stiernhielm's etymological Swedish dictionary *Magog Aramaeo-Gothus* (1643, on letter A), the German-Swedish jurist and historian Johannes Loccenius (1598–1677) contributed with a congratulatory Latin poem, in which he praises the dedicatee's polymathy in elegiac distichs. Concerning Stiernhielm's linguistic learning he states in verses 21–26:

Now, you open the primordial origins of the Gothic language and
teach us to speak in ancient manners according to our own usage.
The relation of agreement of so many foreign words you
demonstrate by means of your endowment and talent.
You join them to the Gothic language in a friendly bond of union
and prove them all to be derived from one common source.¹²⁶⁵

Loccenius also enumerates Stiernhielm's completed and ongoing works in 1644 (Vol.1, Section 3.3.3).

Johannes Gezelius the Elder (1615–1690) was professor of Greek and Oriental languages at the University of Tartu at the same time as Stiernhielm was assessor of the royal court of appeals in the Baltic provinces.¹²⁶⁶ As we have seen (Vol. 1, Section 2.3.4), Stiernhielm

¹²⁶⁵ Latin original, verses 21–26:

En Gothicae pandis modo tu cunabulae linguae
Prisco more doces ore loquique suo.
Tot peregrinarum quae sit concordia vocum
Tu genii monstras ingeniique potens
Sermoni Gothico quas foedere iungis amico:
Omnesque ex uno currere fonte probas.

¹²⁶⁶ Gezelius returned to Sweden in the spring of 1649 to serve as lecturer at the high school of Västerås and then as vicar of Skedevi in Dalecarlia. After the Peace of Cardis with Russia in 1661 he went back the Baltic provinces as Chancellor of the University in Tartu, then as vicar of Riga and was finally promoted to bishop of Åbo 1664. He is known as the educator of Finland and a Bible commentator. He initiated a Swedish Bible commentary that was continued by his son and grandson Johannes Gezelius the Younger (1647–1718) and Johannes Gezelius the Youngest (1686–1733). It was published in 1711–1713 (NT) and 1724–1728 (OT).

entertained contacts with the professors and students at *Academia Gustaviana*. Gezelius dedicated his abridgment of the German Orientalist Martin Trostius's (1588–1635) Hebrew grammar to Stiernhielm.¹²⁶⁷ For the dedication he wrote a Hebrew poem, where Stiernhielm's polyglottism is the subject of his compliment. The poem reads as follows (in English translation):

His words enlighten the eyes of his servant,
and he dresses himself in righteousness as his clothing.

To the prominent and perfect Georgius Sternhelm

(גארגיוס סטרנהלם) plenty of peace!

You, my pleasant lord, though burdened with many concerns, do not abandon the speech of wisdom, but speak wisdom in many languages so that all the world will see and praise the multiplicity of your teaching. And therefore, I make up my mind to fulfil my wish regarding this matter and to write rule by rule a brief work to your honour. Oh, may it be pleasing in the sight of your honour so that my heart rejoices and I find grace in your eyes! And now, may the sheaves of my peace go out from me to present themselves before your glorious honour to cry with a loud voice: peace, peace! And you, be blessed!

Here, in the holy congregation of Dorpat in the year of Christ 5047 [i.e. 1647], the third of Nisan.

Jochannan Getselius.¹²⁶⁸

19.1.2 A critical statement by Laurentius Bureus

In a letter of 3 April 1649 addressed to State Secretary Andreas Gyldenklou (1602–1665), Laurentius Bureus (1623/24–1665) tells how he was on the verge of being engaged by Stiernhielm to assist him with the completion of a dictionary of Old Swedish, but that he did not accept his invitation. To the addressee he argues that he prefers to avoid Stiernhielm because of his ridiculous etymologies that almost everyone considers to be worthless. The historical context of the letter is the spring of 1649. Bureus states:

This is to give notice how Jöran Stiernhielm, after his return from Holland, three times has summoned me by letter to Stockholm to

¹²⁶⁷ The title is: *Grammaticae Trostianae epitome. In usum privatorum collegiorum Academia Gustaviana, quae Dorpati est ad Embeccam in Livonia*. Dorpati/ Tartu Johannes Vogelius (university printer) 1647.

¹²⁶⁸ Gezelius, *Grammaticae Trostianae epitome*, dedication (see the verso-side of the title page). The above translation is based on the English translation that was provided by prof. Tapani Harviainen (Helsinki) for my use.

the matter that I shall help him to complete the dictionary that he has begun on the interpretation of all ancient Swedish words, with a prospect of 200 imperial thalers (“riksdaler”) per year from the Crown. I have, however, declined his request. [...] I would be glad to avoid him because of his fanciful etymologies in order that he may not command me to serve him in expounding them, because they are considered mere nonsense by most people. However, the above-mentioned dictionary is a necessary piece of work and it may well be completed in the course of some months.¹²⁶⁹

19.1.3 A letter of recommendation by the French ambassador

In a letter to Charles Gustavus – prospective King of Sweden – the French ambassador in Stockholm, Pierre-Hector Chanut (1601–1661) shortly before his return to France in 1651 recommended Stiernhielm as a unique polymath. He confirms the rumour of the thoroughness of his comparative language studies, but marvels that Stiernhielm has no renown in Sweden, which he considers to be in accordance with the biblical proverb that a prophet has no honour in his own country.

It is true what I hear from all the learned people, Your Excellency, that he is an exceptional person and one who has penetrated into the source and origin of languages as much as anyone else in our century. Though this study seems be useless to most people, it has nonetheless many uses joined to itself, and in order to overcome the Confusion of Languages, it has been necessary to explore the origins of nations, their dispersion, their mixture and the beginnings of all great Empires. I do not know how it comes about that we accord so little esteem to capable native people. If Mr. Stiernhielm had lived in France or in Italy, he would have been a famous name, and yet Sweden, which today attracts whatever

¹²⁶⁹ Letter from Laurentius Jacobi (i.e. L. Bureus) to Anders Gyldenklou, with the shelfmark: ”Kanslitjänstemännens koncept och mottagna skrivelser, Kristinas tid, vol. 16”, National Archives of Sweden: “Jagh [...] tillkennagiffwer huru Jöran Stiernhielm effter sin hemkomst ifrån Hålland hafwer migh trenne ressor genom skrifwelsser låtit kalla till Stäckholm till dedh ährende, att jagh skall wara honom behielpigh att fullborda dedh lexicon, han hafwer begynt att göra utöfwer alle gamble Svenske ordz uttydningh, låfwandes 200 Riksd. om året utaff Kronan till stipendium, så hafwer jagh alt her till hans begeran ej effterkummit. [...] Jagh undveke honom gerna både för dedh fantasteri han hafwer medh derivationer, att han och icke biuder migh att tiena sigh i dem, dedh jagh förmodar honom ej till stå blifwa, all den stundh de mest aff allom för idel fåfängia hållas, men detta ofwanbemelt lexicon ähr ett nödigt wärck och kan wel på några månars tidh blifwa fullbordat.” For the entire letter (transcribed with modernized spelling), see Henrik Schück, *Kgl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien. Dess Förhistoria och Historia*, vol. 1., Stockholm 1932, p. 183. Cf. Swartling, *Georg Stiernhielm*, p. 70.

there is of more able men in France and Italy, neglects its own competent people and abandons a very rare talent of this kind and one who must do honour to his nation. This is because of the fatal misfortune that no one is a prophet in his own country.¹²⁷⁰

19.1.4 Assessment by Samuel Columbus

Samuel Columbus, who served as Stiernhielm's research assistant for several years (1667–1670), became his first biographer. In his collection of biographical stories he argues that Stiernhielm did not manage to complete the works he began because of his polymathy. Under the heading of *πολυπραγμοσύνη*, that is “the state of having many occupations”, he refers to Stiernhielm among other things as a linguist and etymologist:

He was a jurist, a physicist, a moral philosopher, a linguist, an etymologist, a poet and an antiquarian, since he was chairman of *Collegium antiquitatis* for some years before his death. He also pursued mathematics, a study entirely different from the others.¹²⁷¹

As regards Stiernhielm's etymological works, Columbus was aware that they were mainly extant in manuscript. In one story he refers to “Swea-Göta-fatebuur” and an etymological dictionary, which remain in manuscript.¹²⁷² In his treatise on the cultivation of the Swedish language, entitled *En swensk ordeskötsel*, Columbus refers to these

¹²⁷⁰ Letter from Pierre-Hector Chanut to the hereditary prince Karl Gustaf, with the shelfmark: “Stegeborgssamlingen, Avdelning II: Arvprinsen Karl Gustafs arkiv, vol. E123”, National Archives of Sweden. The original French reads as follows: “Il est vray, Monseigneur, que j’entens de tous les hommes savants que c’est une personne rare et qui a penetré dans le fondt et l’origine des langues autant qu’aucun autre de notre siecle. Quoyque cette estude semble vaine a plusieurs, ell’ a neanmoins beaucoup d’utilités jointes, et pour bien demester la confusion des langues, il a fallu rechercher les origines des nations, leur dispersion, leur meslangue et les commencements de tous les grands Empires. Je ne scay comment il arrive que nous faisons peu d’estat des biens domestiques. Si M. Stiernhielm estoit en France ou en Italie, son nom seroit celebre, et cependant la Suede, qui attire aujourd’huy cequil y a de plus beau en France ou en Italie, neglige ses propres biens et abandonne un esprit tres rare en son genre et qui faut honneur a sa nation, par ce malheur fatal que nul nest prophete en son pais.” With the exception of the key passage from *Quoyque to Empires*, this text is quoted by Swartling (1909: 72).

¹²⁷¹ Columbus, *Mål-roo eller Roo-mål*, edited by Bengt Hesselman, Stockholm 1935, p. 21 (nr. 41). In the Swedish original, this passage reads: “Han var en Jurist, en Physicus, en Moralist, en Linguist eller *Etymologicus*, en Poet, en Antiquist, som han ok i några år för sin död war *Praeses* i Antiquitetz-collegio. Dessutan idkade han myckit *Mathesin*, ett så heelt afskildt studium ifrån de andre.”

¹²⁷² Columbus, *ibidem*, p. 16 (nr. 21).

dictionaries as unpublished works. He specifies the first one as *Swea- and Götha-måles fatebur* “which merely contains old words that he there explores”. The second one is *Dictionarium etymologicum*, in which Stiernhielm “proposes four or five roots to every language, a small but an industrious and beautiful work, had it not been too universal. It is written in folio, but not everything is transcribed and put in order.” It is uncertain which dictionary draft that Columbus is referring to. Perhaps he means the dictionary on the root *ma*, *Radix Ma* (ms. F.d. 2:2:1, Royal Library, Stockholm), of which there is a more complete fair copy in another handwriting than Stiernhielm’s (ms. F.d. 2:2:2). Columbus adds that any editor of this dictionary ought to be skilled in languages in order to be able to successfully set about to work at it.¹²⁷³

In another passage of *En swensk ordeskötsel* Columbus discusses the main languages, to which he counts Hebrew, Slavic, Latin, Greek and Germanic. He briefly describes their diversification into Asiatic and national European languages and argues that the European languages are historically related and derived from one common source. They have split because of their separation in time and space.¹²⁷⁴ In this context, he recounts a story about Stiernhielm’s alleged opinion on the relation between the primeval language and Swedish:

Since the Europeans derive from him [i.e. Japheth], Stiernhielm was of the opinion that the Swedish language was the same as Noah’s, unchanged in its foundation and consequently the same as that of Adam. From this, the rumour spread that Stiernhielm had said that the Swedish language was spoken in paradise.¹²⁷⁵

Columbus compares this claim to Goropius Becanus’ contention that Dutch is a main language and the source of all others, and expressly takes exception to such views as a matter of curiosity rather than of certainty.¹²⁷⁶ He does not defend Stiernhielm, but seems to hint that common people distorted or simplified Stiernhielm’s opinion.

¹²⁷³ Columbus, *En swensk ordeskötsel*, ed. by Sylvia Boström, Uppsala 1963, p. 54.

¹²⁷⁴ Columbus, *ibidem*, pp. 96 f.: “Thed wisseste som man om språken kan döma, är at alle europeiske språk hafwe en gemenskap ok synas komme af samma källa, men hafve fått någon olikhet förmedelst tiden och rummens åtskilnad.”

¹²⁷⁵ Columbus, *ibidem*, p. 96: “Efter de Européer af honom herstamma, wille Stiernhielm at vårt svenske språk skulle vara ded samma som Noachs, oförändrat til grunden, ok altså ded samme som Adams, huar af kom at rychtet gick, som skulle Stiernhielm hafva sagdt at swenska var talat i paradiset.” Paradise here of course means the earthly paradise (see *Svenska Akademiens ordbok*, s.v. paradis 1).

¹²⁷⁶ Columbus, *ibidem*, p. 96.

19.2 Johann Diecmann

19.2.1 Historical and discursive contexts

The German educator and Lutheran theologian Johann Diecmann (1647–1720) summarized the language classification of Stiernhielm in a treatise titled *De lingua primigenia Ebraea et cum aliorum, tum Georg. Stiernhielmii, Joh. Web, Petri Dan. Huetii, Richardi Simonis super ea sententiis γύμνασμα*, that is, ‘On the primordial Hebrew language: an exercise on the opinions on this topic by some scholars, especially by Georg Stiernhielm, John Webb, Pierre Daniel Huet and Richard Simon’. It was published in Stade, which at that time was under Swedish rule, as an invitation to an oratorical performance on the excellence of Latin, Greek, Hebrew and German to be held on 30 March 1682, and given by the author himself, as headmaster of the high school (Gymnasium) of Stade.¹²⁷⁷ Diecmann first reviews the suggestions of Goropius Becanus and Adrian van Schrieck that Flemish and Dutch are primeval. He then describes and evaluates Stiernhielm’s ideas about language origins and dialectal diversification in the preface to the 1671 edition of *Codex Argenteus*.

Diecmann states that the rarity, in Germany, of the treatise in which Stiernhielm proposes his hypothesis that Japhetic Scythian (*Scythica Japhetica*) is the mother of all other languages makes it all the more relevant to present a summary to the interested reader.¹²⁷⁸ Diecmann’s summary served its intended purpose as an intermediary source for linguistic theorists in early modern Europe, as the Swedish edition of *Codex Argenteus* seems to have been rare in the European market.

19.2.2 Summary and criticism of the preface to *Wulfila*

Diecmann reviews Stiernhielm’s main positions in the preface on the origin of languages (*De linguarum origine praefatio*). He accordingly refers to the principles of a primordial monoglottism and of a possible restoration of all languages into the primeval state. Next, he accounts for Stiernhielm’s rejection of the divine creation of seventy-two new languages and for the rationalist assumption that no new languages were created at the Confusion of Languages at Babel, and that the Confusion only served the aim of dispersing the different peoples, and therefore initiated the process of dialect diversification. On this point he recounts that Stiernhielm did not hesitate to claim

¹²⁷⁷ The subtitle continues: *quo humaniorum literarum patronos atque cultores ad actum oratorium de Latinae, Graecae, Ebraicae et Germanicae linguarum encomiis die XXX Mart. h. l. q. c. habendum omni quo par est modo invitat M. Johannes Diecmannus Stadensis, Lycei patrii rector.*

¹²⁷⁸ Diecmann, *De lingua primigenia Ebraea*, p. 12.

that Hebrew, Phoenician, Aramaic, Syriac and Arabic are merely dialects of one and the same language. He points out that for this reason Stiernhielm was eager to establish that the language of Noah remained among the posterity of Shem and among some nations descended from Ham. After that, he relates how Stiernhielm argued that ethnic denominations of languages from eponymous ancestors of the nations are younger than the languages themselves, and that Hebrew has no special status merely because of the name Hebrew (as derived from Heber). Diecmann finally states that, having dethroned Hebrew, Stiernhielm wished to determine what general and common language Hebrew itself could be derived from. Stiernhielm proposed Japhetic Scythian (*Scythica Japhetica*) or Swedish-Gothic-Celtic (*Sueo-Gothico-Celtica*).

Having thus accounted for Stiernhielm's assumptions on these various questions, the author delivers his criticism. He agrees that all languages are derived from a single one and that Hebrew, no less than Aramaic, is a dialect of the primeval tongue, but disagrees with the claim that Aramaic and Hebrew are the same language. Diecmann argues that Stiernhielm embraced the opinions of Christian Ravius, then professor of Oriental languages in Sweden, who claimed that Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Samaritan, Arabic and Ethiopic are but dialects of one and the same Oriental tongue. In a footnote Diecmann refers to Ravius' treatises *Disputatio de Dudaim Rubenis* (Uppsala 1656, pp. 29 and 47), *Orthographiae et analogiae vulgo etymologiae Ebraicae delineatio* (Amsterdam 1646), and *A generall grammar for the ready attaining of the Ebrew, Samaritan, Calde, Syriac, Arabic, and the Ethiopic languages* (London 1649).¹²⁷⁹

19.3 Daniel Georg Morhof

In his literary history of German language and poetry, *Unterricht von der Teutschen Sprache und Poesie* (1682), the German polymath Daniel Georg Morhof (1639–1691) refers to Georg Stiernhielm as the main advocate of the Scythian hypothesis.¹²⁸⁰ In the first chapter he discusses the excellence and antiquity of the German language. He takes the middle ground in defining the position of German in relation to the learned languages Hebrew, Greek and Latin and disagrees with people who subordinate German to these languages. While he does not venture to question the pre-eminence of Hebrew, he argues that German is not younger than Greek and Latin, but rather much older. In this connection, he maintains that the Scythian

¹²⁷⁹ Diecmann, *De lingua primigenia*, p. 21, note 61.

¹²⁸⁰ Morhof, *Unterricht von der Teutschen Sprache und Poesie*, Kiel 1682, p. 5 and p. 11.

or Celtic language – vague terms by which he seems to mean proto-Germanic – is the sister of Greek and Latin rather than their daughter.¹²⁸¹

After a discussion of the nature of the primordial language in terms of the correspondence between words and reality (*analogismus nominum et rerum*) he returns to Stiernhielm's plans to publish a work titled *Runa Suethica* on the great antiquity of Scythian, referring to the printed conspectus or synopsis of chapters, about which Morhof observes that "Hebrew and almost all other languages are dialects of Scythian."¹²⁸² He admits that there are a number of true suppositions in the synopsis and regrets that Stiernhielm did not complete this work. Because of the rarity of extant copies, Morhof quotes the entire conspectus from the 1651 printing, which he possessed.¹²⁸³

Morhof reports on an otherwise unknown attempt to publish *Runa Suethica* after the author's death. He states that Johannes Schefferus (1621–1679), a German-Swedish classical philologist, gave a positive evaluation of *Runa Suethica*, but was not able to put it in order for publication and he also observes that Olof Rudbeck the Elder (1630–1702) in his *Atlantica* adopted many of the ideas from the printed conspectus of *Runa Suethica*.¹²⁸⁴ This was also observed by the Danish literary historian Johann Moller (1661–1725) in his supplement to *Suecia literata*, published in Hamburg in 1698.¹²⁸⁵

19.4 Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz

19.4.1 Leibniz as a linguistic researcher

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716), the famous philosopher and mathematician, was also qualified as a historian and etymologist. His systematic inquiries into comparative language studies date from the time after 1685. Because he used linguistic evidence for determining the origin of peoples,¹²⁸⁶ his historical investigations "brought him

¹²⁸¹ Morhof, *ibidem*, pp. 4–6.

¹²⁸² Morhof, *ibidem*, p. 12.

¹²⁸³ Morhof, *ibidem*, pp. 12–17.

¹²⁸⁴ Morhof, *ibidem*, p. 18.

¹²⁸⁵ Moller, *In Sueciam literatam Johannis Schefferi hypomnemata critico-historica* as an addition to Moller's revised edition of Schefferus' *Suecia literata*, Hamburg 1698, p. 401. This observation of Moller's has been repeated by biographers of Stiernhielm. Nordström emphasizes the similarity between Stiernhielm's *Runa Suethica* and Rudbeck's *Atlantica*. See "De yverbornes ö: sextonhundratsstuder: bidrag till Atlanticans förhistoria", *Rudbeckstudier*, Uppsala 1930, p. 295.

¹²⁸⁶ On Leibniz's use of languages as a historical method, see his programmatic treatise "Brevis designatio meditationum de originibus gentium ductis potissimum ex indicio linguarum", (Brief description of thoughts on the origin of peoples, primarily drawn from the indication of languages) in *Miscellanea Berolinensia ad*

into face to face with early documents in a variety of languages and dialects, but also engaged him in a correspondence that further stimulated his etymological studies.”¹²⁸⁷ One of his correspondents was the German Orientalist Hiob Ludolf (1624–1703), an expert on Ethiopic, with whom he entertained correspondence for discussion of linguistic and ethno-linguistic themes.¹²⁸⁸ According to Waterman’s classification, they discussed: (1) the geographical origin of the Germanic people, (2) the theory of a proto-language, (3) theory and method of establishing linguistic relationships, and (4) the study and improvement of the German language.¹²⁸⁹ These four themes are also the principal topics of Leibniz’s correspondence in general and they are central to his historical and linguistic authorship.¹²⁹⁰

Leibniz drew up a language classification in *Nouveaux Essais sur l’entendement humain* (1704, book III: 2)¹²⁹¹ and in *Brevis designatio*

incrementum scientiarum ex scriptis Societati Regiae Scientiarum exhibitis edita, vol. 1, Berolini/ Berlin 1710, pp. 1–16. At the outset Leibniz proposes the principle that languages serve as written testimonies of the remote origin of peoples, and the proper names of rivers, forests, places and persons are the most ancient traces of languages. This treatise was also published in *Gothofredi Guillelmi Leibnitii opera omnia* by Ludovicus (Ludwig) Dutens, Berlin 1789, vol. IV, part 2: 186–198. In his letter to Huldreich von Eyben of 26 March (5 April) 1691, Leibniz expressed the same view: “Ich glaube gänzlich daß die Harmoni der Sprachen das beste mittel von ursprung der völker zu urtheilen, und fast das einige so uns übrig bleiben, wo die Historien fehlen.” In *Nouveaux essais* III, ch. 2, § 1 he states that languages are the most ancient records of peoples before the invention of script, and the best means to explore the relationships and migrations of peoples.

¹²⁸⁷ Hans Aarsleff, “The study and use of etymology in Leibniz” in *Akten des internationalen Leibniz-Kongresses Hannover, 14.–9. November 1966*, Band III, Wiesbaden 1969, p. 174.

¹²⁸⁸ This correspondence of 61 letters was published as *Commercium epistolicum* by August Benedict Michaelis in 1755 and reprinted by Ludovicus Dutens in *Leibnitii Opera omnia*, vol. VI, part 1: 67–170 and part 2: 177–182, Genevae/ Geneve 1768. A selection has been translated and commented upon by John Waterman, *Leibniz and Ludoph on things linguistic: excerpts from their correspondence (1688–1703)*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1978.

¹²⁸⁹ Waterman, *ibidem*, 1978: 18.

¹²⁹⁰ Leibniz’s linguistic ideas about the origin and relationships of languages, his method of language documentation and his views on the poetry, sources and reform of the German language have been explored by Sigrid von der Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachworscher*, Frankfurt am Main 1973 (written between 1929 and 1939, and published posthumously by Kurt Müller). Leibniz’s linguistic thought on semiotics, universal language, semantic origin and change, primeval language, etymology and cognitive functions of language have been scrutinized by Albert Heinekamp, “Sprache und Wirklichkeit nach Leibniz” in H. Parret, *History of linguistic thought*, pp. 518–570.

¹²⁹¹ *Nouveaux essais*, book III, chapter 2, see G. W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Reihe VI: 6, pp. 280–281. In English translation by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennet: *New essays on human understanding* (1981), p. 280, one of the

*meditationum de originibus gentium ductis potissimum ex indicio linguarum.*¹²⁹² Concurring with Salmasius and Boxhorn, he accepted the results of the Scythian hypothesis, but did not use Scythian as a comprehensive term for the European proto-language. He did not identify Scythian with Gothic either, but used the term Scythian more narrowly as identical with Sarmatian and thus as referring to what he thought to be the common ancestor of Slavic, Turkish-Tataric and Finnish.¹²⁹³

19.4.2 Acquaintance with Skytte and Sparwenfeldt

Even before his encounter with Hiob Ludolf, from his early youth Leibniz had shown an interest in historical linguistic questions. During his time as a jurist in Mainz, he met the Swedish ex-councillor and linguistic scholar Bengt Skytte (1614–1683). During a sojourn in Frankfurt am Main in 1667 they discussed the project of compiling a universal harmonic dictionary of primitive word roots, taking as its point of departure Skytte's and Stiernhielm's attempts to restore the *lost* primeval language. Sigrd von der Schulenburg argues that Leibniz was also informed about Stiernhielm's etymological linguistic ideas on the nature of the primitive language, the designations of things according to their nature in agreement with the conceptions of the name giver, phonosemantic principles in the creation of words and the importance of paying attention to both the

key passages of which is: "If we go even further back in order to understand the origins of Celtic as well as of Latin and Greek, which have many roots in common with the Germanic or Celtic languages, we can conjecture that this results from the common origin of the peoples descended from the Scythians, who came from the Black Sea and crossed the Danube and the Vistula; some could have gone to Greece while the rest will have occupied Germany and Gaul. This is a consequence of the hypothesis that the Europeans came from Asia."

¹²⁹² In *Brevis designatio*, Leibniz proposes a hypothesis of a Euro-Asian language family (Leibniz 1710: 2–3; Dutens, *Leibnitii opera omnia*, pp. 187–188). He divides the world's languages in two classes, Japhetic languages and Aramaic languages, which include Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac, etc. (Leibniz 1710: 4; Dutens 1789: 188).

¹²⁹³ Leibniz, *Brevis designatio meditationum de origine gentium* [...], Dutens (ed.) 1789: 190: "Scythorum nomine a Celtis sejunctorum Turco-Tartarica, Sarmatica et Fennica complector, etsi haec tria multum inter se distent." Leibniz's historical language classification in *Brevis designatio* was systematized by Liselotte Richter, *Leibniz und sein Russlandbild*, Berlin 1946, pp. 82–84 and in a diagram appended to her book. An adaptation of this diagram is found in Waterman, "The Languages of the World: A classification by G. W. Leibniz", *Studies in Germanic languages and literature*, St Louis 1963, p. 34. Leibniz's efforts in sampling and classifying Slavic languages and the languages of the Russian Empire (as the site of Great Scythia, *magna Scythia*) are elucidated by Richter, *ibidem*, pp. 75–81, 84–90.

meaning and the sound of words.¹²⁹⁴ They apparently discussed other topics, such as Skytte's proposal to Friedrich Wilhelm, Elector of Brandenburg, to establish a university dedicated to pansophical learning, which Skytte conceived as "the sunny city of the wise" (*Heliosophopolis*, often only *Sophopolis*).¹²⁹⁵

In 1694, Leibniz began to correspond with the Swedish linguist and diplomat Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeldt (1655–1727). This brought him even closer to Stiernhielm's linguistic ideas, because Sparwenfeldt supplied Leibniz with rare Swedish books, for instance Stiernhielm's *Anti-Cluverius* (1685)¹²⁹⁶, but he apparently already possessed the 1671 edition of *Codex Argenteus* with Stiernhielm's *De linguarum origine praefatio*.¹²⁹⁷ Sparwenfeldt lent him a unique manuscript volume from the 1640s (*Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielm*) which contains Stiernhielm's Hebrew-Swedish dictionary *Magog Gothus*, drafts of phonosemantic ideas that follow up those proposed by Plato in the dialogue *Cratylus* (Vol. 1, Section 9.3.1), moreover notes on the historical foundations of the etymological dictionary *Adelruna* in a text titled *Adelrunae conclusions* (Section 10.3.2) and finally the draft conspectus of *Runa Suethica* (Section 11.1.1) and the etymological treatise *Mysterium etymologicum* (Section 8.1.2). Leibniz showed an interest in these writings. He drew up a summary of Stiernhielm's *de linguarum origine praefatio*¹²⁹⁸ and copied the conspectus of *Runa Suethica* from its second printing with the main title *Babel destructa* (1669).¹²⁹⁹ He also paid attention to *Mysterium etymologicum*, which he had transcribed from Stiernhielm's original in clear handwriting until the first half of the last page.¹³⁰⁰

¹²⁹⁴ von der Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, pp. 31–32.

¹²⁹⁵ Leibniz, *Epistolaris de historia etymologica dissertatio*, Ms. IV 469, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, fol. 84r.

¹²⁹⁶ Leibniz to Claude Nicaise on 9 (19) August 1697, in *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. Philosophischer Briefwechsel*, Band 3 (1695–1700), p. 365, where Leibniz states that he had received several rare Swedish books from Sparwenfeldt, for instance *Suecia literata* by Schefferus (1680), *Anti-Cluverius* by Stiernhielm (1685), and *Zamolxis primus Getarum legislator* by Carl Lundius (1687).

¹²⁹⁷ Leibniz to Gustaf Daniel Schmidt 28 February (8 March) 1695, G. W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Reihe I, Band 11, p. 314: "Je souhaiterois les livres de Sternhielm (excepté des Evangeliques Gothiques)", that is, "I wish to have the books of Stiernhielm apart from his Gothic Gospels."

¹²⁹⁸ Ms. IV 470, fol. 28r–28v, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover. Cf. Sigrid von der Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, Frankfurt am Main 1973, (published posthumously by Kurt Müller), p. 31, note 36.

¹²⁹⁹ Ms. IV, 470, Bl. 253r–254v. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover. Cf. von der Schulenberg, *ibidem*, p. 31, note 37.

¹³⁰⁰ Ms. XXXII. 1715, fols. 1r–2v. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover. Cf. von der Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, p. 31.

19.4.3 Leibniz on Stiernhielm in his correspondence

In his correspondence with his countrymen, Leibniz occasionally refers to the lexicographical projects and the linguistic ideas of both Stiernhielm and Skytte. In his first undated letter to Hiob Ludolf (c. 1688) he proposed the compilation of a small polyglot dictionary that would contain the primitive words of most of the known languages. In this manner, one would come closer to “that which Skytte and Stiernhielm and others have in vain attempted, viz. a harmony of many languages and *in* many languages, from which the origins of peoples would be wonderfully illustrated, to keep silent on the many secrets in these matters that such a comparison would reveal.”¹³⁰¹ He tells his correspondents about Stiernhielm’s equation of Scythian with Scandinavian and the Swedish appropriation of the concept of a Gothic language,¹³⁰² his view that Swedish comes closest to the primeval language¹³⁰³ and that there is a kinship between Finnish and

¹³⁰¹ Leibniz to Hiob Ludolf, around 19 December 1687, in G. W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Reihe I (Allgemeinter politischer och historischer Briefwechsel), Band 5 (1687–1690), p. 31: “Ac tum demum accederemus credo nonnihil ad id, quod Skyttius et Stiernhielmus alique frustra attentarunt, harmoniam scilicet linguarum plerarumque et in plerisque; unde et origines populorum mirifice illustrarentur, ut et alia multa taceam latentia in his arcana, quae una demum collatio detegeret.” Waterman, *Leibniz and Ludolf on things linguistic*, p. 20. Cf. Dutens, *Leibnitii Opera omnia*, vol. VI, part 1: 87.

¹³⁰² Leibniz to Gerhard Meier on 24 September (4 October) 1695, G. W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, I: 11, p. 709: “Interea omnia a bonis illis Septentrionibus ut Stiernhielmio, Rudbeckio, Verelio et similibus profecta, multa cum cautione legenda sunt, nam nimis sibi indulgent. Non video cur Scandica magis sit Scythica, quam quae tot alii habent populi Septentrionis. Multum etiam vereor ut Gothica tantum ad ipsos Scandinavios pertineant, quantum ipsis videtur. Certe Codicis Argentei dialectus longissime distat a Scandica.” In English translation: ‘However, of all works proceeding from good northern authors like Stiernhielm, Rudbeck, Verelius and their likes, many are to be read with caution, as they allow themselves too much. I do not see why Scandinavian is more Scythian than those (languages) that other peoples of the north have. I am also afraid that the Gothic language does not belong so exclusively only to the Scandinavians themselves, as they believe. The language of *Codex Argenteus* is indeed very distant from Scandinavian’. The concept of the north “Septentrio” comprises the whole of Europe in Leibniz’s explicit terminology; see *Brevis designatio meditationum de origine gentium* [...], 1710: 3; Dutens (ed.) 1789: 188: “totam vero Europam nostram Septentrioni computo”.

¹³⁰³ Leibniz to his teacher Jakob Thomasius (1622–1684) on 6 (16) April 1670, *Leibniz philosophische Briefwechsel*, Band 1, pp. 57–58). After having stated that John Webb has ventured to claim that Chinese is the primitive language, Leibniz asks: “Et quid mirum, postquam Georg. Stiernhielm orbi persuadere conatur linguam Suethicam, cui Scythicam veterem eandem facit, esse Hebrea priorem.” In English translation: ‘And what a wonder after Georg Stiernhielm tries to persuade the world that Swedish, which he makes the same as old Scythian, is older than

Hungarian.¹³⁰⁴ In a letter to Sparwenfeldt he reports that Stiernhielm had the same intention as van Schrieck (1560–1622)¹³⁰⁵ and Bengt Skytte.¹³⁰⁶ In a letter to Sparwenfeldt in 1698 he announces that he approves overall of *De linguarum origine praefatio*,¹³⁰⁷ but in a letter to Gerhard Maier in 1696 he had taken exception to Stiernhielm’s hypothesis that Indian-American peoples and languages do not derive from the same stock as the European ones.¹³⁰⁸ Leibniz assumed that all languages can be reduced to the lost primeval language. On the other hand, in a letter to Huldreich von Eyben in 1691 he had stated that all languages from the Indus River to the Baltic Sea are of one and the same origin, but that it is not easy to judge on the languages of India, of the parts Africa not explored by the Romans, and of America.¹³⁰⁹

In a letter to Sparwenfeldt of 6 (16) December 1695 Leibniz notes that Stiernhielm followed in the tracks of Adrian van Schrieck.¹³¹⁰ Sparwenfeldt was evidently of the same opinion as his correspondent. In a letter to Leibniz of 11 November 1696, he argues that Skytte and Stiernhielm held the same views as Adrian van Schrieck (here called Schrieckius Rodornus), who argued that every language has a hidden seed from Hebrew.¹³¹¹ In his letter to Leibniz of 1 January 1698, Sparwenfeldt claims that Stiernhielm was fond of van Schrieck (“a aymé Schrieckius Rodornus”) and that they both compared all

Hebrew’. Most likely Leibniz had learned this from his discussion with Skytte in 1667, since *De linguarum origine praefatio* was still unpublished.

¹³⁰⁴ Leibniz to Adam Adamandus Kochanski, second half of August 1693, Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, I: 9, p. 269: “Stiernielmius et Comenius iam notarunt multa Finnonibus et Hungaris vocabula communia esse.” In English translation: ‘Stiernhielm and Commentius have already noted that there are many words common to the Finns and the Hungarians’.

¹³⁰⁵ van Schrieck was a Flemish state official and linguist, on whose linguistic ideas, see above (Section 3.4.3).

¹³⁰⁶ Leibniz. *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, I: 12: p. 218: After having stated that Skytte had collected a great number of words: “Mr Stiernielm avoit de desseins approachans.”

¹³⁰⁷ Leibniz to Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeldt on 27 December 1698 (6 January 1699), G. W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, I:16, pp. 425–426, referring to Stiernhielm: “Ce qu’il a écrit contre Cluverius ne me [p. 426] paroît pas fort solide. Mais se preface du Codex Argenteus contient des bonnes choses.”

¹³⁰⁸ Leibniz to Gerhard Maier in January 1696: “Miror liberatam, qua ille in publico scribit Americanos videri sibi gentem a quovis alio quam ab Adamo eademque stirpe nobiscum ortam ob plane totoque differentem linguam.” See Sigrid von der Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, p. 99, note 193.

¹³⁰⁹ Leibniz to Huldreich von Eyben on 5 April 1691, Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, I: 6, p. 442.

¹³¹⁰ Leibniz. *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, I: 12: p. 218.

¹³¹¹ Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, I: 14, p. 342.

languages with Hebrew. Moreover, he argues that Stiernhielm's etymology generally withstands the test of examination: "I think at least that this man did good work and had an extraordinary talent, and I have found that there is much sense in a great deal of his etymologies."¹³¹² In the next sentence he points out Stiernhielm's theory of phonosemantics in *Mysterium etymologicum* (ms. XXXII 1715, fols. 77v–79r):

The observation that you made about the speech sounds that contain something particular and natural is a topic that Mr. Stiernhielm also has dealt with, as you can see in his manuscript, which Hertel will bring to you.¹³¹³

Leibniz had obviously mentioned this topic in his correspondence with Sparwenfeldt in an earlier letter of 19 November 1697, which apparently remains unpublished. I have not been able to identify it in the publications of Leibniz's correspondence.

In his dialogue on Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding* (1704, published 1765),¹³¹⁴ and in his historical account of etymological ideas and literature (1712, published 1991),¹³¹⁵ Leibniz argues that the words of the primeval language had a connection to the nature of things, though not according to the rules of reason, but more according to the emotions, conceptions and instincts of man.¹³¹⁶

¹³¹² Sparwenfeldt to Leibniz on 1 (11) January 1698, in G.W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Reihe I, Band 15, Berlin 1998, p. 188: "Je trouve du moins que cet home a bien travaillé et qu'il a eu (un) geni tout à fait extraordinaire, et j'ay trouvé beaucoup de realité dans quantité de ses etimologies."

¹³¹³ J. G. Sparwenfeldt to Leibniz 1 (11) January 1698, in Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe* I:15, p. 188: "L'observassion que vous me faites sur les lettres qui remferment quelque chose de particulier et naturel est une chose que Mr Stiernhielm a pAnsé aussi comme vous le trouvez dans son MSS. que M^f Hertel vous apportera."

¹³¹⁴ Leibniz, *Nouveaux Essais sur l'entendement humain*, book III, chapter 2, see G. W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Reihe VI: 6, pp. 282–285. In this treatise he set out from the French translation of Locke's work by Pierre Coste (1700).

¹³¹⁵ Leibniz, *Epistolaris de historia etymologica dissertatio*, Ms. IV 469, §§ 14–19, fols 74v–80r, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover. A textual edition is provided by Gensini, *Il naturale re il simbolico: saggio su Leibniz* (in the series Bibliotheca di culturs 436), Roma 1991, pp. 215–224. Leibniz establishes the principles of phonosemantics (§§ 14–16) and demonstrates onomatopoetic words in German and Greek (§§ 17–18). He also accounts for his Silesian correspondent Caspar Neumann's application of sound symbolism to Hebrew (§ 19).

¹³¹⁶ von der Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, p. 1. Cf. *Brevis designatio meditationum de origine gentium* [...], 1710: p. 2; cf. Dutens 1789: p. 187: "Tales detegunt sese primae origines vocabulorum, quotiens penetrari potest ad radicem

He thinks that this is a characteristic feature of the primeval language, but that it is lost in modern languages. This theory conforms with Stiernhielm's phonosemantic ideas in his notes on Cratylus and his *Mysterium etymologicum*. A thorough comparison is beyond the scope of the present reception study, but I think that the question of impact should thereby be identified as a topic for further historiographical research.

19.4.4 Leibniz on Stiernhielm in his scholarly treatises

Leibniz refers to Stiernhielm's linguistic ideas in two of his treatises, first in the treatise on the origin of Germanic peoples, *De origine Germanorum*, written around 1697, and then in a treatise on the history of etymology in the form of a letter to Johann Georg Eccard, *Epistolaris de historia etymologica dissertatio* (1712).¹³¹⁷ In the former treatise he discusses the topic of the order of migration, whether Germany was peopled from Scandinavia through waves of migrations of Goths or whether Scandinavia was populated from Scythia and Germany.¹³¹⁸ His discussion of this topic with Eric Benzeliuſ the Younger in the autumn of 1697 and with Sparwenfeldt in their correspondence had drawn his attention to the strong status and impact of Rudbeckianism on the other side of the Baltic Sea. At the end of this treatise he states:

I willingly concede to Stiernhielm and Rudbeck the glory of the Hyperborean name and to Jordanes and Grotius the migrations of

ὀνοματοποιίας. Sed plerumque tractu temporum, crebris translationibus veteres et nativae significationes mutatae sunt aut obscuratae. Neque vero ex instituto profectae et quasi lege conditae sunt linguae, sed naturali quodam impetu natae hominum, sonos ad affectus motusque animi attemperantium.” In English translation: ‘The first origins of the words show themselves like that, as often as we are able to penetrate into the origin of onomatopoeia. But often their ancient and natural meanings are changed and obscured through the course of time and because of frequent transferred meanings. Languages neither proceeded from agreement nor are they formed by a law, but rather they are born out of a natural impulse of men who adjusted the sounds to their feelings and the movements of their minds’.

¹³¹⁷ Ms. IV 469, fols. 68v–104v (fair copy with Leibniz's autograph additions in the margin, referred to as *Reinschrift* by Sigrid von der Schulenburg (1973), Gottfried-Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, Hannover. There is a preliminary draft in ms. IV 469, fols. 36r–45v, and ms. IV 441, fols. 16r–23r.

¹³¹⁸ This is also one of Leibniz's topics in his letter to Huldreich von Eyben of 26 March (5 April) 1691, Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Reihe I, 6, p. 442: “Muß auch in etwas Migrationes Gentium et Origines Linguarum betrachten. Da denn die frage, wo her die Völker zu erst in diese lande kommen, ob aus Scandinavia, wie einige schohn voralters, und letzten Rudbeckius gewolt, oder aber ex Scythia. Und ob nicht vielmehr die völker auß diesen landen in die balthischen Insulen, auch Schweden und Norwegen gezogen.”

colonies of Goths, but I think that these scholars ought to take caution not to interpret whatever is reputable as referring to the honour of their own nations by weak and almost Goropian reasons and in doing so remove reliability from (historical) truth.¹³¹⁹

Towards the end of the treatise, Leibniz also refers to Stiernhielm's hypothesis of a Finno-Ugric language family, as it is expressed in *De linguarum origine praefatio* (1671).¹³²⁰

On the basis of his broad knowledge of premodern etymological literature, Leibniz composed a treatise on the history of etymological studies (*Epistolaris de historia etymologica dissertatio*, 1712) as a reply on his pupil Johann Georg Eccard's history of the study of German etymology (*Historia studii etymologici linguae Germanicae*, 1711). Leibniz aims to fill the gaps in Eccard's work and correct his partly superficial assessments. He demonstrates more broadly the supply of etymological literature that can contribute to developing a German etymological dictionary. He also shows his superiority over Eccard in terms of having a wider general overview, deeper insight into the underlying linguistic theories and a more thorough assessment of previous literature.¹³²¹ Like most of Leibniz's linguistic works, this one was not published in his lifetime. He had certainly intended to make it appear as an introduction to his studies of etymology, but Eccard excluded it when he published Leibniz's etymological collections, *Collectanea etymologica* in 1717. A textual edition of the treatise was planned by Hans Aarsleff in his article on "The study and use of etymology in Leibniz" (1969: 177) and it was realized by Stefano Gensini in 1991.¹³²²

In his treatment of the theory and practice of universalist polyglot lexicography (Ms. IV 469, §§ 25–27, fols. 83v–87v) Leibniz refers to the enterprise of Bengt Skytte and mentions the manuscript treatises by Stiernhielm that Sparwenfeldt had sent him. Leibniz mentions how he, as a young man, met Skytte in Frankfurt and reports Skytte's

¹³¹⁹ Leibniz, "Dissertatio de origine Germanorum" in Dutten (ed.), *Leibnitii opera omnia*, vol. IV, part II (Historia et antiquitates), p. 205: [...] "gloriam Hyperborei nominis Stiernhielmio et Rudbeckio emissasque Gothorum colonias Iordnandi Grotioque non illibenter concedam, tametsi viris doctis cavendum censeam, ne dum quicquid uspiam inclytum est, levibus et pene Goropianis argumentis ad suae gentis decus trahunt, etiam veris fidem demant."

¹³²⁰ Leibniz, "Dissertatio de origine Germanorum", ibidem, p. 204: "Hungaricam autem linguam in multis Fennonicae consentire iam Comenius in Didacticis et Stiernhielmio in Argentei Codicis praefatione notarunt."

¹³²¹ von der Schulenburg, *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, pp. 216–217.

¹³²² Gensini, *Il naturale e il simbolico*, pp. 201–271 with the indication of paragraph numbers of the manuscript (1–50) and of folio numbers of the fair copy.

family background, his dismissal from the royal council and how he persuaded Elector Friedrich Wilhelm the Great to found a pansophical city (*Heliosophopolis*). According to Leibniz, Skytte aimed to collect traces of the primeval language in the modern languages and having collected a sufficient number of word roots to be able to arrive at the common source. Skytte valued Icelandic as a very old dialect of old German, knew of the kinship between Finnish and Hungarian, and recommended old Turkic in its older Tataric stage. Finally Leibniz remarks that Skytte was inspired by Stiernhielm.¹³²³

At this point Leibniz makes a digression on Stiernhielm, whose antiquarian and lexicographic writings Eccard himself is referring to in his history of German etymological studies¹³²⁴: “He [i.e. Skytte] used Stiernhielm as a supporter, whom you too remember and whose various attempts, albeit not so far advanced, have reached me thanks to the noble Sparwenfeldt. There will be an opportunity to talk about him below.”¹³²⁵ The expression “different attempts” ought to refer to the works of Stiernhielm that Eccard mentions and other treatises that are contained in ms. XXXII 1715, notably *Mysterium etymologicum* and the phonosemantic notes on Plato’s *Cratylus*.

After speculating on why Skytte did not manage to recover his status under the reign of Charles XI, Leibniz states that he does not know whether the Swede’s lexicographic notes are of any importance and into whose hands they have come, but considers his plans worth mentioning in “a non-proletarian literary history” (*historiae literariae non proletariae*) and his memory worth being rescued.¹³²⁶

¹³²³ Leibniz, *Epistolaris ... dissertatio*, ms. IV 469, fol. 84r, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, Hannover, fol. 84r in an autograph addition in the margin.

¹³²⁴ J. G. Eccardus, *Historia studii etymologici linguae Germanicae*, Hanoverae/Hannover 1711, pp. 194–200, where *Runa Suethica* (1651), *Magog Aramaeo-Gothicus* (1644), *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur* (1643, here referred to as *Conditorium linguae Suecicae sive lexicon vocabulorum antiquorum Gothicorum*). Eccard tells that according to a catalogue in 1690 (likely U91:1) a complete version of this dictionary is extant in manuscript in the library of the College of Antiquities. He refers to the explanatory index of obscure words in Stiernhielm’s edition of the Westrogothian code (*Wäst-Götha laghbok* 1663). He supposes that an incomplete version of *Virgula divina seu clavis linguarum generalis* is left in manuscript.

¹³²⁵ Leibniz, *Epistolaris*, fol. 84r: “Adiutore Sternielmio utebatur, cuius tu quoque meministi et cuius nonnulla molimina, etsi parum propecta beneficio illustris Sparwenfeldii ad me pervenere. Et erit infra de eo loquendi locus.”

¹³²⁶ Leibniz, *ibidem*, fol. 84r. In a letter to Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeldt of 6 (16) December 1695 Leibniz expresses ignorance of the fate of Skytte’s dictionary: “Mr. Bengt Skytte me disoit un jour lui-meme, qu’il avoit ramassé les racines de quantité des langues, mais je ne sai si cela ne s’est perdu.” See Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, I: 12: p. 218. See the letter to Huldreich von Eyben of 26 March 1691, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, I: 6, p. 442: “Der H. Baron Skitt,

As promised, Leibniz actually returns to Stiernhielm, but not to treat his achievements separately. He mentions him among scholars who do not accept the hypothesis of Hebrew's supreme linguistic primordially. In the first enumeration, Leibniz counts Stiernhielm, Goropius Becanus, Philipp Clüver and Hugo Grotius among the opponents of this idea "who think that the primeval language does not survive anywhere, but is dispersed in all others."¹³²⁷ Though often underlining that he himself takes a middle position between those who approve and those who reject the Hebrew primordially hypothesis, Leibniz adds on this occasion: "their reasons have weight even in my opinion".¹³²⁸ In the second passage, Leibniz numbers Stiernhielm with scholars whom the Oriental philologist Heinrich Muhlius (1666–1733) had criticized in a dissertation on Hebrew as the mother of languages. Again Leibniz states that he stands in the middle, but thinks that Muhlius is too fierce in his criticism of Philastrius of Brescia, Philipp Clüver, Hugo Grotius, Meric Casaubon, Stiernhielm and Pierre Daniel Huet.¹³²⁹

19.5 Jäger and Kirchmaier

19.5.1 Jäger as a precursor of Indo-European linguistics

In modern historiography of linguistic ideas, Andreas Jäger (c. 1658–1730) has got the reputation of being of one of the main precursors of Indo-European linguistics. As stated above (Section 1.2.2), the American linguist George Metcalf called attention to Jäger in an article published in 1974, which is the first modern historiographical

Senator regni Suecici so nun wie ich glaube todt, hatte sich in werenden seinen Exilio viel mit diesen dingen bemühet; und sagte er hätte gesamlet voces radicales plerarumque linguarum exploratarum, so er mit einander zu conciliiren vermeinte, weis nicht wo seine dinge hinkommen." Skytte's dictionary, which is titled "Sol praecipuarum linguarum subsolarium", that is, 'Sun of the main subsolar languages', is extant as ms. Ihre 47 (236 leaves) at Uppsala University Library. There is a fragment at Linköping Diocese Library (Linköping Stiftsbibliotek), ms. S(pråkv.) 2 (68 pages) and another fragment at Royal Library, Stockholm.

¹³²⁷ Leibniz, *ibidem*, fol. 85r: "Huc porro omnes referendi sunt, qui caeteras linguas ex Hebraica deducunt [...] et ut verbo dicam, etymologi pene omnes, si Goropium Becanum (a Levino Torrentio defensum), Cluverium, Sternielmum et ipsum Hugonem Grotium et alios nonnullos recentiores excipias, qui linguam primigeniam nuspiam superesse, sed per caeteras dispersam arbitrantur." Gensini (1991: 237) reads Sternioluum, but the manuscript has Sternielmum.

¹³²⁸ Leibniz, *ibidem*, fol. 85r: "quorum rationes apud me quoque pondus habent".

¹³²⁹ Muhlius, *De origine linguarum variarum, stirpeque ac matre*, Kiloni/ Kiel, 1692, § 27, p. 87v: "etsi ipse paulo acius pro vulgari opinione Babelica contra Philastrium, Philippum Cluverium, Hugonem Grotium, Mericum Casaubonum, Georgium Sternielmum aliosque praeclaros scriptores certet, quibus insignem virum Petrum Danielem Huetium Episcopum Abrincensem emeritum adiungo [...]. Gensini (1991: 242) has *Sternielnium*. The ms. reads *Sternielmum*.

account of the Scythian hypothesis,.¹³³⁰ At the outset, he sums up the contents of this historical linguistic assumption, as presented by Jäger in his master's thesis in Wittenberg in 1686: *De lingua vetustissima Europae vernacula, Scytho-Celtica et Gothica*, 'On the most ancient vernacular of Europe, Scytho-Celtic and Gothic':

An ancient language, once spoken in the distant past in the area of the Caucasus mountains and spreading with waves of migration throughout Europe and Asia, had itself ceased to be spoken and left no linguistic monuments behind, but as a "mother" had generated a host of "daughter languages", many of which in turn became mothers to further "daughters". (For a language tends to develop dialects, and in the course of time these dialects become independent, mutually unintelligible languages.) Descendants of the ancestral language include Persian, Greek, Italic (whence Latin and later the modern Romance tongues), the Slavonic languages, Celtic, and finally Gothic and the other Germanic tongues.¹³³¹

Metcalf emphasizes that these views were "typical of at least one important strand of linguistic tradition in Northern Europe." In their historical account of the advocates of the Scythian hypothesis, Lyle Campbell and William Poser maintain that Jäger's formulation is "perhaps the best known" and "presents a modern-sounding view of Indo-European relationships".¹³³² They quote Metcalf's summary of Jäger's line of argument as if it were Jäger's statement, and they justify the quotation: "because of its particularly modern sound and because of the remarkable similarities that Jones' philologist passage bears to it, though Jones' proclamation came a hundred years later."¹³³³

¹³³⁰ Metcalf, "The Indo-European hypothesis in the 16th and 17th centuries" in Dell Hymes (ed.), *Studies in the history of linguistics: traditions and paradigms*, Bloomington & London 1974, pp. 233–257. Metcalf's historiographical articles on linguistic ideas between 1600 and 1800 including this one have been republished in *On language diversity and relationship from Bibliander to Adelung*, ed. by Toon van Hal and Raf van Rooy, Amsterdam: Benjamins 2013.

¹³³¹ Metcalf, "The Indo-European hypothesis", p. 233 (slightly revised).

¹³³² Lyle Campbell and William J. Poser, *Language classification: history and methods*, Cambridge 2008, p. 22.

¹³³³ Campbell and Poser, *ibidem*, p. 22. Jones' "philologist passage" refers to the famous statement on a historical kinship between Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Celtic, Germanic and old Persian in Sir William Jones' "Third anniversary discourse on the Hindus" delivered on 2 February 1786, first published in *Asiatic Researches*, vol 1, 1788 and later in *The Works of Sir William Jones* (vol. 1, 1799), which I have used. The passage reads (p. 24):

In the dissertation in question, there are many explicit references to treatises by Stiernhielm. Metcalf notes that Stiernhielm is an important authority. The extremely high degree of dependence on Stiernhielm has, however, generally been overlooked. Everything that is stated about Scythian and its diversification into the branches of European languages and into Persian and about the language-dialect distinction – with its Aristotelian criterion of a dichotomy between substance and accidental qualities – turns out to be rephrasings of Stiernhielm’s *De linguarum origine praefatio*, even in some passages where there are no overt references to it. Before exploring Jäger’s use of Stiernhielm, I will outline the course of Jäger’s life and address the intricate question of the authorship of the thesis under consideration.

19.5.2 Jäger’s academic studies and career as a clergyman

In linguistic historiography, the information that is available about the life and work of Andreas Martini Jäger is so far rather scanty. He is merely known as a Swedish philologist and clergyman. However, his life is briefly and accurately described in a biography of Swedish clergymen in the former parish of Trögden in Uppsala diocese, where he served as a vicar between 1710 and 1730.¹³³⁴ From the title page of his 1686 thesis it may be inferred that he was a native of Stockholm (*Holmiensis*). He was son of the Stockholm tanner

The *Sanscrit* language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the *Greek*, more copious than the *Latin*, and more exquisitely refined than either, yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and the forms of grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident; so strong indeed, that no philologist could examine them all three, without believing them to have sprung from some common source, which, perhaps, no longer exists: there is a similar reason, though not quite so forcible, for supposing that both the *Gothick* and the *Celtick*, though blended with a very different idiom, had the same origin with the *Sanscrit*; and the old Persian might be added to the same family, if this were the place for discussing any question concerning the antiquities of Persia.

Robins similarly underlines that Jones was preceded by Jäger: “His conception of a common source had in fact been anticipated in the seventeenth century by the Swedish scholar Jäger (1686)”; see Robins “History of language classification” in Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Current trends in linguistics*, vol. 11, 1973, p. 20.

¹³³⁴ Lars Otto Berg, Magdalena Hellquist, and Ragnar Norrman, *Uppsala stifts herdaminne*, Band II:8:1 (Trögds-Åsunda kontrakt 1593–1999; 1. Trögds kontrakt), Stockholm 2004, pp. 520–522 on Andreas Martini Jäger as vicar of Husby-Sjutolft (in the county of Uppland). This is the main source for my account below. Important biographical information is also given by Gösta Thimon, *Stockholms nations studenter i Uppsala 1649–1800*, Uppsala 1982, pp. 1677–1678.

(*karduansmakare*) Mårten Hindersson Jäger and Margareta Pedersdotter Ross/ Roos.

On 10 February 1677, Andreas M. Jäger enrolled as a student at Uppsala University together with his brother Johannes Martini Jäger. They most likely studied theology, classical philology and Swedish antiquities. Andreas was probably in some way now introduced to the Uppsala circle of Stiernhielm imitators, among whom the brothers Jacob and Andreas Wollimhaus are counted. They later became high officials in the state administration. In 1680, Jacob Wollimhaus was ennobled Gyllenborg, under which name he is one of the two dedicatees of Jäger's thesis on the most ancient language of Europe. Jäger stayed at Uppsala University until 1685, when he went abroad.

Several members of the College of Swedish Antiquities, such as Schefferus (1621–1679) and Verelius (1618–1682), were still active. Olof Rudbeck the Elder (1630–1702), the author of *Atlantica* (four volumes, 1679–1702) also left a distinct mark on the intellectual environment of Uppsala University. Andreas Jäger was most likely influenced by the prevailing ideas of Rudbeckianism. His brother Johannes Jäger submitted a dissertation, *De antiquitate et situ gentis Sveonicae* (1689) under the chairmanship of Petrus Lagerlöf. If these subjects were the main focus of Andreas Jäger's studies it would explain his choice of topic for his thesis at the university of Wittenberg in 1686, where he had enrolled in February 1685.¹³³⁵

At the “amphitheater of Electoral Saxony”, he submitted in the autumn semester of 1685 his *pro exercitio* thesis *Castrum doloris typicum Coronae Sueciae*. In the early spring semester, on 6 February 1686, he defended the dissertation *De lingua vetustissima Europae, Scytho-Celtica et Gothica* under the chairmanship of Georg Caspar Kirchmaier. This was a *pro gradu* thesis, because Jäger was promoted to master of philosophy in Wittenberg on 27 April 1686.

After returning to Sweden he was ordained in 1689 and served at first as a curate at Riddarholmen, Stockholm, then as private pastor for the royal councillor Gustaf Oxenstierna (1626–1693), and after that at other congregations in Stockholm. During 1705–1706, he was pastor in the house of the royal counsellor Ludwig Fahlström, who was factory master at Vällinge in the parish of Salem, Stockholm.¹³³⁶

¹³³⁵ Thimon, *ibidem*, p. 1677.

¹³³⁶ Jäger's time at Vällinge (Salem) is judged very unfavourably in a biography of clergymen in the diocese of Strängnäs; see K. A. Hagström, *Strängnäs stifts herdaminne*, vol. 3, Strängnäs 1899, pp. 139–140. Jäger's actions are assessed from the perspective of the Cathedral chapter. However, according to the country squire Fahlström, who had the right to appoint pastors (“patronsrätt”), Jäger discharged his duties as pastor “to the particular pleasure and delight of everyone”. See L. O. Berg, M. Hellquist, R. Norrman, *Uppsala stifts herdaminne*, vol. II:8:1, p. 521.

By royal decree he was appointed vicar of Husby-Sjutolft (east of Enköping) on 4 June 1708. After passing the vicar's exam in 1708 he took office in 1710 and became a rural dean in 1723.

19.5.3 Question of authorship: Jäger and/ or Kirchmaier

As stated above, Jäger submitted his thesis on the most ancient language of Europe under the chairmanship of the German polymath Georg Caspar Kirchmaier (1635–1700), professor of eloquence. In a separate article, Metcalf (1966) ascribes the authorship to Jäger rather than to Kirchmaier.¹³³⁷ In his opinion, this is made clear by the complete title page with its final line: “publice disseret Andreas Jäger”, that is, ‘Andreas Jäger will publicly discuss’. Under the heading of “Possible counter-evidence” Considine (2008b) questions whether this phrase can serve as a conclusive evidence for Jäger's sole authorship. Moreover, he questions the value of the congratulatory poems of Jäger's countrymen Printz and Rönnow as proof for determining the authorship. Considine argues that the choice of topic did not require any specific knowledge available only to a Swedish scholar, since Kirchmaier refers to Rudbeck's *Atlantica* in a thesis on Plato's views of Atlantis in his dialogues Timaeus and Critias: *De Atlantide ad Timaeum et Critiam Platonis* (1685). He argues that the dissertation topic reflects Kirchmaier's interest in the linguistic, historical and antiquarian topics in a wide range of dissertations that he enumerates, for instance *Parallelismus et convenientia XII linguarum ex matrice Scytho-Celtica Europae* (1697). He identifies a statement, where, in 1693, Georg Wilhelm Kirchmaier takes for granted that his father Georg Caspar Kirchmaier “treated the Gothic language extensively in *De lingua vetustissima Europae Scytho-Celtica et Gothica*”. Considine concludes that Kirchmaier was at least a collaborative author in light of the fact that the chairman generally was the author of an academic dissertation – both *sub praeside* and *pro gradu* – on the European Continent in the 17th and 18th centuries.¹³³⁸

As chairman Kirchmaier wrote a congratulatory letter to Jäger as to “a most worthy candidate of philosophy and a dear house companion and friend” – *philos(ophiae) cand(idato), dignissimo et victori et amico dilectissimo*. He refers to Jäger's written (*litteris*) and spoken (*voce*) defence “publicly at the teacher's podium”

¹³³⁷ Metcalf, “Andreas Jäger and his *De lingua vetustissima Europae* (1686)”, *Modern language notes* 81: 489–593.

¹³³⁸ John Considine, “Did Andreas Jäger or Georg Caspar Kirchmaier write the dissertation *De lingua vetustissima Europae* (1686)?” in *Historiographia Linguistica* 35 (2008): 13–22.

(*publice in cathedra*) of the topic at issue, namely the antiquity of the Scythian language of the Goths and Celts.¹³³⁹ He praises the good judgement shown by choosing this topic. He refers to Jägers's "love of the illustrious psaltery" (*amore psalteriae illustris*, i.e. his interest in music), and "his fervour for studies so far pursued praiseworthily" (*fervore studiorum laudatissime actorum hactenus*). He ends with the wish that gracious God may further favour Jäger's noble attempts (*tuos nobiles conatus*). The word "conatus" refers to scholarly writings. He signs this complimentary letter in his own library (*e museo*) on 28 February 1686.¹³⁴⁰

The author shows a comprehensive acquaintance with antiquarian and linguistic research in Sweden in the latter half of the 17th century. He frequently refers to or quotes from Stiernhielm's *De linguarum origine praefatio*, *Anti-Cluverius* and *De Hyperboreis dissertatio*. Several times he refers to *Atlantica* by Olof Rudbeck the Elder and cites Olof Rudbeck and Georg Stiernhielm as "ornaments of the fatherland" (*patriae ornamenta*)¹³⁴¹ – an homage that can be seen as originating from Jäger solely or as a proof of the collaboration between Kirchmaier and Jäger. In some passages he refers to Olof Verelius' work on the Icelandic sagas (for instance Gautrek's Saga). The knowledge of Stiernhielm's treatises is so profound that it seems to originate from a Swedish philologist, but at the same time it may testify to the close collaboration between Kirchmaier and Jäger.

Jäger dedicated his thesis to the county governor of Uplandia and Stockholm Olof Thegner (1615–1689) and the state official Jacob Gyllenborg, born Wollimhaus (1648–1701). In 1675 the latter married a daughter of Olof Thegner, Anna Catharina (1657–1726). In his dedicatory letter Jäger states that Olof Thegner and Jacob Gyllenborg had once favoured Jäger's parents with their patronage ("charissimos parentes meos patrocínio fovistis olim maximo") Jäger's connection with Jacob Gyllenborg is important, since as a student Gyllenborg belonged to the circle of Stiernhielm-imitating Swedish poets along with Samuel Columbus.¹³⁴² Kirchmaier praises Jäger for his love of music for the psaltery. As far as I know, Jäger was not a poet himself, but this may point to an interest in music and

¹³³⁹ In the 17th century, Celts (Celtae) was a superordinate designation for both the Germans and the Celts proper.

¹³⁴⁰ Kirchmaier (pres.) / Jäger (resp.), *De lingua vetustissima Europae vernacula, Scytho-Celtica et Gothica*, see the congratulatory letter.

¹³⁴¹ Kirchmaier / Jäger, *ibidem*, p. 23.

¹³⁴² Jacob Wollimhaus is the author of a Swedish poem titled *Prosopopoeia mortis* (1666), in which he follows Stiernhielm in form and thematic content. For an edition of the poem, see Per Hanselli (ed.), *Samlade vitterhetsarbeten af svenska författare från Stjernhjelm till Dalin*, vol. 5, Uppsala 1871, pp. 1–6.

poetry. His acquaintanceship with Gyllenborg may have contributed to his interest in Stiernhielm's linguistic ideas. Two younger sons of Olof Thegner, Georg and Arvid, enrolled as students at Uppsala University on 28 May 1675 and probably studied there at the same time as Jäger. Taken together, all the evidence points to the possibility of a close connection between Gyllenborg and Jäger.

Finally, Jäger was celebrated as the respondent by his countrymen in Wittenberg – Carsten Printz of Gothenburg (Carstanus Printz Gotheburgensis) and Magnus Rönnow. The former had matriculated at the University of Wittenberg on 21 August 1684 and the latter in the month of June, 1685. They praised Jäger's Gothic linguistic research in two congratulatory poems, in which they seem to presuppose that the dedicatee, "the eminent and learned" Jäger, is the author. Jäger may have met the latter while studying at Uppsala University, where Magnus Rönnow enrolled in 1680.¹³⁴³

To continue, there are several pieces of evidence that speak very much in favour of Kirchmaier being a collaborative author and a supervisor of Jäger. First of all, the author – in discussing the meaning of the word "rune" in the midst of a unacknowledged quotation from Stiernhielm's *De linguarum origine praefatio* – refers in the first person plural to his treatise on the customs of the Germans (*de Germanorum moribus*).¹³⁴⁴ This is Kirchmaier's commentary on Tacitus' *Germania*.¹³⁴⁵

Moreover, the author compares Mesogothic words in *Codex Argenteus* with German, Swedish, English, Greek and Persian cognates. In doing so, he refers to the German words as those used by "our countrymen" (*nostris*),¹³⁴⁶ which is an indication of the German nationality of the author.

In his dissertation on the parallelism and agreement of twelve languages of a Scytho-Celtic origin (1697), Kirchmaier actually refers to *De lingua vetustissima Europae* as his own work. He states: "When we were publishing a more extensive dissertation on the most ancient language of Europe, Scytho-Celtic and Gothic, in the year 1686, with Mr. Andreas Jäger, a Swede of Stockholm, as respondent,

¹³⁴³ A selection of the Latin poetry of Magnus Rönnow is edited with an introduction, translation and commentary by Elena Dahlberg in her doctoral thesis *The voice of a waning empire. Selected Latin poetry of Magnus Rönnow from the Great Northern War*, Uppsala 2014 (Studia Latina Upsaliensia, 34).

¹³⁴⁴ Kirchmaier and Jäger, *De lingua vetustissima Europae* (1686), p. 40.

¹³⁴⁵ Kirchmaier, *Ad C.C. Tacitum de Germania. Liber commentarius res moresque Germanorum veterum a suis originibus [...] exhibens*, Wittenberg 1664. The author refers to chapter 8 of this treatise, where the pertinent information is found on pp. 144–145.

¹³⁴⁶ Kirchmaier and Jäger, *De vetustissima lingua Europae*, ch. 3, paragraph 4, p. 4.

we explained [...] much [...] about the fame, name, and migrations of the Scythians and Celts and about their primordial language.”¹³⁴⁷

In addition, the polymathic scholarly style of the dissertation supports the authorship of Kirchmaier. His treatises and academic dissertations are furnished with references and quotations from a broad selection of other scholars and writings, a style that also characterizes the dissertation under consideration.

Jäger signed his dedicatory letter “in the house of Kirchmaier” (*in Kirchmaierianis aedibus*), where he presumably stayed not only for accommodation, but also to utilize Kirchmaier’s private library.

During the 18th-century, German scholars unanimously regarded Kirchmaier as the author of the dissertation. The entire work was edited and reprinted in 1774 by Johann Oelreich, who attributed the work to Kirchmaier solely.¹³⁴⁸ Besides, Haquin Spegel, a Swedish coeval of Jäger, referred only to Kirchmaier as author of the dissertation (Section 20.1.2).

Nevertheless, circumstantial evidence speaks in favour of the assumption that Jäger wrote at least some parts of the dissertation as an author-respondent. Among these are Kirchmaier’s preliminary and congratulatory letter to Jäger, the supreme acquaintance with Swedish antiquarianism shown in the thesis, Jäger’s dedicatory letter to his patrons, and the congratulatory poems of his friends. On the other hand, there is, as we have seen, evidence in favour of the assumption that Kirchmaier was a collaborative or main author – in addition to Considine’s proofs. To sum up, I assume that Kirchmaier acted as a supervisor, wrote several parts of the treatise, and put his private library at Jäger’s disposal.

19.5.4 Use of *Stiernhielm* for proposing the Scythian hypothesis

In an attempt to explore how far *Stiernhielm*’s lexicographical ideas had spread into Swedish and continental European intellectual life, Considine accurately surveys the contents of *De lingua vetustissima Europae*.¹³⁴⁹ Below, I offer a new analysis *pace* Considine.

¹³⁴⁷ Georg Caspar Kirchmaier (pres.)/ Johann Michael Heppius (resp.), *Parallelismus et convenientia XII linguarum ex matrice Scythico-Celtica Europae*, Wittenberg 1697, p. A3 verso: “Cum de lingua vetustissima Europae, Scytho-Celtica et Gotbica, prolixiorem ederemus dissertationem anno 1686, resp(ondente) D(omi)n(o) Jägero, Holmiensi Sveco, multa [...] exposuimus [...] de Scytharum Celtarumque fama, nomine, migrationibus et lingua horum princepe.”

¹³⁴⁸ Joh. Oelreich, *Germaniae litteratae opuscula historico philologico theologica*, Bremae/ Bremen 1774, tomus secundus (vol. 2), pp. 1–64.

¹³⁴⁹ Considine, *Dictionaries of early modern Europe. Lexicography and the making of heritage*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 310–312.

In their treatise, Kirchmaier and Jäger begin with a preface on the basic assumptions in linguistic research of their time. They consider the following topics: the supreme primordial status of the language of the patriarchs (Hebrew), linguistic diversity as a divine punishment, and the derivation of Greek from Hebrew, Latin from Greek and the Germanic languages from Latin. They then state that these ideas have given rise to a cardinal error regarding these main languages (p. 1). Instead they contend that the language of the most ancient Germanic tribes is older than Greek and Latin and is Scytho-Celtic and Gothic (p. 2). The treatise itself consists of three chapters, the first of which treats the Scythian ethnicity and language (pp. 3–24), the second the Celtic language (pp. 24–39) and the third the Gothic language (pp. 39–48). In chapter 1, they review the ethnic origin, geographical homeland, literary fame and language of the Scythians. They refer to and quote from Stiernhielm's treatises in every chapter.¹³⁵⁰

Kirchmaier and Jäger's reliance on Stiernhielm's preface to the second edition of Wulfila's Gothic Gospels, *De origine linguarum praefatio*, is evident from their discussion of the origin and dialectal diversification of the Scythian language (ch. 1, §§ 7–8, pp. 15–18). Here they paraphrase Stiernhielm's above-mentioned preface on the origin of languages – mostly without acknowledgement. In paragraph 7 (p. 16), the assertion that Scythian diversified into Phrygian, old Italic, Celtic, Gothic and Slavic is a summary of Stiernhielm's *praefatio*, pages 33–37. The quotations in the same paragraph from Salmasius and Andreas Helwig and the references to Philipp Clüver and Abraham van der Myl occur in the preface at issue on pp. 33–35.

In paragraph 8 (p. 17), they acknowledge that the language-dialect distinction is drawn from the preface under consideration (*praefatio*, page 19). Further, the examples of dialect diversification of Latin and old German into Swabian, Brabantian, Mecklenburgian, Austrian, Misnian¹³⁵¹ and Silesian are taken from Stiernhielm's *praefatio* (p. 9 and pp. 31–32). The authors also drew the examples of different stages of German from the same treatise (*praefatio*, p. 31), where modern German is contrasted with German in the time of Charlemagne, and in the time of the eponymous Tuisco. In the repeated statement on the dialectal differentiation of Scythian (*praefatio*, p. 17 f.) Kirchmaier and Jäger again rely on Stiernhielm. Their quotations from Salmasius are found in Stiernhielm's *praefatio*

¹³⁵⁰ Kirchmaier and Jäger, *De lingua vetustissima*, refer on pp. 17, 35, 40 and 41 to *De linguarum origine praefatio* (as *ad Ulphilam praefatio*), on pp. 32 and 47 to *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum*, and on pp. 21 and 42 to *Anti-Cluverius* (though the former reference concerns the appended treatise *De Hyperboreis*).

¹³⁵¹ Misnian refers to the dialect of Meissen in Upper Saxony.

(pp. 30 and 32), as are statements following these quotations, namely the principle of a historical mutual transformation of languages into dialects and dialects into new languages again (*praefatio*, p. 30 f.) and the analogy between languages and empires in their rise, flourishing and decline (*praefatio*, p. 32 f.).¹³⁵² However, the authors do not always acknowledge that they are quoting from or very closely following Stiernhielm by means of paraphrases.

In their summary of this discussion (§ 10, p. 21), Kirchmaier and Jäger again draw on Stiernhielm in citing the support of 17th-century scholars, such as Meric Casaubon, Abraham van der Myl, Franciscus Irenicus, Franciscus Junius the Younger and Claudius Salmasius. All of these are cited or quoted by Stiernhielm (*praefatio*, pp. 35–36).

In chapter 2, on the Celtic language (§ 6, p. 35), they quote a passage from the work under consideration (*praefatio*, p. 28) on the continuous transformation of a language into dialects and the convergence of dialects into a new mixed language.

In chapter 3, on the Gothic language, paragraph 1, the authors (1686: 40) quote a passage from Stiernhielm (*praefatio*, p. 39 f.) on the etymological meaning of the word “rune” and the origin of the runes or runic script.

To conclude, these ideas on the diversification of Scythian are considered a milestone in the history of Indo-European linguistics, but the authors – Kirchmaier and Jäger – did not contribute to them more than by paraphrasing a selection of Stiernhielm’s preface on the origin of languages (*De linguarum origine praefatio*).

19.6 Petrus Lagerlöf

19.6.1 Preliminaries

The Swedish academic Petrus Lagerlöf (1648–1699) was acquainted with Stiernhielm’s linguistic ideas and with his poem *Hercules*. In his lectures on political geography (1688) he discussed Stiernhielm’s complex concept of Scythian.¹³⁵³ In his lectures on the cultivation and orthographical standardization of the Swedish language (1691)

¹³⁵² Kirchmaier/ Jäger, *De lingua vetustissima Europae*, p. 18: “Ex his iudicium formari queat de naturali generatione adolescentia, virilitate, flore, divergio interituque omnium linguarum. Quod enim hominum, imperiorum, civitatum, hoc idem linguarum fatum est.” In relation to Stiernhielm, the authors paraphrase the first clause (*ex his ... queat* instead of *Ex his capi potest iudicium*), add the word *virilitas* and transpose the words *civitates* and *imperia*. Metcalf, “The Indo-European hypothesis”, p. 136, does not give an exact page reference for the source of Jäger’s rewording.

¹³⁵³ Lagerlöf, “Imperiorum et rerum publicarum descriptio geographica et civilis”, ms. H. 441. p. 72, Uppsala University Library, and “Collegium geographopoliticum” ms. M 3, Royal Library, Stockholm, fol. 21v.

he cited Stiernhielm's sample of an antiquarian dictionary of Old Swedish from 1643 (*Gambla Swea och Götha Måles fatebur*) and the poem *Hercules* as means and models for the cultivation of Swedish. He argued that the dictionary in question is "excellent" (*vacker*)¹³⁵⁴ and thought that Stiernhielm's witty talent has endowed *Hercules* a truly comical and satirical style, but claimed that Stiernhielm would have been unable to raise the poem to the grand style.¹³⁵⁵

19.6.2 The lectures on political geography

Lagerlöf commented on Stiernhielm's classificatory ideas regarding Scythian in a series of lectures on political geography, a topic that reflects his combined skills as a philologist and a geographer. His primary interest had been natural sciences and geography. After an educational journey in Germany, England and France, he was appointed to the chair of logics and metaphysics (1682) and two years later to that of poetry. In this capacity he delivered a series of lectures on Swedish metrics (1685). In 1687, he attained the professorship of eloquence and in 1695 he was appointed royal historiographer (*historiographus regni*).

Lagerlöf's lectures on political geography date from 1688–1689¹³⁵⁶ and are extant in two different records, namely ms. H. 441. Uppsala University Library (791 pages)¹³⁵⁷ and ms. M 3, Royal Library, Stockholm).¹³⁵⁸ Both of these records are unpublished.

Lagerlöf elucidates the geographical division of Europe according to linguistic criteria, viz. the diversity of languages.¹³⁵⁹ He accounts for the different classifications of both ancient and modern languages in Europe. In his exposition of the grouping of ancient mother languages of Europe, he discusses Olof Rudbeck the Elder's division

¹³⁵⁴ For this sense of the adjective, see *Svenska Akademiens ordbok*, s.v. *vacker* 3c.

¹³⁵⁵ Lagerlöf, "Collegium de ornatu ac genio linguae patriae", ms. Palmskiöld. 406, in *Petrus Lagerlöfs collegium angående vårt svenska språks cultiverande*, edited by Hans H. Ronge, Börje Tjäder and Gun Winmark, Uppsala 1999; see p. 180.

¹³⁵⁶ Claes Annerstedt, *Uppsala universitets historia*, II:2, Uppsala 1909, p. 265, gives this dating of one manuscript record (ms. H. 441, UUB).

¹³⁵⁷ The title is: "Imperiorum et rerum publicarum descriptio geographica et civilis", that is, 'Geographical and civil description of realms and republics'.

¹³⁵⁸ Ms. M 3, second section, which is titled: "Collegium geographo-politicum de celeberrimo domino professore Lagerlöf die 6. Martii 1688". The first section is a course on historical political geography by Andreas Nordenhielm (Norcopensis, 1633–1694): "Collegium geographico-politico-historicum de viro amplissimo Andrea Norcopense studiosae iuventuti Upsaliae d. 11 Martii A. MDCLXXXV apertum". I thank PhD Charlotta Forss for calling my attention to this source.

¹³⁵⁹ Lagerlöf, Ms. H. 441, p. 70: "Ut iam de divisione Europae agamus, quae diversimode institui potest, primo quoad divortia et discrimina linguarum." Ms. M. 3, 21r: "Dividitur Europa 1. secundum discrimina et diversitates linguarum."

and contrasts it to Stiernhielm's superordinate use of the concept of Scythian.

In dealing with the modern European languages, Lagerlöf relied on Joseph Justus Scaliger's well-known analysis in *Diatriba de Europaeorum linguis* (1610, for which see Section 4.2.1). Lagerlöf confines himself to a classification of the languages and dialects that are derived from the four languages that according to Scaliger are the mother tongues of Europe, namely Slavonic, German, Greek and Latin (ms. H 441, pp. 73–77; M 3, pp. 22v–23r).¹³⁶⁰

19.6.3 Stiernhielm's concept of Scythian according to Lagerlöf

Lagerlöf first mentions the idea that Greek, Latin, Scythian and Celtic are the mother tongues of Europe, from which the others originate. He justifies this reduction to a few languages by the argument that some languages are mother languages (*matrices*) and others are descendants and dialects (*propagines et dialecti*), a distinction made by Scaliger in his treatise on the European languages. Lagerlöf extends the area of the Celtic language over Spain, Gaul, Germany and old Italy, and then arrives at the conclusion that Latin cannot be counted as a mother language, alleging the common opinion that it is a compound language (as a mixture of Old Italic and Greek), while stating that Old Italic in turn is a derivative of Celtic.¹³⁶¹ He argues that Rudbeck the Elder is correct in positing only three mother tongues in Europe, namely Greek, Scythian and Celtic.

Lagerlöf proceeds to the concept of Scythian, arguing that there are lexical correspondences between Scythian and Scandinavian. In doing so, he enters into Stiernhielm's views on Scythian, which he problematizes. In his account, Lagerlöf depends on the conspectus of *Runa Suethica* as it was republished by Morhof (1682). He contends

¹³⁶⁰ Lagerlöf, Ms. H. 441, p. 73: "Quod pertinet ad linguas hodiernas, de iis non omnes conveniunt. Scaliger undecim facit linguas hodiernas matrices, quae per omnia discrepant. Facit illas duarum classium, in prima 4 ponit linguas matrices, quas maiores appellat, in altera 7 minores. Maiores quattuor hae: Latina, Graeca, Teutonica et Sclavonica. Singulae multae ex se fecerunt propagines." In ms. M 3, the corresponding passage reads, 22r–22v: "Quod ad linguas hodiernas attinet, in ea re non omnes conveniunt. [22v] Scaliger undecim linguas matrices enumerat, quae inter se in totum differunt, easque duarum classium esse statuit, ita ut in una maiore sint 4, in altera minori 7, ex quibus ceterae omnes originem traxerunt et tantum ut dialecti differunt. In maiore classe sunt hae: Latina, Graeca, Teutonica et Sclavonica, quae multas propagines habent."

¹³⁶¹ Lagerlöf, Ms. H. 441, p. 71: "Quo autem fundamento fecerint Latinam linguam matricem, non video. Cum ex duabus aliis conflata, a veteri lingua Italica, qui Osca vocabatur, et Graeca, et quidem ex hac maximam partem. Osca autem fuit dialectus linguae Celticae."

that Stiernhielm certainly located Scythia in Scandinavia, but extended the concept beyond this¹³⁶² by defining Scythian as the common ancestor of Oriental (i.e. Semitic and Persian) and Western languages, thus siding with Salmasius.¹³⁶³ In this way, he concludes that Stiernhielm claimed that Greek and Celtic are related to Scythian as dialects.¹³⁶⁴

He compares Stiernhielm's views to those of Rudbeck the Elder, according to whom Scythian is only a separate branch and not the common ancestor of Semitic and Indo-European languages. Lagerlöf is uncertain whether Stiernhielm's hypothesis holds true. He says:

Despite the fact that Stiernhielm's opinion is supported by such a high plausibility, I cannot affirm anything as certain. Anyone is free to accept Rudbeck's opinion that there are three mother languages or Stiernhielm's that Scythian is the mother of all the others.¹³⁶⁵

19.7 Wotton and Suhm

19.7.1 Wotton as a British scholar

The English historian, antiquarian, and philologist William Wotton (1666–1727) cited Stiernhielm's ideas about a typological linguistic diversity between the languages of the ancient world and those of the new world, but rejected Stiernhielm's assumption that the difference between the languages of the ancient world can be reduced to the principle of dialectal diversification. In the controversy between the ancients and the moderns, he sided with the latter in his *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (1694 and 1697). At the request of his friend the Scottish philosopher and historian Gilbert Burnet (1643–1715), bishop of Salisbury, he wrote *History of Rome* (1701) covering the time of the middle-to-late Principate (Antoninus Pius to Alexander Severus, i.e. 138–235 AD). He was also a collector and translator of medieval Welsh laws.

¹³⁶² Lagerlöf, M. 3, 21r: "Stiernhielmus existimavit Schyticam linguam habuisse genuinam sedem in nostra Scandinavia, quamvis ultra eam se extenderet."

¹³⁶³ Lagerlöf, Ms. H. 441, p. 72: "Stiernhielmus [...] in eadem est sententia ac Salmasius, qui Scyticam linguam matricem affirmat esse omnium linguarum tam Orientalium, quam Occidentalium."

¹³⁶⁴ Lagerlöf, Ms. H. 441, p. 72: "Sic ut iuxta eius sententiam Celtica et Graeca habere se deberent ad Scythicam tanquam dialecti."

¹³⁶⁵ Lagerlöf, Ms. H. 441, pp. 72–73: "Quamvis autem tanta (p. 73) verosimilitudine nitatur eius opinio, ego tamen nihil ausim affirmare, sed poterit quis amplecti et Rudbeckii sententiam, quod 3 sint matrices linguae et Stiernhielmii, quod Scythica sit communis origo omnium reliquarum."

In his enquiry into the questions of language kinship and the nature of the Confusion of Languages, Wotton took an interest in Stiernhielm's linguistic ideas. Relying on his considerable knowledge of Semitic languages he proposed new ideas on the typological "principal characteristics" of Semitic and Western languages in a treatise titled *Dissertatio de confusione linguarum extructoribus turris Babylonicae a Deo inflictæ*, "On the confusion inflicted upon the builders of the Tower of Babel", which was intended to be a commentary on the English writer and translator John Chamberlayne's (1668–1723) polyglot edition of the Lord's Prayer.¹³⁶⁶ Wotton finished his treatise at the end of November 1713. He had then been elaborating on this topic in dialogue with the Dutch Orientalist Adrian Reland (1672–1718).¹³⁶⁷ An English translation was published posthumously from the author's manuscript.¹³⁶⁸

19.6.2 Wotton's case for a typological linguistic diversity

Contrary to the explanation of linguistic diversity as caused not by the Confusion of Languages at the Tower of Babel, but by dialectal diversification, Wotton argues that the typological differences between Semitic and European languages in both grammar and lexis are too great to be reducible to dialect splitting within the short time of world history afforded by early modern chronology (see Section 3.5.1).¹³⁶⁹ Aware of the boldness of this claim, he attempted to discover a previous authority. He found it in Stiernhielm's preface to the origin of languages, namely in the author's exception of American Indian and insular – most likely West Indian or Carribean – languages from historical kinship with the languages of the ancient world, that is, Asia, Africa and Europe.

¹³⁶⁶ Chamberlayne, *Oratio dominica in diversas fere omnium gentium linguas versa*, Amsterdam 1715, pp. 37–75. Wotton refers to Stiernhielm's preface to the edition of *Codex Argenteus* by the College of Antiquities as "discursus de origine et progressu linguarum" on p. 51.

¹³⁶⁷ Towards the end of his treatise, Wotton refers to and counters the criticism of Reland. In the collection of treatises in honour of Chamberlayne, Reland wrote on the remnants of ancient Egyptian ("De λειψάνοις veteris linguae Aegyptiacae", *Oratio dominica*, pp. 94–124).

¹³⁶⁸ Wotton, *A Discourse concerning the Confusion of Languages at Babel*, London 1730. The main reference to Stiernhielm occurs on pp. 27–28.

¹³⁶⁹ Wotton, "Dissertatio de confusione linguarum", pp. 44–50; idem, *A Discourse concerning the Confusion of Languages at Babel*, pp. 14–27. In the Latin original Wotton concludes (p. 50): "Hæ sunt principales characteristicæ, quibus Hebraea eique cognatæ linguae differunt a Graeca, Latina et ab iis quæ a Teutonica derivantur." In the English translation he says (p. 27): "These are some of the principal characteristics, by which Hebrew and its kindred tongues differ from the Greek and the Latin and the languages that are derived from the Teutonic stock."

Wotton thinks that Stiernhielm's exception of certain languages supports his position that there is an essential difference between two major language families, a diversity that he believes speaks in favour of a *limited* miraculous Confusion of Languages at Babel, namely a split into two major language families. In his preface to Wulfila (p. 4) Stiernhielm, as we have seen confines the validity of the principle of a historical monoglottism to the languages that originate from the descendants of Noah, and that are or have been in use in Asia, Africa and Europe. He argues that the differences between the American Indian languages and the Noachic languages are too great to allow the assumption of a common historical descent.

Wotton interprets Stiernhielm as follows:

For thereafter he has laboured to prove that the languages of Europe, Asia and Africa were originally one, and that they could still be retraced to one, and consequently differ from another, not otherwise than as the common and natural changes which time has necessarily introduced in three or four thousand years, he is forced to add that he means only those languages which are derived from that which was spoken by Adam and Noah, which are in use in Asia, Europe and Africa. For as to the languages of America and the islands of the Indies, he gives them up and allows that there are no traces of any coherence or agreement between these languages and those spoken in our continent.¹³⁷⁰

At the same time Wotton apparently wished to show that Stiernhielm as one of the principal advocates of the rationalist interpretation of the Confusion of Languages – together with Meric Casaubon, C. Vitringa the Elder, and J.H. Heidegger – failed to account for the diversity of the Indian American and Caribbean languages.

Theories like these could of course run the risk of being connected with the Pre-Adamite hypothesis (Section 12.4, footnote 866 above).

¹³⁷⁰ Wotton, *A Discourse concerning the Confusion of Languages at Babel*, pp. 27–28 (quoted with modernized spelling). In “Dissertatio de confusione linguarum” p. 51, this passage reads: “In hoc tractatu postquam satis probasset linguam Europae, Asiae et Africae originaliter tantum fuisse unam, ad quam adhuc reduci posset et per consequens omnes illas iam in tribus orbis partibus extantes linguas non aliter a se invicem differre quam ut communes et naturales mutationes quas ter aut quarter mille annorum spatio necessario introduxit. Tandem fateri cogitur se intelligere solummodo linguas ab ea quam Adamus et Noachus locuti sunt et quae in usu fuerunt in Asia, Europa et Africa. Inter linguas autem Americanas Insularumque Indicarum et reliquas continentis nostri nullum amicitiae et cognationis deprehendi vestigium concedit.”

Wotton comments on Stiernhielm's attitude to this idea:¹³⁷¹ "Which (he says) has made some people rashly imagine that the men that speak these tongues are a species of their own and not descendants of Adam, the common parent of us all."¹³⁷² In his conclusion, Wotton does not see any reason to suspect Stiernhielm of "irreligion" and he justifies his citation of him as an authority with reference to Stiernhielm's ability as linguistic scholar: "It comes from one who by his great skill in languages, both ancient and modern, was very well qualified to judge on this question" (*A discourse*, p. 29).

Wotton returns to Stiernhielm in his discussion of Adrian Reland's criticism of "my sketch of my thought some years ago". He maintains that Reland takes much the same position as Stiernhielm:

His notion is much the same as Stiernhielm's that there were no tongues formed at Babel, but that either they have all formed by gradual or imperceptible alterations from Hebrew, which he takes for granted was the language of Noah, or were formed at once by mutual agreement (*A discourse*, p. 55).

19.7.3 Peter Frederick Suhm 1769

The Danish historian Peter Frederick Suhm (1728–1798) similarly assumed a typological diversity of certain language families after the Tower of Babel. In a treatise on the origin of nations in general and of the Scandinavian nations in particular¹³⁷³ Suhm provides a general language classification of all the then known languages of the world. He sets out from twelve main post-Babelic language families that are grouped after some of the sons of Shem, Ham and Japheth. Like Wotton, Suhm cites Stiernhielm as an authority on the typological distinction between languages of the ancient world, namely European languages and Asian and African languages close to Europe on the one hand, and languages of the new world, namely Asian languages, African languages more distant from Europe, and American

¹³⁷¹ Stiernhielm dismissed the pre-Adamite hypothesis in the preface to the Gothic Gospels (*De linguarum origine praefatio*, p. 4), but had previously accepted it in his draft of *Runa Suethica*, where he states that an unnamed author has proposed it *non immerito*, "justly". See the critical apparatus on this passage, Section 12.3, p. 225, footnote 683. Stiernhielm was thus acquainted with the idea of a heterogenesis of humankind before the publication of Isaac la Peyrère's *Prae-Adamitae* in 1655.

¹³⁷² Wotton, *A Discourse concerning the Confusion of Languages at Babel*, pp. 28. Cf. p. 56, concerning both Stiernhielm and Reland's linguistic thought: "I think it is detestably unjust to suspect, much less to arraign, any man of impiety or of favouring the Pre-Adamites".

¹³⁷³ *Försøg til et udkast af en historie over folkenes oprindelse i almindelighet som en inledning til de nordiske folkes i særdeleshed*, København 1769.

languages on the other hand.¹³⁷⁴ He concludes that the original language of humankind was completely lost at Babel and that new different main languages came into being.¹³⁷⁵ Suhm reveals his reliance on Wotton by referring to Stiernhielm's preface with the same wording, "on the origin and progress of languages".¹³⁷⁶

19.8 Albert Schultens

The Dutch Orientalist Albert Schultens (1685–1750) possessed the Swedish edition of *Codex Argenteus*¹³⁷⁷ and had most likely read its preface (*De linguarum origine praefatio*). In an unpublished treatise on the nature and identity of the primeval language and the Western discourse on this topic, he refers to Stiernhielm's assumption of a natural process of language diversification.¹³⁷⁸

And this method of interpreting the narrative of Moses seems all the more likely, the more abundantly scholars with knowledge of many languages have demonstrated that "by the intervals of time and space dialects turn into languages," a hypothesis that Heidegger [...] and Vitringa [...] embraced together with Isaac and Meric Casaubon, and that Stiernhielm defended by exceptional diligence in the preface to *Wulphila's Gothic Gospels*.¹³⁷⁹

¹³⁷⁴ Suhm, *Försøg til et udkast*, p. 84: "Den lærde Stiernhielm har af alle gjort sig mest umage for at vise overensstemmelsen i sprogene: det har og nogenledes lykkedes for ham at vise den imellem de europeiske sprog inbordes, saa og imellem dem igien, og de som taltes og endnu tales i de lande i Asia og Africa, der ligge nærmest Europa, men i de længre fraliggende i Asia og Africa og i alle Americanske haver han maat tilstaae at al hans umage haver været forgæves, og at slet ingen lighed findes imellem dem og de Europeiske."

¹³⁷⁵ Suhm, *ibidem*, p. 84: "Hvad viser dette andet end at det ældste sprog er aldeles glömt og tabt, og folgelig at ganske nye og forskiellige sprog ere opkomne ved Babel."

¹³⁷⁶ Suhm, *ibidem*, p. 84, note: "De origine et progressu linguarum, ante Ulphilae Evangelia."

¹³⁷⁷ In the catalogue of the Schultens family library, *Bibliotheca Schultensiana*, Leiden 1780, it is listed among Bibles and concordances in quarto; see p. 11, nr. 108: "Quatuor Evangelia ab Ulphila Gothice reddita atque edita cum parallelis versionibus Sueo-Gothica, Islandica et vulgata Latina, Stockholm 1671. Accedit Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum linguis affinibus a Fr. Junio atque Sueo-Gothica a Georgio Stiernhielmio auctum, *ibidem* 1670."

¹³⁷⁸ Schultens, *Theses de lingua primaeva*, ms. Or. 1469: 12, 5r, Leiden University Library.

¹³⁷⁹ Schultens, *ibidem*, § XLI. "Atque haec Mosaicam historiam interpretandi ratio eo probabilior videtur, quo copiosius multarum linguarum periti viri demonstraverint *temporum ac locorum intervallis dialectos abire in linguas*, quam thesin cum Isaaco et Merico Casaubonis amplectunt Heidegger [...] et Vitringa [...] et singulari industria tuitus est Georg Stiernhielm, praef. ad *Gothica Evangelia Ulphilae*, p. 28 sq."

20. Reception by lexicographers of Germanic languages

20.1 Haquin Spegel

20.1.1 Preliminaries: *Spegel as a poet and lexicographer*

The Swedish theologian, hymnist, poet and lexicographer Haquin Spegel (1645–1714) was the foremost successor of Stiernhielm with regard to his Swedish poetry and lexicography, both of which he used as means to renew and ennoble the Swedish vernacular. After studies at the cathedral school of Lund, Spegel went abroad for education at German universities (Greifswald, Rostock, Wittenberg and Leipzig) and in the Netherlands and England, thereby acquiring fluency in German, Dutch and English.¹³⁸⁰ He made an ecclesiastical career as court pastor, superintendent of Gotland, bishop of Skara, bishop of Lincopia (Linköping) and finally archbishop of Sweden.

Spegel is an example of the interacting reception of Stiernhielm as a poet and a linguist. He combined his own Swedish poetry with an endeavour to revive archaic or archaizing Swedish words as well as with his undertakings in Swedish lexicography. As a poet in the vernacular,¹³⁸¹ he employed Gothic archaism based on the same Icelandic sagas and medieval Swedish law codes as were used by Stiernhielm and biblical archaism based on Gustav Vasa's Bible (1541).¹³⁸² In his dictionary *Glossarium Sveo-Gothicum eller Swensk Ordabook* (1712) he set out four aims, which he also fulfilled: (1) to record contemporary Swedish words and those in use when the entire

¹³⁸⁰ Josef Helander, *Haquin Spegel. Hans lif och gärning intill år 1693*, Uppsala 1889, pp. 9–18.

¹³⁸¹ Spegel's Swedish poetry comprises epic poems, viz. *Guds Werk och Hwila*, (God's Work and Rest, 1685), which was continued in *Thet öppna paradis*, *Thet tilslutna paradis*, and *Thet återvundna paradis* (Paradise Open, Paradise Lost, and Paradise Regained, 2nd ed. 1705), based on the literary model of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, and finally *Konung Salomons vishet och herlighet* (The Wisdom and Glory of King Solomon).

¹³⁸² Spegel's use of Gothic and Biblical archaisms in his epos on the Creation, viz. *Guds Werk och Hwila* (1685) has been studied by Bernt Olsson in his thesis *Guds Werk och Hwila. Tillkomstshistoria, världsbild, gestaltning* (Stockholm 1963) and by Eeva Melkas, *Studier i de arkaiska och dialektala orden i 1600-talets diktning*, unpublished thesis, University of Helsinki 1970, pp. 7–45. She used Bernt Olsson's work as a resource for delimiting old Icelandic and Old Swedish archaisms.

Bible was first translated into Swedish, (2) to add the “Gothic words, which are found in the Sagas and several law codes,” (3) to explain all these words with semantic, etymological or homonymic equivalents in Danish, German, English and Dutch, and (4) to compare them with Latin, French, Italian and Spanish.¹³⁸³ He justified his first aim by his intention to make the biblical language more comprehensible to common people and the second by his efforts to revive outdated Swedish words. The third aim partly depended on his express wish to facilitate the understanding of the Swedish church language in the Bible and in sermons among the subjects in formerly Danish provinces of Sweden (Scania, Blekingia, Hallandia, Bohuslandia, and Gotlandia).¹³⁸⁴

20.1.2 *Spegel's preface to his dictionary*

In the preface to his dictionary, Spegel gives an account of research in comparative language studies and the lexicography of individual languages in early modern Europe. He begins with a survey of the controversial questions of language origins, language kinship and linguistic change and continues with an overview of linguistic treatises on different European languages, for instance German, English, Dutch, French, Italian, Welsh and Cornish. He then reviews etymological and multilingual dictionaries and comes to an end by presenting a set of assumptions on Gothic language philology and etymology. At the outset of this final part, Spegel states that he has read everything that he could find “on the high antiquity of Sueo-Gothic, on its glorious purity and on its orderly copiousness” in the works of Stiernhielm,¹³⁸⁵ Rudbeck (viz. *Atlantica*, 1679 ff.) and Verelius (viz. *Index linguae veteris Scytho-Scandicae sive Gothicae*, 1691). These authors, among whom Stiernhielm turns out to be especially important, supplied Spegel with the Gothicist ideological impulse to compile a dictionary.

In the current debates of his time Spegel takes an intermediate position having perused central treatises of previous and

¹³⁸³ See the preface to *Glossarium Sueo-Gothicum eller Swensk Ordabook* (1712). These aims conform with the goals that he outlined in a note during his education abroad. See Josef Helander, *Haquin Spegel*, pp. 17–18.

¹³⁸⁴ Preface to *Glossarium Sveo-Gothicum*, Lund 1712.

¹³⁸⁴ Preface to the dictionary, p. 24 and p. 26. Spegel's dictionary is explored by Anna Helga Hannisdóttir in *Lexikografihistorisk spegel: den enspråkiga svenska lexikografins utveckling ur den tvåspråkiga*, Göteborg 1998. pp. 128–178. She also quotes the main passages where Spegel describes his aims, pp. 133–134.

¹³⁸⁵ Probably mainly the antiquarian dictionary on letters beginning with A, 1643; the Gothic dictionary (*Dictionary Ulphila-Gothicum*), 1670; the preface on language origins and language relationships, 1671; and *Anti-Cluverius*, 1685.

contemporary linguistic discourse. Among other works, he refers to Theodore Bibliander, *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum* (1548) and Thomas Hayne, *Linguarum cognatio seu de linguis in genere et de variarum linguarum harmonia dissertatio* (1648). Regarding the question of the absolute or relative primordality of Hebrew, the archbishop cites Stiernhielm's opinion that Scytho-Japhetic or Scytho-Gothic is at least a sister of Hebrew, if not its mother language, appealing to the approval of this idea in Kirchmaier's dissertation on the most ancient language of Europe and in Morhof's treatise on German language and poetry, but he also refers to the critical response from Diecmann.¹³⁸⁶

Spegel then raises the question of whether German gave rise to the Nordic languages or if there perhaps are more solid grounds to think, like Stiernhielm, that the descendants of Japheth gradually spread across Europe and were primarily called Scythians (as derived from Chitim, 1 Chronicles, ch. 1). For this opinion, he had recourse to Stiernhielm's *Anti-Cluverius* (pp. 87–88).¹³⁸⁷

In his views on the kinship of Hebrew with other languages, Spegel takes a middle position. On the one hand, he rejects the opinion that there is no relationship at all between Hebrew and other languages. On the other hand, he dismisses the common attempts to derive all words from Hebrew by various methods justifying his own intermediate position with reference to the principle of dialectal diversification as described by Stiernhielm in *De origine linguarum praefatio*.¹³⁸⁸

20.2 Johann Georg Wachter

Stiernhielm was cited as authority by Johann Georg Wachter (1673–1757) in his etymological German dictionary, which he compiled in two versions between 1722 and 1737. The first was published as a sample (1727) and the second was published ten years later in two

¹³⁸⁶ “Företaal” to the dictionary, p. 2: “Hanc G. Stiernhielmii opinionem, quam novam appellat Mollerus, Hypomn. p. 402 tueri videtur *Georg Caspar Kirchmajer* in dissertation.: *Morhof et Scheffer*, sed impugnavit D. *Joh. Diecman* superintendens Ducatus Bremensis Sved. in *Gymnasmate de lingua primigenia Ebraea*, Stadae anno 1682 excuso p. 12, 24. Scythica lingua est mater Germanae et Gothicae (quae ambo forsan una sunt) *Morhof* de lingua Germanica, p. 64.”

¹³⁸⁷ Spegel, “Företaal” p. 6.

¹³⁸⁸ Spegel, “Företaal” p. 7: “Ita *Stiernhielm* in praef.¹³⁸⁸ linguae sensim abeunt in dialectos, dialecti perpetua mutationum serie transformantur in alias linguas primae plane dissimiles, qua *filum* sc. et qua *colorem*, qua vero *substantiam* eadem sunt nec aliae, etsi nomina longe diversissima sortiantur.” In this quotation, *qua* is used as a preposition governing the accusative and with the meaning “concerning”.

volumes (1737).¹³⁸⁹ For the second edition he wrote prolegomena on the science of etymology as a complement to the preface of the first version, *Praefatio ad Germanos*, which deals with the position of German in relation to Scythian and Celtic, in the sense of proto-Germanic. In the prolegomena he refers to Stiernhielm as an advocate of the hypothesis that all languages are related, because they are derived from the primordial one (*De linguarum origine praefatio*, p. 4). He quotes Stiernhielm's comparison between the morpho-lexical substance of the primeval language and the primordial substance in ancient Greek philosophy (ibidem, p. 6) concluding that this is a very apt metaphor, which is "supported and confirmed not only by the Holy Scriptures, but also by history and experience of every time."¹³⁹⁰

20.3 Johan Ihre

In one of his early dissertations as professor Skytteanus of eloquence and politics at Uppsala University, Johan Ihre (1707–1780) refers to Stiernhielm's observation of the continuous process of linguistic change. He formulates the principle that the older the stage of a language, the more different it is from modern usage mentioning as an example the difference between archaic Latin, as known from the Laws of the Twelve Tables (c. 450 BC), and modern Italian. To corroborate this he quotes a passage from Stiernhielm's *De linguarum origine praefatio* (see p. 9) and calls this *Stiernhielm's principle*:

Firmus itaque stat canon nobilissimi STIERNHIELMII: "Linguas senium pati, exolescere et emori iterumque renasci, adolescere, juvenescere."¹³⁹¹

¹³⁸⁹ Wachter, *Glossarium Germanicum continens origines et antiquitates linguae germanicae hodiernae ex ampliore farragine decerptum*, Leipzig 1727. Idem, *Glossarium Germanicum continens origines et antiquitates totius linguae Germanicae et omnium pene vocabulorum vigentium et desitorum*, Leipzig 1737.

¹³⁹⁰ *Glossarium Germanicum*, 1737, Prolegomena, sect. 1 *De etymologia*, § 10, p. 3: "Unus in transitu pro omnibus verba faciat GEORGIUS STIERNHIELMIUS: *Ajo videri omnes linguas, quae in orbe cognito extiterunt et hodie extant, ex una ortas et ad unam posse reduci. Hanc primam, generalem, perennem et nunquam qua substantia perituram vocat. Quo pacto ex illa omnes ortae sint et porro oriturae eleganti similitudine declarat: Qua conditione similis est materiae primae, quae capax est omnium formarum, unam post aliam induit, nullius perpetuo pertinax, ipsa in basi existens immobilis et immortalis. Verissima haec sunt et non solum sacrarum literarum auctoritate, sed etiam Historia et experientia omnium temporum fulta et comprobata. Qui plura desiderat, adeat auctorem.*"

¹³⁹¹ Johan Ihre, (pres),/ Jacob Boëthius (resp.). *De mutationibus linguae Sueo-Gothicae*, part 1, Upsaliae/ Uppsala 1742, p. 1.

“Languages undergo old age, become obsolete and die off, and are again reborn, grow, become young.”

In a draft from 1769 of the preface to his Swedish etymological dictionary, Ihre comments on Stiernhielm’s role as a Swedish lexicographer. He regards Stiernhielm as one of his predecessors:

The first one who successfully ran in this course of lexicography was Mr. Georgius Stiernhielm, very able in ancient languages. He prepared a Sueo-Gothic dictionary¹³⁹² and commenced one that was published in quarto.¹³⁹³ Only a few leaves saw public light, and they have, by unpropitious fortune, become so rare that only a couple of times have I had the opportunity to look into them. Still, it is easy to form an opinion of the merits of this book from that which the very talented author achieved in *Glossarium Ulphilanum*,¹³⁹⁴ where such thorough learning is displayed everywhere that the competent reader cannot but admire the author’s education and acknowledge that he pursues a praiseworthy discussion even in passages where one disagrees with him.¹³⁹⁵

In the published dictionary (*Glossarium Suio Gothicum*, 1769) Ihre refers the Stiernhielm’s etymologies, insofar as they were available to him. He mainly used *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum* (1670), but also Stiernhielm’s marginal annotations to Boxhorn’s dictionary of Welsh

¹³⁹² In Stiernhielm’s Archive at Royal Library, Stockholm, there are several drafts on a Swedish dictionary, notably F.d. 6a *Utkast till Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*; i.e. “Draft of the storehouse of the Swedish and Gothic language”, which comprises 239 folio-sized leaves. There are also minor drafts, for instance F.d. 10a *Utkast till ett svenskt lexikon*, that is, “Draft of a Swedish dictionary” (73 folio-sized leaves); see further Section 5.3.1 above, pp. 76–79.

¹³⁹³ Stiernhielm, *Gambla Swea- och Götha- måles fatebur*, which actually only comprises words beginning with the letter A, Stockholm 1643.

¹³⁹⁴ Stiernhielm, *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum*, Stockholm 1670.

¹³⁹⁵ Ms. Ihre 88 (the final draft of *Glossarium Suio Gothicum*, part 1), pp. 85–86: “Qui primus in hoc stadio cum successu decurrit vir fuit linguarum antiquarum peritissimus Do[mi]n[us] Georgius Stiernhielm, qui Glossarium Suio Gothicum meditatus est et in forma 4^{ta} instituit. Illius operis aliquot folia lucem publicam videre, quae tamen nescio quo fato ita disparuere, ut non nisi semel iterumve eadem oculis usurpare mihi licuerit. De meritis autem huius libri iudicatu facile est ex iis, quae in Glossario Ulphilano praestitit ingeniosissimus auctor, utpote in quo tam solida eruditio ubique apparet, ut lector harum literarum callens non possit non ipsius eruditionem ubique suspicere et etiam, ubi ab eo dissidet, cum honore eum diserere.” The phrase “in stadio currere” is an athletic metaphor, which was common in the 17th and 18th centuries. It is used in 1 Cor. 9:24. In the Vulgate, the first clause reads: “Nescitis quod ii qui in stadio currunt”.

(*Lexicon Britannico-Latinum*,¹³⁹⁶ at that time, and still, preserved in Uppsala University Library.¹³⁹⁷

¹³⁹⁶ M. Z. Boxhorn, *Originum Gallicarum liber. [...] Cui accedit antiquæ linguæ Britannicæ lexicon Britannico-Latinum*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam 1654.

¹³⁹⁷ Ihre, *Glossarium Suiothicum*, s.v. *jul*, col. 1006, refers to Stiernhielm's derivation of Swedish *jul* from Walesian *qwylio*, "to keep watch, to be vigilant" as it were "vigilia sacra". Stiernhielm annotated: "*jul* a *guylio*, vigilare; *jul*, id est vigilia nativitatæ Christi". Ihre also refers to Stiernhielm's origination of *krig*, that is "war", from Celtic *gryd* (*Glossarium Suiothicum*, col. 1161).

21. Historiographical reception by Swedish biographers

21.1 Arckenholtz and Franzén

21.1.1 *Arckenholtz* 1751

The court of Queen Christina was characterized by an orientation towards French literary culture and by the promotion and flourishing of Swedish patriotism. This dual legacy arose again at the court of Queen Lovisa Ulrika in the 1750s¹³⁹⁸ and created an environment where Stiernhielm began to be assessed as a Swedish poet according to the pattern of French literary criticism.¹³⁹⁹ This paved the way for later appraisals of Stiernhielm's achievements as a historical linguist and language renewer during the Gustavian era (1772–1792).

The Swedish historian and diplomat Johan Arckenholtz (1695–1777) composed a biography of Queen Christina to rehabilitate her international reputation. In refuting the criticisms of Bouhors and Cramer, Arckenholtz argued that Queen Christina patronized and promoted Swedish art and literature.¹⁴⁰⁰ He chose Stiernhielm as a case in point, assigning him the same rank among Swedish poets as the French critic Nicolas Boileau (1636–1711) had once given to Françoise de Malherbe (1555–1628) among French poets.¹⁴⁰¹

21.1.2 *Franzén* 1802

Arckenholtz's international comparison became a watershed in the literary debate on Stiernhielm in the latter half of the 18th century in Sweden. It became necessary to determine Stiernhielm's place on the Swedish national Parnassus. Two questions that occupied the critics were more precisely whether Georg Stiernhielm and Olof von Dalin had the greatest merits as reformers in the history of Swedish poetry, or whether both were surpassed by the mid 18th-century poets Gustaf Fredrik Gyllenborg and Gustaf Philip Creutz.

These issues were discussed by the literary historian and poet Frans Michael Franzén (1772–1847), subsequently permanent

¹³⁹⁸ Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar* (1974), p. 9.

¹³⁹⁹ Swahn, *ibidem*, pp. 147–183 (the reception); pp. 15–45 (literary parameters).

¹⁴⁰⁰ Arckenholtz, *Memoires concernant Christine reine de la Suède*, Amsterdam and Leipzig 1751, volume 1, p. 311. Cf. Swahn, *ibidem*, pp. 51–52.

¹⁴⁰¹ Arckenholtz, *ibidem*, vol. 1, p. 355. See Swahn, *ibidem*, p. 148.

secretary of the Swedish Academy, vicar in Kumla and bishop of Härnösand. In his song on Count Gustaf Philip Creutz (1797, 2nd version 1802) he made an attempt to determine Stiernhielm's place in the history of Swedish poetry.¹⁴⁰² In the opening of the second printed version of 1802, he contrasts the Renaissance of belletristic literature in Italy to the absence of Swedish poetry during the reign of Gustav Vasa, who “ended his life uncelebrated in song, only greeted by the chirping of birds.”¹⁴⁰³ He depicts the rise of Sweden – Manhem – as a European empire and the emergence of a new cultural attitude “across the country and at the court”, comparing Swedish poetry to flowers that were planted by Queen Christina, but which, as a foreign import, could not endure the harsh northern climate.¹⁴⁰⁴ He states with reference to talent as a personification of literary activity in general and presumably that of Stiernhielm in particular:

Snillet vaknar, skyddadt af Christina;
 Och re'n gro på Mälarns strand
 Pindens blommor, ack! men de förtvina
 undan vården, Stjernhjelm, af din hand.
 Främlingar här under polen
 sakna den eld, som stänks af solen
 öfver Mantuas lagerlund,
 öfver Lesbos myrtenkrönta sund.¹⁴⁰⁵

Talent awakens, protected by Christina;
 and on Mälär(e)n's shore Pindus' flowers
 soon grow, but alas! they wither
 under the care, Stiernhielm, of your hand.
 Like foreigners here under the pole
 they lack the fires that are sprinkled by the sun
 over Mantua's laurel groves.
 over Lesbos' myrtle-crowned sound.¹⁴⁰⁶

¹⁴⁰² Franzén, “Sång öfver Grefve Gustaf Philip Creutz” in *Svenska akademiens handlingar ifrån år 1796*, vol. 2, pp. 41–55, published in 1802; and in *Frans Michael Franzéns samlade dikter*, vol. 1, 1867, pp. 50–65. In his song Franzén paid homage to Creutz as his Finland-Swedish countryman and poetic precursor.

¹⁴⁰³ Franzén, “Sång öfver Grefve Gustaf Philip Creutz”, lines 32–33: “Obesjungen Vasa slöt sitt lopp, / helsad blott av fågelns qvitter.”

¹⁴⁰⁴ The image of poetry as a plant derives from French literary criticism of the 17th century. The question of the impact of climate or environment on culture was much debated in 18th-century Sweden. See Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar*, pp. 179 ff.

¹⁴⁰⁵ Franzén, “Sång öfver Grefve Gustaf Philip Creutz”, lines 40–47.

¹⁴⁰⁶ “Mantua's laurel groves” hints at the didactic and epic poet Virgil as a native of Mantua with an allusion to his epithaph *Mantua me genuit* etc., while “Lesbos’

Since the preposition “undan” either means “away from” (implying “beyond the reach of, in lack of”) or “under” (implying “because of, owing to”), two interpretations are possible: (1) Stiernhielm made a considerable contribution to the creation of a native Swedish poetry, which disappeared after his death; (2) his high-standing Latin learning and ambitions quenched the incipient Swedish poetry, since its Latinizing metrical and rhetorical nature was foreign to the nature of native Swedish poetry (which was usually rhymed), and it was impossible for subsequent Swedish poets to imitate him.¹⁴⁰⁷

Which of these interpretations is most plausible is difficult to determine.¹⁴⁰⁸ The latter view is more in agreement with Franzén’s clearer statement in his speech on Gustaf Fredrik Gyllenborg in 1811, when he was inaugurated into the Swedish Academy.¹⁴⁰⁹

21.2 Samuel Gagnerus

21.2.1 Preliminaries

The first biographer of Stiernhielm to assess his literary and scholarly achievements is the archivist and publicist Samuel Gagnerus (1731–1791). He authored an extensive biographical eulogy on Stiernhielm in Swedish (1776) and composed a more concise biography of him in Latin, which remains unpublished.¹⁴¹⁰ In Swedish literary history, the former work is relatively well-known, especially for its bombastic style in imitation of contemporary French models.¹⁴¹¹ The latter work

myrtle-crowned sound” refers to Greek lyric poets born on Lesbos, namely Sappho and Alcaeus. These circumlocutions may also allude to classical writers generally.

¹⁴⁰⁷ Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar*, p. 181, states the ambiguity of this preposition.

¹⁴⁰⁸ Swahn, *ibidem*, p. 183, gives an analysis in favour of the latter interpretation: the language is exploited by excessive elaborations and rhetorical embellishments, so that the flowers of poetry could not grow. The opinion that Stiernhielm’s poetry succumbed under the weight of its author’s classical erudition can be confirmed by the system of rhetorical devices in *Proteus rhetoricus*. See Vol. 1, Section 11.1.2.

¹⁴⁰⁹ Franzén, *Minnesteckningar öfver utmärkte svenske statsmän, hjeltar, lärde, konstnärer och skalder*, vol. 1, Stockholm 1848, p. 25: “Before Gyllenborg and Creutz, Stiernhielm had certainly flashed forth out of the darkness, and his *Hercules* withstands time and the more refined taste. But this piece of poetry stands as a solitary ruin in a deserted field” [...] “No one among the subsequent poets had his mind, and since they did not imitate his metrics or style, his influence on the formation of the Swedish language was unexpectedly small.” He argues that Stiernhielm offended against the principle of decorum (*bienséance*), when emphasizing his astonishment about “the original synthesis of Greek ideas in Gothic garments, of a poetic mind in grotesque characters”.

¹⁴¹⁰ The Latin biography is extant in the letter collection of Gagnerus, shelfmark Ep. G. 1:2, pp. 31–49, Royal Library, Stockholm.

¹⁴¹¹ Sven Delblanc, *Ära och minne: studier kring ett motivkomplex i 1700-talets litteratur*, Stockholm 1992, pp. 122–123. In a letter to Samuel Ålf on 16 Dec. 1776 Gagnerus admits that he follows genre of historical eulogy, which was fashionable

has more or less fallen into oblivion. In both pieces, Gagnerus praises Stiernhielm's learning, virtue, rationality and moderation.

Gagnerus was active at the end of the so-called Age of Freedom and in the first decades of the Gustavian era. Between 1751 and 1758 he studied at Uppsala University, where he became a master of philosophy in June 1758. He may have been a pupil of Johan Ihre. In any case, his description of Stiernhielm's comparative method resembles Ihre's etymological principles. Gagnerus also devoted himself to antiquarian research, with the aim of renewing the Swedish language. He also pursued Swedish lexicography.¹⁴¹² He received appointments as assistant librarian (*amanuensis*) at the Royal Library in 1763, and assessor and translator at the Archives of Antiquities in 1770. In this latter capacity he had access to Stiernhielm's manuscript collection, which was preserved at the Archives before they were merged with the Royal Library in 1780. In a letter to Samuel Älf (1727–1799) he states that when writing his panegyric he conformed to the requirements of the historical eulogy: though he was well acquainted with Stiernhielm's larger and minor writings, he did still not quote the sources or supply references, since this would be alien to the panegyric genre.¹⁴¹³

The below account of Gagnerus's presentation of Stiernhielm is mainly based on his Swedish panegyric, *Äreminne öfver krigsrådet Georg Stjernhielm*, that is 'Commemorative eulogy on the military counsellor Georg Stiernhielm', which was published in Stockholm in 1776. In his Latin biography, Gagnerus chooses for the sake of brevity not to review the historical, philological and etymological works in Stiernhielm's vast output.¹⁴¹⁴

in 18th-century France, and in particular imitated its foremost practitioner, Antoine-Léonard Thomas (1732–1785).

¹⁴¹² He drew up a list of archaic Swedish words in order to enrich the contemporary Swedish vocabulary: *Förtekning på gamla svenska eller göthiska ord, hvilka dels torde vitna om fornspråkets sinrikhet och styrka, dels ännu, med liten eller alsingen förändring, kunna tjäna, at rikta den moderna svenskan*, Stockholm 1775. He also published a plan for a more complete Swedish dictionary in the journal of the Swedish society of education, *Upfostringssällskapets tidningar*, Stockholm 1784.

¹⁴¹³ Gagnerus, letter to Samuel Älf, on 16 December 1776 (shelfmark: Ep. G. 1:1, Royal Library, Stockholm): [...] "För mitt ändamål har jag måst göra en anseelig samling och en tämligen vidsträckt bekantskap med vår Stiernhielms arbeten, både större och mindre, jämte upplagor och editioner däraf, deras öden m[ed] m[era], fast jag inte uti min väg fick speciellt åberopa mig eller anföra allt sådant såsom panegyrist." Quoted by Swartling, *Georg Stjernhielm*, p. 2.

¹⁴¹⁴ Gagnerus, the Latin biography, ms. Ep. G. 1:2, p. 43: "Vastae praeterea eruditionis Stiernhielmii ingentia et multiplicia reperiuntur specimina. Opera eius etymologica, philologica et historica innumera sunt, quare brevitatis studiosi iisdem heic recensendis supersedemus."

21.2.2 *Stiernhielm as a hero of erudition*

In his Swedish panegyric, Gagnerus describes Stiernhielm as a hero of erudition of the first rank in his own time, a Swedish Montesquieu, and a powerful and creative genius.¹⁴¹⁵ He argues that Stiernhielm combined historical imagination with sound judgment and wide-ranging knowledge, contending that he was born and endowed by nature to pursue the mission of creating a new intellectual world.¹⁴¹⁶

At the outset of his Latin biography Gagnerus, in an inflated style, depicts Stiernhielm as a brilliant star in the sky of letters:

Georg Stiernhielm, the light and fame of Scandinavia and of his fatherland, was born in the neighbourhood of Vika in the borderland between Vestmannia and Dalecarlia, more precisely in the village of Svartskär, in the year of 1598. Since he was poor and of humble birth, he must be considered to have arisen as a most splendid star out of the darkness, in order, by his force, his diligence and the splendour of his unique talent, to entirely and completely liberate the Sweo-Gothic Muses from the mist of the night and from the power of the shadows by the force of the splendid light surrounding him, as it were.¹⁴¹⁷

In the Latin biography he even compares Stiernhielm to Aristotle and Plato: “As (Samuel) Columbus once sang: if Brunkeberg had been Mount Pindus, if Sweden had been Greece, Stiernhielm would have been Aristotle and Plato himself.”¹⁴¹⁸

21.2.3 *Stiernhielm as a historical linguist*

In his Swedish panegyric, Gagnerus delivers a vivid and insightful depiction of Stiernhielm’s panoramic method of historical language

¹⁴¹⁵ Gagnerus, *Äreminne öfver krigsrådet Georg Stjernhjelm*, preface: “en lärdom-hjälte på sin tid af den första rangen”, p. 30: “en svensk Montesquieu för sin tid” and p. 51: “ett starkt och skapande snille.”

¹⁴¹⁶ *Äreminne*, p. 69: “Stiernhielm förstod at förena den lifligaste inbildnings-kraft med det djupaste omdöme. Han var likasom född, likasom väpnad af naturen at skapa en ny verld. Han måste sjelf känna alt, för at kunna lära verlden alt.”

¹⁴¹⁷ Gagnerus, the Latin biography, Ep. G. 1:2, p. 31: “Georgius Stiernhielm, Septentrionis ac patriae lumen et decus, natus in Vika Vestmanno-Dalecarliae et quidem in pago Svartskär, anno millesimo quingentesimo nonagesimo octavo. Hic, cum ex humili esset ortus genere, veluti stella lucidissima e tenebris exiisse censendus est, ut vi, solertia et splendore ingenii prorsus singulari Musas Sviogothicas circumfuso et uberiori quasi lumine a noctis caligine vel umbrarum geniis sollemnissime et penitus liberaret.”

¹⁴¹⁸ Gagnerus, *ibidem*, p. 41: “Si mons Brunconis, ut olim cecinit Columbus, Pindus fuisset, si Svecia Graecia, Stiernhielmus esset Aristoteles et ipse Plato.” For Samuel Columbus’ use of this comparison, see Vol. 1, Section 2.6.1, p. 78.

classification and his attention to internal as well as external causes of linguistic change:

Stiernhielm's genius did not endure limitation to some part; it stretched itself out across the whole. His extensive field of vision soon made him aware of how one language was adjacent to and cognate with another, what more or less clear links and bonds joined them together, what mixtures of tribes and descendants, what changes of fortunes and times, of warfare and commerce, of migration and colonization, of ethnic destruction and blending that also had affected the world of languages.¹⁴¹⁹

Gagnerus argues that Stiernhielm was guided in his etymology by an inquiry into the inner connection of all words with their first origins:

Stiernhielm thinks that he will find light, order and a system in this darkness and disorder. In this mould, in this sea, he believes that he is able to discover the first creation of words and the first source, from which several thousand rivers have emanated. He thinks that he will discover their confusing alterations, notice their often unnoticeable traces and finally know the time and manner, when and how, they in turn sooner or later have lost themselves in the Ocean. Our hero considers himself able to explore such a secret and thereby to clearly determine the first and actual origin of almost millions of nations.¹⁴²⁰

Gagnerus argues that Stiernhielm did not solve the tangled knot of linguistic origins in the same way as Alexander hit the Gordian knot, but claims that Stiernhielm rather relied on an incredible knowledge of languages with insight into the process of the diversification of languages into dialects, and vice versa. He clarifies this topic:

¹⁴¹⁹ *Äreminne*, p. 61: "Stiernhielms snille tålde ej inskränkning inom någon del: det utbredde sig snart öfver det hela. Hans vidträckta syn blef snart varse huru det ena språket närgränsade och beslägtade det andra: hvilka mer eller mindre tydliga länkar och band dem förenade: hvilken blandning af stammar och afkomlingar: hvilken förändring af öden och tid, af vapen och handel, af utflyttning och colonier, af folkslagens förstörelser och blandning, äfven öfvergått språkkretsen."

¹⁴²⁰ Gagnerus, *ibidem*, p. 61: "Stiernhielm tror sig finna ljus, ordning och reda uti detta mörker och oreda. I denna mörja, i detta haf, tror han sig åter kunna igenfinna den första skapelsen af ord och den första källan, hvarifrån flere tusende floder framrunnit. Han tror sig upptäcka deras villsamma omgång, märka deras ofta nog omärkliga spår och sist känna tiden och sättet, när och huru de sig åter, förr eller senare, uti Oceanen förlorat. Vår hjälte tror sig kunna uppdaga en sådan hemlighet och i det samma tydligt afgöra snart millioner Folkslags första och egentliga ursprung."

An intricate and complicated knot here requires the strength of a Stiernhielm to solve; and he does not use the sword like Alexander. He peruses most of the world's known languages with an almost unbelievable linguistic knowledge. He examines the multifarious European and Oriental languages with their specific particularities and expressions of speech. He perceives how parent languages often vanish and give way to prevalent dialects, and how the latter sometimes disappear on account of the dominance of entirely new emerging languages. In this interruption, in this labyrinth, in these illusions, in this fog and mist, the hero thinks that he can attain his intended goal.¹⁴²¹

The panegyrist then describes the systematicity by which Stiernhielm tackled the problems of language kinship and linguistic change. In this section of the eulogy, Gagnerus shows his acquaintance with the comparative method of Johan Ihre.¹⁴²² The phrase "closer and more distant degrees" seems to be drawn from Ihre's bipartite view of the relationship of Swedish with cognate languages. Gagnerus states:

He compares the languages between themselves. He tracks the first parent language and thence derives the priorities of later languages to one another and their relationships and kinship. He notes closer and more distant degrees of kinship. He counts the ascendant and descendant lines and knows the collateral branches of languages. Everything presents itself to him as the most rich genealogical tree on the most beautiful picture.¹⁴²³

Gagnerus also applies the 18th-century concept of linguistic laws to the validity of Stiernhielm's comparative linguistic method. By this

¹⁴²¹ Ibidem, p. 61: "En konstig och invecklad knut fordrar här en Stjernhjelm's styrka at uplösa: och han nyttjar inte det Alexandrinska svärdet. Han genomgår med en snart otrolig Språkkunnighet de flästa af världens kända Tungomål. Han granskar de mångfaldige Europeiska och Österländska Språken med deras särskilte Egenheter och Tale-arter. Han ser hur Stamspråken ofta förgås och lemna rum för rådande Dialecter och huru dessa åter stundom försvinna för en väldigare övermakt af helt nya up kommande språk. I denna brytning, i denna irgång, i dessa villor, genom denna dimba och mist, tror hjelten sig kunna upå sit föresatta mål."

¹⁴²² On Ihre's classificatory and etymological method, see Eskhult's and Östlund's forthcoming study, *Johan Ihres språkklassificering, etymologi och lexikografi*.

¹⁴²³ Gagnerus, ibidem, pp. 61–62: "Han (62) jämförer tungomålen sig emellan. Han uppsöker det första Stamspråket och leder derifrån de sednares inbördes företräde, förhållande och gemenskap. Han anteknar närmare och fjärmare leder. Han räknar up- och nedstigande lineer och känner språkens sido-grenar. Alt framställer sig för honom såsom det rikaste Slägt-träd på den vackraste tafla."

term he presumably refers to the regular inter-lingual sound changes between related languages that Ihre explored in his etymological Swedish dictionary (*Glossarium Suiogothicum*, 1769, preface, pp. xli-xlvi). Stiernhielm had noted the interrelationship of certain consonant groups, which are more or less the same as those later established in the first Germanic sound shift, according to Grimm's Law (1822).¹⁴²⁴ Gagnerus also comments on Stiernhielm's hypothesis of an original monoglottism and his idea of a universalist restoration of the primeval language:

Celts, Moors, Greeks, Persians, Tyrians and Phoenicians, Slavs, Scythians, and Goths must here obey the scholarly and extensive linguistic laws of Stiernhielm. He proves that all languages derive from one single language, and he believes what in the opinion of other people is incredible, namely that after the passage of several thousand years they can be restored to the single primeval one. Even here patriotism and love of the fatherland often prevail over truth and full evidence.¹⁴²⁵

Gagnerus recognizes that Stiernhielm considered Scythian to be the original language of mankind in opposition to the then common hypothesis of the anterior and primordial status of Hebrew. This part of the eulogy apparently came to serve as a model for later biographers such as Carl Gustav Nordin and Lorenzo Hammarsköld:

The original language underlying all the world's languages and dialects would now be Scythian. Hebrew itself must admit its age and pre-eminence. Contrary to common opinion, Stiernhielm did not consider this venerated original language to be the primordial one. His reservations and reasons concerning that were among others, that all or most of the stems, original (monosyllabic) words or roots are not found in Hebrew, and this was considered by our hero to be a requirement of an original language. On the contrary, in his learned prejudice he saw there only poverty, anomalies and deficiency. He did not refer to Hebrew, Phoenician, Chaldaic, Syriac, Arabic, Egyptian and Ethiopic as languages, but only as

¹⁴²⁴ Jacob Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik*, 2nd ed. Göttingen 1822, p. 584. Cf. Sections 4.1.4 and 4.1.5 above, pp. 57–60. Cf. Vol. 1, Section 7.1.2, p. 142.

¹⁴²⁵ Gagnerus, *ibidem*, p. 62: "Celter, Morer och Græker, Perser, Tyrer och Phœnicier, Slaver, Scyther och Göter måste här alle lyda en STJERNHJELMS lärda och vidsträckta språklagar. Han beviser at alla språk härstamma ifrån et enda, och han tror det som för andra otroligt är at de nu åter och efter flere tusende år til et enda och det första kunna återföras. Patriotisme och kärlek til fäderneslandet råda äfven här ofta mer än sanning och fulla bevis."

dialects. On the other hand, Scythian – or in his opinion the original language of the world – would possess all or most of such perfections, characteristics and properties that he demanded of a language of that kind.¹⁴²⁶

In a footnote to this passage, Gagnerus refers to the intellectual duel between the Orientalist Johannes Terserus and Stiernhielm on this controversial subject. In this public debate, which took place at the command of Queen Christina, Terserus was, according to Gagnerus, forced “to mix reason and proofs with admiration and annoyance”. The biographer tells that Stiernhielm “as a joke or in the heat of the fight” provoked his antagonist with an alternative etymology of the name Adam by deriving it not from Hebrew, but from “pure Swedish” as *af dam*, that is ‘from dust’.

Gagnerus next argues that Stiernhielm paved the way for the two Rudbeckians (the Elder and the Younger), but criticizes Rudbeck the Elder for neglecting “the laws of permutation and transposition” in his etymologies of historical names and thereby “deluding, confusing and undermining the historical truth itself”.

The panegyrist finally comments on Stiernhielm’s efforts as editor of the provincial law of Westrogothia and of Codex Argenteus. It was Stiernhielm’s wide knowledge of languages that enabled him to carry out these tasks and elucidate the lexis in these documents. He argues that Stiernhielm succeeded in establishing a text of Wulfila’s Gospels that was superior to the previous effort. According to Gagnerus, Stiernhielm’s introduction is “a remarkably learned and literary preface on the origin of languages from one single original language”. Since Stiernhielm opposed the primacy of Hebrew and denied that new languages emerged at Babel, he did not please the clergy, particularly as he seemed to favour the hypothesis of pre-Adamites, Gagnerus concludes.¹⁴²⁷

¹⁴²⁶ Gagnerus, *ibidem*, p. 62: Detta Stam-språk för alla Tungomål och Dialecter i verlden skulle nu vara det Scythiska. Sjelfa Hebreiskan måste erkänna des ålder och företräde. Detta vördade urspråk ansåg en STJERNHIJELM tvärt emot en almän (63) tanka icke för det första. Hans mistankar eller skäl därtill voro ibland annat at alle eller de fläste andre Tungomåls stammar, ursprungs-ord eller rötter icke skola finnas deri: och sådant fordrade vår Hjelte af et Stamspråk. Han såg tvärtemot, i sin lärda fördom, där idel fattigdom, anomalier och brist. Hebreiska, Phœniciska, Chaldeiska, Syriska, Arabiske, Ægyptiska och Æthiopiska Tungomålen kallade han icke Språk utan blotta Dialecter. Det Scythiska eller i hans tanka verldens Stamspråk skulle däremot äga alla eller de flästa sådana fullkomligheter, kännetekn och egenskaper, som han af et så beskaffat språk fordrade.”

¹⁴²⁷ Gagnerus, *ibidem*, pp. 65–69.

21.3 Carl Gustaf Nordin

21.3.1 Preliminaries

The Gothic philologist and theologian Carl Gustav Nordin (1749–1812) is the author of a biographical sketch on Stiernhielm, *Minne af krigsrådet Georg Stjernhjelm*, ‘Commemorative speech on the military counsellor Georg Stiernhielm’,¹⁴²⁸ which he delivered before the Swedish Academy on 20 December 1791. It forms part of his series of biographical speeches on famous Swedish men.

As an expert on Gothic philology, Nordin was qualified to assess Stiernhielm’s historical linguistic works. He was educated at Uppsala under the guidance of the etymologist Johan Ihre (1707–1780), and was in 1774 appointed reader of Gothic literature and Nordic antiquities. In his political and cultural views he was a Gustavian, for which King Gustav III rewarded him by making him a founding member of the Academy in 1786. The fact that he was a pupil of Ihre presumably also contributed to this appointment.

Like Gagnerus, Nordin emphasizes the virtue, genius and learning of Stiernhielm. In a tripartite structure, he deals with Stiernhielm’s merits as a government official, scholar, and subject (citizen). In the first part he accordingly describes Stiernhielm’s career as an official (pp. 199–207). In the second he surveys Stiernhielm’s scientific, scholarly and literary writings (pp. 208–213). In the third he reflects on Stiernhielm’s philosophy of life and the vicissitudes of his own life (pp. 214–216). I will focus on the second part of the oration.

Nordin conceives Stiernhielm’s lifework as an enterprise “to offer all subjects a more sweet feeling of life, of society, of citizenship.” By fostering a milder character among the people he aroused “true enlightenment, love for the fatherland and all those efficacious virtues that the hero and the statesman afterwards use in public service and for the happiness of the individual.”¹⁴²⁹ In general, Nordin thus adopts a utilitarian framework of interpretation.

¹⁴²⁸ Nordin’s speech was first published in *Handlingar rörande svenska akademiens högtidsdag den XX december MDCCXCI*. Stockholm 1792. It was republished as “Minne af krigsrådet och preses i Kongl. Antiquitets Collegio, herr Jöran Stjernhjelm” in Stockholm in 1808; and with the same title in *Svenska Akademiens handlingar ifrån år 1786*, part 4, Stockholm 1809, pp. 197–216. I have used this edition. It was posthumously republished in Nordin’s *Minnen över namnkunniga svenska män*, Stockholm 1818, pp. 155–176.

¹⁴²⁹ Nordin, “Minne af krigsrådet och preses i kongl. antiquitets collegium, herr Georg Stjernhjelm” in *Svenska Akademiens handlingar ifrån år 1786*, fjärde delen, 1809, p. 200: “Han är sysselsatt med att bereda all medborgare till en ljufligare känsla af lifvet, af samhället, af medborgerligheten; och i det han skapar ett mildare lynne hos folket, framkallar han den sanna upplysningen, kärleken till fäderneslandet och alla de verksamma dygder, dem hjelten och statsmannen sedan använda till det allmännas uppkomst, till den enskildas lycksalighet.”

21.3.2 Stiernhielm as a philologist

Nordin begins by arguing that Stiernhielm was the most learned man of his time in the Swedish realm, and that he put his multi-disciplinary learning at the service of his fatherland. He mentions Stiernhielm's mathematical knowledge as a first example, and then turns to Stiernhielm's linguistic and antiquarian without entering into an exhaustive discussion of the topic.

Nordin argues that it was Stiernhielm's conversation with Bureus that made him inclined to study languages and literature. On the question of the similarity between these two thinkers, Nordin states that Bureus aimed towards the same goal that Stiernhielm fulfilled. The difference is that the same intention remained "a thought with the former and became an action with the latter."

Nordin then maintains that Stiernhielm's comparative linguistic research is closely related and subordinated to the study of antiquities, which at that time was "seductive", that is, politically charged. Clarifying why it was seductive, he argues that the Swedish nation during the reigns of Gustavus Adolphus and Christina was emerging "from a condition of weakness" and rapidly developing into a great power in Northern Europe. He does not further develop this argument, but declares that "this civic pride" makes the exaggerated patriotism of excellent scholars of that time excusable. Nordin adds: "he never intentionally betrayed truth or insulted its laws," but admits that it could happen that Stiernhielm exhibited biased "in Scythian disputes, where the sound judgement depends on the trifling speech sounds" (p. 210 f.).

21.3.3 Stiernhielm as language renewer

Nordin calls some attention to Stiernhielm's renewal of Swedish. He refers to it as enlightening and an improvement. He assumes that it was a reaction against the increase in foreign loanwords in Swedish, which was a consequence of Sweden's involvement in the Thirty Years' War. Stiernhielm combined his ambitions regarding linguistic purism with antiquarian aims. Nordin explains how Stiernhielm went about in his efforts to add strength and vigour to the Swedish language:

He adopted outdated words, created new ones, put two together, either to increase the meaning or to express double concepts; he made other words more smooth by removing superfluous particles, he truncated long endings, where a shorter one could fit, he sorted out foreign words and expressions that burdened

sentences and also changed the syntax from the German to the Latin kind, which in times past had belonged to the language.”¹⁴³⁰

Nordin adds:

All this he successfully set about thanks to his great knowledge of dead and living languages, which imparted him a sense of their similarities and gave him a more independent view of the field of Nordic languages.¹⁴³¹

21.4 Lorenzo Hammarsköld

21.4.1 Preliminaries

An advocate of Romanicism, Lorenzo Hammarsköld (1785–1827) – critic, poet, translator, and historian of art, literature, and philosophy – republished Stiernhielm’s belletristic works, to which he composed a biographical introduction. There he claims that although the poets of the 18th century were “endlessly inferior to Stiernhielm in terms of merits, they rightly understood his value and knew to esteem his poetry by an innermost reverence”.¹⁴³² He further maintains that Stiernhielm’s Swedish poems began to be exposed to contempt in the last decade of the 18th century, after the last public expression of reverence, namely Nordin’s memorial speech on Stiernhielm in 1791. However, he maintains that “the New School” of Swedish literature, which he himself represented as a Romanticist, had recently called new attention to the beauty of Stiernhielm’s poems and songs.¹⁴³³

Hammersköld in a well-informed way evaluates all the branches of Stiernhielm’s scholarly and literary authorship: jurisprudence (pp.

¹⁴³⁰ Nordin, *ibidem*, p. 211: “Han uptog nedlagde ord, gjorde nya, hopsatte tvänne för at antingen öka bemärkelsen eller at uttrycka dubbla begrepp: lättade andre ord med borttagande af öfverflödiga partiklar: afskar långa ändelser, där en kortare kunde äga rum: utgalrade främmande ord samt uttryck som förtyngde meningar och i öfrigt drog han sammanbindningen ifrån Tyska til latinska arten, hvilket fordom hade tilhört språket.” The last clause was restated by Atterbom, *Svenska siare och skalder*, vol. 2, p. 63: ”Sammanbindningen, eller construction och periodbyggnad, sökte han återföra från den tysksläpiga arten till den gamla, och med detsamma till större likställighet med den latinska.”

¹⁴³¹ Nordin, *ibidem*, pp. 211–212: “Alt detta kunde han lyckligt sätta i verket igenom sin stora kännedom af döda och lefvande språken, som bibragte honom likheten och gäfvö honom såmedelst en friare utsigt öfver Nordiske Tungomålens fält.”

¹⁴³² Lorenzo Hammarsköld (ed.), *Georg Stjernhjelm's Vitterhets-Arbeten, fullständigare samlade och ånyo utgifne*, Stockholm 1818. The introduction has the title: “Anteckningar till Georg Stjernhjelm's lefvernesbeskrivning” (Notes for a biography of Georg Stiernhielm), see p. 57.

¹⁴³³ Hammarsköld, *ibidem*, pp. 57–59.

37–38), history (38–40), philology (pp. 40–42), mathematics (pp. 42–45), natural philosophy (pp. 45–47),¹⁴³⁴ and poetry (pp. 48–54).

21.4.2 *Stiernhielm as a historian*

Hammaršköld states that Stiernhielm only wrote two historical treatises, *Anti-Cluverius* and *Dissertatio de Hyperboreis*, which both were published posthumously in 1685 by Johann Hadorph. He makes clear that these works are a manifestation of the quest for a glorious past of the Swedish nation. The destruction of the Western Roman Empire was, at that time, the most glorious exploit conceivable, to which the Goths had contributed. Their homeland was by Johannes Magnus (1488–1544) ascribed to Sweden according to the tradition of the 6th-century historian Jordanes, who made Scandinavia the original abode of nations (*vagina gentium*). This was disputed by the German geographer and historian Philipp Clüver (1580–1622), who in his *Germania antiqua* (1616) located the original abode of the Goths to the lower regions or mouth of the Vistula river. Hammaršköld sums up the main tenets of *Anti-Cluverius*. The first principle was the identification of Scythians with the Swedes and Scythia with Sweden:

In the opinion of that time, this was an infamy inflicted upon the Swedish nation, and Stiernhielm assembled the full extent of his learning and acumen to refute this assertion. For this purpose he adopted the same position as that which for long had been common and which was further developed by the contemporary historians Verelius, Schefferus and Rudbeck the Elder, namely that we Swedes are Scythians, that these Scythians after their appearance on the stage of Europe called themselves Goths, since they emigrated from Gothia, one of the regions of their Scythian fatherland, Sweden, the same country that the ancient writers called Atlantis, Basilea, Bannomanna or Scania.¹⁴³⁵

¹⁴³⁴ Hammaršköld later described Stiernhielm's philosophical system in his history of philosophic studies in Sweden, *Historiska anteckningar rörande fortgången och utveckningen av det filosofiska studium i Sverige*, Stockholm 1821, pp. 98–109.

¹⁴³⁵ Hammaršköld, *ibidem*, biographical introduction, p. 38: "Enligt denna tidens åsigt var detta en infamie tillfogad svenska nationen och Stiernhielm samlade hela omfånget av sin lärdom och skarpsinnighet för att vederlägga detta påstående. Han antog för detta ändamålet samma mening, som länge varit gängse och den hans samtidige häfdeforskare Verelius, Scheffer och förnämligst O. Rudbeck den äldre vidare utfört: att vi svenskar voro schyter: att dessa schyther, efter deras uppträdande i Europa kallat sig Göther, emedan de utgått från Göthaland, den ena del av deras schytiska fädernesland Sverige: samma land, som de gamle än kallat Atland, än Basilia, än Bannomana, än Scandia o.s.v."

He also points out the importance of the Hyperborean tradition for Stiernhielm's historical thought:

Moreover, he represents it as certain that the first inhabitants of Sweden descended from Magog, the grandson of Noah, and were the most ancient nation of the world, whose language contained the roots of all Oriental, Occidental and Nordic languages. However, he was not only content with the claim that all countries got their inhabitants from Sweden, but also claimed that they received their culture from there, and consequently he endeavoured to show that, by the term Hyperboreans, the Greeks referred to the inhabitants of the Scandinavian peninsula, among whom Osiris, Apollo and Orpheus were born and educated.¹⁴³⁶

Hammaršköld certainly admired "the genius and learning" that Stiernhielm brought to bear in arguing these hypotheses and admitted that something was gained in the exploration of Swedish antiquities, but dismisses the foundations of this intellectual edifice. He argues that "unbiased scholars" have proved the futility of the main argument. In particular, they have exposed the vagueness of the term Scythians in ancient ethnography. The ancient writers "under this term subsumed all nations that they could not relate to any other tribe."¹⁴³⁷

21.4.3 Stiernhielm as a linguist

Hammaršköld continues with an analysis of Stiernhielm's theory of language origins. He held that Stiernhielm drew the main proof¹⁴³⁸ of his historiography from languages and underlined the importance of the Scythian hypothesis for Stiernhielm's linguistic thought. He did obviously not, however, recognize the points of similarity with the Indo-European hypothesis in contemporary linguistic theory. He states:

¹⁴³⁶ Hammaršköld, *ibidem*, p. 38: "Vidare framställer han som afgjort att dessa Sveriges aborigines härstamma från Noachs sonson Magog och voro det äldsta folkslag i verlden, hvars språk äfven innehöll radices till alla så orientaliska, som occidentaliska och nordiska språk. Men ej nöjd med, att från Sverige alla länder fått sina innebyggare, de hafva därifrån äfven fått hela sin cultur och därför söker han visa att grekerne, med sin hyperboreer, förstod skandinaviska halvöns innebyggare, bland vilka Osiris, Apollo, Orpheus etc. blifvit födde och uppfosttrade."

¹⁴³⁷ Hammaršköld, *ibidem*, p. 40: "under detta namn betecknades alla de nationer, hvilka de icke till någon annan stam kunde härföra."

¹⁴³⁸ The Swedish original has the word "hufvud-dokumentet" that is, main proof. See SAOB, s.v. "dokument, 1".

He took for granted without evidence the hypothesis that Swedish is a Scythian language, but on the other hand he used much learning and acumen in proving that the so-called Scythian language was the most ancient of all. He has tried to demonstrate this thesis in several treatises, e.g. in the preface to Wulfila, in *Anti-Bochart*, and most exhaustively in his unpublished *Discursus philologicus de omnibus linguis in genere*.¹⁴³⁹

Hammaršköld comments on Stiernhielm's rejection of the hypothesis that Hebrew is linguistically prior to all other languages and mentions the public dispute between Terserus and Stiernhielm:

It was assumed almost as a religious dogma by the theologians of that time that Hebrew was the first primeval language. Since Stiernhielm did not exclude this language from his derivation,¹⁴⁴⁰ this thesis aroused much annoyance in connection with his ideas about a pre-Adamite humankind, and bishop Terserus, who was later himself accused of heresy, requested that Queen Christina allow him to persuade Stiernhielm in a public dispute that his opinion was heretical. The good Terserus was unable to stand against the wide reading and dialectical ingenuity of Stiernhielm, although at this dispute the latter even argued, on the basis of his *Philological discourse*, that the name Adam is Swedish and is derived from the words *af* and *dam*, that is, 'from dust'.¹⁴⁴¹

¹⁴³⁹ Hammaršköld, *ibidem*, p. 40: "Hufvud-dokumentet för Stjernhjelm Historiographi hämtade han från språken. Hypotesen att svenskan var ren schytiska antog han utan vidare bevis såsom gifven, men deremåt använde han så mycket mer lärdom och skarpsinnighet till bestyrkande att detta så kallade Schytiska språk var det äldsta af alla. Denna sats har han i flere skrifter, såsom i företalet till Ulphilas, i Anti-Bochart, men med största utförlighet i sin otryckta *Discursus philologicus de omnibus linguis in genere* sökt genomdrifva."

¹⁴⁴⁰ His derivation] Stiernhielm's theory and practice of deriving languages from the primordial one.

¹⁴⁴¹ Hammaršköld, *ibidem*, p. 40: "Då det på de tiderne hos theologerne var antagit, nästan som en religionsdogm, att hebreiskan var det första urspråket och då Stjernhjelm icke untantog detta heliga tungomål i sin härledning, så väckte denna hans thes i samband med hans idéer om ett prae-adamitiskt menniskoslägte mycken förargelse, och den sjelf sedermera förkättrade biskopen TERSERUS anhöll hos drottning CHRISTINA att genom en offentlig disputations-act, få öfvertyga Stjernhjelm om hans vilfarelse. Den gode Terserus kunde dock inte bestå mot Stjernhjelm's beläsenhet och dialektiska påhittighet, ehuru han till och med under denna disput ur sin *Discursus philologicus* yrkade att namnet Adam var svenskt, uppkommit utaf orden af och dam, d[et] ä[r] af stoft." See the record of the dispute with Terserus in Section 14.2.2. In his draft of a chapter, no. 20, in *Runa Suethica* he derives biblical proper names including Adam from Swedish (Section 9.1.2).

21.5 Per Daniel Amadeus Atterbom

21.5.1 *Stiernhielm as a pioneering Swedish poet*

In his history of Swedish literature *Svenska siare och skalder*, the poet and critic Per Daniel Amadeus Atterbom (1790–1855) continued the evaluation of Stiernhielm's role as a national poet.¹⁴⁴² He based his analysis on a comparison with foreign poets, viz. Clement Marrot and Pierre de Ronsard in France, Daniel Heinsius, Peter Corneliszoon Hooft and Jacob Cats in the Netherlands, and Georg Rudolf Weckherlin and Martin Opitz in Germany.¹⁴⁴³ According to Atterbom, Stiernhielm deserves the titles of epoch-making poet and the father of Swedish poetry in the sense that domestic Swedish poetry *as an art* ("såsom konst") began with him.¹⁴⁴⁴ Atterbom acknowledges him as the author and first advocate of "linguistic and technical formalism, which later on developed into 'taste' in the French sense".¹⁴⁴⁵ Regarding the pre-eminence of Stiernhielm or Dalin, he came to the relativistic conclusion that both of them filled the same function in the time in which they lived.¹⁴⁴⁶ They are both fathers of a national Swedish poetry.¹⁴⁴⁷ Atterbom thus energetically vindicated the epithet that already had been conferred on Stiernhielm by Nordin (1791),¹⁴⁴⁸ Hammarsköld (1818) and Lénström (1838), and thus confirmed the reputation of Stiernhielm as a national poet, though his precedence to this honour continued to be disputed, for instance by Hanselli (1871).

21.5.2 *Stiernhielm as a language reformer*

Atterbom devotes one section to the topic of Stiernhielm's relation to language and science, where he comments on the programme for linguistic purism and language renewal, quoting from the preface to *Svea- and Götha-måles fatebur* and the preface to *Baculus Carolinus*.

¹⁴⁴² P. D. A. Atterbom, *Svenska siare och skader*, vol. 2, Uppsala 1843, pp. 1–73 with the main chapter title "Georg Stiernhielm. Svenska skaldekonstens fader", especially pp. 44–73 with the subtitle "II. Stjernhjelm".

¹⁴⁴³ Atterbom, *Svenska siare och skalder*, vol. 2, first edition, Uppsala 1843, p. 44; second edition, Örebro 1862, p. 41. There is a copy of *Oeuvres de Ronsard* at Royal Library, Stockholm, with the signature of Johan Markvard Stiernhielm.

¹⁴⁴⁴ Atterbom, *ibidem*, first edition, p. 44: "Mellertid begynte dock från honom, liksom i Tyskland från Opitz, den inhemska poesin såsom konst."

¹⁴⁴⁵ Atterbom, *ibidem*, first edition, p. 44.

¹⁴⁴⁶ Atterbom, *ibidem*, first edition, p. 45 (second edition, p. 42): "Det var alltså – i grunden – Stjernhielms verk, som fortsattes genom Dalin och som ändtligen uppnådde genom Kellgren och Leopold sin fulländning."

¹⁴⁴⁷ Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar*, p. 314.

¹⁴⁴⁸ Nordin, "Minne af krigsrådet Göran Stjernhjelm", thinks that Stiernhielm's *Hercules* should be modernized to do justice to "the first father of Swedish poetry" (svenska skaldekonstens första stamfader). Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar*, p. 172.

Stiernhielm's endeavour "to form a pure high Swedish" had in Atterbom's opinion a purging effect, in so far as good words were brought into use from Old Swedish, Swedish dialects or Icelandic, or were coined anew. The ideal at which he aimed was a Swedish style, where the manner of expression is "strong, concise, full of meaning, euphonic, and at the same time majestic and simple."¹⁴⁴⁹ Atterbom emphasized Stiernhielm's courage to write poetry in a Germanized vernacular, "which then was completely only a rough material".¹⁴⁵⁰

Atterbom calls attention to the fact that Stiernhielm equated Old Swedish with the primeval language of humankind, "from which all other languages had emerged and could be derived",¹⁴⁵¹ and connects this view with Stiernhielm's linguistic purism and programme to replace Latin and Greek technical terms with indigenous Swedish ones. Against this background, Atterbom thinks it is remarkable that Stiernhielm did not express his philosophy "in the Sweo-Gothic language". He deplores the fact that the author did not leave us the smallest fragment of a philosophical treatise in Swedish, since he was "a real philosopher, nay a thinker of high importance", whose writings evince "an independently fashioned Neoplatonic world view that aimed at a reconciliation with Christianity".¹⁴⁵²

Atterbom also reveals the contrast between Stiernhielm's zeal for a pure Swedish and his everyday usage, which abounds in Latin and German loanwords. Subsequent Swedish rulers and statesmen of the 17th century (Oxenstierna, Queen Christina, Charles XI and Charles XII) and literary critics of the Gustavian era (Kellgren, Leopold, and the Swedish Academy) show the same opposition between language purism in decrees or declarations and language mixing in their own practice of speaking and writing.¹⁴⁵³

21.5.3 *Stiernhielm as a comparative philologist*

In the account of Stiernhielm's relation to language, Atterbom touches on Stiernhielm's efforts as a historical linguist. He states that the path Stiernhielm chose as a scholar was particularly that of comparative linguistics and etymology, where he thinks he showed "a wastefulness of astonishing learning and quick-wittedness"¹⁴⁵⁴ and paved the way for Rudbeck's argument in *Atlantica*, with reference

¹⁴⁴⁹ Atterbom, *ibidem*, second edition, 1862, p. 63: "Honom föresväfvade idealet of en Svenska, der uttryckssättet vore starkt, concist, tankdigert, välljudande, på samma gång majestätiskt och enkelt."

¹⁴⁵⁰ Atterbom, *ibidem*, pp. 50–53, p. 63.

¹⁴⁵¹ Atterbom, *ibidem*, p. 52.

¹⁴⁵² Atterbom, *ibidem*, p. 55.

¹⁴⁵³ Atterbom, *ibidem*, pp. 61 f..

¹⁴⁵⁴ Atterbom, *ibidem*, p. 52: "med ett slöseri av förvånande lärdom och fyndighet".

to Stiernhielm's 'manuscript dictionaries' of Icelandic, Gothic, Old English, Finnish, Slavic, Welsh and Armenian.¹⁴⁵⁵

21.6 Eric Gustaf Geijer

21.6.1 Preliminaries

Erik Gustaf Geijer (1785–1847) assessed Stiernhielm's scholarship and poetry in his capacity as a member of the Swedish Academy. In 1840, the Academy requested him to write a biographical eulogy on Stiernhielm, because no submissions in the contest of eloquence on the topic "In memory of Georg Stiernhielm", announced in 1836 and reannounced with double rewards in 1837 and 1838, had fulfilled the requirements of the prize. At the annual meeting on 20 December 1840 Geijer read his *Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhjelm* "as much as time allowed".¹⁴⁵⁶ The essay was published ten years later, 1850.¹⁴⁵⁷

Geijer held the chair of history at Uppsala University for thirty years (1817–1846). As a historian he advocated historical idealism with attention to the interaction of social, cultural, and intellectual circumstances. In this biographical panegyric, Geijer joins his idealist and neo-Gothicist sentiments with an analysis of the cultural and mental character of Sweden in Stiernhielm's time and an assessment of his achievements. In this way, he deals with the following topics:

- (1) characteristics of an average Swedish subject in the era of Gustavus Adolphus (pp. 214–217),¹⁴⁵⁸
- (2) Stiernhielm's qualities as a polymath in Swedish State service as a case in point (pp. 217–218),
- (3) his achievements as a historical linguist (pp. 218–220),
- (4) his achievements as a Swedish poet (221–222).

Geijer argues that the different fields of Stiernhielm's polymathy are interrelated. To the rhetorical question of why he does not devote all the limited space of his speech to a discussion of Stiernhielm's merits regarding Swedish belletristic literature he replies: "Stiernhielm the poet" is not comprehensible without "Stiernhielm the scholar and scientist", and neither of them without "Stiernhielm the citizen and man".¹⁴⁵⁹ This is, in reverse order, a justification of the topics of the speech. In his biographic-panegyric oration Geijer sums up and sheds

¹⁴⁵⁵ Atterbom, *ibidem*, p. 52.

¹⁴⁵⁶ *Svenska Akademiens handlingar ifrån år 1796*, vol. 20, p. 293.

¹⁴⁵⁷ It was printed in the Acts of the society, *Svenska Akademiens handlingar ifrån år 1786*, part 23, Stockholm 1850. It was republished in the collected work of E. G. Geijer, *Samlade skrifter*, vol. 7, Stockholm 1875, pp. 214–223, which I have used.

¹⁴⁵⁸ The autograph draft of this part is preserved in ms. V 250 cc, UUB, pp. 79–88.

¹⁴⁵⁹ Erik Gustaf Geijer, "Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhjelm", *Samlade skrifter*, p. 221: "emedan Stjernhjelm skalden ej är begriplig utan Stjernhjelm vetenskapsmannen, liksom ingendera utan Stjernhjelm medborgaren och menniskan."

new light on most of the points that earlier biographers had made. Carl August Hagberg similarly contended that Stiernhielm's Swedish poetry, linguistic research and jurisprudence are interrelated.¹⁴⁶⁰

21.6.2 *A typical subject of the Swedish Great Power*

To begin with, Geijer portrays the political, moral, and intellectual climate of Sweden during the reign of King Gustavus Adolphus. From an idealistic perspective he characterizes this era "as a time of unfinished intentions", in particular regarding the exploits of the king himself. Quoting a passage on Gustavus Adolphus from his own *History of the Swedish people* (1836), Geijer states: "Everywhere one perceives tracks, but not the end of the roadway, scattered intentions to reach a conclusion, for which death came inbetween."¹⁴⁶¹ In his biography he elaborates this idea by applying it to the subjects: "As the king, so his subjects."¹⁴⁶² He characterizes the typical subject of this epoch as a man with virtue in the old sense of capability (*duglighet*), that is, a capable man (*en dugande man*), furthermore a man with natural ability rather than with learning, in much an autodidact, a great beginner – and certainly by necessity a great beginner. What the typical subjects have left behind, despite the greatness, is often patchwork, "as is everything human". In Geijer's opinion, the typical features can be reduced to "the Old Swedish innate bravery under the leadership of a hero".

21.6.3 *Stiernhielm as a citizen and a polymath*

Secondly, Geijer argues that all these qualities are manifested in the actions and works of Georg Stiernhielm. In doing so, he applies the quality of being a great beginner to Stiernhielm:

His career was as multi-faceted as it was extensive. As a teacher, judge, statesman, and landowner he served four rulers of Sweden in war as well as in peace. He was a linguistic researcher,

¹⁴⁶⁰ *Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhelm*: p. 11: "Hos ingen af Sveriges skalder har diktens frändskap med språket framträtt klarare än hos Stjernhjelm. Det vore derföre lika ensidigt som ytligt att betrakta hans skaldekonst oberoende av hans språkforskningar, serdeles då vi i dessa finna sjelfva urkällan till hans skaldeåder." [...] And p. 59: "Likasom Stjernhjelm's skaldekonst i språkvetenskapen fann sin närmaste väckelse, så fördes han äfven af sina forskningar i svenska språkets källor till kunskap om fäderneslandets lagar."

¹⁴⁶¹ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 216, quoting himself from *Svenska folkets historia*, vol. III, Örebro 1836, p. 32. "Man ser öfver allt spår, men ej slutet på vägen, spridda föresatser till en slutsats, vid hvilken döden trädde emellan."

¹⁴⁶² Geijer, "Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhelm", *Samlade skrifter*, vol. 7, Stockholm 1875, *ibidem*, p. 216: "Sådan konungen, sådana hans män."

antiquarian, natural scientist, lawyer, geometrician, philosopher, and poet. There is no field in which his work did not leave a trace; there is hardly any field in which he was not a discoverer in his time: there is hardly any field in which even his mistakes did not point in directions that later would lead to new and great prospects in a more purified form. He has attempted much and accordingly completed little. But to recall an expression used before, he was in everything a great beginner. In sum, his work is prophetic.¹⁴⁶³

Geijer concludes this second point with a claim about the interconnectedness and internal coherence of Stiernhielm's polymathic scholarship:

In the interplay between Swedish science and belles-letters there is hardly any strand that Stiernhielm has not touched upon, and much of what has subsequently developed in a clashing multiplicity shows itself to be joined together in him.¹⁴⁶⁴

21.6.4 Stiernhielm as a historical linguist

Geijer finally arrives at his third point, namely evaluating Stiernhielm as a historical linguist. To begin with, he offers a characterization of the state of language studies at the time when Stiernhielm flourished, in comparison with the state of this discipline in his own time:

Language studies were the foremost, and almost the only, form of secular learning, but they were confined within the boundaries of the so-called learned languages. Many people complain that these languages no longer are the subject of undivided attention and, as we hear, believe they see in that circumstance proof of a decreasing thoroughness.¹⁴⁶⁵

¹⁴⁶³ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 218: "Han har som lärare, domare, statsman, förvaltare, så i fredlig, som krigisk väg, tjänat fyra Sveriges regenter. Han var språkforskare, häfdaforskare, naturforskare, jurist, geometer, filosof och skald. Det finnes intet af dessa fält, på hvilket ej hans arbeten lemnat spår efter sig; knappt något, å hvilket han ej tillika är för sin tid upptäckare; icke något, å hvilket ej äfven hans misstag hänvisat på riktningar, som, framdeles renade, skulle föra till stora och nya utsigter. Han har försökt sig i mycket och följaktligen föga fullbordat. Men, för att återkalla ett redan nytjadt uttryck, han var i allt en stor börjare. Sammanfattad är hans verksamhet *profetisk*."

¹⁴⁶⁴ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 218: "Det finnes i samklangen af svensk vetenskap och vitterhet knappt en sträng, som ej Stjernhjelm vidrört och mycket af hvad sedermera utbildat sig i stridig mångfald visar sig hos honom förenadt."

¹⁴⁶⁵ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 218: "Språkstudier voro hans tids förnämsta, nästan enda världsliga lärdom. Men den var inskränkt inom de företrädesvis så kallade lärda

Geijer argues that this change provides an opportunity for the renewal of classical languages studies. In doing so, he points to actual and possible joint results of 18th-century neo-humanism and 19th-century historical linguistics:

But now, how much light has not been cast on the classical literatures and languages, now that they are no longer the only ones to be studied, having taken their place alongside others as parts of an increasingly developing whole. The light that has arisen through recent investigations is so life-giving that it is justifiable to state with full reason: within the span of one hundred years classical antiquity has grown young again. Would it then be alien to the younger generation, as is claimed? Impossible. Even at my age, I feel that this is not the case. Even if these studies will be pursued in a different way than before, this does not mean that they will cease or weaken.¹⁴⁶⁶

Geijer places Stiernhielm's linguistic theory and learning in the context of this progress of language studies in more recent times:

It is the 18th century that paved the way for this transformation of language studies, and it is up to the 19th century to complete it. Stiernhielm still belonged to the 17th century.¹⁴⁶⁷

He goes on to highlight the potential for innovation in Stiernhielm's linguistic theory, in spite of its Gothicist tendency, patriotic bias and etymological ingenuity:

He possessed all the learning of his era; but the idea that behind the world of learned languages there is still another that to no less an extent is worthy of scholarly attention, this surmise showed

språken. Man hör mången, som deri vill se ett bevis på aftagande grundlighet, beklaga att dessa språk ej mera äro föremål för en lika odelad uppmärksamhet.”

¹⁴⁶⁶ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 218: “Men nu – hvilket ljus har ej uppgått öfver de klassiska (p. 219) litteraturerna och språken, sedan de ej mera äro de enda som studeras, sedan de intagit sin plats bredvid andra såsom delar af ett allt mera sig utvecklande helt. Detta genom senare forskningar uppgångna ljus är så lifgifvande, att med fullt skäl kan sägas: antiken har inom hundra år blifvit ung på nytt. Och den skulle just nu blifva främmande för ungdomen, såsom man påstår? Omöjligt! Jag känner ännu i min ålder att så ej förhåller sig. Om dessa studier ock komma att bedrivas annorlunda än förr, så innebär detta hvarken att de skola upphöra eller försvagas.”

¹⁴⁶⁷ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 219: “Det är det adertonde seklet som förberedde, det är det nittonde som skall fullborda denna omskapning af språkstudierna. Stjernhjelm tillhörde ännu det sjuttonde.”

itself in his claim about the primordially and world-historical significance of the Gothic language branch – a claim until then unheard of. Nowadays we laugh at the patriotic exaggeration that went so far as to try to make Gothic or Scythian the ancestral mother of languages. We do not allow ourselves to be captivated by the endlessly ingenious wit, with which Stiernhielm everywhere found similarities to prove any cherished proposition.¹⁴⁶⁸

As we can see, Geijer noticed the resemblance between the Scythian and Indo-European hypotheses. He had the advantage of writing just after the breakthrough of historical-comparative linguistics, and not just before or during it, as in the case of Lorenzo Hammaršköld. Geijer continues his argument as follows:

But if we look at the outcome of the great explorations of our own time that have derived the ancestry of the Germanic languages from India and that placed alongside these languages, as their sisters, on the one hand Greek together with Latin, and on the other hand the Slavic languages, and that shows that this whole great language family has an equally legitimate claim to primordially as the Semitic languages, one must acknowledge that the pathway that Stiernhielm entered would prove, in a more purified and fulfilled form, to reach far and wide.¹⁴⁶⁹

Geijer argues that as a historian Stiernhielm exhibits approximately the same faults and merits as he does as a linguistic researcher,¹⁴⁷⁰ but passes over this topic, in order to clarify Stiernhielm's achievements as a Swedish poet. In doing so, he finally touches on

¹⁴⁶⁸ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 219: "Han egde hela sin tids lärdom; men att bakom dess lärda språkverld ännu en annan fanns ej mindre värd forskarens uppmärksamhet, denna aning visade sig i hans hittills ohörda påstående om den götiska språkstammens ursprunglighet och verldshistoriska vikt. Man ler nu åt den patriotiska öfverdrift som till och med ville göra götiskan eller skytiskan till språkens stammoder. Man låter ej hänföra sig af den gränslöst hittiga qvickhet, med hvilken Stjernhielm öfver allt fann likheter till bestyrkande af en älskad förlagsmening."

¹⁴⁶⁹ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 219: "Men ser man på utslaget af vår tids stora forskningar som ledt till de germaniska språkens anor till Indien, som bredvid dessa språk, såsom deras systrar, ordnadt å ena sidan grekiskan med latinet, å andra sidan de slavonska tungomålen och som visa huru hela denna stora språksläkt har lika rätt till ursprunglighet med den semitiska språken, måste man erkänna att den bana Stjernhielm först beträddt, skulle, renad och fullföljd, föra långt."

¹⁴⁷⁰ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 220: "Felen och förtjänsterna äro hos honom såsom språk- och häfdaforskare ungefär desamma."

the topic of Stiernhielm's role as a linguistic purist and language renewer. The accuracy of Geijer's judgements justifies giving an account of his statements, although this topic is partly beyond the scope of this reception study.

21.6.5 Stiernhielm as a language innovator

Geijer connects Stiernhielm's enterprise of writing poetry in Swedish with his puristic striving for language renewal. He highlights how Stiernhielm overcame the unrefined and foreignized state of Swedish by his forging of the language like a metal – an image that alludes to Stiernhielm's mining ancestry:

The language still lay rough and uncultivated. Our political conquests had had detrimental repercussions for our language and had filled it with foreign elements. One has to understand the barbarity into which it had decayed in order to rightly evaluate what it became under the hand of Stiernhielm, who with the innate miner's skill hammered out the pure and ringing metal of Swedish from the rusty stuff, by which this kernel was surrounded. Our ancestors said: "to forge songs".¹⁴⁷¹

Geijer explains the implication of this metaphor as follows:

As a poet, Stiernhielm expresses what this imagery means. Stiernhielm commenced this forging relatively late. In fact, it seems that he first set about it in a state of patriotic wrath at the obstacles that the barbarity of the language put in the way of expressing his thoughts. He wanted to write Swedish and was not satisfied with borrowing from a learned language to express his native thoughts. The fire of his thoughts also melted the language from within and drove out the slag that covered its surface.¹⁴⁷²

¹⁴⁷¹ Geijer, *ibidem*, pp. 221: [...] "Språket låg ännu rått och ouppodladt. Sjelfa våra eröfringar hade på vårt språk skadligt återverkat och fyllt det med främmande beståndsdelar. Man måste känna det barbari, hvari det i följd deraf förfallit, för att rätt värdera allt hvad det blef under Stjernhjelm's hand, som med medfödd bergsmannaskicklighet liksom genom en egen smältning dref ut svenskans rena, klingande metall ur de rostade ämnen, hvaraf denna kärna omhöljdes. Våra förfäder sade: smida sånger."

¹⁴⁷² Geijer, *ibidem*, pp. 221–222: "Stjernhjelm uttrycker såsom sångare hvad denna bild innebär. Stjernhjelm trädde sent till detta smide. Ja, det synes som han först gripit dertill i patriotisk vrede öfver de hinder som språkets barbari lade i vägen för (p. 222) uttrycket af hans tankar. Ty han ville skrifva svenska och nöjde sig ej med lånet af ett lärdt språk för hemfödda tankar. Elden af dessa tankar har ock omsmält språket inifrån och utkastat det slagg som betäckte dess yta."

Geijer underlines that Stiernhielm's language purism and language renewal were two sides of the same coin:

At one and the same time, Stiernhielm has purified and enriched it [Swedish] in such a way that ought always to serve as a model; by returning to the genuine old sources of Swedish – both the ancient language and the popular language – and expelling all unnecessary foreign additions.¹⁴⁷³

Commenting on the rhythmic nature of Stiernhielm's poetry, Geijer maintains that it is bold, free, and unconventional sometimes rush forth sounding like rapids in the forest, which he thinks represents a rhythmic power that was still unsurpassed in his time.¹⁴⁷⁴ In depicting Stiernhielm's poetic individuality as based on his origin and home district, Geijer foreshadows the views on poetry in the era of national romanticism, for instance by Erik Axel Karlsfeldt who conceived poetry as the expression of both individuality and nationality.¹⁴⁷⁵

In his own literary newspaper *Litteratur-bladet* Geijer argues that Stiernhielm was not epoch-making in the history of Swedish poetry, while he ascribes incontestable merits to Dalin.¹⁴⁷⁶ This opinion is voiced in a review of Atterbom's poems in February 1838, at the time of his famous "apostasy" to liberalism. According to Sigbrit Swahn, Geijer valued Dalin more than Stiernhielm because Dalin belonged to the Age of Liberty, an epoch that the liberals valued more highly than the Age of Sweden as a Great Power. About the same time, Lénström represented Stiernhielm as "a genuine Swedish liberal, who disliked the uncertain use of absolute royal power, just as much as aristocratic oppression and democratic arbitrariness."¹⁴⁷⁷

¹⁴⁷³ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 222: "Stjernhielm har på en gång renat och riktat det på ett sätt som alltid borde tjena till mönster: genom att återgå till den gamla äkta svenskans källor i fornspråk och folkspråk och genom att utdrifva all onödig främmande tillsats."

¹⁴⁷⁴ Geijer, *ibidem*, p. 222: "I poesin behagade rytmen mer än rimmet. Han undrade om ej musiken af de gamles metriskä rytmer äfven slumrade i svenskans metall. Han slog den an och klangen är god. Han är för öfrigt i sin metrik hvad han är i sin ordbildning: djerf, fri, oregelbunden. Men makten af hans rytmer, som stundom störta och ljuda som forsen genom skogen, är ännu i vårt språk oöfverträffad."

¹⁴⁷⁵ See Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar*, p. 323. Cf. Göran Mjöberg, "Karlsfeldt and Georg Stiernhielm" in *Vägvisare för Karlsfeldt: nio uppsatser om bakgrunden till Karlsfeldts diktning*, Malung, pp. 38–49.

¹⁴⁷⁶ Geijer, *Litteratur-bladet*, vol. 2, February 1838, pp. 19–20.

¹⁴⁷⁷ Swahn, *Ryktets förvandlingar*, pp. 301–302

Appendix: An inventory of Stiernhielm's preparatory works for his Swedish and universal lexicography with other unpublished writings

Stiernhielm's writings: Columbus' inventory from c. 1669

Source and dating: *Svenska Akademiens samlingar*, volume 289, in folder nr. 3, titled "Manuskript och teckningar av Stiernhielm", the Archives of the Swedish Academy. The inventory edited below was most likely drawn up by Samuel Columbus in 1669. In the ms. (fol. 2r), the list is titled *Opuscula G.S.* I have identified most of the drafts with specific writings in Stiernhielm's archive at Royal Library, Stockholm. The shelfmarks are referred to in square brackets.

1. Preparatory works pertaining to a Swedish dictionary

(1r) Ad Antiquarium linguae Scandia-Gothicae eller *Gambla Swea ok Götha tungomålets fatebur* pertinent sequentia collectanea:

- Duo indices vocum obscuriorum, quae occurrunt in legibus Suiotheticis tum antiquioribus quam recentioribus [F.d. 2:3].
- Index vocum obscuriorum ex legibus Islandicis [F.d. 2:6 titled thus; F.d. 2:7:1:2 titled "Collectanea ad lexicon Sueogothicum ex legibus Islandorum", 11 leaves comprising A–W].
- Gemini indices per plurimarum vocum variarum dialectorum.¹⁴⁷⁸
- Notata obscuriora ex Passionario [F.d. 2:4].
- Dictionarium Norraeum ex Damasceni Barlam.
- Onomasticon Runicum.
- Collectanea ex Vilcina Saga.
- Declaratio obscurarum vocum in legibus Cimbricis [F.d. 9:14:1].
- Voces ex Bibliis Islandicis collectae [F.d. 9:14:3].
- Index vocum in re rustica occurrentium [likely F.d. 9:14:5].
- Proverbia ac monosyllaba Islandica.
- Nudus index directorius omnium vocum Gothicarum iuxta seriem alphabeti digestus [likely F.d. 8 with c. 3,000 entries].
- Stiernhielmii Historia Damasceni.¹⁴⁷⁹

¹⁴⁷⁸ F.d. 4:4:2, fols. 4r–5v: a list of Icelandic, German, and Swedish words in double columns, so as to make four columns per page. .

¹⁴⁷⁹ *Glossarium ex Barlaam Damasceni* in Stiernhielm's handwriting is crossed out.

2. Preparatory works pertaining to a universal etymological lexicon

Ad Lexicon etymologicum universale pertinent:

- Discursus philologicus de omnibus linguis in genere, et in specie de Suethica et affinis [F.d. 14a].
- **(2r)** Magog Gothus, hoc est Dictionarium Hebraeo-Gothicum demonstrans radices Hebraearum vocum convenire et easdem esse cum radicibus linguae Suethicae et consequenter totam linguam Sueo-Gothicam radicitus eandem esse cum antiquissima et primigenia [F.d. 17].
- Duo lexica Gothica philologica [F.d. 10, and F.d. 6a].
- Duo volumina radices linguae primigeniae perplurimas continentia¹⁴⁸⁰
- Latinarum et Gothicarum vocum communes origines [F.d. 9:1].
- Radix *Ma* elaborata [F.d. 2:2; cf. F.d. 9:7, fols. 1v–2r, 5r–6r].
- Radix *Ag* elaborata [F.d. 9:7, fols. 16r–17v, 28r–28v].
- Radicis *Da* defectivae vocum index [F.d. 2:1:1:5, fol. 1r, and F.d. 7:1, fols. 9r–9v and 43r.].
- Index vocum Suethicarum cum lingua Cambrica et aliis linguis convenientiam habentium [F.d. 9:4].
- Observationes de permutatione literarum inter etymologizandum [F.d. 7:3].
- Analogia rerum et verborum [F.d. 9:3].
- Vocabula veteris linguae Gallicae, quae origine Celtica seu Scythica, id est Suethica, esse probantur, contra Bochartum.¹⁴⁸¹
- Annotata philologica in Genesin.¹⁴⁸²
- Specimina linguae et philologiae Finnonicae [F.d. 13].
- Glossarium vetus Latino-Teutonicum [F.d. 7:2, 16 fols., comprising words from A to S].
- Glossarium Latino-Teutonicum vetustissimum ex Cod. MS. longe antiquissimo Bibliothecae Boxhornianae.
- Glos[s]arium antiq. Latino-Suethicum MS. a Mylonio datum.
- **(2r)** Dictionarium Armeno-Latinum [F.d. 22].
- Grammatica Lapponica.
- Nomenclatura quorundam propriorum Germanorum nominum ex Aventino [F.d. 2:5].
- Voces plurimorum populorum antiquae ex Wolfgango Lazio [probably F.d. 9:2].

¹⁴⁸⁰ F.d. 5 *Runa Suethica*, 46v–143v, and F.d. 7:1 *Miscellanea etymologica*, 2v–3r, 9r–9v, 19r–61v, 69r–83v, 93v–97v, and 105r–113v.

¹⁴⁸¹ This treatise was published in *Acta literaria et scientiarum Sueciae* 1738–1739.

The autograph draft is extant in F.d. 7:1, fols. 100r–103r.

¹⁴⁸² In F.d. 9:15 *Primus liber Moysi Genesis* provides Genesis 1:1–6 in Latin and in Slavic languages (probably Russian and Polish) with philological annotations.

3. Other writings in unpublished manuscripts

3.1 Geometric writings on various topics

Ad constitutionem Lineae Carolinae pertinent:

- Descriptio Lineae Carolinae Latine [F.d. 19:a and 19:b].
- Item Baculus Carolinus Suethice [F.d. 19:d], cui accedit Tractatus de ponderibus et mensuris Suethicis.¹⁴⁸³
- Constitutio et usus pedis Stockholmensis [F.d. 19:f].
- De pede, amphora et uncia Romana [F.d. 19:c].
- Item de ponderibus et mensuris variarum gentium et civitatum [F.d. 19:a, second wrapper, 33v–34r;¹⁴⁸⁴ and F.d. 19:c¹⁴⁸⁵].
- De re nummaria collectanea [F.d. 19:c]¹⁴⁸⁶
- Usus Harpae Aureae.¹⁴⁸⁷
- Tab. □ et □ et Areae ○ earumque usus [F.d. 13a; F.d. 19:b].¹⁴⁸⁸

3.2 Principal philological, historical and philosophical works

Praeter haec tria opera praecipua:

- Novum Testamentum Ulphilae Latinis literis descriptum. Lexicon etymologicum Ulphilianum [F.d. 2:1]
- Anti-Cluverius, hoc est Tractatus de antiqua patria et vera Gothorum origine contra Cluverium [F.d. 14, fols. 1–98].
- Libellus et variae dissertationes de naturae principiiis constitutivis.¹⁴⁸⁹

3.3 Drafts of mathematics and polygraphy

- Collectanea varia in Mathesi [F.d. 18], in Polygraphicis [F.d. 13]
- Algebra Suethica [ms. A 4, in 4:o, Uppsala University Library]
- Arithmetica mnemonica universalis [F.d. 15, fols. 2r–31v].
- Opuscula mathematica plurima.

¹⁴⁸³ “Berättelse om Swea-Rijkes vigt och mål” (in the text headed “Underrättelse om swenske nu inrättade mått och måls skick och beskaffenhet”) is extant in the Archives of the Swedish Academy, *Svenska Akademiens samlingar*, vol. 289.

¹⁴⁸⁴ This text is headed: “Pedium diversorum Romanorum et aliorum gentium veterum et modernorum dimensio in catena Protei et linea Carolina.”

¹⁴⁸⁵ At the end: “Aequiparatio mensurarum Anglorum ad mensuras Suethicas” and an account of Swedish, German, Spanish and Italian measures of length.

¹⁴⁸⁶ In F.d. 19c a booklet is titled *De re nummaria collectanea* on the cover, but headed *Georgii Stiernhielmii pes, amphora, libra Romana demonstrata*.

¹⁴⁸⁷ Joh. Megalinus, *Memoriale mathematicum seu problematum mathematicorum syllabus*, Dorpat 1655, states that Stiernhielm’s *Harpa mathematica* is a tool for describing and determining proportions: *instrumentum proportionum*.

¹⁴⁸⁸ F.d. 13a *Computus decimalis* has the subtitle “quo declaratur usus tabularum □ et □. Est numeratio [...] divisa in partes decimas, centesimas, millesimas etc. F.d. 19b, fols. 3r–5r *In Usu Tabb. □ et □ observanda*; In F.d. 6b:1, two leaves titled *Usus tabularum partium centesimalium et millesimarum*. Cf. F.d. 6b:3c.

¹⁴⁸⁹ *Peplum Minervae* (F.d. 4:4:1) and *Monile Minervae* (F.d. 6b:2; F.d. 5, fols. 4r–32v, 40r–46r; F.d. 9**, and at Uppsala University Library, the copy N. 539).

Bibliography

Manuscript sources

Royal Library (Kungliga Biblioteket, KB) – the National Library of Sweden, Stockholm

Stiernhielm's archive

- F.d. 2:2 *Radix Ma sive specimen etymologicum unius stius vocis*
- F.d. 2:7 *Fragmenta varia* 1 and *Fragmenta varia* 2
- F.d. 3 *Mysterium etymologicum*
- F.d. 4:4:1 *Collectanea philosophica*
- F.d. 4:4:2 *Collectanea philosophica et etymologica*
- F.d. 5 *Runa Suethica et alia miscellanea ad lexicon etymologicum*
- F.d. 6 *Collectanea ad Runam Suethicam pertinentia*
- F.d. 6b:1 and F.d. 6b:3. Drafts on linguistic, philological, philosophical and geometrical topics.
- F.d. 6c *Virgula divina*
- F.d. 7:1 *Miscellanea etymologica*
- F.d. 9 *Miscellanea etymologica*
- F.d. 9** *Adversaria quotidiana. Monile Minervae.*
- F.d. 10 *Lexicon Gothicum philologicum*, which on the lower half of the title page also is called *Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica*
- F.d. 12 *Lexicon etymologicum Ulphilianum, rectius notae in Novum Testamentum Ulphilae*
- F.d. 13, wrapper 2:1 *Specimen philologicum in primam literam A*; and wrapper 2:2 “Spridda fragment av språkfilologiskt innehåll”, including *Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica*.
- F.d. 14a *Discursus philologicus de omnibus linguis in genere et in specie de Suethica et affinis*
- F.d. 19:d *Baculus Carolinus*

Other collections

- Ep. G. 1:1 Letter from Samuel Gagnerus to Samuel Älf on 16 Dec. 1776
- Ep. G. 1:2, pp. 31–49: Samuel Gagnerus' Latin biography of Stiernhielm
- M. 3: *Collegium geographo-politicum amplissimi et celeberrimi Dni. professoris Lagerlöf, die 6 Martii, 1688*
- N. 24 (photostatic copy) *Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielm facientia ad illustrationem nationis et linguae Gotho-Suedicae*

Autograf-samlingen (Collection of autograph letters and notes)
Stiernhielm, Georg

The Archives of the Swedish Academy (Svenska Akademiens arkiv), Stockholm

Collections of private archives

Svenska Akademiens samlingar, volumes 289 and 291 (which are parts, vols. 1 and 3, of the Vasula Archive of the Stiernhielm family):

vol. 289, envelope 3 “Manuskript och teckningar av Stiernhielm” (i.e. Manuscripts and drawings by Stiernhielm),

vol. 291, the second envelope consisting of Georg Stiernhielm’s *personalia*, titled “Lebensbeschreibung über G. Stiernhielm”

vol. 291, the booklet *Äreminne öfver Georg Stiernhielm* by Carl August Hagberg, 1839 (unpublished manuscript)

National Archives of Sweden (Riksarkivet, RA), Stockholm

Kanslitjänstemännens koncept och mottagna skrivelser, Kristinas tid, vol. 16: letter from Laurentius Jacobi (that is, Laurentius Bureus) to Anders Gyldenklou 1649.

Stegeborgssamlingen, Avdelning II: Arvprinsen Karl Gustafs arkiv, vol. E123: letter from P.-H. Chanut to the hereditary prince Karl Gustaf

The Royal Library (Det Kongelige Bibliotek) – The National Library of Denmark), Copenhagen

Ny Kongelig Samling (abbreviated NKS) 150: 4^o: *De linguis in genere obiter et ad diligentiore inquisitionem annotata*.

Latvian Academy Library, University of Latvia, Riga

Vasula manor, 1783: the painting titled “Prospect des Gutes Wassula im Dörptischen Kirchspiel”, in J. Chr. Brotze, *Sammlung verschiedener Liefländischer Monumente, Prospective* [...] vol. 3, part 2, Riga 1790. nr. 186, BM03137A. https://www.acadlib.lu.lv/broce/vol_3_2.htm

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek – Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, Hannover

IV 469: G.W. Leibniz, *Epistolaris de historia etymologica dissertatio*, fols. 68v–104v (non-autograph fair copy with Leibniz’s additions)

XXXII. 1715 *Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielm facientia ad illustrationem nationis et linguae Gotho-Suedicae* (Remarks of Georg Stiernhielm aiming at the illustration of the Gothic Swedish nation and language).

Leiden University Library, Leiden

Ms. Or. 1469, envelope 12: Albert Schultens, *Theses de lingua primaeva*

The National Library of Finland (Kansalliskirjasto), Helsinki

D. II. 37. *Georgii Stiernhielmi de linguis in genere ad diligentiore investigationem annotatae*, which comprises the following texts: *De linguis in genere* (fols. 1r–24v), *Runa Suetica*, chapt. 1–5, fols. 25r–60v, *De Othino* (8 leaves), and *De Hyperboreorum situ et qui revera fuerint* (14 leaves).

Uppsala University Library (Uppsala universitetsbibliotek, UUB)

- A 4, 4:o Matematiska skrifter, i.e. Mathematical writings, among others Stiernhielm's *Algebra Suethica*, fols. 1r–58v.
- H. 441: Dn. Petri Lagerlöfii, eloquentiae prof. et Historiogr. Reg., Imperiorum et rerum publicarum descriptio geographica et civilis, facta Upsaliae Anno 1688, 1689: a record of the public lectures on political geography held by Petrus Lagerlöf in 1688–1689.¹⁴⁹⁰
- R. 21: *De linguis in genere*. Arvid Moller's copy of Stiernhielm's minor linguistic and antiquarian writings, dated 1701.¹⁴⁹¹
- X 201, "Lärde och berömmelige svenske män", by Olof Celsius the Younger.
- X 211 (in the collections of S.L Gahm-Persson), fols. 361r–381r, *Georg Stiernhielms lefwernes beskrivning*, by Magnus von Celse.

Particular archives

- Den Ihreska handskriftsamlingen (the Collection of the Ihre family)
ms. Ihre 88: *Glossarium Suiogothicum* (Johan Ihre's manuscript of his etymological and antiquarian Swedish dictionary)
- Palmsköldska samlingen (the Collection of Palmsköld),
ms. Palmsk. 336, fols. 43–54 (Jordan Edenius' record of the public debate between Stiernhielm and Terserus in 1653)

Printed sources

- Alsted(ius), Johannes Henricus. 1630. *Encyclopaedia septem tomis distincta* [...], Hernbornae Nassoviorum/ Hernborn: Friedrich van Hulsius.
- Annius of Viterbo (Annius Viterbensis/ Giovanni Nanni). 1498. *Commentaria super opera diversorum auctorum de antiquitatibus loquentium*, Romae/ Rome: Silber.
- Annius of Viterbo. 1515. *Antiquitatum variarum volumina XVII*, Parisiis/ Paris: Parvus & Badius (i.e. Jean Petit and Josse Badius)
- Annius of Viterbo. 1510. *Berosus Babilonicus de his quae praecesserunt inundationem terrarum. Item: Myrsilus de origine Turrhenorum, Cato in fragmentis, Archilocus in Epitheto de temporibus, Metasthenes de iudicio temporum, Philo in breviario temporum, Xenophon de equiuocis temporum, Sempronius de diuisione Italiae, Q. Fab. Pictor de aureo saeculo et origine urbis Rhomae* [...], Parhisiis/ Paris: Marnef.

¹⁴⁹⁰ The volume is divided into the following chapters: *Geographia in genere*, pp. 1–16; *De Terra Boreali incognita*, pp. 16–41, *De Islandia*, pp. 42–54, *De Europa in genere*, pp. 55–87, *De Moscovia*, pp. 87–213, *De Norvegia*, pp. 213–250, *Dania*, pp. 250–441, *Magna Britannia*, pp. 441–631, *Belgium*, pp. 631–791.

¹⁴⁹¹ R. 21 comprises the following writings: *De linguis in genere*, 1r–13r, *De Thor*, 13v–16r, *De convenientia linguae Suethicae cum lingua Phrygica*, 16v–19r, *De vocum Ebraearum Adam, Eva, Seth, Cain etc, Ex Edda observata*, 19r–19v, fols. 20r–21r and *Nomina deorum pleraque omnium gentium esse Scythica*, fols. 21v–24r, *Dissertatio de Othino. De Oden, Othin, Godan, Wodan*, 25r–31r, *De etymo vocum fader, moder, broder*, 31v–32v, and *De Hyperboreorum situ* 33r–44r.

- Arckenholtz, Johan. 1751. *Memoires concernant Christine reine de Suède, pour servir d'eclaircissement a l'histoire de son regne et principalement de sa vie privée, et aux evenemens de l'histoire de son tems civile et littéraire*, tome permier (vol. 1), à Amsterdam et à Leipzig: Mortier.
- Bacon, Francis. 1954 (reprint of the 1915 edition. 1st ed. 1605). *The Advancement of Learning*, edited with an introduction by G. W. Kitchin, London: Dent, and New York: Dutton.
- Bacon, Francis. 1620. *Instauratio magna*, Londini/ London: Bill. Only the second volume entitled *Novum organum* was published.
- Bacon, Francis. 1623. *De dignitate et augmentis scientiarum*, Londini/ London: Haviland.
- Baillet, Adrien (editor). 1691. *La vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes*, à Paris: Horthemels.
- Benzelius, Eric the Younger. 1722. Review of Johan Possieth's hymns and spiritual songs "Sabbatsdagens afton-offer eller andeliga sånger öfver sön- högtids- och helgedagars åhrliga epistlar" (Stockholm 1720), *Acta literaria Sueciae anno MDCCXXI*, pp. 191 ff., Upsaliae: Russworm.
- Biblia, se on: coco Pyhä Ramattu suomexi. Pääramattuin Hebrean ja Grecan jälken*, Stockholm/ Stockholm: Keisarilda (i.e. Keyser), 1642.
- Bibliander, Theodor(us). 1548. *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum commentarius*, Tiguri/ Zürich: Christoph Frosch.
- Bibliotheca Schultensiana sive catalogus librorum, quos collegit vir clarissimus Johannes Jacobus Schultens [...]*. 1780. Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Mostert.
- Bochart, Samuel 1646. *Geographiae sacrae pars altera Chanaan seu de coloniis et sermone Phoenicum*, Cadomi/ Caen: Cardonelle.
- Bochart, Samuel 1651. *Geographiae sacrae pars prior Phaleg seu de dispersione gentium et terrarum divisione facta in aedificatione turris Babel*, Cadomi/ Caen: Cardonelle.
- Bodin, Jean. 1566. *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*, Parisiis/ Paris: Juvenis.
- Bouhours, Dominique. 1671. *Les entretiens d'Artiste et d'Eugène*, Paris: Sebastien Mambre Cramoisy.
- Boxhornius, Marcus Zuerius 1647a. *Bediedinge van de tot noch toe onbekende afgodinne Nehalennia, over de durent ende ettelicke hondert jaren onder het sandt begraven, dan onlancx ontdeckt op het strandt van Walcheren in Zeelandt*, Leyden: Van der Boxe.
- Boxhornius, Marcus Zuerius. 1647b. *Antwoord van Marcus Zuerius van Boxhorn, gegeven op op de Vraaghen, heem voorgesteldt over de Bediedinge van de afgodinne Nehalennia, onlancx uytghegheuen, in welcke die ghemeine herkomste van der Gricken, Romeinen ende Duytschen Tale uet den Scythen duydelijk bewesen, ende verscheiden Odheden van dese Volckeren grondelijk ontdeckt ende verklaert worden*, Leiden: Van der Boxe.
- Boxhornius, Marcus Zuerius. 1650. *De Graecorum, Romanorum et Germanorum linguis earumque symphonia dissertatio*, which is appended to *Grammatica regia sive nova et facillima ratio discendi*

- linguae Latinae praecepta, pro Christina, Suecorum etrc. regina*,
Leiden: ex officina Guilielmi Christiani.
- Boxhornius, Marcus Zuerius. 1654. *Originum Gallicarum liber, in quo veteris & nobilissimae Gallorum gentis origines, antiquitates, mores, lingua & alia eruuntur et illustrantur. Cui accedit antiquae linguae Britannicae lexicon Britannico-Latinum*. Amstelodami: Janssonius.
- Bureus, Johannes (editor). 1634. *En nyttigh bok om Konnunga styrilse och höfdinga, fordöm för någre hundrade åhr af en förståndig svensk man skrifvin och nyliga framkommen [...]*, Uppsala: Eskil Mattsson.
- Buxtorf the Younger, Johannes. 1662, 2nd edition [1st edition 1644]. *Dissertationes philologico-theologicae*: Basel: Decker.¹⁴⁹²
- Busbecq (Busbequius), Ogier Ghiselin de. 1595, *Legationis Turcicae epistolae quatuor*, Francofurti/ Frankfurt (am Main): Wechel.
- Camers (Camerte), Giovanni Ricuzzi Vellini. 1520, *In C. Iulii Solini Polyhistora enarrationes*, Vienna: Alantse.
- Cappel, Louis. 1643. *Ad Novam Davidis Lyram animadversiones cum gemina diatribe una de voce Elohim, altera de nomine Dei YHWH*, Salmurii/ Saumur: Desbordes.
- Casaubon(us), Meric(us). 1650. *De quatuor linguis commentationis pars prior, quae de lingua Hebraica et de lingua Saxonica*, Londini/ London: Flesher (printer), Mynne (publisher).
- Celsius, Olof the Elder (pres.) / Olof Odhelius (resp.). 1723. *Dissertatio philologico-historica de convenientia linguae Persicae cum Gothica*, Upsaliae/ Uppsala: Werner.
- Celsius, Olof the Younger. 1753. *Lärde svänske*, Stockholm.
- Chamerlayne, John (ed.). 1715. *Oratio dominica: in diversas omnium fere gentium linguas versa et propriis cuiusque linguae characteribus expressa, una cum dissertationibus nonnullis de linguarum origine variisque ipsarum permutationibus*, Amstelaedami/ Amsterdam: David & William Goereus.
- Cluverius (Clüver), Philipp(us). 1631, 2nd edition (1st ed. 1616). *Germaniae antiquae libri tres. Opus post omnium curas elaboratissimum, tabulis geographicis et imaginibus priscum Germanorum cultum moresque referentibus exornatum*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Elzevir.
- Columbus, Samuel. written c. 1678. published 1935. *Mål-roo eller roo-mål utgiven på grundval av de bevarade manuskripten med inledning och ordförklaringar av Bengt Hesselman* (Nordiska texter och undersökningar 6), Uppsala: Stockholm: Gebers.
- Columbus, Samuel. written c. 1679, published 1963. *En svensk ordeskötsel, utgiven med inledning och kommentar*, Stockholm, Göteborg, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Cramer, Johann Friedrich. 1694. *Vindiciae nominis Germanici contra*

¹⁴⁹² I have used the first three dissertations: *Dissertatio prima de linguae Hebraeae origine et antiquitate*, pp. 1–50, *Dissertatio secunda de linguae Hebraeae confusione et plurium linguarum origine*, pp. 51–111, and *Dissertatio tertia de linguae Hebraeae post confusionem conservatione et propagatio*, pp. 112–167.

- quosdam obtrectatores Gallos*, Berolini/ Berlin: Rudiger.
- Dalin, Anders Fredrik. 1850. *Ordbok öfver svenska språket*, Stockholm.
- Dalin, Olof von. 1758. *Swea rikes historia från desz begynnelse til våra tider*, vol. 1, hedniska tiden (i.e. pagan times), Stockholm: Grefing.
- Dante, Alighieri. written c. 1304./ republished 2005. *De vulgari eloquentia*. Edited and translated by Steven Botterill, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diecmann, Johann. 1682. *De lingua primigenia Ebraea et cum aliorum, tum Georg. Stiernhielmii, Joh. Web, Petri Dan. Huetii, Richardi Simonis super ea sententiis γόμνασμα* [...]. Stadae/ Stade: Holwein.
- de Dieu, Louis. 1628. *Grammatica linguarum orientalium, Hebraeorum, Chaldaeorum et Syrorum inter se collatarum*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Elzevir.
- Dorn, Bernhard. 1827. *Über die Verwandtschaft des Persischen, Germanischen und Griechisch-Lateinischen Sprachstammes*, Hamburg: Meissner.
- Elichmann, Johannes. 1640. *Tabula Cebitis Graece, Arabice, Latine* [...] *cum praefatione cl. Salmasii*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Maire.
- Eobanus Hessus. Helius. 1539. “Silvarum libri novem” in *Operum* [...] *farragines duae*, Halae Svevorum/ Hall in Swabia, fols. 179r–340r.
- Erpenius, Thomas. 1621. *Orationes tres de linguarum Ebraeae atque Arabicae dignitate*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Erpenius.
- Erpenius, Thomas. 1625. *Historia Saracenica, qua res gestae Muslimorum inde a Muhammede primo imperii et religionis Muslimicae auctore usque ad initium imperii Atabacaei explicantur*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Maire & Elzevir.
- Estienne, Robert. 1544. *Authores historiae ecclesiasticae*, Basel.
- Franzén, Frans Michael. 1802. “Sång öfver Grefve Gustaf Philip Creutz” in *Svenska Akademiens handlingar ifrån år 1796*, vol. 2, Stockholm: Delén & Forsgren, pp. 41–55.
- Franzén, Frans Michael. 1867 (first published 1801). “Sång öfver Grefve Gustaf Philip Creutz” in *Frans Michael Franzéns samlade dikter*, vol. 1, Örebro: Lindh, pp. 50–65.
- Franzén, Frans Michael. 1848. *Minnesteckningar öfver utmärkte svenske statsmän, hjeltar, lärde, konstnärer och skalder*, vol. 1, Stockholm: Norstedt.
- Gagnerus, Samuel. 1775. *Förteckning på gamla svenska eller göthiska ord, hvilka dels torde vitna om fornspråkets sinrikhet och styrka, dels ännu, med liten eller alsingen förändring, kunna tjäna, at rikta den moderna svenskan* (16 pages), Stockholm.
- Gagnerus, Samuel. 1776. *Äre-minne öfver krigs-rådet Georg Stjernhjelm*, Stockholm: Carlbohm.
- Gatterer, Johann Christoph. 1770. Review of Johan Ihre’s *Glossarium Suiogeticum* (1769), in *Allgemeine historische Bibliothek*, vol. 13, Halle, pp. 131–179.

- Gatterer, Johann Christoph. 1771. *Einleitung in die synchronistische Universalhistorie zur Erklärung seiner synchronistische Tabellen*, Theil 1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.
- Geijer, Erik Gustaf. 1850. "Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhjelm", *Svenska Akademiens handlingar ifrån år 1786*, part 23, Stockholm: Norstedt, pp. 151–171.
- Geijer, Erik Gustaf. 1875. "Äreminne öfver Georg Stjernhjelm", *Samlade Skrifter*, vol. 7, Stockholm: Norstedt, pp. 214–223.
- Gesner, Conrad. 1555. *Mithridates: de differentiis linguarum. tum veterum, tum quae hodie apud diversas nationes in toto orbe terrarum in usu sunt*, Tiguri/ Zürich: Froschoverus.
- Gesner, Conrad. (original author). / Caspar Waserus (editor and commentator). 1610. *Mithridates Gesneri exprimens differentias linguarum, tum veterum, tum quae hodie per totum terrarum orbem in usu sunt* [fols. 1r–85v]. *Casparus Waserus recensuit et libello commentario illustravit* [86r–140v]. Tiguri/ Zürich: typis Wolphianis.
- Gesner, Conrad. 2009. *Mithridates (1555): Introduction, texte latin, traduction française, annotation et index* by Bernard Colombat and Manfred Peters, Genève: Droz (Travaux d'humanisme et Renaissance).
- Gezelius, Johannes. 1647. *Grammaticae Trostianae epitome. In usum privatorum collegiorum Academiae Gustaviana, quae Dorpati est ad Embeccam in Livonia*. Dorpati/ Tartu: Johannes Vogelius.
- Gomerus, Franciscus. 1637. *Davidis lyra seu nova Hebraea Sacrae Scripturae ars poetica*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Maire.
- Goropius Becanus, Johannes. 1569. *Origines Antverpianae sive Cimmeriorum Becceselana novem libros complexa. Atvatica, I. Gigantomachia, II. Niloscopium, III. Cronia, IV. Indoscythica, V. Saxsonica VI. Gotodanica VII. Amazonica VIII. Venetica et Hyperborea IX. Antverpiae/ Antwerp: Plantinus.*
- Goropius Becanus, Johannes. 1580. *Opera hactenus in lucem non edita, nempe Hermathena, Hieroglyphica, Vertumnus, Gallica, Francica, Hispanica*, Antverpiae/ Antwerp: Plantinus.
- Grimm, Jacob. 1822. *Deutsche Grammatik*, 2nd ed. Göttingen: in der Dieterischen Buchhandlung.
- Grotius, Hugo. 1644. *Annotata ad Vetus Testamentum*, Lutetiae Parisiorum/ Paris.
- Grotius, Hugo. 1655. *Historia Gotthorum, Vandalorum et Langobardorum*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam: Elzevir.
- Grotius, Hugo. 1803 (written 1602). *Parellelon rerum publicarum liber tertius de moribus ingenioque populorum*, Haarlem: Loosjes.
- Hammaršköld, Lorenzo. 1818. "Anteckningar till Georg Stjernhjelm's lefvernesbeskrivning" in idem, *Georg Stjernhjelm's Svenska Vitterhets-arbeten, fullständigare samlade och å nyo utgifne*, Stockholm: Hedmanska tryckeriet, pp. 3–57.
- Hammaršköld, Lorenzo. 1821. *Historiska anteckningar rörande fortgången och utveckningen av det filosofiska studium i Sverige, från de äldre till nyare tider*, Stockholm: Zacharias Häggström.

- Helwig(ius), Andreas. 1611. *Etymologiae sive origines dictionum Germanicarum ex tribus illis nobilibus antiquitatis eruditae linguis Latina, Graeca, Hebraea derivatarum*, Francofurti/ Frankfurt an der Oder: Antonius Hummius.
- Homann, Johannes Baptista and his heirs. 1759. *Atlas geographicus maior exhibens tellurem seu globum terraqueum in mappis generalibus et specialibus*, part 1, vol. 3: Danubius, Ungaria, Turcia, Scandinavia, Borussia, Polonia, Russia, Nurimbergae/ Nürnberg: Homann.
- Horn(ius), Georg(ius). 1654. Preface to Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn, *Originum Gallicarum liber*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam: Janssonius, pp. 3v–**2v.
- Horn(ius), Georg(ius). 1665. *Brevis et perspicua introductio ad Universalem Historiam*, Lugduni Batavorum: Hack.
- Ihre, Johan (pres.) / Jacob Boethius (resp.) 1742. *Dissertatio academica de mutationibus linguae Sueo-Gothicae*, part 1, Upsaliae/ Uppsala.
- Ihre, Johan. 1769. *Glossarium Suiogothicum, in quo tam hodierno usu frequentata vocabula quam in legum patriarum tabulis aliisque medii aevi scriptis obvia explicantur et ex dialectis cognatis Moesogothica, Anglo-Saxonica, Alemannica, Islandica ceterisque Gothicae et Celticae originis illustrantur*, 1–2, Uppsala: Edman.
- Irenicus (Friedlieb), Franciscus (Franz). 1518. *Germaniae exegeseos volumina duodecim*, Haganoae/ Grossenhain (in Saxonia)
- Jones, Sir William. 1799. “The fourth anniversary discourse on the Hindus, delivered 2^d of February, 1786” in *The works of Sir William Jones*, vol. 1, London: Robinson, pp. 19–34.
- Jones, Sir William. 1799. “The ninth anniversary discourse on the origin and families of nations, delivered 23^d of February, 1792” in *The works of Sir William Jones*, vol. 1, London: Robinson, pp. 129–142.
- Jones, Sir William. 1799. “The tenth anniversary on Asiatic history, civil and natural discourse, delivered 28th of February, 1793” in *The works of Sir William Jones*, vol. 1, London: Robinson, pp. 143–159.
- Junius, Hadrian(us). 1588. *Batavia, in qua praeter gentis et insulae antiquitatem, originem, decora, mores aliaque ad eam historiam pertinentia declaratur [...]*, Leiden: Raphelengius.
- Junius, the Elder, Franciscus (as commentator) and Immanuel Tremellius (as translator and commentator), 1607 (3rd ed.). *Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra sive libri canonici priscae Judaeorum ecclesiae a Deo traditi*, Sancti Gervasii/ Saint Gervais: Société Caldorienne.
- Junius, the Younger, Franciscus, and Thomas Marshall. 1665. *Quatuor D. N. Jesu Christi Euangeliorum versiones perantiquae duae, Gothica scil. et Anglo-Saxonica, quarum illam ex celeberrimo Codice Argenteo nunc primum depromsit Franciscus Junius F[rancisci] f[ilius], hanc autem ex Codicibus Mss. collatis emendatius recudi curavit Thomas Mareschallus, Anglus. Accessit et Glossarium Gothicum cui praemittitur Alphabetum Gothicum, Runicum, etc. opera eiusdem Francisci Junii*, Dortrecht/ Dordrecht: van Esch.
- Kircher, Athanasius. 1636. *Prodromus coptus sive Aegyptiacus, in quo cum linguae Coptae sive Aegyptiacae, quondam Pharaonicae, origo, aetas,*

- vicissitudo, inclinatio, tum hieroglyphicae litteraturae instauratio [...] exhibentur*, Romae/ Rome: Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide).
- Kircher, Athanasius. 1643. *Lingua Aegyptiaca restituta. Opus tripartitum. quo linguae Coptae sive idiomatis illius primaevi Aegyptiorum Pharaonici, vetustate temporum paene collapsi, ex abstrusis Arabum monumentis, plena instauratio continetur [...]*, Romae/ Rome: Scheu & Grignanus.
- Kircher, Athanasius. 1679. *Turris Babel sive archontologia, qua primo priscorum post diluvium hominum vita, mores, rerumque gestarum magnitudo, secundo turris fabrica civitatumque exstructio, confusio linguarum et inde gentium transmigrationis cum principalium inde enatorum idiomatum historia multiplici eruditione describuntur et explicantur*, Amsterdam: officina Janssonio-Waesbergiana.
- Kirchmaier, Georg Caspar (pres.) / Andreas Jäger (resp.). 1686. *De lingua vetustissima Europae vernacula*, Wittenbergae/ Wittenberg: Christian Schrödter.
- Kirchmaier, Georg Caspar. 1774. "De lingua vetustissima Europae vernacula" in Joh. Oelreich, *Germaniae litteratae opuscula historico philologico theologica*, vol. 2, Bremae/ Bremen: Cramer, pp. 1–64.
- Kirchmaier, Georg Caspar (pres.) / Johann Michael Heppius (resp.), 1697. *Parallelismus et convenientia XII linguarum ex matrice Scythico-Celtica Europae*, Wittenbergae/ Wittenberg: Schrödter.
- de Laet, Jean. 1625. *Nieuwe wereldt ofte beschrijvinghe van West-Indien*, Leyden: Elzevir.
- de Laet, Jean. 1633. *Novus orbis seu Descriptio Indiae Occidentalis*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Elzevir.
- La Peyrère, Isaac. 1655. *Prae-Adamitae sive exercitatio super versibus duodecimo, decimotertio et decimoquarto capitis quinti epistolae D. Pauli ad Romanos, quibus inducuntur primi homines ante Adamum conditi*. Sine loco.
- Lagerlöf, Petrus. 1999. "Collegium de ornatu ac genio linguae patriae" (according to ms. Palmskiöldianus 406, UUB) in *Petrus Lagerlöfs collegium 1691 angående vårt svenska språks cultiverande*, edited by Hans H. Ronge, Börje Tjäder and Gun Winmark, Uppsala: Textgruppen.
- Lazius, Wolfgang, 1557. *De gentium aliquot migrationibus, sedibus fixis, reliquiis, linguarumque initiis et immutationibus ac dialectis libri XII*, Basileae/ Basel: Oporinus.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1704. "Nouveaux Essais sur l'entendement humain" in *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Reihe VI: Band 6, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1981. *New essays on human understanding translated and edited by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1710. "Brevis designatio meditationum de originibus gentium ductis potissimum ex indicio linguarum", *Miscellanea Berolinensia ad incrementum scientiarum ex scriptis*

- Societati Regiae Scientiarum exhibitis edita*, vol. 1, Berolini/ Berlin: Papenius, pp. 1–16.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1789. “Brevis designatio meditationum de originibus gentium ductis potissimum ex indicio linguarum” in Ludwig Dutens (ed.), *Gothofredi Guillelmi Leibnitii ... opera omnia*, tomus quartus, pars II (comprising *Historia et antiquitates*), Cologne: Piestre & Delamolière, and Berlin: Himbürg, , pp. 186–198.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1697. “Dissertatio de origine Germanorum” in Dutens (ed.), *Leibnitii opera omnia*, vol. 4, part 2, Cologne and Berlin.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 2006 (2nd expanded ed.), *Philosophischer Briefwechsel*, hgg. von der Leibniz-Forschungstelle der Universität Münster, Erster Band (1663–1685), Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 2013. *Philosophischer Briefwechsel*, hgg. von der Leibniz-Forschungstelle der Universität Münster, Band 3 (1695–1700), Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Allgemeiner politischer und historischer Briefwechsel*, hgg. von dem Leibniz-Archiv der Niedersächsischen Landesbibliothek Hannover, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Erste Reihe: Band 5 (1687–1690), Berlin 1954; Band 6 (1690–1691), Berlin 1957; Band 9 (1693), Berlin 1975; Band 11 (January–October 1695), Berlin 1982, Band 12 (November 1695–June 1696), Berlin 1990; Band 14 (May–Dec. 1697), Berlin 1993; Band 15 (January–September 1698), Berlin 1998; and Band 16 (October 1698–April 1699), Berlin 2000, all vols. published at Akademie Verlag.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, and Hiob Ludolf. 1768. [1st edition 1755] “Commercium epistolicum” in Ludovicus Dutens (ed.), *Gothofredi Guillelmi Leibnitii [...] Opera omnia*, vol. VI, part 1: 67–170; part 2: 177–182, Genevae/ Geneve: Fratres de Tournes.
- Lipsius, Justus. 1604. *Manuductionis ad philosophiam Stoicam libri tres*, Antverpiae/ Antwerp: Plantinus.
- Lipsius, Justus. 1614. *Epistolarum selectarum centuria tertia ad Belgas*, Antverpiae/ Antwerp: Moretus.
- Lundius, Carl (pres.). 1687. *Zamolxis primus Getarum legislator*, Upsaliae: Keyser.
- Lübecke, Christoph Wilhelm. 1780. *Allgemeines schwedisches Gelehrsamkeits-Archiv*, Erster Theil für das Jahr 1772, Leipzig: Junius.
- Magnus, Johannes. 1554. *Historia [...] de omnibus Gothorum Sveonumque regibus, qui unquam ab initio nationis extitere, eorumque memorabilibus bellis late varieque per orbem gestis*, Romae/ Rome: de Viottis.
- Marshall, Thomas. 1665. “Observationes de versione Gothica” in Franciscus Junius (ed.), *Quatuor D. N. Jesu Christi Euangeliorum versiones perantiquae duae, Gothica scilicet et Anglo-Saxonica*, Dordrecht/ Dordrecht: van Esch.
- Martini, Matthias. 1623. *Lexicon philologicum, praecipue eymologicum, in quo Latinae et a Latinis auctoribus usurpatae tum purae tum barbarae*

- voces voces ex originibus declarantur, comparatione linguarum [...] subinde illustrantur*, Breae/ Bremen: Villerianus.
- Megalinus, Johannes. 1655. *Memoriale mathematicum seu problematum mathematicorum syllabus*, Dorpati Livonum/ Dorpat (Tartu).¹⁴⁹³
- Molino, Giovanni. 1641. *Dittionario della lingua italiana-turchesca con l'indice delli vocabuli Turcheschi e brevi rudimenti di detta lingua*, Roma: Gioiosi.
- Moller, Johannes. 1698. "In Sueciam literatam Johannis Schefferi hypomnemata critico-historica" in *Svecia literata seu de scriptis & scriptoribus gentis Sveciae*, Hamburgi/ Hamburg: Liebezeit.
- Molnar, Albert Scenczi. 1621. *Lexicon Latino-Graeco-Ungaricum*, Heidelbergae/ Heidelberg: Wechel.
- Morinus, Stephanus. 1694. *Exercitationes de lingua primaeva eiusque appendicibus*, Ultrajecti/ Utrecht: Broedelet.
- Muhlius, Heinrich. 1692. *De origine linguarum variarum, stirpeque ac matre Graecae, Latinae et Germanicae, Hebraea dissertatio*, Kiloni/ Kiel: Richelius.
- Myl (Mylius), Abraham van der. 1612. *Lingua Belgica sive de linguae illius communitate cum plerisque aliis, tum praesertim cum Latina, Graeca, Persica deque communitatis illius causis; tum de linguae illius origine et latissime per nationes quamplurimas diffusionem, ut et de eius praestantia*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Ulric Cornelii Honthorst & Joris Abrahami Marsce.
- Negri, Domenico Mario. 1557. *Geographiae commentariorum libri XI*, Basileae/ Basel: Petri.
- Nordin, Carl Gustaf. 1791. "Minne af krigsrådet och preses i Kongl. Antiquitets Collegio, herr Jöran Stjernhjelm 1791", *Svenska Akademiens handlingar ifrån år 1786*, part 4, 1809, pp. 197–216.
- Örnhielm, Claudius. 1765. "Descriptio regni Sveciae", *Greinir or þeim gaumlu saugum, laugum og íþrotter*, published by Christian von Nettelblå, Stockholm, pp. 173–296.
- Ortelius, Abraham. 1587. *Thesaurus geographicus*, Antverpiae/ Antwerp.
- Pontanus, Johannes Isacius. 1616. *Originum Francicarum libri VI*, Hardervici/ Harderwijk: Henricus.
- Pontanus, Johannes Isaacus. 1631. *Rerum Danicarum historia*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam: Janssonius.
- Postellus, Guillaume. 1553. *De originibus seu de varia et potissimum orbi Latino ad hanc diem incognita, aut inconsiderata historia, quum totius Orientis, tum maxime Tartarorum, Persarum, Turcarum et omnium Abrahami et Noachi alumnorum origines et mysteria Brachmanum retegente*, Basileae/ Basel: Oporinus.
- Ramus, Petrus. 1543. *Aristotelicae animadversiones*, Paris: Bogard.

¹⁴⁹³ Megalinus describes problems in geometry, geodesy, stereometry, music, optics, geography, astronomy, fortification, horology and metallurgy. A copy of this treatise is extant in the Archives of the Swedish Academy, *Svenska Akademiens samlingar*, vol. 289, envelope 4 ("originaltryck").

- Ravius, Christian. 1646. *Orthographiae et analogiae (vulgo etymologiae) Ebraicae delineatio*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam: Janssonius.
- Ravius, Christian. 1648. *A generall grammer for the Ebrew, Samaritan, Calde, Syriac, Arabian and Ethiopic tongue*, London: Wilson.
- Ravius, Christian. 1649. *A discourse of the Orientall tongues, viz. Ebrew, Samaritane, Calde, Syriac, Arabic and Ethiopic. Together with A generall Grammar for the said languages*, London: Wilson.
- Reland, Hadrian. 1715. “De λειψάνοις veteris linguae Aegyptiacae”, Chamberlayne 1715, *Oratio dominica*, Amsterdam, pp. 94–124.
- Rittershausen, Konrad. 1615. *Ioannis antiqui glossatoris summa in Novellas Iustiniani [...] ex bibliotheca et recensione Conradi Rittershusii*, Frankfurt am Main: Emmel.
- Rivet(us), Andreas. 1633. *Theologicae et scholasticae exercitationes CXC in Genesin ex publicis eius praelectionibus in celeberrima Batavorum Academia*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Elzevir.
- Rosenhane, Gustaf or Schering (under the pseudonym Skogekär Bergbo). 1658. *Thet swenska språketz klagemål*, Stockholm: Källkvist.
- Sahlstedt, Abraham. 1773. *Swensk Ordbok med latinsk uttolkning / Dictionarium Svecicum cum interpretatione Latina*, Stockholm: Carl Stolpe.
- Salmasius, Claudius. 1643. *De Hellenistica commentarius controversiam de lingua Hellenistica decidens et plenissime pertractans originem et dialectus Graecae linguae*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Elzevir.
- Salmasius (de Saumaise), Claudius. 1629. *Plinianae exercitationes in Caji Julii Solini polyhistora*, Parisiis/ Paris: Morell(us).
- Scaliger, Joseph Justus. 1610. “Diatriba de Europaeorum linguis” in *Opuscula varia antehac non edita*, Parisiis/ Paris: Hadrian Beys, pp. 119–122.
- Scaliger, Joseph Iustus. 1627. *Epistolæ omnes quæ reperiri potuerunt*, ed. by Daniel Heinsius, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Elzevir.
- Schefferus, Johannes (editor and translator). 1669. *Konunga ok höfðinga styrilse, hoc est regum principumque institutio ab incerto auctore gentis Sueticae ante saecula nonnulla patrio sermone conscripta*, Holmiae/ Stockholm: Wankijf.
- Schlözer, August Ludvig. 1781. “Von den Chaldäern”, *Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur*, Achter Theil, Leipzig: Weidmann & Reich.
- Schrieckius, Adrianus. 1614. *Van t’beghin der eerster volcken van Europaen, in-sonderheyt van den oorsponck en de saecken der Nederlandren XXII boecken*, in Latin entitled *Originum rerumque Celticarum et Belgicarum libri XXII*, T’Ypres: Bellett.
- Schrieckius, Adrianus. 1615. *Monitorum secundorum libri V*, Ypris Flandrorum/ Ypres: Bellett(us).
- Schrieckius, Adrianus. 1620. *A consiliis adversariorum libri IIII. His argumentis: linguam Hebraicam esse divinam et primigeniam*, Ypris Flandrorum/ Ypres: Bellett(us).

- Scioppius (Schoppe), Caspar 1609. *Observationes linguae Latinae*, Francofurti: Richter
- Spegel, Haquin. 1712. *Glossarium Sveo-Gothicum eller Swensk Ordabook inrättat them til en wälment Anledning som om thet härliga språket willia begynna någon kunskap inhämta*, Lund: Habereger.
- Stiernhielm, Georg. 1643. *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, Stockholm: Peter von Selaw.
- Stiernhielm, Georg. 1651. *Runa Suethica, duobus systematibus comprehensa, quorum primum exhibet dissertationem de linguis et vera linguarum origine; secundum radices universales et omnibus fere linguis communes eruit et aperit. Sine loco.*
- Stiernhielm, Georg. 1663. *Wäst-Götha laghbook, uppå den Stormechtigste / Höghborne Furstes och herres / herr Carl then Ellofftes, Sweriges / Göthes och Wändes Konungs [...] befalning uthaff ett offgammalt MS.to som fins in Archivo Regni, medh flijt uthskrifwin och i wisse balkar, flockar och §§ samman-fattat aff Georg Stiernhielm*, Stockholm: Meurer.
- Stiernhielm, Georg. 1671. *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum linguis aliquot affinibus per Fr. Junium, nunc etiam Sveo-Gothica moderna et antiqua, cui innumerae accesserunt etymologiae et voces ex affinibus Orientalibus, Graeca et Slavonicis locupletatum et illustratum per Georgium Stiernhielm Sacrae Regiae Maiestatis Consiliarius Militaris et Collegii Antiquitatis praesidem*, Holmiae/ Stockholm: Wankijf.
- Stiernhielm, Georg. 1671. “De linguarum origine praefatio”, *Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Sacrosancta Evangelia ab Ulfila Gothorum in Moesia episcopo circa annum a nato Christo CCCLX ex Graeco Gothice translata, nunc cum paralelis versionibus Sveo-Gothica, Norraena seu Islandica et vulgata Latina edita*, Stockholm: Wankijf.
- Stiernhielm, Georg. 1685. *Anticluverius seu scriptum breve Johanni Cluverio, Dantisco-Borusso oppositum, gentis Gothicae originem et antiquissimam in Scandia vel Scandinavia sedem vindicans, ut et eiusdem De Hyperboreis dissertatio brevis*, Holmiae/ Stockholm: Keyser.
- Stiernhielm, Georg. 1738–1739. “Anti-Bochartus” in *Acta literaria et Scientiarum Sueciae*, Uppsala 1739, pp. 363–389; and 1739, pp. 454–477.
- Stiernhielm, Georg. 1763. “Observatio de etymo vocum fader moder, broder, syster, amma, barn, dotter, son” in *Greinir or þeim gaumlu saugum, laugum og íprotter. [...] Oder Nachlese von alten und neuen, fremden und eigenen, einheimischen und ausländischen Abhandlungen, Anmerckungen, ungedruckten und seltenen gedruckten Sachen*, published by Christian von Nettelbla, Stockholm, pp. 217–219.
- Suhm, Peter. 1769. *Försøg til et udkast af en historie over folkenes oprindelse i almindelighet som en inledning til de nordiske folkes i særdeleshed*, Kiøbenhavn/ Copenhagen: Georg Chr. Berling.
- Theodoret of Cyrrihus (original author)/ John F. Petruccione (editor) Robert C. Hill (translator). 2007. *Questions on the Octateuch, vol 1: On Gensis*

- and *Exodus*, Washington D.C. The Catholic University Press of America.
- Terserus, Johannes Elai (pres.)/ Jordanus Edenius (resp.). 1653. *Disputatio publica Mosaico philologica V. ex cap. V. Geneseos et sequentibus*, Upsaliae/ Uppsala: Johannes Pauli.
- Verelius, Olof. 1691. *Index linguae veteris Scytho-Scandicae sive Gothicae ex vetusti aevi monumentis collectus*, Upsalae/ Uppsala.
- Vives, Juan Luis. 1531. *De disciplinis libri XX*, Antverpiae/ Antwerp: Hillenius.
- Vossius, Gerard Joannis. 1641. *De theologia gentili et physiologia Christiana sive de origine et progressu idolatriae [...]*, 2 vols. Amsterdami/ Amsterdam: Blaeu.
- Vossius, Gerard Joannis. 1645. *De vitiis sermonis et glossematis Latino-barbaris*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam: Elzevir.
- Vossius, Gerard Joannis. 1662. *Etymologicon linguae Latinae; praefigitur eiusdem tractatus de permutatione literarum*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam: Elzevir.
- Vulcanius, Bonaventura. 1594. *Agathiae historici et poetae eximii de imperio et rebus gestis Iustiniani imperatoris libri quinque*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Plantinus (printer) and Raphelengius (publisher).
- Vulcanius, Bonaventura. 1597. *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum*, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden: Plantinus (printer) and Raphelengius (publisher).
- Wachter, Johann Georg. 1727. *Glossarium Germanicum continens origines et antiquitates linguae germanicae hodiernae. Specimen ex ampliore farragine decerptum*, Leipzig: Schuster.
- Wachter, Johann Georg. 1737. *Glossarium Germanicum continens origines et antiquitates totius linguae Germanicae et omnium pene vocabulorum vigentium et desitorum. Opus bipartitum*, vol. 1, Lipsiae/ Leipzig: Gleditsch.
- Wehner, Paul Matthias. 1610. *Alte und erneuerte Ordnung und Reformation der Römischen Kayerlichen Mayestät, Keyserlichen Hoffgerichts zu Rotwell*. Part 2: *Notae et observationes*, Franckfurt am Mayn: Bringern (printer), Rosen (publisher).
- Wehner, Paul Matthias. 1624. *Practicarum iuris observationum selectarum liber singularis*, Francofurti ad Moenum/ Frankfurt am Main: Weissius (printer), Rivalius (publisher).
- Willich. Iodocus. 1551. *In Cornelii Taciti equitis Romani Germaniam commentaria*, Francofurti ad Viadrum/ Frankfurt an der Oder: Eichhorn.
- Worm, Ole. 1642–1651. *Antiquitates Danicae. Literatura Runica. Lexicon Runicum. Monumenta runica. Additamenta. Fasti Danici*. Hafniae/ Copenhagen: Martzan (printer), Holst (publisher).
- Wotton, William. 1715. “Dissertatio de confusione linguarum extructoribus turris Babylonicae a Deo inflicta” in J. Chamberlayne (ed.), *Oratio dominica in diversas fere omnium gentium linguas versa*, Amsterdam, pp. 37–75.

Wotton, William. 1730. *A Discourse concerning the Confusion of Languages at Babel proving it to have been miraculous, from the essential difference between them, contrary to the opinion of Mons. Le Clerc, and others*, London. printed for S. Austen; and W. Bowyer.

Secondary literature

- Aarsleff, Hans. 1969. "The study and use of etymology in Leibniz", *Akten des internationalen Leibniz-Kongresses Hannover, 9.–14. November 1966*, Bd III: Erkenntnislehre, Logik, Sprachphilosophie, Editionsberichte (Studia Leibnitiana supplementa, 3), Wiesbaden.
- Agrell, Jan. 1955. *Studier i den äldre språkjämförelsens allmänna och svenska historia fram till 1827* (Uppsala universitets årsskrift 1955:13), Uppsala: Lundequistska bokhandeln, and Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Almqvist, Joh. Ax. 1945. "Tornérspelet vid kröningen 1617: ett bidrag till 1600-talets bibliografi", *Donum Grapeanum: festskrift tillägnad överbibliotekarie Anders Grape*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, pp. 1–7.
- Andersson, Bo & Raimo Raag (eds.). 2012. *Från Nyens skans till Nya Sverige: språken i det Svenska Riket under 1600-talet* (Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien, Konferenser 78), Stockholm: Danagård LiTHO AB.
- Annerstedt, Claes. 1909. *Uppsala universitets historia, II: 1655–1718, 2: Universitetets organisation och verksamhet*, Uppsala: Universitetet.
- Atterbom, Per Daniel Amadeus. 1862 *Svenska siare och skalder*, Örebro: Lindh (1st ed. Uppsala 1843: Lundequist).
- Bahner, Werner. 1983. "Skizzen zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft von der Mitte des 15. bis zu den Anfängen des 17. Jahrhunderts", *Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie*, 22:2, Berlin, pp. 177–222.
- Bahner, Werner. 1981. "Kontinuität und Diskontinuität in der Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft", *Zur Dialektik der Determinanten in der Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. I, Berlin: Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft, pp. 1–18.
- Berg, Lars Otto; Magdalena Hellquist; and Ragnar Norrman, 2004. *Uppsala stifts herdaminne*, Band II:8:1 (Trögds-Åsunda kontrakt 1593–1999; 1. Trögds kontrakt), Stockholm.
- Blume, Herbert. 1978. "Sprachenteori und Sprachenlegitimation in 17. Jahrhundert in Schweden und in Kontinentaleuropa", *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, vol. 93, pp. 205–218.
- Blume, Herbert. 2000. "Rötter och stamord. Stiernhielms och samtida tyska språklärdas tankar om ordens byggnad", Stig Örjan Ohlsson and Bernt Olsson (eds.), *Stiernhielm 400 år*, pp. 219–229.
- Bonfante, Giuliano. 1954. "Ideas of the kinship of the European languages from 1200 to 1800", *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale / Journal of world history*, vol. 1, Paris, pp. 679–699.
- Brewer, Douglas J., and Emily Teeter, 2008 (2nd ed), *Egypt and the Egyptians*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bridgman, Timothy P. 2004. *Hyperboreans: myth and history in Celtic-Hellenic contacts* (Studies in Classics), London: Routledge.
- Broberg, Gunnar. 1991. "Vår upplysta tid" in idem (ed.), *Gyllene äpplen: svensk idéhistorisk läsebok*, Stockholm: Atlantis.
- Brough, Sonia. 1985. *The Goths and the concept of Gothic in Germany from 1500 to 1750*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Burke, Peter. 1969. *The Renaissance sense of the past*, London: Arnold.
- Burke, Peter. 1998. *The European Renaissance: centres and peripheries*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Burke, Peter. 2000. *A social history of knowledge: from Gutenberg to Diderot*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Burke, Peter. 2004. *Languages and communities in early modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, Lyle and William J. Poser. 2008. *Language classification: history and method*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Considine, John. 2008a. *Dictionaries in early modern Europe and the making of heritage*, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Considine, John. 2008b. "Did Andreas Jäger or Georg Caspar Kirchmaier write the dissertation *De lingua vetustissima Europae* (1686)?" *Historiographia linguistica* 35: 13–22.
- Considine, John. 2010. "Why was Claude de Saumaise interested in the Scythian hypothesis?" *Language and history* 53:2, pp. 81–95.
- Cordes, Günter. 1966. *Die Quellen der Exegesis Germaniae des Franciscus Irenicus und sein Germanenbegriff*, Marburg.
- Crawford, M. H. 1996. *Roman statutes*, London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London.
- Cunliffe, Barry W. 2019. *The Scythians: nomad warriors of the steppe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dahlberg, Elena. 2014. *The voice of a waning empire. Selected Latin poetry of Magnus Rönnow from the Great Northern War* (Studia Latina Upsaliensia, 34), Uppsala.
- Dekker, Kees. 1999. *The origin of old Germanic studies in the low countries*, Leiden: Brill.
- Delblanc, Sven 1992. *Ära och minne: studier kring ett motivkomplex i 1700-talets litteratur*, Stockholm: Bonniers.
- Deneire, Tom, and Toon van Hal. 2006. *Lipsius tegen Becanus*, Amersfoort: Forivallis.
- Diderichsen Paul 1974 "The Foundations of comparative linguistics: revolution or continuation" in Dell Hymes (ed.), *Studies in the history of linguistics. Traditions and paradigms*, Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press, pp. 277–306.
- Droixhe, Daniel. 1978. *La linguistique et l'appel de l'histoire (1600–1800): rationalisme et révolutions positivistes*, Genève: Droz.
- Droixhe, Daniel. 1980. "Le prototype défiguré. L'idée scythique et la France gauloise (XVIIe–XVIIIe siècles)" in E.F.K. Koerner (ed.), *Progress in linguistic historiography. Papers from the international*

- conference on the history of the language sciences (Ottawa 28–31 Aug. 1978), Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp.123–137.
- Ernby, Birgitta. 2008. *Norstedts etymologiska ordbok*, Stockholm: Norstedt.
- Eskhult, Josef. 2006. "Latin Bible versions in the age of Reformation and post-Reformation: On the development of new Latin versions of the Old Testament in Hebrew and on the Vulgate as revised and evaluated among the Protestants" *Kyrkohistorisk årsskrift 2006*, ed. by Anders Jarlert, Malmö 2006, pp. 31–67.
- Eskhult, Josef. 2007. *Andreas Norrelius' Latin translation of Johan Kemper's Hebrew commentary on Matthew. Edited with introduction and philological commentary* (Studia Latina Upsaliensia 32), Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Eskhult, Josef. 2013. "Augustine and the primeval language in early modern exegesis and philology" in *Language and history*, ed. by Nicola McLelland and David Cram, vol. 56:2, November 2013, Maney Publishing, pp. 97–118.
- Eskhult, Josef. 2014. "The primeval language and Hebrew ethnicity in ancient Jewish and Christian thought until Augustine" in: *Revue d'Études Augustiniennes et Patristiques*, vol. 60:2, Brepols publishers, pp. 291–347.
- Eskhult, Josef. 2018. "Vulgar Latin as an emergent concept in the Italian Renaissance (1435–1601): Its ancient and medieval prehistory and its Renaissance emergence and development", *Journal of Latin linguistics* 17:2, pp. 191–230.
- Eskhult, Josef. 2020. "The concept of dialect in the works of three 17th-century linguistic theorists: Georg Stiernhielm, Claudius Salmasius and Christian Ravius. An exploratory survey of their intellectual contexts, defining criteria and classificatory aims" in: Raf Van Rooy (ed.), *Essays in the history of dialect studies. From ancient Greece to modern dialectology*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, pp. 85–106.
- Eskhult, Josef. 2020. "Christian Ravius' Turkish and Semitic studies and his work as an Orientalist in the Swedish state service" in: Éva Á. Csató, Gunilla Gren-Eklund, Lars Johanson, Birsal Karakoç (eds.), *Turcologica Upsaliensia: an illustrated collection of essays*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 47–71.
- Eskhult, Josef. 2022. "Vulgar Latin as a pre-modern concept (1435–1601)" in Gerd Haverling (ed.) *Studies in Late and Vulgar Latin in the early 21st century*, Uppsala 2022, pp. 340–355.
- Eskhult, Josef. f.c. *Albert Schultens as the innovator of Hebrew etymology and lexicography. Historical, lexicographic and conceptual contexts and his own theory, method and practice of the field* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia).
- Eskhult, Josef. f.c. 2023. *Albert Schultens. Unpublished manuscripts on comparative Hebrew philology* (Studia Latina Upsaliensia).
- Eskhult, Josef. f.c. "Christian Ravius' views on the unity and diversity of the Semitic languages: a prestructuralist approach to comparative Semitic morpho-phonology and semantics".

- Eskhult, Mats, and Josef Eskhult. 2013. "The language of Jesus and related questions – a historical survey" in Reinhard G. Lehmann (ed.), *KUSATU: Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, vol. 15, pp. 315–373.
- Eskhult, Josef, och Krister Östlund. f.c. *Johan Ihres språkklassificering, etymologiska metod och lexikografi: studier av Ihres språkjämförelse samt översättning av Ihres företal till Glossarium Suiogothicum*,
- Faithfull, R. Glynn. 1953. "The concept of 'living language' in cinquecento vernacular philology", *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 48, pp. 278–292.
- Fellman, Jack. 1974. "The first historical linguistic" i *Linguistics: an international review*, vol. 137, The Hague & Paris, pp. 131–133.
- Fellman, Jack. 1975. "On Sir William Jones and the Scythian language", *Language sciences* 34, Bloomington, pp. 37–38.
- Fellman, Jack. 1978. "Semitic linguistics and indo-european comparative and historical grammar", *Linguistics: an international review* 206, the Hague, Paris and New York, pp. 51–53.
- Flasch, Kurt. 2004. 2nd ed. [1st ed. 1993]. *Was ist Zeit? Augustinus von Hippo, das XI. Buch der Confessiones: historisch-philosophische Studie: Text - Übersetzung - Kommentar*, Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.
- Friberg, Axel. 1945. *Den svenske Herkules: studier i Stiernhielms diktning*, Stockholm: Stockholms högskola.
- Fuchs, Mechthild. 2009. *Helius Eobanus Hessus. Psalterium universum*, Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Berlin.
- Gardt, Andreas. 1999. *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland: vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Gensini, Stephano. 1999. "Rhetoric, the philosophy of language and the study of languages in the Humanistic tradition" in Peter Schmitter (ed.), *Sprachtheorien der Neuzeit. I Der epistemologische Kontext neuzeitlicher Sprach- und Grammatiktheorien*, Tübingen: Narr, pp. 1–42.
- Gensini, Stefano. 1991. *Il naturale e il simbolico: saggio su Leibniz* (Bibliotheca di culturs, 436), Roma: Bulzoni.
- Grafton, Anthony. 1993. *Joseph Scaliger: a study in the history of classical scholarship, 2. Historical chronology*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gustafson, Bengt Y. (ed.). 1970. *Atlas till historien*, third edition, Stockholm: Generalstabens litografiska anstalt.
- Haapamäki, Saara. 2002. *Studier i svensk grammatikhistoria*, Åbo: Åbo Akademis förlag (distribution: Oy Tibo-Trading Ab).
- Hagström, K. A. 1899. *Strängnäs stifts herdaminne*, part 3: Daga, Södertörns, Södertelge [...] kontrakt, Strengnes: Westerlund.
- Van Hal, Toon. 2010. *"Moedertalen en taalmoeders": het vroegmoderne taalvergelijkende onderzoek in de Lage Landen*. Brussel: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, Paleis der Academien.

- Van Hal, Toon, and Considine, John 2010. "Classifying and comparing languages in post-Renaissance Europe", *Language and history* 53:2, pp. 63–69.
- Van Hal, Toon. 2011. "The earliest stages of Persian-German language comparison" in Gerda Hassler and Gesina Volkmann (eds.), *History of linguistics 2008: selected papers from the eleventh international conference on the history of the language sciences*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 147–165.
- Van Hal, Toon. 2011. "Reviving the old Teutonic language. An unpublished preface by Abraham Mylius", *Lias* 38:1, pp. 129–147.
- Van Hal, Toon. "Quam enim periculosa sit ea via ...". Josephus Justus Scaliger's views on linguistic kinship", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 20, pp. 111–140.
- Van Haal, Toon. 2010. "On 'the Scythian theory': reconstructing the outlines of Johannes Elichmann's planned *Archaeologia Harmonica*", *Language and history*, vol. 53:2, pp. 70–80.
- Hannedóttir, Anna Helga. 1998. *Lexikografihistorisk spegel. Den enspråkiga svenska lexikografins utveckling ur den tvåspråkiga*, (Meijerbergs arkiv för svensk ordforskning), Göteborg: Novum grafiska.
- Hannedóttir, Anna Helga. 2007. "Först och sist: Haquin Spegel och ordförrådets förnyelse", *LexicoNordica: tidsskrift om lexikografi i Norden* 14, Oslo: Nordisk forening for leksikografi i samarbeit med Nordisk språksekretaria, pp. 125–139.
- Hanselli, Per (ed.). 1859. *Samlade vitterhetsarbeten af svenska författare från Stjernhjelm till Dalin*, vol. 5 (Jakob Gyllenborg, Anders Leijonstedt), Uppsala: Hanselli.
- Hanselli, Per (ed.). 1871. *Samlade vitterhetsarbeten af svenska författare från Stjernhjelm till Dalin*, vol. 1 (G. Stjernhjelm, Gustaf Rosenhane, Johannes Columbus), Uppsala: Hanselli.
- Hassler, Gerda, and Cordula Neis. 2009. *Lexikon sprachtheoretischer Grundbegriffe des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hassler, Gerda, & Schmitter, Peter (eds.) 1999. *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprachen in 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, Münster: Nodus.
- Haugen, Einar. 1986. "Learned lexicographers of the north: seventeenth century vignettes", Reinhart R.K. Hartman (ed.), *The history of lexicography: papers from the Dictionary Research Centre Seminar at Exeter*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 99–105.
- Haugen, Einar. 1976. *The Scandinavian languages: an introduction to their history*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Heinekamp, Albert. 1976. "Sprache und Wirklichkeit nach Leibniz" in H. Parret, *History of linguistic thought and contemporary linguistics*, Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, pp. 518–570.
- Helander, Josef. 1889. *Haquin Spegel. Hans lif och gärning intill år 1693* (Uppsala universitets årsskrift, 1900), Uppsala.
- Helander, Hans. 2004. *Neo-Latin literature in Sweden in the period 1620-1720: stylistics, vocabulary and characteristic ideas*, (Studia Latina Upsaliensia 29), Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.

- Hellquist, Elof. 1993. *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*, 3rd ed, Malmö: Gleerups.
- Heyman, Harald J. 1921. "Stiernhielms skrifter om mått och vikt", *Uppsala universitets biblioteks minnesskrift 1621–1921*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, pp. 317–328.
- Holm, Lars. 2009. *Jesper Swedberg, Svensk ordbok, utgiven efter Uppsala-handskriften med tillägg och rättelser ur övriga handskrifter* (Skara stiftshistoriska sällskaps skriftserie, 46) Värnamo: Fälth & Hessler.
- Hotson, Howard. 2007. *Commonplace learning: Ramism and its German ramifications, 1543–1630*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hotson, Howard. 2020. *The Reformation of common learning. Post-Ramist method and the reception of the new philosophy, 1618–c.1670*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 2001. "The study of early Germanic languages in Scandinavia: Stiernhielm and Ihre" in Sylvain Auroux, E. F. K. Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe, Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the language sciences, Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften, Histoire des sciences du langage* (HSK 18:2), vol. 2, Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 1124–1128.
- Ingemarsdotter, Jenny. 2011. *Ramism, rhetoric and reform: an intellectual biography of Johan Skytte* (Uppsala Studies in History of Ideas), Västerås: Edita Västra Aros.
- Jacoby, Michael. 1990. *Historische lexikologie zur nordgermanischen Raum: Lexika als Kultur- und Sprachdokumente zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit [...]*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Johannesson, Kurt, and Hans Helander. 2018. *Goternas och Svearnas historia/ Johannes Magnus*. vol. 1: Översättning av Kurt Johannesson, vol. 2: kommentarer av K. Johannesson och Hans Helander, Stockholm: Michaelisgillet & Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien.
- Johansson, J. Viktor. 1939. *Variantexemplar av Stiernhielms Ulfilas-edition: en bokhistorisk undersökning*, Göteborg.
- Johansson, Monica. 1997. *Lexicon Lincopense: en studie i lexikografisk tradition och svenskt språk vid 1600-talets mitt* (Meijerbergs arkiv för svensk ordforskning 21), Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning, and Göteborgs universitet.
- Jones, William Jervis. 1999. *Images of language: six essays on German attitudes to European languages from 1500 to 1800*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Jørgensen, Arne. 1930. *Universitetsbiblioteket i Helsingfors 1827–1848*, Helsinki: Mercator.
- Klein, Jürgen. 2012. "Francis Bacon", in Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of philosophy*, published online at Stanford University: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/francis-bacon>
- Kramer, Johannes. 1998. *Die Sprachbezeichnungen Latinus und Romanus im Lateinischen und Romanischen*. Berlin: Schmidt.
- Kuhn, Thomas. S. 1996 (1st ed. 1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

- Law, Vivien. 1990. "Language and its students: the history of linguistics" in Neville Edgar Collinge (ed.), *An encyclopaedia of language*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 784–841.
- Law, Vivien. 2003. *The history of linguistics in Europe: from Plato to 1600*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leezenberg, Michel. 2010. "How comparative should a comparative history of the humanities be?" in Rens Bod, Jaap Mat and Thijs Weststeijn (eds.), *The making of the Humanities*, vol. 1 early modern Europe, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short. 1879. *A Latin dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press. A digital version is available at perseus.tufts.edu.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. 1940. *A Greek-English dictionary, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Robert McKenzie*, Oxford: Clarendon Press. A digital version is available at perseus.tufts.edu.
- Lindroth, Hjalmar. 1912. *J. Th. Bureus. Den svenska grammatikens fader*, vol. 2, Stockholm: Norstedt.
- Lindroth, Hjalmar. 1913. *Stiernhielms Hercules: en diktmonografi*, Lund: Gleerup.
- Lindroth, Sten. 1975. *Svensk lärdomshistoria*, vol. 2: Stormaktstiden, Stockholm: Norstedt.
- Magnus, Margaret. 2013. "A history of sound symbolism", Keith Allan (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the history of linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 191–208.
- McKendry, Eugene. 1999. "J. G. Sparwenfeldt and Celtic linguistics in seventeenth-century Sweden" in David Cram, Andrew Linn and Elke Nowak (eds.), *History of linguistics 1996: selected papers from the seventh international conference on the history of the language sciences*, vol. 1, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 181–189.
- McKeown, Simon. 2005. "Recovering the *Codex Argenteus*. Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, David Klöcker Ehrenstrahl and Wulfila's Gothic Bible", *Lychnos*, pp. 9–28.
- Melkas, Eeva. 1971. *Studier över de arkaiska och dialektala orden i 1600-talets diktning*, Helsinki (unpublished thesis, "laudatursavhandling". available in Helsinki University Library, Helsinki, Finland).
- Metcalf, George. 1953. "Abraham Mylius on historical linguistics", *Modern language Association* 68:3, pp. 535–554.
- Metcalf, George. 1963. "The Views of Konrad Gesner on language", *Studies in Germanic languages and literatures*, St. Louis, pp. 15–26.
- Metcalf, George. 1974. "The Indo-European hypothesis in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries", Dell Hymes (ed.) *Studies in the history of linguistics: traditions and paradigms*, Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, pp. 233–257.
- Metcalf, George. "Andreas Jäger and his *De lingua vetustissima Europae* (1686)", *Modern language notes* 81: 489–593.
- Metcalf, George. 1980. "Theodor Bibliander and the languages of Japheth's progeny", *Historiographica linguistica*, vol. 7, pp. 323–233.

- Metcalf, George. 2013. *On language diversity and relationship from Bibliander to Adelung*, a collection of Metcalf's articles edited by Toon van Hal and Raf van Rooy, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Minns, Ellis Hovell. 1913. *Scythians and Greeks: a survey of ancient history and archaeology on the north coast of the Euxine from the Danube to the Caucasus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Miert, Dirk. 2011 (ed. and one of the contributors). *The kaleidoscopic scholarship of Hadrianus Junius (1511–1575): northern humanism at the dawn of the Dutch golden age*, Leiden: Brill.
- Mjöberg, Göran. *Vägisare för Karlfeldt: nio uppsatser om bakgrunden till Karlfeldts diktning*, Falun: Karlfelt-samfundet.
- Moss, Ann. 2003. *Renaissance truth and the Latin language turn*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Muller, Jean-Claude. 1986. "Early stages of language comparison from Sassetti to Sir William Jones (1786)", *Kratylos: Kritisches Berichts- und Rezensionsorgan für indo-germanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. 31: 1–31, Wiesbaden.
- Müller, Max. 1862. *Lectures on the science of language*, London: Longman.
- Nationalencyklopediens ordbok*, vol. 1, 1995, vols. 2 and 3, 1996, edited by Göteborgs universitet. Språkdata, published in Höganäs: Bra böcker.
- Neuman, Werner 1981, "Zur Einleitung" pp. i–xiii, and "Kontinuität und Diskontinuität der Geschichte punkte beim Übergang zur hisyorischen Sprachwissenschaft", *Zur Dialektik der Determinanten in der Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, I, Berlin: Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft, pp. 19–37.
- Nilsson, Stig. 1974. *Terminologi och nomenklatur: studier över begrepp och deras uttryck i matematik, naturvetenskap och teknik*. Lund: Blom.
- Nordström, Johan. 1924. *Georg Stiernhielm. Filosofiska fragment med inledning och kommentar*, vol. 1 introduction, vol. 2 textual edition with an unfinished commentary. Stockholm: Bonniers.
- Nordström, Johan. 1930. "De yverbörnes ö: sextonhundratalsstudier: bidrag till Atlanticans förhistoria", *Rudbeckstudier: festskrift vid Uppsala universitets minnesfest 1930*, Uppsala.
- Nordström, Johan. 1940. "Några notiser om drottning Christinas akademier", *Lychnos: lärdomshistoriska samfundets årsbok*, Uppsala and Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Nordström, Johan, and Bernt Olsson. 1973. *Samlade skrifter av Georg Stiernhielm. Första delen: poetiska skrifter. Första bandet*. (Svenska författare utgivna av svenska vitterhetsamfundet, vol. VIII), Lund: Blom.
- Nordström, Johan, and Bernt Olsson. 1976. *Samlade skrifter av Georg Stiernhielm. Första delen: poetiska skrifter. Andra bandet: kommentar* (Svenska författare utgivna av svenska vitterhetsamfundet, vol. VIII), Lund: Blom.

- North, J.D. 1977. "Chronology and the age of the world" in W. Yourgrau et alii (eds.), *Cosmology, history and theology*, New York: Plenum 1977, pp. 307–334.
- Ohlon, Rolf. 1989. *Från Stiernhielms Carl-Staf till metern*, Stockholm: Statens provningsanstalt.
- Ohlsson, Stig Örjan. 2002. "Outline of research on Nordic language history before 1800" in Oskar Bandle, Kurt Braunmüller, Ernst Hakon Jahr, Allan Karker, Hans-Peter Naumann, Ulf Teleman, Lennart Elmevik and Gun Widmark (eds.), *An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, vol. 1 (HSK 22:1), Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Ohlsson, Stig Örjan, & Olsson, Bernt. 2000. *Stiernhielm 400 år: Föredrag vid internationellt symposium i Tartu 1998* (Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademie. Konferenser 50), Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell international.
- Olsson, Bernt. 1963. *Guds Werk och Hvila. Tillkomstshistoria, världsbild, gestaltning*, Stockholm: Natur och kultur.
- Ohlsson, Stig Örjan. 2000. "Stiernhielms språkvetenskapliga terminologi" in Ohlsson & Olsson (eds.), *Stiernhielm 400 år*, pp. 199–217.
- Olender, Maurice. 1996. "Der arisch-semitische Streit zu Beginn der modernen Sprachwissenschaft", *Philosophy of language: an international handbook of contemporary research* (HSK 7:2), Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, pp. 943–952.
- Olsson, Bernt. 1974. *Den svenska skaldekonstens fader och andra stiernhielmstudier*, Lund: Gleerup.
- Olzow-Schlanger, Judith. 1999. "The 'generall grammar of oriental tongues': and universal language schemes in the 17th century: the contribution of Christian Ravius" in David Cram, Andrew Linn and Elke Nowak (eds.), *History of linguistics 1996, vol. II: from classical to contemporary linguistics* (Studies in the history of language sciences, 95), Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 131–141.
- Östlund, Krister. 2000. *Johan Ihre on the origin and history of the Runes: Three Latin dissertations from the mid 18th century edited with translation and commentary* (Studia Latina Upsaliensia, 25), Uppsala Textgruppen.
- Otto, A. 1962. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Hildesheim: Olm (reprint of the 1890 edition).
- The Oxford Classical dictionary*, 3rd edition, edited by Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, Oxford 2003: Oxford University Press.
- Parzinger, Hermann. 2004. *Die Skythen*. München: Beck.
- Ralph, Bo. 2000. "Vanans makt i svensk språkhistoriebeskrivning", *Studier i svensk språkhistoria* 5, Umeå, pp. 360–379;
- Ralph, Bo. 2001 "Orden i ordning: den historiska framväxten av en lexikografisk tradition i Sverige", *Nordiska studier i lexikografi* 5, Göteborg, pp. 282–322.
- Richter, Liselotte. 1946. *Leibniz und sein Russlandbild*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- Robins, Robert. 1973. "The history of language classification" in Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Current trends in linguistics*, vol. 11: Diachronic, areal and typological linguistics, the Hague: Mouton, pp. 3–15.
- Robins, Robert H. 1997 (1st ed. 1967). *A short history of linguistics*, fourth edition, London & New York: Longman.
- Rocher, Rosane. 1995. "Discovery of Sanskrit by Europeans" in E.F.K. Koerner and R.E. Asher (eds.), *Concise history of the language sciences: from the Sumerians to the cognitivists*, New York: Pergamon, pp. 188–191.
- Rocher, Rosane. 2001. "The knowledge of Sanskrit in Europe until 1800" in Sylvain Auroux, E. F. K. Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe, Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the language sciences: an international handbook on the evolution of the study of language from the beginnings to the present*, vol. 2, Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 1156–1163.
- Rolle, Renate. 1980. *Die Welt der Skythen. Stutenmelker und Pferdeboegner: ein antikes Reitervolk in neuer Sicht*. Luzern: Bucher.
- Rolle, Renate. (original author)/ E. G. Wells (translator), 1989. *The World of the Scythians*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Van Rooy, Raf. 2017. *Through the vast labyrinth of languages and dialects: the emergence and transformation of a conceptual pair in the early modern period (c. 1478–1782)*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- Van Rooy, Raf, 2020. *Language or dialect?: the history of a conceptual pair*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1983 (1st ed. 1916). *Course in general linguistics*, ed. by Charles Bally and Albert Secheheye with the collaboration of Alb. Riedlinger, translated and annotated by Roy Harris, London: Duckworth.
- Schulenburg, Sigrid von der 1973. *Leibniz als Sprachforscher*, (published posthumously by Kurt Müller), Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.
- Schück, Henrik. 1932. *Kgl. Vitterhets historie och antikvitets Akademien. Dess förhistoria och historia, 1: Antikvitetsstudiets början*, Stockholm: Wahlström och Widstrand.
- Schück, Henrik. 1933. *Kgl. Vitterhets, Historie och Antikvitets Akademien. Dess förhistoria och historia, 2: Antikvitetskollegiet*, Stockholm: Wahlström och Widstrand.
- Schück, Henrik and Karl Warburg. 1985 (1st ed. 1927), *Illustrerad svensk litteraturhistoria, 2: Reformationstiden och stormaktstiden*, Stockholm: Gidlund.
- Simone, Raffaele. 1998. "The early modern period" in Giulio Lepschy (ed.), *History of linguistics: volume III: Renaissance and early modern linguistics*, London and New York: Longman, pp. 149–236.
- Stipa, Günter Johannes. 1974. "Sprachverwandtschaftsprobleme zur Zeit von Comenius und Stiernhielm," *Acta linguistica academiae scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. XXIV, Budapest, pp. 351–358.
- Stähle, Carl Ivar. 1951. "Språkteori och ordval i Stiernhielms författarskap," *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, vol. 66, pp. 52–94.

- Ståhle, Carl Ivar. 1975. *Vers och språk i Vasatidens och stormaktstidens svenska diktning*, Stockholm: Norstedt.
- SAOB = *Svenska Akademiens ordbok* (originally *Ordbok öfver svenska språket*), A–Åväxt, 1893–2022, Stockholm: Svenska Akademien.
- SAOL = *Svenska Akademiens ordlista*, 1st ed. 1873 and 14th ed. 2015.
- Sverdrup, Jakob. 1920. “Av sprogvidenskabens historie. Ihre – Rask – Grimm”, *Nordisk tidskrift för vetenskap, konst och industri* utgiven av Letterstedtska föreningen, Stockholm, pp. 459–477.
- Swahn, Sigbrit. 1974. *Ryktets förvandlingar. Stiernhielm, Lucidor och Runius bedömda av 1700-talet – en studie i den litterära kritikens utveckling i Sverige*, Lund: Gleerup.
- Swartling, Birger. 1909. *Georg Stiernhielm. Hans lif och verksamhet*, (Uppsala universitets årsskrift. Filosofi, språkvetenskap och historiska vetenskaper, 4), Uppsala: Akademiska bokhandeln.
- Swiggers, Pierre. 1984 “Adrianus Schrieckius: De la langue des Scythes a l’Europe linguistique,” in *Histoire Epistemologie Langue*, vol. 6, issue 2, pp. 17–34.
- Swiggers, Pierre. 2003. ”History of linguistics: an overview” in W.J. Frawley (ed.), *International encyclopedia of linguistics*, 2nd ed., vol. 2, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 180–183.
- Swiggers, Pierre. 2010. “History and the historiography of linguistics: Status, standards and standing” in *EUTOMIA: Revista online de litteratura et linguistica*, III:2.
- Swiggers, Pierre. 2012 “Linguistic historiography: object, methodology, modelization”, *Todas as letras: revista de linga et literatura*, vol. 14, nr. 1, pp. 38–53.
- Tamm, Fredrik August. 1890–1905. *Etymologisk svensk ordbok* (unfinished dictionary, A–Karsk), Uppsala: Akademiska boktryckeriet, Edv. Berling
- Tavoni, Mirko. 1998. “Renaissance linguistics” in Guilio Lepschy (ed.), *History of linguistics*, vol. III: *Renaissance and early modern linguistics*, pp. 1–108, London and New York: Longman.
- Teleman, Ulf. 2002. *Ära, rikedom och reda: svensk språkvård och språkpåolitik under äldre nyare tid*, København: Norstedts Ordbok.
- Thimon, Gösta. 1982. *Stockholms nations studenter i Uppsala 1649–1800. Vinculum Stockholmense*, part 1, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Villani, Francesco Paolo. 2003. “Scythae: Un problema linguistico, etnografico e culturale dell’età moderna”, *Linguistica* 1: 443–491.
- Walde, Otto. 1945. “Om Georg Stiernhielms bibliotek: några anteckningar” in *Donum Grapeanum: festskrift tillägnad överbibliotekarien Anders Grape på sextiofemårsdagen den 7 mars 1945 [...]*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, pp. 107–141.
- Warmington, Eric Herbert. 1957–1967 (1st ed. 1935–1940), *Remains of Old Latin*, in four volumes, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Waterman, John. 1963. “The Languages of the World: A classification by G. W. Leibniz” in *Studies in Germanic languages and literature in memory of Fred. O. Nolte: a collection of essays written by his*

- colleagues and former students, edited by Erich Hofacker & Liselotte Dieckmann, St. Louis: Washington University Press, pp. 27–34.
- Waterman, John T. 1978. *Leibniz and Ludolf on things linguistic: excerpts from their correspondence (1688–1703) translated and edited with commentary and notes*, Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Wessén, Elias. 1961. *Våra ord: deras uttal och ursprung: kortfattad etymologisk ordbok*, 2nd ed. (1st ed. in co-operation with Lars Levander 1932), Stockholm: Norstedt.
- Weis, Volkhard. 2009. *Der Begriff der Dichtung in der frühen Neuzeit*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Widenberg, Johanna. 2006. *Fäderneslandets antiqviteter: etnoterritoriella historiebruk och integrationssträvanden i den svenska statsmaktens antikvariska verksamhet 1600–1720* (Studia Historia Upsaliensia 225), Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Widmalm, Sven. 1991. “Tyrann eller kung of Guds nåde?” in Gunnar Broberg (ed), *Gyllene äpplen: svensk idéhistorisk läsebok*, Stockholm: Atlantis, pp. 210–218.
- Wieselgren, Harald. 1884–85. “Leibniz bref till Sparvenfelt”, *Antiquarisk tidskrift för Sverige* VII:3, pp. 1–64.
- Wieselgren, Per. 1937–48. and idem, 1957. *Samlade skrifter av Georg Stiernhielm. Tredje delen: brev och inlagor. Första bandet and Andra bandet* (Svenska författare utgivna av Svenska Vitterhetsamfundet, vol. VIII), Stockholm: Bonniers.
- Wieselgren, Per. 1962. “Germanismer hos Stiernhielm”, *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, vol. 77, pp. 198–213.
- Wieselgren, Per (ed.). 1968. *Brev till Georg Stiernhielm, utgivna och kommenterade [...]*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Wifstrand Schiebe, Marianne. 1992. *Annius von Viterbo und die schwedische Historiographie des 16. und 17 Jahrhunderts*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Wrangel, Evert. 1888. *Det Carolinska tidehvarfvets komiska diktning*, Lund: Gleerup.

Indices

Index I: Names

- Aarsleff, Hans Christian (1925–), Danish linguist 389, 396, 462
- Adam of Bremen (dead before 1095), German medieval chronicler 16, 173
- Adelung, Johann Christoph (1732–1806), German grammarian, lexicographer librarian (Dresden) 42, 399
- Agathias Scholasticus (c. AD 532–580), historian and poet in Constantinople 308
- Agrell, Jan (1918–2005), Swedish scholar, pedagogue, psychologist 14, 16, 57–59, 462
- Aeschylus (c. 525–456), Greek dramatist 171
- Alcaeus (7th century BC), Greek lyric poet 423
- Alexandrov, Pavel (1808–1857), a cavalry general, son of Grand Duke Constantin Pavlovich and grandson of Tsar Paul I of Russia 85, 86
- al-Makin, Jirjis ibn al-'Amid (1205–1273), Coptic Christian historian 307
- Älf, Samuel (1727–1799), Swedish scholar, poet, clergyman 423 f.
- Alsted, Johann Heinrich (1588–1638), German encyclopaedist, philosopher and theologian 201, 259, 262, 450
- Annerstedt, Claes (1839–1927), Swedish historian and librarian 36, 408, 462
- Annius of Viterbo (Giovanni Nanni), (1432–1502), Italian historian 145, 146, 154, 157, 158, 169, 191, 196, 202, 203, 289, 450, 473
- Apuleius (fl. in the 2nd cent. AD), Roman writer, orator and philosopher 304
- Aristarchus of Samothrace (c. 220–145 BC), Greek critic and grammarian 96
- Aristotle of Stagira (384–322 BC), Greek philosopher 64, 126, 192, 259, 260, 262, 277, 425
- Arckenholtz, Johan (1695–1777), Swedish official and historian 10, 377, 379, 380, 421, 451
- Atterbom, Per Daniel Amadeus (1790–1855), Swedish literary critic, author, professor of aesthetics (Uppsala) 10, 14, 377, 432, 436–437, 444, 462
- Augustine, Aurelius (354–430), Bishop of Hippo, theologian and philosopher with a decisive impact on Western theological and philosophical thought 61, 92, 260, 265, 271, 277, 278, 311, 333, 334, 464
- Axehielm, Johan (1608–1692), Swedish antiquarian 25
- Bacon, Francis (1561–1626), English philosopher, statesman and a pioneer of empiricism 259, 260, 262, 451, 467

- Baazius, Johannes (1583–1649), Swedish clergyman, church politician, bishop of Växjö 145
- Becanus, Johannes Goropius (1519–1573), Dutch physician, humanist and philologist 15, 34, 41–44, 49, 65, 116, 130, 166, 251, 294, 321, 322, 347, 385, 386, 398, 454, 463
- Becman, Christian (1580–1648), German theologian and Latin philologist (headmaster in Naumburg, superintendent of Zerbst) 343
- Bede, the Venerable (672–735, Anglo-Saxon scholar, church historian 155, 346, 347, 352
- Benzelius Eric the Younger (1675–1743), Swedish scholar, polyhistor, chief librarian at Uppsala University, Bishop of Gothenburg and Linköping 13, 58, 215, 380, 395
- Benzelstierna, Gustaf (1687–1746), Swedish state official, royal librarian and *censor librorum* 215, 379
- Berch, Carl Reinhold (1706–1777), Swedish official, antiquarian, numismatist 343, 345
- Berig, legendary king of the Goths, led a migration from Scandinavia 23, 24
- Bibliander, Theodore (1504–1564), Swiss Reformed theologian, Hebraist and classical philologist 54, 58, 59, 61, 199, 229, 265, 341, 348, 399, 417, 451, 469
- Biondo, Flavio (1392–1463), Italian historian and humanist of the Latin Renaissance 37
- Blankaart, Nicolas (1625–1703), Dutch classical scholar, historian, cartographer, physician 42
- Blondel, David (1590–1655) French Protestant theologian, church historian, professor of history in Amsterdam (1650–1655) 9, 172, 177, 193–195, 220, 237, 276, 312, 315, 316, 379
- Blume, Herbert (1938–2021), German linguist, Germanist, expert on the language and literature of the Baroque in northern Europe 14, 462
- Bochart, Samuel (1599–21667), French Orientalist, Protestant biblical scholar, vicar in Caen 49, 172, 175, 177, 180, 190, 190, 203, 207, 231, 233, 235–237, 243 f., 270–276, 283, 284, 307–309, 313, 435, 446, 451
- Bodin, Jean (1530–1596), French historian, jurist and political philosopher 54, 266, 451
- Bohours, Dominique (1628–1702), French literary critic and Jesuit 380
- Boileau-Despréaux, commonly known as Boileau, Nicolas (1636–1711), French poet, critic, aesthetician, advocate of classicism 421
- Bonamy, Pierre-Nicolas (1694–1770), French historian, treated the sociolinguistic history of Latin 37
- Bondestam, Torgny (1914–2009) city archivist in Borås 72, 360
- Boxhorn, Marcus Zuerius (1612–1653), Dutch historian, poet, professor of eloquence and history (Leiden) 23, 35, 38, 40, 42, 43, 47–51, 65, 75, 83, 172, 177, 313, 340, 341, 346, 347, 349, 351–353, 390, 419, 420, 451, 452, 539
- Bredsdorff, Jakob Hornemann (1790–1841), Danish linguist and scientist 58

- Brotze, Johann Christoph (1742–1823), German ethnographer, (Riga) 2, 449, 544
- Brough, Sonia (1953–), British scholar, translator 30, 31, 463
- Bruni, Leonardo (1374–1444), Italian humanist, historian, Chancellor of Florence 37
- Buchner, August (1591–1661), German philologist and literary critic 48
- Bureus, ennobled Bure, Andreas (1571–1646), Swedish cartographer 348
- Bureus, Johannes (1568–1652), Swedish antiquarian, linguist, mystic, scientist 15, 16, 19, 23, 25, 26, 71–73, 167, 208, 345, 347, 350, 351, 366, 431, 452, 468
- Bureus, Laurentius (1623–1665), antiquarian 382, 383, 449
- Burke, Peter (1938–), British historian 28, 29, 462, 463
- Buxtorf, Johannes (1599–1664), Swiss Hebraist 174, 175, 333, 342
- Caesar, Gaius Iulius (100–44 BC), Roman statesman, philosopher, rhetorician 152, 153, 157, 228, 254, 266, 267, 301, 315
- Cadmus (c. 2000 BC), legendary Boeotian Thebe and introduced the alphabet in Greek 152, 158, 179, 223, 254, 301
- Camden, William (1551–1623), English antiquarian 350
- Casaubon, Isaac (1559–1614), French classical scholar and theologian 177, 414
- Casaubon, Meric (1599–1671), Dutch-English classical philologist 110, 176, 177, 218, 251, 291–294, 340, 341, 349, 398, 407, 412, 414, 452, 540
- Cats, Jacob (1577–1660), Dutch poet, jurist, politician 436
- Cawdry, Robert (1538–after 1604), English clergyman 343
- Celsius, Olof the Elder (1670–1756), Swedish botanist, philologist and clergyman, mentor of Carolus Linnaeus 42, 452
- Celsius the Younger, Olof (1716–1794), Swedish historian, clergyman and politician 13, 450, 452
- Chanut, Pierre Hector (1601–1662), French state official and diplomat 383, 384, 449
- Charles X Gustav (1622–1660), King of Sweden 22, 330, 383
- Charles XI (1655–1697), King of Sweden 216, 330, 341, 360, 397, 437
- Christina (1626–1689), Queen of Sweden 22, 36, 48, 79, 83, 91, 94, 330, 421, 422, 429, 431, 435, 437, 451, 469
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius (106–43 BC), Roman philosopher, rhetorician and statesman 109, 153, 174, 179, 182, 214, 267, 304, 358, 361, 362, 367
- Cittadini, Celso (1553–1627), Italian grammarian and philologist 38
- Clüver (Cluverius), Philipp (1580–1622), German geographer, born in Danzig, active in Leiden, founder of historical geography 24, 142, 144, 148–155, 157, 159, 161, 162, 165–170, 179, 188, 189,, 202, 204, 205, 250, 293, 338, 393, 398, 406, 433, 447, 452
- Columbus, Samuel (1640–1679), Swedish grammarian, poet and linguistic theorist 77, 79, 84, 384, 385, 403, 425, 445, 452

- Comenius (Komenský), Jan Amos (1572–1670), Czech religious leader (bishop of the Unity of Brethren) and a post-Ramist educational reformer, who supported pansophism and ecumenism 261, 393, 396, 472
- Considine, John (1966–), British historian of linguistic ideas, especially of early modern lexicography 16, 19, 20, 21, 46, 75, 402, 405, 463, 466
- Cramer, Johann Friedrich (1664–1715), German statesman (in Berlin, Halle, and Amsterdam) and jurist 380, 421, 452
- Creutz, Gustaf Philip (1731–1785), Count, poet, royal counsellor, diplomat, Chancellor of the central government (kanslipresident) 421–423, 453
- Crinesius, Christoph (1584–1629), German Orientalist (active in Wittenberg and Altdorf) 345
- Cruciger, Georg (1575–1637), German Reformed theologian and philosopher 349, 353
- Dal, Nils Hufwedsson (1690–1740), Swedish antiquarian, publisher, historian 13, 378
- Dalin, Olof von (1708–1763), Swedish historian and poet 310, 421, 436, 444, 453
- Dante, Alighieri (1265–1321), Italian poet and philosopher 37, 282, 453
- De la Gardie, Magnus Gabriel (1622–1682), Count, state official, Chancellor of the Realm 206, 217, 220, 299, 468, 530
- Demosthenes (384–322 BC), Greek orator (Athenian) 174, 179, 182, 192
- Diekmann, Johann (1647–1720), German theologian, philologist and pedagogue, superintendent of Bremen 386–387, 417, 453
- Diogenes Laertius (*floruit* in the 3rd century AD), a biographer of Greek philosophers 157
- Diodorus of Sicily (Siculus), (90–30 BC), Greek historian 148, 156, 169–171, 179, 206, 327
- Droixhe, Daniel (1946–), Belgian linguist, historian of linguistic ideas 16, 38, 463
- Eccard (von Eckhart), Johann Georg (1674–1730), German etymologist, historian and librarian 83, 177, 395–397
- Elichmann, Johann (1600–1639) Dutch physician, Orientalist, expert on Persian 42, 47, 250, 292, 453, 466
- Ehrenstrahl, David Klöcker (1628–1698), German-Swedish painter (born in Hamburg) 530
- Erpenius, Thomas (1584–1624), Dutch Arabist and Orientalist 174, 307, 453
- Eustathius of Thessalonica (1115–c. 1195), Byzantine Greek scholar, Archbishop 142, 144, 145, 207, 237, 277
- Faithfull, Robert Glynn (1912–1998), British philologist, intelligence officer in World War II, lecturer of Italian at Liverpool University 64, 465
- Festus, Sextus Pompeius (2nd cent. AD), Roman grammarian 325
- Forss, Charlotta (1986–), Swedish historian (Stockholm) 6, 408
- Franzén, Frans Michael (1772–1847), historian, literary critic, poet, hymn writer, bishop of Härnösand 10, 377, 421–423, 453
- Fronto, Marcus Cornelius (AD 95–166), Roman orator 304
- Gagnerus, Samuel (1731–1791), Swedish archivist, linguist and

- literary critic 10, 377, 378, 423–430, 448, 453
- Gatterer, Johann Christoph (1727–1799), German historian 41, 53, 453, 454
- Geijer, Erik Gustaf (1783–1847) Swedish historian, political theorist, poet and composer 10, 377, 438–444, 454
- Gellius, Aulus (fl. in the mid-2nd cent. AD), Roman author (miscellanist) 304, 309, 529
- Gensini, Stefano (1953–) Italian linguist, historian of linguistic ideas, particularly language philosophy 27, 33, 34, 394, 396, 398, 465
- Gesner, Conrad (1516–1665), Swiss linguist and botanist 58, 61, 145, 207, 218, 220, 233, 252, 267, 272, 296, 300, 303, 304, 341, 345, 353, 454, 468
- Gezelius, Johannes, the Elder (1615–1690), Swedish theologian (Dorpat) and bishop of Åbo 381, 382, 454
- Grimm, Jacob (1785–1863), German linguist and literary scholar 16, 57, 58, 428, 454
- Grotius, Hugo (1583–1645), Dutch historian, jurist and Bible commentator 9, 35, 42, 328, 332, 333, 395, 398, 454
- Guichard, Étienne (*floruit* 1606), French Hebraist (prof. of the holy languages in Paris) 342
- Gustav Vasa (1496–1560), King of Sweden 348, 415, 422
- Gustavus II Adolphus (1594–1632), King of Sweden 22–25, 431, 438
- Gyármathi, Samuel (1751–1830), Hungarian linguist, founder of the Finno-Ugric linguistics 18
- Gyldenstøp, Michael Olai Wexonius (1609–1670), Swedish jurist (Åbo) 145
- von Gyllenschmidt, Carl Otto (1739–1784), lieutenant, engineer, mathematician 544
- Haapamäki, Saara (1968–), Finnish linguist, professor of Swedish (Åbo Academy) 62, 465
- Hadorph, Johan (1630–1693), Swedish antiquarian 24, 26, 168, 433
- Hagberg, Carl August (1810–1864), Swedish linguist and translator, especially of Shakespeare's dramas 68, 259, 304, 305, 378, 439, 449
- Van Hal, Toon (1981–), Belgian linguist, historian of linguistic ideas 41–44, 45, 47, 51, 61, 463, 465, 466, 469
- Hammaršköld, Lorenzo (1785–1827), Swedish author, literary critic 10, 360, 377–379, 428, 432–436, 442, 454
- Hanselli, Per (1815–1879), Swedish printer and publisher 14, 299, 360, 403, 436, 466
- Harsdörffer, Georg Philipp (1607–1658), German jurist and poet of the Baroque period 48, 362
- Heinsius, Daniel (1580–1955), Dutch classical scholar, professor of political science (Leiden), author of Latin and Dutch poetry 45, 436, 459
- Helander, Hans (1942–), Swedish Latinist (professor) 5, 6, 66, 143, 146, 150, 154–156, 162, 165, 260, 267, 290, 466
- Hellquist, Elof (1863–1933), Swedish linguist, etymologist 74, 276, 311, 327, 370, 467
- Helwig (Helvigius, Helvicus), Andreas (1572–1643), German classical philologist, professor of poetry (Rostock) 200–202, 251, 294, 342, 349, 406, 455

- Hesiod (*floruit* c. 700 BC), Greek poet 171
- Herodotus of Halicarnassus (5th cent. BC), Greek historian 41, 52, 136, 146, 150, 154, 158, 159, 165, 166, 168, 171, 204, 205, 298, 301, 324
- Hessus, Helius Eobanus, (1488–1540), German humanist poet, 306, 453, 465
- Homer (8th century BC), Greek epic poet 53, 171, 192
- Hoof, Peter Corneliszoon (1581–1647), Dutch poet, playwright, historian 436
- Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus, 65–8 BC), Roman lyric poet 287, 367
- Horn(ius), Georg (1620–1670), German historian, geographer, professor at Dutch universities (Harderwijk and Leiden) 9, 35, 49–51, 326, 327, 455, 539
- Huet, Pierre Daniel (1630–1721) French classical scholar, bishop of Avranches 386, 398, 453
- Hutter, Elias (1553–1605), German Hebraist, professor of Hebrew (Leipzig) 346
- Ihre, Johan (1707–1780), Swedish scholar, *professor Skytteanus*, etymologist, dialectologist 5, 10, 40–42, 58, 71, 135, 307, 310, 418–420, 424, 427, 428, 430, 450, 453, 455, 465, 467, 470, 472
- Jäger, Andreas (c. 1658–1730), Swedish clergyman and philologist 9, 19, 21, 379, 398–407, 456, 463, 469
- Jerome (Hieronymus), (c. 342–420), Bible translator and commentator 225, 263, 264, 305, 307
- Johannes Magnus (1488–1544) Swedish historian and theologian 24, 144, 146, 150, 151, 154, 156, 157, 163, 165, 167, 169, 289, 433, 457, 467
- Johannesson, Kurt (1935–2020), Swedish rhetorician, professor (Uppsala), cultural and literary historian 31, 146, 150, 154, 156, 165, 467
- Jones, Sir William (1746–1794), English philologist, Orientalist and jurist, judge of the high court of Calcutta 53, 399f., 455
- Jónsson, Arngrímur (1568–1648), Icelandic scholar, clergyman, historian and philologist 345
- Jónsson, Runólfur (1619–1654), Icelandic linguist, headmaster in Hólar (Iceland) and Kristianstad (Scania) 346, 349
- Jordanes (*floruit* in the 6th cent.), according to earlier practice written Jornandes, Byzantine official and historian, held to be of Gothic descent 24, 150, 153, 155, 161, 164–167, 222, 255, 259, 302, 395, 433
- Josephus, Flavius (37–100 AD), Jewish historian 40, 61, 169, 170, 231, 250, 270, 284, 291
- Junius, Franciscus the Elder (1545–1602), a Reformed theologian and philologist, (Heidelberg and Leiden) 333, 334, 455
- Junius (de Jon), Franciscus the Younger, Dutch clergyman and scholar, pioneer of Germanic philology 29, 58, 75, 81, 83, 116, 164, 205, 218, 251, 294, 295, 340, 349, 407, 455
- Junius (de Jonghe), Hadrianus, (1511–1575), Dutch polymath, physician classical scholar, antiquarian, Latin poet 155, 165, 339, 455, 469

- Juvenal (Decimus Junius Iuvenalis), (AD 60–130), Roman critic and satirist 367
- Karlfeldt, Erik Axel (1894–1931), Swedish poet and author 444, 469
- Kellgren, Johan Henric (1751–1795), Swedish literary critic 436, 437
- Kepler, Johannes (1571–1630), German astronomer 62, 360 f.
- Kilianus (Kiliaan), Cornelius (c. 1529–1607), Dutch lexicographer 44, 339, 343
- Kircher, Athanasius (1601/ 1602–1680), German polymath, scientist, mathematician, Egyptologist 236, 275, 342, 346, 353, 455, 456
- Kirchmaier, Georg Caspar (1635–1700), German polymath, professor of eloquence at the university of Wittenberg 9, 398–407, 417, 456, 463
- von Korff, Johann Albrecht (1697–1766), Russian Baron, diplomat in Sweden and Denmark 86
- La Peyrère, Isaac (1596–1676), French theologian 263, 413, 456
- de Laet, Jean (*floruit* 1625), Dutch geographer 195, 347
- Lagerlöf, Petrus (1648–1699) Swedish scholar, professor of logic, poetry and eloquence (Uppsala), royal historian (*historiographus regni*) 9, 61, 366, 401, 407–410, 450, 456
- Law, Vivien (1954–2002), Canadian-British linguist, historian of linguistic ideas, particularly late ancient and medieval grammar 17–19, 29, 38, 468
- Lazius, Wolfgang (1514–1565), Austrian humanist, historian, cartographer, physician 154–157, 161, 164, 338, 338, 446, 456
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm (1646–1716), German polymath, mathematician, philosopher, diplomat, linguist 6, 9, 41, 42, 45, 53, 105, 379, 388–398, 449, 456, 457, 462, 465, 466, 471, 473
- Lénström, Carl Julius (1811–1894), Swedish clergyman and literary historian 14, 378, 436, 444
- af Leopold, Carl Gustaf (1756–1829), Swedish poet, author, and librarian 436, 437
- Lindenbrog, Friedrich (1573–1648), German jurist, editor of Germanic law codes 346, 352
- Lindroth, Hjalmar (1878–1947), Swedish linguist, professor of Swedish 208, 468
- Lindroth, Sten (1914–1980), Swedish professor (Uppsala), historian of learning and ideas 14, 15, 72, 208, 468
- Lipsius, Justus (1547–1606), Flemish humanist, classical philologist, philosopher, founder of Neostoicism 42, 44, 132, 141, 174, 223, 224, 260, 347, 348, 457, 463
- Loccenius, Johannes (1598–1677), German historian, jurist, classical philologist, *professor Skytteanus* (Uppsala) and royal librarian 146, 168, 351, 381
- Lovisa Ulrika (1720–1782), Queen of Sweden 421
- Lucidor, Lasse (1638–1674) Swedish lyric poet 380
- Ludolf, Hiob (1624–1704), German Orientalist, expert on Ethiopic (*Ge'ez*), corresponded with Leibniz 389, 390, 392, 457, 473

- Luther, Martin (1583–1546),
German Reformer, professor of
biblical interpretation in
Wittenberg 62, 306, 351
- Lye, Edward (1694–1767), British
Germanist, expert on Old
English and Gothic 58
- Maaler, also Mahler, Latinized
Pictorius, Josua (1529–1599),
Swiss lexicographer 343
- Maczynski, Jan (c. 1520–1587),
Polish Protestant humanist,
lexicographer of Polish 343
- de Malherbe, François (1555–
1628), French classicist poet
421
- von Mallinckrodt, Bernhard
(1591–1664), book collector
and dean in Münster 48, 351
- Mancelius, Georg (1593–1654),
Baltic-German theologian,
lexicographer of Latvian 343
- Marrot, Clement (1496–1544),
French Renaissance poet 436
- Martini, Matthias (1572–1630),
German classicist, theologian,
philosopher (Bremen) 97, 135,
143, 158, 161, 342, 353, 457
- McKendry, Eugene (c. 1958–),
Irish linguist 21, 468
- Megalinus, Johannes (born c.
1630, fl. 1656), Swedish
mathematician, tutor of
Stiernhielm's sons Georg Otto
and Gustaf 447, 458
- Megiser, Hieronymus (1554–
1619), German historian and
linguist 341, 343, 353
- Melkas, Eeva, Finnish linguist of
Scandinavian languages 69–
71, 415, 469
- Ménage, Gilles (1613–1694),
French scholar, lawyer and
lexicographer 345
- Merula, Paulus (1558–1607)
Dutch historian, jurist,
geographer, librarian 344
- Messenius, Johannes (1580–1636)
Swedish historian 145
- Metcalf, George J. (1908–1994)
American Germanist, historian
of early-modern linguistic
ideas 16, 19, 34, 38, 40, 44, 61,
398–400, 402, 407, 468, 469
- Minsheu, John (1560–1627),
English philologist, polyglot
lexicographer 348
- Molino, Giovanni (*floruit* 1641),
Italian Turkish scholar,
dragoman 343, 353, 457
- Moller(us), Arvid (1674–1757),
Swedish jurist, professor of
jurisprudence (Tartu and Lund)
86, 117, 120, 186, 203, 450
- Moller, Johann (1661–1725)
Danish literary historian 388,
417, 458
- Molnar, Albert Szenci (1574–
1639), Hungarian scholar,
lexicographer 253, 298, 343,
458
- Morhof, Georg Daniel (1639–
1690), German polyhistor 9,
177, 387, 388, 409, 417
- Muller, Jean-Claude (1956–),
Luxembourgian linguist and
cultural scientist 16, 38, 469
- Muzio, Girolamo (1496–1576),
Italian courtier, poet and
vernacular humanist 64
- Mylus (van der Myl), Abraham
(1563–1637), Dutch theologian
and philologist 9, 34, 42, 44,
45, 109, 110, 116, 250, 251,
293, 294, 321, 322, 458, 466,
468
- Neumann, Caspar (1648–1715),
German clergyman in Breslau,
statistician, and Hebraist 394
- Newton, Isaac (1642–1727),
English scientist, mathemat-
ician and theologian 62
- Nicot, Jean (1530–1604), French
lexicographer 345

- Norberg, Matthias (1747–1826), Swedish Orientalist and Hellenist 16
- Nordin, Carl Gustaf (1749–1812), Swedish historian, linguist, politician and bishop 10, 14, 377, 428, 430–432, 436, 458
- Nordrup (Aquilonius), Bertel Knudsen (1588–1650), Danish classical scholar, poet, theologian, rural dean of Löderup (Scania) 349
- Nordström, Johan (1891–1967), Swedish professor (Uppsala), historian of learning and ideas 259–262, 312, 388, 469
- Ohlön, Rolf (1929–2018), Swedish scientist of metrical systems 71, 360, 470
- Ohlsson, Stig Örjan (1939–2012), Swedish linguist, professor of Swedish (Tartu) 360, 367, 377, 461, 470
- Olsson, Bernt (1929–2013), Swedish scholar and literary historian 14, 360, 366, 367, 415, 462, 470, 471
- Opitz, Martin (1597–1639), German poet, theorist of a classicizing art of German poetry 14, 436
- Ortelius, Abraham (1527–1598), Flemish cartographer 146, 149, 155, 458
- Östlund, Krister (1960–), Swedish latinist and librarian 306, 427, 465, 470
- Otfrid of Weissenburg (c. 800–after 870) monk, author of a rhyming gospel harmony in Old High German 94, 119, 214, 228, 266, 318, 344, 365
- Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso), (43 BC–AD 17), Roman poet 222, 253, 259, 265, 296, 297, 301, 306, 367
- Oxenstierna, Axel (1583–1654), Swedish Count, statesman, Chancellor of the Realm 25, 141, 168, 366, 401, 437
- Pagninus, Santes (1470–1536), Italian biblical scholar, Hebraist 270, 271, 307
- Padt-Brugge, Dionysius, Dutch engraver 530
- Paulinus Gothus, Laurentius (1565–1646), Swedish theologian, astronomer, Bishop of Strängnäs, Archbishop 145
- de Peiresc (Peirescius) Nicolas-Claude Fabri (1580–1637), French Renaissance polymath, astronomer, archaeologist 328
- Petraeus, Aeschillus Olai (1593–1657), Finnish linguist 346
- Pfeiffer, August (1640–1698), German Lutheran theologian and Orientalist 42
- Philastrius of Brescia (fl. 383 AD), bishop of Brescia 398
- Pindar (born c. 518 BC), Greek lyric poet 158, 171
- Plautus, Titus Maccius (c. 254–184 BC), Roman playwright 307, 308
- Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus), (23–79 AD), Roman soldier, official, encyclopaedist, naturalist and natural philosopher 53, 147, 152, 155, 171, 270, 318, 327
- Pomponius Mela (*fl.* AD 44) Roman geographer 144, 156, 171
- Pontanus, Johannes Isac (1571–1639), Dutch historian, 150, 153–155, 164–166, 339, 345, 350, 458
- Poser, William J. (1956–) Canadian-American linguist 399, 463
- Possieth, Johan (1667–1727), Swedish court preacher and

- hymn writer, finally vicar of Riddarholmen 13, 462
- Ptolemy, Claudius (*floruit* AD 146–170), Greek astronomer and geographer in Alexandria 147, 165, 166, 171
- Pufendorf, Samuel (1632–1694), German historian and political theorist, Swedish Baron 145
- Quintilian, Marcus Fabius (35–100 AD), Roman educator and rhetorician 56, 219, 247, 248, 287, 288
- Ralph, Bo (1945–), Swedish linguist, member of the Swedish Academy 73, 74, 470
- Ramus (de la Ramée), Petrus (Pierre), (1615–1572), French philosopher, logician and rhetorician 262, 458
- Raphelengius (van Ravelingen), Franciscus (Frans) (1529–1597), Flemish scholar, printer and publisher 41, 44, 455, 461
- Rask, Rasmus Kristian (1787–1832), Danish comparative philologist 58, 472
- Ravius, Christian (1613–1677), German Orientalist, active in the Netherlands, England, Sweden and Germany 9, 21, 23, 36, 37, 39, 64, 279, 280, 329, 387, 458, 459, 464, 470
- Rivet(us), André (1572–1651), French Protestant theologian 191, 229, 230, 233, 268, 269, 271, 321, 459
- Rhzelius, Johannes Haquini (1601–1666), Swedish archaeologist, antiquarian 26
- Rivola, Francisco (*floruit* 1633), Italian scholar, lexicographer of Armenian 343
- Robins, Robert (1921–2000), British linguist, historian of linguistic ideas 27, 33, 53, 400, 470, 471
- Rocher, Rosane (1937–), American historian of indology 40, 471
- Rolle, Renate (1941–), German historian 39, 470, 471
- de Ronsard, Pierre (1524–1584), French Renaissance poet 436
- Van Rooy, Raf (1990–), Belgian linguist, historian of linguistic ideas 21, 64, 279, 399, 464, 469, 471
- Rosenhane, Gustaf (1619–1684), Baron, Swedish official and poet 298, 459, 466
- Rudbeck, Olof the Elder (1630–1702), Swedish scientist and historian 144, 388, 392, 395, 396, 401–403, 408–410, 416, 429, 433, 437, 469
- Rudbeckius, Johannes (1581–1646), Swedish theologian, churchman, educator 145, 348
- Runeberg, Edvard Fredrik (1721–1802), Swedish political economist 379
- Runius, Johan (1679–1713), Swedish poet 380, 472
- Rålamb, Åke (1651–1719), Baron, Swedish officer and encyclopaedist 361, 378
- Salmasius (Saumaise), Claudius (Claude) (1588–1653), French classical philologist, from 1631 active in Leiden 9, 17, 18, 21, 23, 39, 40, 42, **45–47**, 50, 51, 64, 65, 75, 133, 158, 173, 174, 178, 180, 191, 205, 218, 226, **247–252**, 264, 279, **287–292**, 295, 296, 322–326, 349, 390, 406, 407, 410, 453, 459, 464
- Salmon, Paul (1921–1997), British Germanist 28
- Sappho (7th century BC), Greek lyric poet 423
- Scaliger, Iulius Caesar (1484–1558), French classical scholar and physician 112, 114, 260

- Scaliger, Joseph Justus (1540–1609), French philologist and historian, from 1593 in Leiden 38, 44, 61, 62, 92, 93, 114, 150, 158, 174, 200, 201, 223, 224, 233, 235, 236, 260, 272, 274, 276, 347, 409, 459, 465
- Scapula, Johannes (1540–1600) Swiss Hellenist 342
- Scaurus, Quintus Terentius (*floruit* in 2nd cent. AD), Latin grammarian 57
- Schefferus, Johannes (1621–1679), German-Swedish classical scholar, *professor Skytteanus* 72, 267, 388, 391, 401, 417, 433, 458, 459
- Schindler, Valentin (1543–1604), German Orientalist 342, 513, 514
- Schilter, Johann (1632–1705), German jurist, antiquarian 58
- Schottelius, Justus Georg (1612–1676), German Baroque poet, grammarian 42, 362, 366
- Schotti, Henric (d. 1616), a correspondent of Justus Lipsius 42, 44, 132, 141
- Schrieckius (van Schrieck), Adrian Rodornus (1560–1621), Flemish state official, humanist, linguist 34, 42, 45, 49, 65, 116, 338, 341, 386, 393, 459, 472
- Schroderus, Erik Johannes (born before 1609, d. 1639), Swedish scholar, lexicographer 73, 344
- van der Schuren, Gert (1411–1496), German official in the Duchy of Cleves (Cleveland), chronicler, lexicographer 347
- Schück, Henrik (1855–1947), Swedish literary historian 14, 15, 25, 26, 177, 218, 383, 471
- Schultens, Albert (1685–1750), Dutch Orientalist 5, 9, 36, 39, 414, 449, 464
- Siccarna, Sibrandus (*floruit* 1617), Dutch jurist 352
- Simone, Raffaele (1944–), Italian linguist and lexicographer, historian of language philosophy 28, 62, 471
- Skytte, Bengt (1614–1683), Baron, state councillor, linguist and polyglot 9, 340, 341, 345, 352, 390–393, 396–398
- Skytte, Johan (1577–1645), Swedish high official, state councillor, Ramist educator 117, 145, 327, 467
- Socrates of Constantinople (c. 379–440) Greek lawyer and Church historian 222, 258
- Solinus, Gaius Iulius (*fl.* AD 200), Roman geographer 142, 144, 145, 147, 152, 153, 318, 325, 452, 459
- Sophocles (5th cent. BC), Greek playwright 171
- Sozomen (AD 5th cent.), Greek lawyer and Church historian 222, 258
- Sparwenfeldt, Johan Gabriel (1618–1698), Swedish diplomat, linguist and polyglot 21, 45, 105, 390–397, 468
- Spegel, Haquin (1645–1714), Swedish poet, lexicographer and Archbishop 10, 69, 74, 380, 405, 415–417, 460, 466
- Spelman(nus), Henry (1562–1641), English antiquarian 339
- Stahl, Heinrich (c. 1600–1657), Baltic-German clergyman, superintendent of Ingria 344
- Stephanus, Stephan Hansen (1599–1650), Danish lexicographer 351
- Stevin, Simon (1548–1620), Flemish-Dutch scientist, mathematician, engineer 370 f.

- Stiernhielm, Georg (1598–1672), *passim*, mainly on the following topics:
- a pioneer of Swedish artistic poetry 13, 378, 436
 - earlier research on his comparative linguistics 14–26;
 - historical and comparative language studies 55–72;
 - lexicography 73–81;
 - theory and practice of etymology 92–134;
 - linguistic works: *Adelruna* 139–166; *Runa Suethica* 172–214, *De linguarum origine praefatio* 47, 62–68, 81, 86, 87, 151, **215–311**, 386, 391, 393, 396, 400, 403, 404, 406–407, 413, 414, 417, 418, 460
 - views on scholars of his own time 312–330;
 - linguistic library 338–353;
 - programme for Swedish language renewal 357–374
 - reception in the Republic of Letters 381–420;
 - evaluation by Swedish biographers 421–444
- Strabo (64 BC–24 AD), Greek geographer and historian 51, 52, 64, 152, 154, 158, 161, 165, 171, 324
- Ståhle, Carl Ivar (1913–1980), Swedish linguist, professor of Scandinavian languages (Stockholm) 14, 71, 72, 76, 105, 266, 312, 352, 471, 472
- Suhm, Peter Frederik (1728–1798), Danish historian 9, 413, 414, 460
- Świącicka, Elżbieta (1950–), Swedish Turcologist 353
- Swahn, Sigbrit (1933–), Swedish literary historian and professor of French 377, 379, 380, 421–423, 436, 444, 472
- Swartling, Birger (1879–1910), Swedish literary historian, biographer of Stiernhielm 14–16, 77, 105, 111, 177, 259, 312, 383, 384, 424, 472
- Swiggers, Pierre (1955–), Belgian linguist, historian of linguistic ideas 34, 38, 472
- Symmachus, Quintus Aurelius (AD 345–402), Roman statesman, orator, writer 304
- Tacitus, Cornelius (56–120 AD), Roman historian and politician 42, 144, 148, 149, 151–153, 155, 156, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167, 189, 204, 206, 254, 255, 267, 289, 339, 301, 404, 461
- Tavoni, Mirko (1949–), Italian linguist, historian of linguistic ideas 29, 33, 34, 472
- Teleman, Ulf (1934–), Swedish linguist 23, 69, 300, 362, 377, 470, 473
- Terserus, Johannes (1605–1678), Swedish theologian, bishop of Åbo and Linköping 4, 9, 198, 330–336, 429, 435, 450, 461
- Theodoretus of Cyrrhus (AD 393–466) Greek theologian, church historian, bishop 222, 258
- Tolomei, Claudio (1492–1556), Italian grammarian and philologist 64
- Trostius, Martin (1588–1636), German Hebraist 382
- Ulfilas, early modern spelling of Wulfila 8, 18, 86, 116, 151, 205, 215, 222, 255, 458
- Ulphilas, Greco-Roman spelling of Wulfila 67, 116, 151, 152, 163, 164, 254, 258, 416, 435, 447, 448
- Ussher, James (1581–1656), English scholar, church leader, Archbishop of Armagh 62

- Varchi, Benedetto (1502–1565), Italian humanist, poet and historian 64
- Varro, Marcus Terentius (116–27 BC), Roman polymath 56, 57, 109, 174, 179, 182
- Verelius, Olof (1618–1682), Swedish antiquarian 13, 73, 392, 401, 403, 416, 433, 460
- Victorinus, Gaius Marius (*fl.* 4th cent. AD), Roman rhetorician and philosopher 57
- Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro) (70–19 BC), Roman poet 122, 124, 128, 309, 422
- von der Schulenburg, Sigrid Hedwig Helene (1885–1943), German Countess, philosopher, literary and linguistic historian 389–396, 471
- Vossius, Gerard Joannis (1577–1649), Dutch classical scholar, theologian and historian 9, 23, 58, 112, 127, 135, 189, 202, 204, 205, 235–237, 253, 267, 274, 276, 298, 312, 328, 329, 345, 349, 461
- Vossius, Isaac (1618–1689), Dutch philologist and historian 164, 231, 269
- Vulcanius, Bonaventura (1538–1614), Flemish humanist 41, 42, 46, 94, 151, 152, 163, 221, 254, 295, 300, 301, 308, 344, 460
- Wachter, Johann Georg (1663–1757), German scholar and etymologist 10, 40, 42, 58, 417, 418, 461
- Walde, Otto (1879–1963), Swedish librarian 69, 144, 341, 342, 472
- Wasmuth, Matthias (1625–1688), German Orientalist and Lutheran theologian 42
- Webb, John (1611–1672), English scholar 386, 392
- Weckherlin, Georg Rudolf (1584–1653), German poet and diplomat 436
- Widekindi, Joh. (1620–1678), Swedish historian 145
- Wifstrand Schiebe, Marianne (1948–), Swedish Classical philologist and intellectual historian 145, 289, 473
- Wieselgren, Per (1900–1989), Swedish linguist, professor (Tartu) 13, 25, 75, 139, 312, 316, 361, 363, 366, 473
- Williram (Willeram) of Ebersberg (1010–1085), Benedictine Abbot, expositor of the Song of Songs in Old High German 94, 339, 344, 349, 365
- Willich(ius), Jodocus (1486–1552), German polyhistor, physician, philologist 152, 254, 255, 301, 461
- Wollimhaus, ennobled Leijonstedt, Andreas (1649–1725), Swedish Count, royal counsellor, diplomat, poet 401
- Wollimhaus, ennobled Gyllenborg, Jacob (1648–1701), Swedish Count, royal counsellor, district governor of Uplandia 401, 403
- Worm, Olaus (Ole) (1588–1654), Danish physician, classical scholar and antiquarian 25, 167, 218, 221, 255, 302, 310, 342, 345, 350, 351, 461
- Wotton, William (1666–1727), English classical scholar, theologian and linguist 9, 410–414, 461, 462
- Wulfila (311–383 AD), Bishop of the Goths 16, 143, 163, 164, 167 (Vulfila), 218, 219, 258, 259, 294, 300, 302, 386, 406, 412, 429, 435
- Zosimus (*floruit* 490–510), Greek historian (Constantinople) 147

Index II: Subject matters, key words, names of languages and peoples, place names, and biblical proper names

Entries on Latin words usually contain occurrences of inflected forms.

- Abraham, the patriarch 107, 174, 199, 203, 234, 235, 240, 241, 243, 246, 273, 274, 280, 281, 283, 286, 293, 332
- Adam, proper name of the first human being 20, 43, 75, 86, 106, 107, 115, 118, 140, 175, 176, 179, 182, 186, 195, 199, 203, 223, 225, 261, 263, 332–334, 385, 393, 412, 413, 429, 435
- Adam’s perfect knowledge 106–107
 - Adamic language (*Adamaea*, viz. *lingua*) 19, 43, 174, 184, 198, 225, 262, 319
 - various etymologies of 118
- accidents, *accidentia*, grammatical 37, 63, 107, 226, 279, 280, 307
- Adelruna seu Sibylla Sueo-Gothica*, a title of Stiernhielm’s etymological dictionary 76, 77, 87, 93, 131, 132, 139–141, 353, 391, 448
- Adelruna*, preface to the dictionary about the theoretical bases 141–143
- Adelrunae conclusiones*, Gothicist historical assumptions 8, 24, 60, 86, 144–169, 221, 391
- Africa, the continent 52, 153, 186, 236, 262, 276, 329, 393, 411, 412, 414; with dittography *Affrica* 65, 186, 225, 329
- African language 413
- Albanian language 61
- alphabet 25, 77, 78, 80, 218, 255, 301, 302, alphabetic 48, 73, 78, 84, 140, 296, 297, 350
- America, North 51, North and South 262, unspecified 195, 196, 327, 393
- American Indian languages 184, 185, 219, 225, 262, 393, 411–414
- American Indian people 195
- Anglo-Saxon (*Anglo-Saxonica*), that is Old English language 15, 75, 118, 129, 205, 206, 258, 291, 295, dictionary of 84, 343, Church history of Bede 347
- Anglo-Saxon laws 139, 339, 346, 352,
- Anglo-Saxon Bible translation: the Gospels 205, 457, the Psalms 345
- Anti-Bochartus* 13, 86, 435, 460
- Anti-Cluverius* 8, 13, 24, 139, 152, 168, 169, 171, 391, 403, 406, 416, 417, 433, 447, 460, 521
- antiphrasis*, a Stoic etymological device based on contrariety 92, 106, 111, 112
- antiquity, linguistic:
- a clue to ethnic origins 31
 - part and parcel of language legitimization 69
 - assertions of anteriority in favour of Dutch 110, 321, German 387, Hebrew 61, 321, 335, Scythian 34, 45, 61, 388, 403, Swedish 19, 21, 67, 75, 144, 169, 117, 416
 - of the Gothic alphabet 221,
 - of the Gothic laws 364
- antiquarianism 4, 7, 23, 24, 25, 70, 405
- Arabic language 32, 35, 36, 39, 65, 71, 80, 93, 94, 143, 209, 220, 266, 272, 274, 277–281, 292, 307, 308, 329, 347, 387, 390, 428, 459; *Arabica* 65, 93, 173, 175, 178, 179, 181, 185, 187, 189, 191, 192, 211, 234,

- 235, 237–240, 250, 428, 453, 459, *Arabice* 129, 235, 308
- Arabian people: the Arabs 272;
Arabes 201, 233, 329, *pater* [...] *et conditor gentis Arabicae* (about Jectan or Joctan, Gen. 10: 25) 234
- Aramaic language 32, 35, 39, 53, 65, 80, 94, 140, 175, 220, 273, 282, 283, 386, 387, 390;
Aramaea (with inflected forms) 132, 142, 145, 148, 149, 156, 173, 187, 234, 242. See further the misapplied term Chaldaic and *Chaldaica*.
 – ancient dialects of 242, 283
- Aramaean people 39. See further Chaldeans.
- Aramaic Scythian language, different to Aramaic as a branch of Semitic languages 43, 65; *Schythica Aramaea* 132, 187
- Aramaean Scythian people: *gentis Scythicae Aramaeae* 142 and 148, *Posteros Noae* [...] *dictos fuisse Schyrtas Aramaeos et Sagas* 142 and 144
- Aramaean Scythia: *Scythia Aramaea* 145
- Ararat, Mount 124, 142, 144, 170, 231, 250, 269, 270, 291, 308
- Araxes (Arax, Aras), River in the Caucasus mountains 109, 145, 146, 170, 308
- architectural orders:
 – Doric, Ionic and Corinthian 124, 126 f.
 – Gothic (referring to Church buildings in Italy) 124, 127
- Armenia, the region 142, 144, 145, 146, 170, 187, 190, 191, 207, 236, 270, 276, 308, 321
- Armenian language (*Armena Armenica*) 20, 21, 65, 66, 76, 83, 84, 145, 175, 180, 183, 188, 438, dictionary of 352
- Asia, the continent (in Latin including inflected forms) 18, 20, 21, 38, 40, 44, 46, 51–53, 64–66, 145, 146, 149, 153, 154, 163, 169, 186, 187, 202, 225, 250, 262, 291, 329, 390, 399, 412–414
- Asia Minor 44, 146, 315, cf. *rex Asiae Mithridates* 132
- Assyria 200, 201, 231, 234, 235, 237, 240, 242, 270, 282, 283
- Austrian language (*Austriaca*) 67, 290, 406
- Babel (*Babylon*), an ancient city in Mesopotamia 157, 201, 202, 232, 271, 315, the site of the Confusion of Languages 20, 32, 117, 191, 193, 196, 200, 211, 219, 260, 261, 263, 274, 278, 309, 316, 319, 386, 411–414, 429
- Babel, Tower of 18, 43, 52, 62, 63, 191, 270, 309, 411, 413, the building of 43, 62, 191, 271, 278, 282, *aedificatio turris* 190, 191, 202, 207, 332, 451, *aedificatio Babylonicae* 197, *aedificatio Babyloniae* 115, *exstructio Babylonicae* 194, *a destituto opere turris* 226, *structura turris* 232, 233, 238, *post molitionem turris* 232
- Babel destructa*, a title of a Stiernhielm's universal etymological dictionary 19, 75, 79, 180, 181, 391
- Babylonian Captivity (*Captivitas Babylonica*) 52, 108, 199, 223, 234, 242, 243, 245, 261, 273, 282, 283, 286, 309, 335
- Babylonian Confusion, see Confusion of Languages
- Bactrian people 151, 250, 291
- Bactria, a region in Central Asia 146, 232, 270
- Balkh river 146

- barbarian language 111 (*ex Babarorum ... lingua*), 134 (*lingua barbarica*), 142, 157
barbarian philosophy 157, 174 (*philosophia barbarica*)
barbarians 158, 169, 267, 288, 295–297; *barbari* 26, 157, 170, 165, 252, 320, 324, 327
barbarism, linguistic 57, 286, 443
Basque language (*Cantabrica*) 61, allegedly a remnant of old “Spanish” 187
Bible 20, Antwerp Polyglot Bible 41, Hebrew Bible 280, 284, Samaritan Bible 269
Bible commentary 381
Bible translations 69, 84, 348, in Aramaic 175, 276, in Finnish 83, 344, 451, in Gothic 29, 258, 414, in Icelandic 344, 348, in Latin: by Castellio 124, 270, by Pagninus 270, 307, by Tremellius & Junius 334, in Swedish 348, 415, 416
Bithynian language and people 250, 276, 291, 314
Bithynia, a region in northern Asia Minor 207
Breton language 61; *Britannica* 100, 188 (Old Breton equated with Welsh), 205, 213 (*vetus Britannica*), 347, 349, 420
Breton people (*Britanni*) 173, 178, 182, 189, 206, 250, 293
Brittonic language 48, 49, 61
Catalan language 221, 303
catena rerum, “the chain of being” 101, 102, cf. *catenatim* 95
Caucasus mountains 17, 39, 43, 44, 53, 124, 145, 169, 196, 308, 399, 469
Celtic languages (*Celtica*) 15, 17, 18, 21, 34, 40, 44, 45, 49, 65, 66, 68, 81, 96, 97, 100, 131, 134, 135, 142, 149, 156, 158, 159, 166, 179, 187–189, 205, 209, 211, 213, 225, 244, 253, 263, 284, 296–298, 321, 322, 328, 388, 390, 400, 407, 409, 410, 418, 420, 446, 455, 459
Celts (*Celtae*) 32, 142, 149, 152, 155, 157–159, 169, 170, 189, 204, 205, 221, 250–252, 253, 291, 294, 296, 390, 403, 405, 428
Chaldaea, the historical region of south-western Babylonia 231, 234, 235, 240, 270, 273, 274
Chaldean people: Chaldeans 273, 276, 280, 281; *Chaldaei* 157, 167, 201, 234, 236, 241, 309
Chaldaic (*Chaldaea*, *Chaldea*, *Chaldaica*), a misnomer for Aramaic. When juxtaposed with Syriac, often referring to Biblical Aramaic 36, 65, 129, 173, 178, 179, 181, 185, 187, 192, 235, 237, 239, 241–243, 270, 273, 274, 277–279, 280 (Caldaic), 281, 283, 284, 309, 332, 342 (Chaldaïque), 428, in the title of Ravius’ Semitic grammar of 1649 spelled Calde 36, 279, 280, 387
Chinese language 47, 327, 392
Cimbrians (*Cimbri*), the Germanic tribe 34, 43, 147, 154, 155, 205, 228, 250, 266, 291
chronology 7, 39, 44, 52, 62, 150, 157, 165, 190, 200–202, 209, 284, 309, 317, 41, 465, 470
– world chronology 52, 201
– of the Creation 52
– of the Flood 52, 62
Codex Argenteus 13, 15, 20, 23, 65, 71, 81, 83, 86, 116, 164, 198, 205, 215, 217, 218, 386, 391–393, 411, 414, 429, 468, 528–530, 532
College of Antiquities, Swedish 13, 22, 23, 215, 217, 218, 397, 401, 411

- Confusion of Languages 16, 32, 62, 63, 117, 192, 193, 196, 200, 211, 219, 220, 260, 261, 264, 269, 280, 309, 316, 317, 386, 411–413, 461; in Latin usually called *Confusio Babylonica*, in the nominative 192, 195, in the genitive 114, in the accusative as governed by the prepositions *ad* “until” 226, 309, *ante* “before” 201, *in* “in” 242, *per* “through” 223 and *post* “after” 98, 178, 202, 321, or without a preposition 192, 229; in the ablative as governed by the prepositions *a* “from” 142, 156, 211, 332, *ex* “from, out of” 173, 177, 181, 192, 193, 223, 225, 229, 241 and *in* “in” 108, 225 or without a preposition 208. Other expressions are: *Confusio linguarum in aedificatione Turris Babylonicae* 202, *Confusio linguarum Babylonica* 201, 319, *miraculosa linguarum confusione* 193, *de Babylonica linguae turbatione* 196, and *in conturbatione Babylonica* 197
- Coptic language 275
- Cornish language 416
- Cossackian language 61
- Crimea (*Taurica Chersonessus*), 45, 140, 168
- Crimean Gothic 46
- Crimean Goths 140, 168
- Crimean Tataric 61
- Czech language (*Bohemica*) 67, 136
- Danish language (*Danica*) 22, 32, 45, 67, 134, 188, 209, 213, 221, 322, 416
- Danish letters 25, 255, 302
- dialect (*dialectus*) 15, 16, 18, 21, 36, 37, 45, 46, 49, 53, 63, 65, 67, 87, 110, 114, 132, 175, 179, 180, 183, 187, 189, 209, 216, 220, 234, 239, 241, 246, 250–252, 272, 279, 281, 286, 290, 292–294, 303, 314, 317, 318, 326, 334, 363, 366, 386, 387, 392, 397, 400, 409, 459, 464, 471
- Stiernhielm’s definition of the concept of dialect 18, 63
- dialects as regional varieties or daughter-languages (*dialecti*) 17, 18, 20, 33, 37–39, 45, 47, 49–51, 53, 60, 61, 63, 65, 66, 68, 99, 108, 115, 116, 133, 136, 173, 178–187, 191, 192, 205, 206, 218, 219, 228, 234, 237–254, 267, 272, 277–291, 294, 298, 309, 310, 318, 322, 323, 328, 329, 332, 335, 343, 349, 386–389, 399, 407, 409, 410, 414, 426–429, 437, 445, 471
- Dutch language (*Belgica*) 23, 32, 34, 43–45, 47, 66, 75, 205, 213, 248, 251, 290, 293, 294, 321, 348; van der Myl’s (Mylius’) *Lingua Belgica* 34, 42, 44, 45, 109, 110, 250, 293, 315, 321, 322, 458
- Old Dutch (*Cimbrica*) 34, 43, 67, 75, 180, 183, 188, 189, 205, 213, 294
- Egyptian Captivity (of the Israelites in Egypt in the second millennium BC) 220, 283, 309
- Egyptian language (*Aegyptia* and *Aegyptiaca*) 65, 173, 178, 181, 187, 207, 235–237, 239, 243, 244, 246, 274, 275, 277–279, 283, 284, 309, 335, 346, 411, 428, 455, 456, 459
- Ancient Egyptian designated as Pharaonic, and the latest stage as Coptic 275
- Egyptian people (*Aegyptii*) 199, 235, 326, 237, 244, 245, 274, 275, 277, 284–286, 336, 346

- English language (*Anglica*) 32, 66, 97, 115, 116, 119, 132, 135, 136, 140, 187, 189, 213, 348, 405, 416, 417
- Old English 15, 67, 75, 82, 84, 141, 218, 311, 438
 - Meric Casaubon's treatise on Old English, *De lingua Saxonica* 110, 176, 205, 218, 251, 258, 291–295, 340, 341, 349, 452
- Estonian language 17, 18, 22, 82, 133, 189, 253, 298, 327
- Estonian people 146, 327
- Ethiopic language (*Aethiopica*) 32, 35, 36, 51, 65, 129, 178, 181, 187, 192, 220, 235–239, 244, 274, 275, 277–279, 280, 284, 387, 389, 428, 459
- Etruscan language (*Hetrusca, antiqua Thusca Tusca* and *Tyrha*) 100, 110, 111, 140, 145, 159, 174, 175, 179, 180, 182, 188, 205, 213, 253, 254, 297, 328;
- Etruscan letters 152, 221, 301
- Etruscan people 301
- etymology, as an art or a science 13, 15, 27, 76, 87, 105, 106, 113, 114, 117, 123, 124, 127, 160, 389, 394–396, 416, 418, 426, 433, 437
- distinction between particular and universal 55, 113
 - Stiernhielm's principles of 91–104
- the principle of analogy and decomposition 102–104
 - the Greco-Roman methods of viz. *prosthesis*, *aphaeresis*, *syncope*, *apocope*, *crasis*, *metathesis* and *antiphrasis* criticized by Stiernhielm 106, 111, 112
 - Stiernhielm's conception of etymology as a science 113, 114, 124
 - Scaliger's definition of as *etymologia est vocis ratio* "etymology is the relationship of a word", viz. to the true meaning 92 f.
- etymology, as the practice of deriving words and meanings 44, 108 (*etymologiae*), 261, 429
- of biblical proper names 43, 45, 117, 118, 336, 338, 348 of the name Adam **118**, 429
 - of the tetragrammaton (YHWH) 123, 127 f.
 - of the Gothic adjective *hails* 134–135
 - of the Swedish words *hjärta*, 'heart', 160 and *runa*, 'rune' 220, 300, 310, and of the numbers nine and ten 325
 - Stiernhielm's 69, 79, regarded as unpractical 378, rejected an invalid 382, 383, esteemed as reasonable 394 and worth reflecting on 420
- experientia*, "experience", as a source of knowledge 60, 94, 178, 181, 195, 207, 214, juxtaposed with *ratio* and *tempus* 186, with *natura* 193, with *ratio* and *historia* 227, with *historica veritas* 229, with *historia Biblica* 238, with *ratio* 224, 317, with *veritas* 319, with *historia* 418
- Europe (*Europa*) 7, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 27, 28–31, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 45, 46, 49–51, 53, 61, 62, 64–66, 75, 98, 101, 142, 149, 154–156, 169, 170, 186, 202, 225, 250, 262, 291, 307, 315, 338, 344, 363, 379, 386, 392, 399–414, 416, 417, 418, 431, 433, 446, 447, 450, 453, 456, 459, 461–469, 471, 472; *Europaei orbis* 73, 344

- European languages 16, 27, 28, 29, 40, 187, 299, 385, 393, 400, 409, 411, 413, 416, 427, Scaliger's *Diatriba de Europaeorum linguis* 38, 61, 409, 459
- Europeans (*Europaei*) 46, 423, 428, proto-Europeans 39, 42, 204
- Eve (*Eva, Heva, Hevah*) 43, 86, 118, 175, 179, 182, 332–334, 336
- Finnish grammar 346, 350
- Finnish language (*Finnonica*) 15, 17, 18, 22, 40, 59, 61, 75, 76, 82–84, 100, 145, 189, 220, 253, 298, 346 (*Finnica*), 390 (*Fennica*), 392, 397, 438
- Finnish people: Finns (*Finni, Fenni*) 22, 83, 84, 155, 196, 197, 251, 293, 298, 327, 393
- Finno-Ugric linguistic kinship 18, 220, 253, 298, 396
- Finno-Ugric philology 27, and lexicography 82
- Flemish language (*Flandrica*) 34, 66, 248, 290, 338, 386
- Flood of Noah (*diluvium*) 43, 52, 53, 62, 64, 142, 144, 145, 156, 165, 169, 170, 190, 194, 195, 199–203, 231, 238, 278, 307, 317
- Franconian language (*Francica*) 75, 116, 166, 189, 206, 228, 295, 318, 320, 339, 344, 345, 349, 352, 454 and people (*Franci*) 149, 153, 250, 291
- France, modern 32, 263, 312, 383, 384, 408, 424, 436
- French language (*Gallica*) 23, 27, 32, 51, 66, 69, 75, 98, 100, 129, 140, 166, 175, 180, 182, 187–189, 205, 220, 221, 243, 244, 246, 247, 256, 284, 286, 288, 298, 299, 303, 319, 320, 323, 343, 345, 348, 357, 362, 416, 454
- dialects of Norman, Parisian, Picard, Provençal, Toulouse (*Nortmannica, Parisiensis, Picardica, Provincialis, Tholosana*) 246, 287
- Frisian language (*Frisica*) 66, 67, 82, 134, 248, 290
- Gaul, unspecified 207, 237, Gauls (probably Cisalpine and Transalpine) 315, 318
- Gaulish language (*Gallica vetus, prisca Gallica*) 44, 49, 66, 175, 180, 182, 187, 213, 244, 284, 285, 446
- Gaulish people: Gauls (*Galli*) 149, 152, 155, 157, 170, 173, 178, 182, 206, 250, 251, 254, 255, 266, 291, 293, 294, 301, 314
- Gaelic, Scottish 61
- Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur* (1643), Stiernhielm's antiquarian dictionary of Old Swedish (c. 1225–1375) 70, 75, 77, 87, 139, 160, 357, 358, 372, 420, the preface to 357–359, in Latin variously referred to as *Antiquarius linguae Scandogothicae* 77, 139, *Antiquarius Sueo-Gothicus* 122, *Antiquarius linguae Suethicae et Gothicae* 128, *Conditorium linguae Suecicae* 397, *Inventarium linguae veteris Sueo-Gothicae* 77
- Genesis, book of 17, 29, 32, 39, 40, 41, 52, 53, 83, 191, 199, 260, 268, 271, 286, 330, 331, 334, 336, 446
- German language (*Germanica*) 40, 42, 45–51, 55, 57, 69, 82–84, 99–102, 106, 110, 112, 128, 130, 134, 135, 140, 157, 161, 177, 180, 188, 189, 205, 213, 219, 223, 225, 228, 246, 248–252, 255, 263, 266, 267, 286, 289, 290, 292, 294–296, 299, 301, 318, 325, 327, 328, 344,

- 360, 363, 365, 366, 380, 386,
387, 389, 394, 404, 409, 415–
418, 432, 451, 454, 458, 461,
464
– dialects of 228, 249, 267, 290
– Old German (*Teutonica*,
Teuthonica, *Theutonica*,
Teotisca, *vetus* or *antiqua*
Germanica) 46, 47, 100,
136, 151, 160, 161, 164,
179, 187, 214, 250, 252,
255, 293, 322, 328, 344,
397, 409, 412
– Old High German
(*Alemannica*) 14, 58, 67, 75,
116, 311, 344, 365
– Old Low German or Old
Dutch (*Teutonica*) 44, 116,
129, 135, 160, 311, 338,
339, 343, 446, 466
- German people (*Germanica gens*):
Germans (*Germani*, *Teutoni*)
22, 35, 38, 41, 48–52, 60, 82,
118, 123, 144, 148–157, 159,
161, 165–167, 170, 173, 178,
182, 188–190, 192, 204, 205,
221, 223, 228, 237, 250, 251,
254, 255, 261, 267, 276, 289,
291, 293, 295, 301, 322, 344,
395, 396, 403, 404, 418, 448,
449, 451, 452, 454, 457;
Alemanni: 140, 153, 295, 351
- Germanic languages 5, 9, 15, 17,
18, 34, 38, 45, 46, 66–68, 75,
79, 80, 116, 124, 131, 133, 209,
293, 328, 377, 385, 390, 399,
406, 415, 442, 467, 468, 470,
473
- Germany (*Germania*) 22, 24, 30,
31, 48, 142, 147, 148, 152, 153,
155, 161, 173, 174, 178, 179,
182, 183, 189, 202, 205, 206,
237, 276, 289, 294, 315, 318,
386, 390, 395, 408, 409, 436,
463, references to Ph. Clüver's
Germania antiqua 24, 148,
161, 168, 170, 204, 205, 250,
293, 338, 433, 452; Tacitus'
Germania 254 f., 289, 404, 461
- Getae*, a Thracian tribe at the
Lower Danube 24, 42, 46, 132,
140, 142, 146, 148, 150–154,
157, 159, 165–168, 173, 178,
181, 188, 189, 221, 236, 251–
254, 291, 295–297, 300, 301,
344, 391, 457, 461
- Gothia, the land of the Goths in
Scandinavia 163, 169, 433,
divided into Westrogothia and
Ostrogothia 163, 165, 169
- 'Gothic' archaism 14, 70, 72, 415
- Gothic Aramaean, a supposed
Indo-European form of Semitic
Aramaic 65
- Gothic language (*Gothica*), four
different senses of which ought
to be distinguished:
– east-Germanic 18, 20, 31, 44,
81, 83, 84, 94, 100, 116,
133, 134, 188 line 18, 189,
205, 206, 225, 344, Meso-
gothic 220, 258, 295, 404
– a term of the oldest stage of
the Germanic languages
(allegedly including Celtic
languages) 134, 188 line 2,
206 (*vetus Gothica*), 222,
250, 251, 253, 320, 322,
328 in Section 11.6, 399,
417
– a comprehensive term of
languages today classified
as Germanic 214, 293, 328
in Section 11.5, 455
– a designation of Swedish or
Scandinavian (a misnomer):
23, 65, 66, 68, 82, 93, 134,
139, 140, 142, 143, 188 line
1, 204, 381, 392, 416, 452
- Gothic philology 32, 34
- Gothic people: Goths (*Gothi*, *gens*
Gothica) 23, 24, 31, 32, 41, 71,
75, 77, 79, 86, 139, 140, 142,
144, 146–155, 157–170, 188–

- 190, 204, 218, 221–223, 244,
250, 254, 258, 259, 261, 285,
289, 291, 295, 300, 351, 395,
396, 403, 428, 433, 461, 463
- Gothicism 4, 7, 8, 14, 15, 168;
Swedish Gothicism 23 f., 30,
applied to lexicography 74;
neo-Gothicism 436
- Greece (*Graecia*) 45, 48, 51, 133,
151, 158, 161, 164, 173, 178,
207, 222, 181, 252, 254, 259,
295, 298, 301, 323–325, 390,
425, Hellas: *Hellenes* 132, 183;
Magma Graecia 328
- Greek language (*Graeca*) 15, 17,
18, 20, 31, 32, 34, 38–40, 44–
51, 57, 61, 65–67, 75, 80, 82,
83, 88, 93, 94, 98–102, 106,
109–113, 115, 124, 125, 129,
133–135, 140, 143, 146, 158,
159, 161, 173, 174, 178, 179,
182, 187–189, 192, 199, 206,
209, 211, 214, 218–220, 223,
250–253, 261, 275, 292 (Greek
dialect in the sense of Greek
language), 294–298, 321, 322,
324, 325, 328, 338, 362, 385–
388, 390, 394, 399, 400, 404,
406, 409–411, 442
– the four main dialects of
ancient Greek, specifically
Ionic, Doric, Aeolic, Attic
39, 323, generally 47
- Greek letters 151, 152, 252, 301,
302, 326
- Greek people: the ancient Greeks
(*Graeci*) 39, 40, 43, 47–50, 93,
100, 110, 116, 122, 128, 132,
133, 142, 151, 152, 157, 158,
161, 163, 165, 167, 169, 171,
174, 176, 178, 179, 182, 189,
197, 205, 237, 251–255, 276,
294–298 301, 314, 315, 323,
325, 326, 428, 434, 469,
Hellenes 45, 252, 295,
Mycenaean Greeks 165
- Ham (*Cham*), son of Noah 15, 52,
53, 65, 101, 170, 187, 191, 192,
203, 230–232, 235–238, 240,
268–272, 274, 276–278, 280
- Hamites (*Chamitae*) 65, 238, 278
- Hamito-Semitic, or Semito-
Hamitic, branch of languages
65; *lingua Semi et Chami* 191
- Hebrew grammar 37, 59, 329, 382
- Hebrew language (*Hebraea*,
Hebrea, *Hebraica*) 94, 96–101,
106, 108–113, 115, 117–120,
122, 124–129, 131, 133, 135,
140, 142, 143, 156, 157, 161,
173–182, 185, 187, 197–200,
209, 211, 218, 219, 220, 223,
225, 226, 234, 236–245, 249,
251, 261, 263, 264, 272–284,
286, 291, 294, 309, 309, 310,
314, 318, 321, 322, 332–336,
338, 349, 386–388, 392–395,
398, 406, 411, 412, 428, 429,
435, 452, 458, 459
– Hebrew regarded as one of
the three holy languages 61
– Hebrew not to be considered
the language of Jesus 241
– Hebrew supposed to be the
primeval language by some
Church Fathers, e.g. Jerome
225
– in antiquity subject to
linguistic change 199, 242
– had regional varieties like
other languages 242 f.
- Hebrew people (*Hebraei*) 39, 43,
95, 96, 100, 108, 127, 156, 157,
175, 176, 309, 320, 332–336,
348, 450
- Hebrew script 93, 308
- Hungarian language (*Ungarica*,
Hungarica) 15, 17, 18, 40, 60,
61, 82, 83, 113, 220, 253, 298,
393, 396, 397
- Iberia, one of the ancient names of
Spain 236, 276

- Iberian language (*Iberica*), 100, 175, 189, 320, identified with ancient Spanish and considered a Celtic language 187
- Iberian people (*Iberi*), 173, 178, 182, 207
- idioma*, in the sense “a particular language” 152, 228, 234, 239, 241, 243, 255, 282, 363
- Icelandic language (*Islandica, Norrena*) 15, 18, 32, 67, 68, 70, 75, 83, 116, 131, 134, 188, 206, 213, 215, 310, 311, 397, 437, 438, 445, 455, 460
- Icelandic sagas 23, 24, 71, 84, 266, 403
- Indo-European hypothesis 17, 19, 34, 38, 40, 41, 61, 399, 468
- Indo-European languages 10, 28, 410
- Indo-European linguistics 398, 407
- Indo-Scythian language 46, 65, 66, 291
- Indo-Scythian people: *Indo-Scythae* 250
- Ingrian language 22, 316
- Italian language 27, 32, 37, 38, 64, 66, 75, 130, 221, 286, 288, 289, 348, 357, 362, 417, 419, 447
- dialects of 246, 286:
Lombardica, Thuscana, Neapolitana, Veneta 246
 Lombardic, Tuscan, Neapolitan, Venetian 287
- Italic languages 66, 293, 399, 407, 410
- Italy 32, 124, 157, 164, 196, 259, 266, 364, 383 f., 409, 422
- Japheth (*Iaphet*), son of Noah 16, 17, 40, 52, 53, 64, 66, 98, 101, 142, 156, 157, 166, 178, 187, 191, 196, 197, 205, 207, 208, 220, 230–233, 238, 268, 269, 271, 278, 291, 320, 322, 385, 413, 417, 469
- Japhethian or Japhetic language/s (*lingua Iaphetica*) 16, 18, 45, 53, 65–67, 98, 110, 113, 122, 134, 192, 197, 199, 205, 220, 249, 251, 253, 291, 294, 297, 321, 322, 363, 386, 387, 390, 418; *Gotho-Iaphetica* 134, *Scythica Iaphetica* 386, 387
- Japhethites (*Iaphetida*) 17, 40, 64, 65, 156, 169, 196, 208, 220, 232, 238, 250, 270, 278, 321
- identified with the Scythians 196, 250
- Langobards (*Langobardi*) 139, 140, 153, 291, 292, 346
- languages (*linguae*), passim, e.g.:
 – early-modern research of the origins of 27, 28, 30, 32, 52
 – and their origin and kinship: in premodern linguistic thinking 32–39
 the Persian-European linguistic kinship 39–51
 main topics of Stiernhielm’s unfinished treatise titled *Dissertatio de linguis et vera linguarum origine* 172–183, 217
 main topics of the published treatise *De linguarum origine praefatio* 219–220
 refutation of the idea that seventy-two languages emerged at the Tower of Babel 230 (according to André Rivet), Stiernhielm’s reasons for rejecting it 231–233
 – linguistic change, the fact of 17, 194, 227–229, 319 f.
 external causes of 53 f., 194, 214, 227, 266, 316–318, internal cause of: the passage of time 214, 266, 286, 319, cultural causes of 265

- Scaliger’s conception of mother-languages (*linguae matrices*) in his historical language classification 61
- the extent of Stiernhielm’s knowledge of 14, 75, 134. Referring to Old Swedish, Germanic languages, Greek and Latin Stiernhielm states: *Ego multum laboris et aetatis in iis funditus descendis insumpsi* 134
- Stiernhielm’s threefold conception of language 63
- Stiernhielm’s distinction between *language* as lexical substance and *dialect* as grammatical accidents 246, 286 f.
- Stiernhielm’s theory of a macrolevel relationship of all languages: *Omnes linguae sibi invicem cognatas esse* 115
- Stiernhielm’s theory of common lexical roots in European languages 98: aphorism no. 7
- Stiernhielm’s planned universal dictionary of lexical roots: *Lexicon primitivorum* 140, *Clavis linguarum universalis* 79, 119, 176, 180, 183, 184
- Stiernhielm’s genealogical method of explaining the relationship of languages, peoples and plants 186
- Lappish, see Sami language.
- Latin language, passim, e.g.:
 - part of a Scythian language family 17, 18, 34, 38, 44, 45, 61, 65, 66
 - rediscovery of classical usage in the Renaissance 29, 30
 - and vernacular languages in medieval Europe 28
 - and national consciousnesses in early modern Europe 29
 - one of the main languages of scholarly culture in the early modern era 29, 31
 - not formed as a new language at the Tower of Babel 319
 - emerged as a result of convergence and mixing of Italic languages, Celtic, Greek and Phrygian 66, 109, **253**, **297**, 322, cf. 410 between Italic languages, Greek and Phrygian 159, 174 (thesis 14), 179 (thesis 16), 182 (thesis 16);
 - Latin according to Hugo Grotius not originating from Phrygian, this origin justified however by Stiernhielm 328
 - decayed from its classical form as a consequence of political disintegration of the Roman Empire 247, 288
 - with regard to etymologies of Cicero and Varro 109, 174 (thesis 15), 179 (thesis 17), 182 (thesis 17)
 - periodization of 64, 214, 229, 267 f.
 - and Romance philology 32, 33
 - as mother of Italian, French, Spanish 288, of these languages and Rhaeto-Romance, Sardinian and Romanian 255–257, 302–304, and all these with the exception of Sardinian 323
 - and Persian 42, 43
 - and German and Greek 47
 - one of the main languages in Europe, grouped in different constellations: with Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Finnish, and Slavic 100

- with Hebrew Greek and German 101, 116, 385, 386
- with Greek, Slavic and German 409
- with Greek and Celtic 410
- with German, Sanskrit, Greek and Slavic 440
- should not be derived from Greek nor be considered the source of Germanic languages or more ancient than them 61, 106, 131, 134, 219, 223, 261, 387, 406
- as different from French as much as Hebrew differs from Ethiopic 244, 284
- typological diversity in relation to Hebrew 412
- Latvian language 22, 83
- letter (*litera*), written character or spoken speech sound, passim:
 - the concept of formative letters: (letters that) “mark grammatical case, tense, person and mood” 54
 - the kinship of certain groups of: *literae cognatae*, “cognate letters” 59, 60, 95, *literarum cognatio(nes)* 91, 95
 - changed because of euphony: *Literae euphoniae causa aut mutatae aut adhibitae* 91
 - the use of letters among the Getae or Goths in antiquity: *Getae longe ante Graecos et Romanos literas coluere* 150, 151–152. among the Germans 151–152, 254 f., 301, among the Swedes 149, 163, 206
- lexicography 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 23, 36, 55, 59, 60, 72–76, 79–82, 84, 117, 139, 143, 175, 280, 308, 396, 415, 416, 419, 424, 445, 464, 466
- linguistic historiography 33, 34, 35, 38, 41, 400, 462
- Livonian language 296
- Livonian people 196, 197, 296
- Lydian language and people 233, 237, 250, 272, 277, 291
- Lord’s Prayer 221, 255–257, 295, 302–304, 411
- Magog, son of Japheth 16, 17, 19, 40, 75, 156, 170, 205, 207, 236, 276, 434
- Magog Gothus, Magog Gothicus or Magog Aramaeo-Gothicus*, Stiernhielm’s Hebrew-Latin-Swedish dictionary 19, 75, 76, 80, 94, 108, 168, 381, 391, 397, 446
- monosyllable (*monosyllaba*) 93, 128, 134, 140, 199, 325, *monosyllabum* 128, monosyllabic words 98–99, 198, 200, 321, 428, monosyllabicity 198
- morpheme, lexical 30, 55, 61, 70, 87, 120, 127, 135, 362; see further “roots, lexical”
- Mysterium etymologicum*, Stiernhielm’s etymological treatise 67, 86, textual edition of 106–113, W. G. Leibniz’s knowledge of 391, 395, 397
- national languages 29, 380
- natural language, equated with the primeval language in its morpho-lexical roots, but not in its word formations and inflections 176, agrees with the nature of things in terms of speech sounds and meanings: *literis et sensu conveniens cum ipsa indole et natura rerum* 186
- Noah, in Latin *Noah* (without case endings or inflected *Noae* or *Noahi* in the gen., *Noaho* in the abl.) *Noach* or *Noachus* (*Noachi* in the gen.), *Noha* (*Nohae* in the gen. *Noham* in

- the acc.), *Noë* (not inflected)
17, 29, 40, 43, 51–53, 65, 98,
101, 107, 115, 120, 142–146,
150, 156, 157, 170, 175, 178,
179, 182, 186, 187, 190–192,
195, 197, 199, 202, 203, 209,
220, 230–232, 240, 241, 260,
263, 269, 270, 280, 281, 289,
307, 308, 314, 317, 321, 332,
334, 337, 385, 387, 412, 413,
434, 458
- Noachides (*Noachidae*), the
descendants of Noah 163, 169,
178, 191, 195, 317
- Noachic language: *lingua*
Noachica or *Nohaea* 100, 109,
113, 122, 192, 210, 225, 241,
262, 321, 412
- Norman language 286
- Norman people (*Normanni*) 140,
250, 291, 291
- Norwegian language (*Norvegica*)
67, 73, 187, 213, 327 and
people: Norwegians (*Norvagi*)
139, 237, 276, 328
- Oriental, that is Semitic languages
(*Orientales*, viz. *linguae*) 35,
36, 101, 178, 181, 191, 275,
277, 291, 320, 381, 387, 427
– only differ as dialects, not as
separate languages 239
- Oscan language 66, 84, 297
- Parthian language (*Parthica*) and
people (*Parthi*) 46, 161, 188,
250, 251, 291, 292, 295, 325,
327
- permutatio literarum*, “substitution
of phonemes”, also termed
commutatio literarum, one of
the four categories of phonetic
change in Classical etymology
56–60, 102
– C in Latin corresponds to H
in Germanic languages 160
- Pelasgian language (*Pelagica*,
Pelasma) 181, 187, 323, 324
- Pelasgian people (*Pelagici*),
defined as a barbaric pre-
Hellenic people of Greece 109,
158, 189, 323–325, 328
- Persian language (*Persica*)
17, 18, 20, 21, 27, 34, 38–51,
60, 65, 66, 76, 131, 132, 140,
141, 143, 161, 167, 173, 175,
178, 180, 181, 183, 188, 192,
211, 250–252, 292–295, 327,
399, 400, 404, 410, 452, 458
– juxtaposed or equated with
Parthian (*Parthica*) 250, 251,
292, 295
- Persian-German kinship, theory of
41, 42, 44–47, 131, 141, 466
- Persian people 41, 46, 145, 277,
291, 328
– juxtaposed or equated with
the Parthians 46, 188, 250, 291
- Phoenicia, the historical region
175, 276
- Phoenician language (*Phoenicia*)
65, 173, 178, 187, 211, 220,
236, 239, 240, 275, 279, 280,
387, 451
- Phoenician alphabet 301
- Phoenician people (*Phoenices*) 49,
157, 158, 236, 252, 275, 296,
428
- phonetic change, the basic pattern
of linguistic change is a 19th-
century insight 39, the four
categories of (viz. addition,
removal, substitution, and
transposition) 56 f., 101, 239,
279
- Phrygian language (*Phrygia*) 18,
43, 44, 65, 66, 134, 140, 143,
158, 159, 161, 173–183, 187,
188, 207–209, 211, 250, 253,
292, 297, 328, 406
- Phrygian people: Phrygians
(*Phryges*) 43, 109, 122, 143,
146, 161, 146, 159, 181, 233,
237, 250, 272, 276, 277, 291,
314, 347

- Phrygia, a region in Asia Minor
158, 207
- Polish language (*Polonica*) 67, 80,
83, 153
- Polish people (*Poloni*) 47, 150,
252
- Polish dictionary 339, 343
- pre-Adamite hypothesis 263, 393,
412, 413, 435, 456
- De linguarum origine praefatio*,
Stiernhielm's main treatise on
language origins, language
relationship and linguistic
change:
- classifies the “Japhetic
Scythian” branch of
languages 65–67
 - was published as a preface to
the 1671 edition of *Codex
Argenteus* 86, 215, 458,
called “Preface to Wulfila”
386, 406, 412, 435
 - the contents of 219–221
 - textual edition of 222–257
 - English translation of with
explanatory notes 258–304
 - reception of directly by
Dieckmann 286 f., by
Leibniz 391, 393, 396, by
Kirchmaier and Jäger 400,
403, 404, 406–407, by
Wotton 412–413, by Suhm
413 f., by Schultens 414, by
Spegel 416–417, by
Wachter 4187 f., by Ihre
418 f., implicitly by
Gagnerus 426–429 by
Nordin 431, by Geijer 442
- primeval language 15, 16, 28, 32,
35, 39, 43, 55, 61–63, 65, 68,
106, 114, 117, 198, 219, 263,
264, 274, 280, 309, 331–333,
385, 387, 389, 390, 392–395,
397, 398, 414, 418, 428, 435,
437, 464
- definition of 62
 - terminology of 63:
primigenia (viz. *lingua*)
116, 156, 174, 176, 188,
209, 235, 238, *Noachi
lingua primigenia est* 240,
241, 242, 246, 251, 386,
398, *primogenia* 338,
primaeva (viz. *lingua*) 96,
319, 332–334, *prima* (viz.
lingua) 108, 318, 227
 - identity of with Hebrew,
an idea embraced by the
majority of early-modern
scholars 219
supported by Hebrew
etymologies of biblical
proper names 117;
this proof rejected by
Grotius 332 f. and
Stiernhielm 63, 198–200
 - retained by the Japhethites,
since they did not take part
in the Tower of Babel 233,
238, 271, 278
 - retained by Nimrod 274
 - retained by Jectan (Joctan),
the ancestor of the south-
Arabians 272
 - recovered by the Semites and
Hamites after a brief
Confusion of Tongues 238,
278
 - claimed identification with
national languages 386
 - the starting point of
Stiernhielm's language
classification 65, 186
 - the possible restoration of
*Linguas omnes ex una ortas
ad unam posse reduci* 100;
*Videri omnes linguas, quae
in orbe cognito extiterunt et
hodie extant, ortas ex una et
ad unam posse reduci* 173,
177, 181 (*Runa Suethica*,
part 1, thesis no. 1), this
principle discussed in *De*

- linguarum origine praeformatio* 224, 226, 262, 264, restated in the preface to *Runa Suethica* 185, a principle referred to by Diecmann 386 and Gagnerus 428 and cited by Wachter 418
- Punic language (*Punica*) 181, 187, 189, 211, 236, 276, 320 and Punic people: *Poeni* 236, 267
- purism, linguistic 14, 55, 69, 70, 362, 463, 431, 436, 437, 444
- purity, linguistic 9, 55, 67, 69, 70, 220, 285, 299, 358, 416
- ratio*, except for the frequent sense of ‘cause, ground’ mainly used in the following meanings:
- the cognitive power/ faculty as a source of knowledge: ‘reason, common sense’: *res ipsa et ratio arguunt* 48, *rationi maxime obvium* 110, (*lingua*) *quam ratio Adamo dictavit*, (the language) “that reason dictated to Adam” 115, *rationis et veritatis ductu* 125, *rationis ductu* 126, *ipsa ratione infusum* 175, 180, *ex rationis fundo*, “on the basis of reason”, *rationi consentaneum* 232, 245, *rationi satis concinens* 242; juxtaposed with *historia sacra* 226, with *historia* and *experientia* 227, with *experientia* 224
 - rational system: *non ... est ... ratio omnium reliquarum* 99, *nec rationis nec cohaerentiae aut cognationis ullum vestigium* “not any trace of regularity, coherence and kinship” 225
 - relationship or principle, e.g. *Eadem enim plane est ratio hominum, rerum et linguarum*, “Men, things and languages share entirely the same relationship/ principle” 186, *eandem puto esse rationem sermonis, quae est naturae universi*, “I think that language has the same relationship/ principle as the nature of the universe” 320
 - method, passim, e.g. *ratio significandi*, “method of expressing meaning” 43 *ratio discendi*, “method of learning” 48, *ratio etymologizandi*, “method of studying etymology” 97, 107, *ratio architectonica*, “architectural method” 124
 - public accounts 152
- Renaissance, the 17, 28–30, 33, Italian Renaissance 37, 64, 422
- Renaissance humanism 27, 29, 34, Renaissance humanists 30, 37
- Renaissance historical linguistic theory 32–34
- Republic of Letters (that is, the Commonwealth of Learning) 5, 9, 14, 50, 62, 259, 260, 381; *Respublica literaria* (only in the ablative case) 112, 125, 223
- Romanian language 66, 221, 304
- Romance languages 15, 17, 27, 33, 38, 221, 399
- roots, lexical 16, 20, 55, 59, 68, 79, 80, 83, 94, 106, 113, 114, 124, 140, 141, 184, 198, 200, 264, 272, 279, 280, 289, 300, 328, 385, 390, 397, 400, 428, 434; *radices* 8, 55, 79, 80, 92–98, 100–103, 106, 108, 110, 111, 113, 115, 116, 122, 127, 134, 172, 175–183, 185, 198–200, 206, 207, 226, 233, 239, 240, 246, 328, 434, 446, 460
- theory of universal lexical roots *Aio linguarum principium esse unum et*

- omnibus radices communes* 94, *dari radices universales atque omnibus linguis communes* 185, object of etymology *indagare radices omnibus linguis communes* 113, object of etymological lexicography *Radices universales et omnibus fere linguis communes eruit et aperit*: 172, 177, 181
- original word-roots 15, 19, 20, 55, 79, 106, 113, 124, 140, 141, 390, designated by various terms:
 - matres* 96, 97, 115
 - matres vocabulorum* 108
 - primigeniae vocum radices* 186
 - primitiva* 55, 106, 142, 156, 159, 185, 199
 - primitiva prima* 108
 - radix*, e.g. 93, 95–98, 103, 108, 115, 119, 123, 130, 135, 326, 366, 446
 - radices primitivae* 106, 108
 - voces primae* 115
 - voces primitivae* 93, 140
 - vox primigenia* 130, *voces primigeniae* 132
 - vocula* 98, 122, 136, 251, 254, *voculae* 129
 - voculae primae* 240
 - triconsonantal roots in Hebrew 101, 185, 200
- Runa Suethica*, an incomplete work in two parts: a historical-linguistic treatise and an etymological dictionary 19
- the conspectus 19, 79, 86, 87, 172, 176, 177, 193, 196, 217, 219, 220, 312, 316, 388, 391, 410
 - the historical-linguistic treatise 16, 23, 59, 60, 65, 86, 87, 222–249 (variant readings *passim*), 260, 263, 283, 284, 413; chapters 1–5 as the basis of *De linguarum origine praefatio* 87, 216
 - the etymological dictionary 76, 79, 133, 397
 - textual edition of the conspectus in the first manuscript draft 172–176, and of the first and second printings 177–183
 - textual edition of the preface 184–185
 - textual edition of the drafts of other unpublished texts, see Sections 7.7, 82, 8.5, 9.1, 9.2, 11.3–11.7, as follows:
 - principles of analogy and decomposition 102–104
 - the twofold purpose of etymology 113
 - the bases of etymology 115
 - the ontological relation of the stem or root to semantics 115,
 - the origins of biblical proper names 118–120
 - the origin of YHWH as the name of God 120–129
 - the origin of the word ‘wind’ 130–131
 - the origin of the words ‘father, mother, brother’ 131–133
 - a general classification of languages 186–189 f.,
 - use of Scythian as a term for the primeval language of humankind 190–192
 - the nature of the Confusion of Languages 192–196
 - the rise of the Japhetic language 196–197
 - Hebrew not fulfilling the criteria of the primeval language 198–200
 - synchronization of mytho-historical Mesopotamian

- chronology with biblical prehistory 201–203
 - the antiquity of Swedish 204–208
 - the particularity of Swedish 208 f., in comparison with Danish 209
 - the nature of language diversification 210–213
 - types of language diversification 214
- runes, runic stones, runic inscriptions 23, 24, 68, 151, 152, 163, 167, 171, 197, 220, 221, 255, 300, 302, 307, 310, 342, 347, 350, runic script 218, 255, 302, 407
 - the origin of the runes 254, 300, 407, 470
- Russian language (*Moschovitica*) 22, 67, 153, 380, 446
- Russian people: Russians and Muscovites (*Muschovitae*, *Moschi*) 251, 252, 293, 296, 314, 322
- Sami language 22, 61, termed Lapp 17, 18, *Lapponica* 253
 - Lappish 298, grammar of 346
- Sami people: Lapps 196, 322 and *Lappi* 197
- Sardinian language 66, 221, 303
- Sarmatian language 44, 65, 187, 189, 253, 297, 390
- Sarmatian people 168, 204, 205, 297, 314
- Sarmatia, the historical region north of the Black Sea 315
- Saxon language (*Saxonica*) 66, 100, 116, 128, 134, 187, 189, 206, 213, 351
- Saxon people: Saxons (*Saxones*) 60, 66, 139, 152, 153, 165, 228, 267
- Scandinavia (*Scandia*, *Scanzia*) 16, 24, 147–149, 152, 153, 155, 163–166, 168, 169, 173, 178, 182, 183, 189, 206, 276, 315, 322, 395, 410, 425, 433, 455, 460, 467
- Scandinavian language (*Scandica*) 45, 67, 68, 79, 100, 179, 188, 206, 213, 299, 311, 360, 392
- Scripture/s, Holy 258, 269–271, 277, 278, 300, 418; *Scriptura* (with or without *Sacra* or *Sacrosancta*) 106, 121, 170, 181, 191–193, 200, 202, 230–232, 237, 238, 314, 321, 333.
- Scythia, a historical region:
 - the region north of the Black Sea 39, 144, 325, called *Scythia Maior* 16
 - the larger nomadic region as the cradle of peoples in Europe and Asia 46
 - distinction between Asaitic and European Scythia 46
 - in antiquity, the northern hemisphere of the world 51
 - located at Mount Ararat 124, 127, 170, called Aramaean Scythia 145, the cradle of post-diluvian humankind 145, 178
- Scythia Minor*, the Roman province (corresponding to the region Dobruja between the Danube and the Black Sea), identified with Moesia 222, 259
- Scythia Minor* or *Europaea*, equated with the Scandinavian peninsula 16, 149, 173, 178, 182, 204, 289, 410, 433
- Scythia Magna* (*Scythia Maior*), identified with Germany 205
- Scythian ethnicity 17, 39–41, 64, 196, 204, 291–292, 434
- Scythian hypothesis 7, 16, 17, 19, 32, 34, 38–51, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 75, 313, 387, 390, 399, 434, 463, 466 (Scythian theory)
- Scythian language (*Scythica* or *Schythica*) 16–20, 34, 42–51,

- 60, 65–67, 75, 86, 99, 100, 110, 111, 118, 120–122, 127, 128, 132, 134, 136, 142, 145, 173, 175, 178–183, 185–192, 199, 205, 209, 213, 218, 220, 225, 250–252, 263, 291, 292, 294, 298, 312, 315, 320, 322, 327, 328, 363, 386–388, 390, 392, 400, 405, 406–410, 417, 419, 428, 431, 434, 438, 442, 446
- the common ancestor of
 - Greek, Latin, German and Persian 49–50
 - identified with Japhethian
 - Mihi enim una est lingua Scythica, Iaphetica, Noachica* 192, *linguam Suecorum Scythicam esse eandemque Iapheticam* 205, *Tota Iapheti posteritas Scythae appellata est, unde et lingua Scythica* 250, *Hi omnes propagine Scythae, Scythica usi sunt lingua, singuli singulis dialectis* 250
 - European Scythian 66–67
- Scythian people: Scythians (*Scythae, Schythae*) 16, 17, 32, 34, 39–47, 51, 52, 64, 66, 111, 142, 144–147, 149, 150, 152, 166–170, 173, 176, 178, 181, 182, 189, 191, 192, 196, 204, 205, 236, 237, 250, 251, 276, 277, 291, 292, 295, 312, 313, 314, 320, 323 (*Scythia*), 327, 390, 405, 406, 417, 428, 433, 434, 463, 469, 471, 472
- identified with the
 - Japhethites 40, 196, 250
 - divided into European and Asiatic 205,
 - European Scythians 205
 - migrations from the Caucasus Mountains 170, 196, 197
- Scytho-Celtic language (*Scytho-Celtica*) 399, 401–406
- Scytho-Gothic language 66, 417
- Scytho-Scandinavian language (*Scytho-Scandica*) 73, 416, 461
- Shem (*Sem*), son of Noah 16, 52, 53, 64, 166, 191, 220, 230, 238, 269–272, 277, 278, 280, 283, 387, 413
- Semites (*Semitae*) 65, 220, 238, 240, 278, 280
- Semitic languages 5, 27, 28, 30, 32, 34–37, 43, 45, 53, 59, 65, 124, 175, 410, 411, 442
- Semito-Hamitic languages 65, 190
- Slavic or Slavonic languages (*Sclavonica, Sclavonia, Slavonica*) 17, 18, 34, 45–47, 52, 61, 65–67, 76, 81, 83, 100, 136, 141, 155, 163, 165, 188, 252, 253, 296–298, 385, 390, 399, 406, 409, 438, 442, 446
- Slavic people: 205 (*gentes Sclavonicae*), 206 (*Slavi*)
- Spain (*Hispania*) 142, 155, 237, 244, 315
- Spanish language (*Hispanica*) 32, 66, 75, 100, 130, 140, 166, 180, 182, 189, 205, 207, 221, 247, 256, 288, 303, 319, 320, 323, 348, 357, 416, 454;
- Spanish people: Spaniards (*Hispani*) 152, 170, 189, 202, 205, 206, 206, 250, 251, 254, 293, 294, 301, 314
- Specimen linguae et philologiae Finnonicae* 82 ff. 446
- sound shift, the Germanic 57, 58, 60, 428
- speech sound/s (*sonus/ soni*) 7, 56–60, 63, 91, 95, 99, 100, 102, 107, 113, 248, 253, 283, 296, 315, 326, 395, 394, 431
- Sueo-Gothic language (*Sueo-Gothica*) 21, 67, 68, 75, 81, 110, 116, 141, 250, 293, 414, 418, 437, 455, 446
- Sueo-Gothic people (*Sueo-Gothi*) 162, 163

- Sweden and the Swedish realm: its multilingualism 22–23, Gothic identity in the 17th century 24–26, the idea about its ethnic homogeneity 68, in Latin *Suecia*, *Suethia* or *Suediot*: 91, 149, 153, 157, 161, 163, 164, 165, 173, 174, 205, 206, 324, 360 388, 322, 391 identified with Scythia Minor 173, 204,
- Swedish language (*Suecica*, *Suedica*, *Suethica*, *Svethica*, *Suethice*) 13, 14, 20, 23, 26, 55, 67–71, 80, 82, 94, 97, 99, 100, 106, 107, 110, 112, 113, 115, 118, 128, 129, 135, 147, 149, 161, 165, 168, 175, 179–182, 185, 188, 199, 203, 204, 206, 208, 209, 216, 217, 220, 222, 228, 246, 250, 251, 254, 266, 267, 286, 293, 299, 300, 322, 336, 357, 357–364, 366, 377, 392, 397, 423, 427, 429, 446–448
- claimed to be more ancient than Greek and Latin 113
 - periods of lexicography 73–74
 - Stiernhielm’s planned dictionaries of 76–79
 - regional dialects of:
 - Dalecarlian 213, 229, 267, 277, 374, Smalandian 228, 267, Angermannian 228, 267, Roslagian 135
 - Old Swedish (in the period 1225–1526) 4, 15, 70, 71, 120, 266, 276, 310, 311, 382, 415, 437, 439, 445
 - Swedish counterparts to Latin grammatical and rhetorical terms, philosophical terms, and common words 366–374
 - Stiernhielm’s programme for Swedish language renewal 69–71, 357–363
- Swedish people: Swedes (*Sueci*, *Suedi*, *Sueones*, *Suiones*, *Suethi*, *Suediotae*) 23, 25, 68, 119, 144, 148, 149, 152, 155, 161, 162, 164, 167, 169, 170, 174, 179, 182, 203–205, 223, 261, 267, 276, 292, 293, 322, 324, 345, 357, 358, 380, 433, 448
- Swedish Law Codes, medieval 24–26, 71, 72, 78, 84, 120, 139, 266, 346, 364, 415, 416
- Syriac (*Syriaca*, *Syra*) 32, 35, 36, 65, 75, 129, 173, 175, 178, 185, 187, 192, 199, 234, 235, 239–244, 246, 272–275, 277, 279–284, 309, 318, 334, 348, 350, 386, 387, 390, 428, 459
- Syrian people: Syrians (*Syri*) 53, 233, 234, 236, 237, 272, 273, 275, 309, 334
- Tataric language 65, 187, 390, 397
- Trojans (*Troiani*) 159, 276
- Troy 52, 165, 297
- Turkish language (*Turcica*) 27, 36, 47, 65, 94, 136, 188, 318, 353, 390, 464
- Twelve Tables, Law of 267, 418
- vernacular languages 14, 15, 22, 25–33, 175, 285, 299, 309, 357, 380, 399, 415, 415, 437, 465
- Virgula divina*, an early title (c. 1641) and an unfinished draft of Stiernhielm’s etymological dictionary 56, 59, 76, 77, 79, 91–97 (the preface), 162, 397
- Visigoths, laws of 139, 140, 162, 346, 352, 364
- Welsh language, Cymraeg (*Cambrica*, *Cambro-Britannica*, *Cymraeca*) 61, 66, 76, 81, 82, 100, 116, 131, 175, 180, 183, 188, 213, 320, 347–349, 410, 416, 419, 438, 446
- West Indies 262, 263
- Westrogothia, Older Law of 15, 70, 79, 346, 364, 365, 429

Index III: Swedish words occurring in the texts edited

Stiernhielm used the symbol * for non-attested forms. The below list also contains a large number of archaizing forms.

<i>aar</i> , i.e. <i>år</i> , 129	<i>axl</i> 160	<i>evig</i> 129
<i>afbildning</i> 369	<i>backe</i> 160	<i>falla</i> 93
<i>afkomst</i> 371	<i>bak</i> 111	<i>fast</i> 103
<i>afl</i> , “power” 374	<i>baka</i> 146	<i>flock</i> 372
<i>afla</i> 104	<i>ball</i> 160	<i>flodh</i> 368
<i>afledningsord</i> 370	* <i>ball</i> 326	<i>flyttia</i> 93
<i>afmåld</i> 369	<i>bard</i> , i.e. <i>yxa</i> 160	<i>flå</i> 120
<i>afmålning</i> 369	<i>begrep</i> 369	<i>fläckia</i> 120
* <i>aforma</i> 374	<i>benägenhet</i> 371, 373	<i>foga</i> 103
<i>afsondring</i> 372	<i>bescripfning</i> 372	<i>foot-sola</i> 160
<i>afsprungs-ord</i> 370	<i>bewijs</i> 373	<i>form</i> 370, 373, 374
<i>afwändning</i> 368	<i>bewijs-konst</i> 372, 373	<i>forma</i> 373
<i>aga</i> , “to possess” 134	<i>bijfogigt</i> 369	<i>fortgång</i> 374
<i>agga</i> 103	<i>bijgång</i> 368	<i>fot</i> 160
* <i>ala</i> , “to give birth” 374	<i>bijnamn</i> 369	<i>framsteg</i> 374
<i>almen</i> , i.e. <i>allmän</i> 370	<i>bi-läti</i> 374	<i>framgång</i> 374
<i>almen-äfne</i> 374	<i>biälla</i> 326	<i>frågan</i> 368
<i>det almena</i> 370	<i>blatt-ord</i> 371	<i>froma</i> 374
<i>allbekänt</i> 369	<i>blom-werk</i> 370	<i>frålla</i> 326
<i>a-läti</i> 374	<i>blomering</i> 370, 371	<i>fullgiord</i> 373
<i>amma</i> 131, 133	<i>bläntz-ord</i> 371	<i>fullgård</i> 373
<i>anbehör</i> 372	<i>bock-språng</i> 368	<i>fullgöra</i> 373
<i>andraga bewijs</i> 373	<i>bullra</i> 326	<i>fysa</i> , “feel inclined to, have mind to” 160
<i>anhang</i> 372	<i>byte</i> 373	<i>fäste</i> 371, 373
<i>anläte</i> 374	<i>bäla</i> 326	<i>fäste för infäste</i> 371
<i>anmark</i> 369	<i>bögnings-wijs</i> 367	<i>föga</i> 103
* <i>anna</i> , i.e. <i>unna</i> , “to grant, allow” 94, 119	<i>böla</i> 326	<i>förvänt ordsätt</i> 371
<i>an-negd</i> 371	<i>böriare</i> 370	<i>förbijgång</i> 368
<i>anroop</i> 368	<i>börian ände-lijk</i> 368	<i>förbloma sitt taal</i> 370
<i>arm</i> 160	<i>börian-lijk</i> 368	<i>förblomat taal</i> 370
<i>ars-hohl</i> 160	<i>börie-börian</i> 368	<i>fördeelning</i> 372
<i>art</i> , i.e. <i>species</i> 373	<i>daande</i> 373	<i>förelag</i> 374
<i>artas</i> 370	<i>deel för heelt</i> 371	<i>förlikning</i> 372
<i>arten för könet, för slächtet</i> 371	<i>dägu</i> 374	<i>förläggia</i> 373
<i>artigheet</i> 373	<i>edli</i> 374, cf. <i>ädli</i>	<i>galma</i> 326
<i>artskap</i> 373, 374	<i>eenständigt namn</i> 369	<i>gamba</i> 160
<i>aud</i> 104	<i>efftermäld</i> 369	<i>glamma</i> 326
<i>aud-döma</i> 104	<i>egenskap</i> 373	<i>gen-stand</i> 372
<i>aud-huma</i> 104	<i>egentlig</i> 372	<i>gen-sättning</i> 372
<i>aude</i> 104	<i>egn</i> 373	<i>gendriff</i> 373
	<i>edli</i> 374	<i>genomförsl</i> 373
	<i>eldi</i> 374	<i>goom</i> 160
	<i>en, een</i> 136	

grund 373
grund-ord 370
gå fast 103
gå 118
gädi, i.e. *godhet* 118
gärd 373
göranden för
gärningen 371
görande orsak 373
gööl 160
hava “to have” 134
hals 160
**ha*, i.e. *god* 103
han, honom 129
hale 160
ham 129
hamn 373
haska 104
hasta 103
heckizera 104
heelt för deel 371
heemställning 368
hert 160
het, hit, “this” 372
hexa 104
hierta 160
hiärna 160
hinder-driva 373
hint, “that” 372
hiskia 104
hol 325
hon, henne 129
hoop 325
hoop-mal 372
hoop-wijs 372
hopkast 368
hoppas 326
horva 326
hovd 160
hud 160
huerva, i.e. *värva*, “to
 carry out, fulfil” 326
hugfästa 369
hugränningar 371
huijt 209
humpel 325
hund 101, 102

hurra 326
hurudanheet 373
huvud 160
håår, håren 160
hårdfällig 371
hädde 374
häfd 373, 374
häga, “to keep intact”
 134
hälsa as a noun 134
hälsosam 134
häl 160
häla 325
härre 103
härva 326
häst 103
häte 371, 373
häti 369
hätte 369, 374
hävel 370
höfd 160 (cf. *hövd* 70)
infästad warelse 371
infäste 372
infäste för fäste 371
ingrep 368
innehållande för
innehåldet 371
inward 373
inwarelse 372
inwarande varelse 372
inwäsen 373
inälde 373
inäldi 374
irra 326
jaka 370
jata, i.e. *jätta*, *lova*,
 “to promise”, 370
jen 135, *jet* 136
jåla 326
jållra 326
jämförsel 372
jän 135, *jät* 136
kahl 160
kalla 326
kast 325
kast-spiut 325
keck 119

kinner 160
klacka 326
klaffa 326
klaga 326
klanka 326
klinga 326
klyfva 200
klykia 200
knulla in the sense of
 “kuttra”, i.e. “coo”,
 call of a pigeon 326
knullra, i.e. “kuttra”,
 that is, “coo” 326
knä 160
ko 119
konst-mäle 369
krafft 374
krage 209
krop 373
kviga 119
kynne 370
kär 324
käre 324
kön 370, 374
köna 370
laghman 159
**lägia* 200
läpp 160
lijska-ord 371
lijsk-fällig 368
lijsk-lydig taal-
ändning 368
lijskord 371
liksels-ord 371
lijsknings-taal 369
liuf-talig 370
lius 374
lubb 160
lumb 160
lycka 374
lynd 373
lynde 369, 374
låg 209
läkia 209
länkia 367
länkning 367
läti 372, 374

lätu 373
löpa 209
**ma* 103
maat 209
man 128
man-dicht 369
man-kön 370
manlig 368
marg-fälle 368
meen 97
meer 103
mestare 370
midel-måål 372
midio midia lijk 368
midio-lijk 368
missbruk 369
modd 98
modh 373
mold 98
mudd 98
muld 98
**mynd* 339
myndigheet 370
mång-fällig 368
må 372
målsked 369
målskeel 369
måls-ord 373
mått 374
måtta as a noun 374
måål 369, 374
måål-satt 373
måål-sättia 373
måålskeda 369
måålskedning 369
mägne 369, 372, 374
mäla 373
mäld 369
mäle 373
mält 373
märcke för thet
 bemärkte 371
mäst 103
mätenheet 369
na, “near, close” 103
nogh 120
nägd 373

när 103
näsa 160
näst 103
nöga 120
oegentlig 372
ofulbordat 370
ofulgiort 370
ombyte 373
omeent 371
omstände 372
omsättning 369
omvänding 373
ophovsman 370
oplösning 370
opstegh 368
or 145
ord 367
ord-vändning 369
ordbegrep 371
ordlijkund 371
ordförsättning 371
ordwexel 371
ord-biläte 370
ord-bloma 370
ord-blomster 370
ord-boot 368
ord-byte 369
ord-fager 370
ord-fägring 370
ord-hoot 368
ord-kämp 372
ord-leek 368
ord-lijkning 369
ord-läte 370
ordpryde 370
ord-pracht 370
ord-prål 370
ord-prång 370
ord-strijd 372
ord-stååt 370
ord-wändning 369
ord-wäxt 372
orsäkt 372
orva 326
que 119
queg 119
querva 326

quick 119
quin-kön 370
quinlig 368
**quäda* 104
qvacka 119
pigga 103
pijl 120
plocka 120
plogh 120
plugg 120
plöga 120
polering 372
påle 120
piäla 120
raka bort 94
redlighet 372
reeda 372
rijk 91
rymd 372
rådha 93
samband 369
samning 368
samtaal 368
samwäxt 369
sandor 145
sed 374
ser-skillning 372
serskilt 369
sidha, “side” 93
sijden 93
sielfstand 371, 374
sielfständig 371, 374
sijra 326
sinne 374
skada 103
skall 326
skalra 326
skap 373, 374
skapa 373
skap-lynde 370, 374
skepur 374
skidia 103
skog 209
skrof 372, 373
skråla 326
skrälla 326
skröfd 372, 373

skyda 103
skyld 372
skyldman 372
skyldskap 372
skäl 372, 374
skäl-begrep 373
skäl-samna 373
skälla 326
slag 371
slaget för arten 371
slagh 370
slump 374
slächte 370, 371
skära 103
smutt 97
smälta 97
små 97
småt[t] 97
smör 97
sneo 104
snäf 104
sorra 326
spea, speia 136
spila 120
spilra 120
spiäl 120
spiäla 120
spiälka 120
språk-bild 370
språk-biläte 370
språkprydning 370
sqallra 326
stam-ord 370
standor 145
stald 370
stege 368
stofferig 369
stunta 103
stöta 103
surra 326
sverm 326
sverma 326
sverva 326
swirra 326
syra 326
säga 103, *säija* 103
sättia mål 373

sär 103
särliga 103
sätt 370, 374
sätta 119
sättia 336
sättia måål 373
säyeligt 372
sökia 103
taal-dikt 372
taalkonst 368
taal-måål 368
taal-ändning 368
taga 103
tagga 103
tala ståtliga 370
tand 60, 160
tee 103
tekna 103
til-bögd 371
til-bögsel 371
tilbögsel 371
tilfällig orsak 372
tilfälligt wäsende 374
tillaga 372
tillfall 373, 374
tilnägd 371
ting 128
ting-balck 372
ting-sked 372
tyg 372
underkast 374
underlag 371, 373, 374
understand 372, 374
understånd 369
underständig 371
up-hoopning 372
up-ökning 372
ur-äfne 374
ut-fijlning 373
utprydning 370
utreedning 372
wirra 326
walla 119
warelse 374
wercktyg 372
werva 326
widd 374

wijs 370
wijs-quinna 254
wräka 94
wänd-ord 371
wärckanden 373
wärck 373
wäsende 374
å-witra 104
ymst 370
yra 326
yst, ytst, yterst 153
yste-woner 153
yther-woner 153
ålla 326
äterkall 368
äterkast 369
ädli 371, 373
ädst 153
äfl 319
äflas 319
äfne 373, 374
äga 136
äldi 373
ämne 373
änd-orsak 373
ända 373
ända-ändeljk 368
ändan-börie-lijk 368
ände-lijk 368
är 135
äst 135
äta 209
ätt 374
äve 129
öde 374
öfveraf 374
öfuerflöd 368
öfuerhopning 368
öfuerlag 369, 371
öfuerläggning 368
öfuerslag 369
öfverwåld 374
öga 60, 160
öra (noun) 326
öra (verb) 60, 160
örke för wercket 371
ör-läpp 160

Index IV: Words in Indo-European languages being referred to or discussed in the texts edited

Armenian	<i>starre</i> 132	French
<i>maeck</i> 136	<i>thing</i> 123	<i>aage</i> 129
<i>maegh</i> 136	<i>whif</i> 123	<i>coeur</i> 133
<i>mi</i> 136	<i>whole</i> 135	<i>ouy</i> 129
		<i>gaigner</i> 119
Basque	Old English	<i>moudre</i> 98
<i>bat</i> 136	<i>bealve</i> , “evil” 119	<i>mouldre</i> 98
	<i>beo</i> 136	
Croatian (<i>Illyrica</i>)	<i>beod</i> 136	German
<i>bi</i> , <i>biti</i> 136	<i>hal</i> 134	<i>Ableitung</i> 367
<i>edn</i> , <i>eden</i> 136		<i>Abwächselung der</i>
	Estonian	<i>Rede</i> 367
Czech	<i>ytte</i> 136	<i>Ankunfft</i> 367
<i>geden</i> 136	<i>ytz</i> 136	<i>Augelein</i> 160
		<i>allerley</i> 368
Danish	Etruscan	<i>*balo</i> , “evil” 119
<i>huijd</i> 209	<i>Aesar</i> 143	<i>*belis</i> , “evil” 119
<i>krafue</i> 209	<i>ara</i> 143	<i>ballen</i> 326
<i>lauff</i> 209	<i>arundmader</i> 143	<i>beyderley</i> 368
<i>logmon</i> 143	<i>aruns</i> 143	<i>biegen</i> 111
<i>low</i> 209	<i>Lar</i> 143	<i>bin</i> 136
<i>läge</i> 209	<i>Lars</i> 143	<i>bist</i> 136
<i>löbe</i> 209	<i>lord</i> 143	<i>brullen</i> 326
<i>maad</i> 209	<i>lavard</i> 143	<i>brügen</i> 111
<i>mand</i> 209	<i>lucumon</i> 143	<i>Bälle</i> 326
<i>skouf</i> 209	<i>lugumon</i> 159	<i>Daughter</i> 132
<i>äde</i> 209	<i>vadimon</i> 143	<i>Dochter</i> 132
	<i>veia</i> 145	<i>ein</i> 136
Dutch	<i>watuman</i> 143	<i>einfach</i> 367
<i>heel</i> 134		<i>einige</i> 368
<i>hiel</i> 160	Finnish	<i>Fall</i> 367
<i>kaje</i> 336	<i>aica</i> (i.e. <i>aika</i>) “time ,	<i>Erstfall</i> 367
<i>kaitman</i> 336	age, era” 129	<i>Zweytfall</i> 367
<i>onesäydelik</i> 371	<i>äiti</i> , “mother” 94	<i>Drittfall</i> 367
<i>Schampelwen</i> 374	<i>karva</i> , “hair” 160	<i>Viertfall</i> 367
<i>Schamplun</i> 370	<i>wia</i> , likely <i>viedä</i> , “to	<i>Fell</i> 160
<i>Skamplun</i> 374	lead” 145	<i>geel</i> 160
<i>stoffe</i> 370	<i>yx</i> (<i>yksi</i>), “one” 136	<i>Gestalt</i> 370
<i>yet</i> 372		<i>haben</i> 134
	Frisian	<i>hall</i> 326
English	<i>aad</i> , “old” 129	<i>Hamme</i> 160
<i>an</i> 135, 136	<i>*aade</i> , “age, time,	<i>Haupt</i> 160
<i>boy</i> 133	period” 129	<i>heilig</i> 134
<i>man</i> 123		<i>hell</i> 134

herentsprungen 367
Hund 101
Jahr 129
Kohl
Kopf 160
Kuhe 119
me[h]rfaltige
männlich 368
pflugen 120
Sagwort 367
Schindel 103
Schaft 325
Theilbetrachtung 367
ubel 119
unbenant 368
ursprünglich 367
Veränderung 367
wehen 55, 130, 145
weiblich 368
wejen 130
ween 130
Wind 55, 130
Zahl 368
zusammengesetzt 368

Low German

hooft 160
kahle 160
kohle 160
övel 119
pael 120
paele 120
paelen 120
pegel 120
pegelen 120
spalken 120
Uur 129

Old High German

bem, ben 136
heil 134

Gothic

adel 163
allodium 163
atta 94
feudum 163

haban 133, 134
hails 134
hairto 133
 Crimean Gothic
ita 136

Greek

*ἀβειν (a word
 reconstructed to
 correspond to
habere and *hava*),
 “to have” 118
 ἄβεις, “you have”
 122
 ἄβω 134

ᾄδω, “to sing”, 93,
 and the variant
 spelling αἰδω 93
 αἰί, “always” 129
 αἰείδω, “to sing” 93
 αἰών, “lifetime,
 generation; long
 space of time, age,
 era” 129

ἄορ, “sword” 111
 ἀπέχειν, “to hold off,
 prohibit” 134
 ἄριστος, “the best”
 136

αὐταρκής, “self-
 sufficient,
 independent” 125
 αὐτός, “himself” 104
 ἀφή, “a lighting,
 kindling” 134

ἄχα, with the alleged
 meaning “water”;
 otherwise Doric for
 ἡχή, “a sound,
 noise, roar” 147

ἄω, a primitive root,
 with the alleged
 meaning “to shine”
 115

βεκατόν, Attic variant
 of ἑκατόν 326

γεκατόν, Doric for
 ἑκατόν 326
 γενάομαι, “to bear, to
 beget”, a form
 reconstructed for
 γίνομαι, Ionic and
 Koine for γίγνομαι,
 “to come into being,
 to be born” 119

γένος, “race, stock,
 kin; offspring” 119

*γένω, see γενάομαι
 above 94

Γέτης, “Get”, member
 of the tribe Getae
 205

γεῦμα, “a taste” 160

*γῆθεώ, “be glad,
 rejoice” 119

γύμνασμα, “exercise”
 386

Γοτθός, “Goth” 205

Δάαι, Δάοι, Δάκοι,
 Δάσαι, “Dahai”, a
 Scythian people in
 Central Asia (near
 Margiana) 205

δέκα, “ten” 325

διακριτικοῖς, the dat.
 plur. neuter/ masc.
 of διακριτικός,
 “separative,
 diacritic” 329

διαλέκτων, the gen.
 plur. of διάλεκτος,
 “the language of a
 country; regional or
 local variety of a
 language, dialect”
 247

δῖς, “twice, double”
 112

ἑκατόν, “hundred”
 326

ἔν, neuter of εἷς 129,
 135, 136

- εἶδος, "form, shape; class, kind, species" 371
- εἷς, "one" 129, 136
- ἔλις, a form of ὅλος 134
- ἐννέα, "nine" 325
- ἔννος, "year" 129
- ἔνος, "year" 129
- ἔτι, "still, yet" 129
- ἔχειν, "to have" 118
- ἔχεις, "you have" 122
- ἔω, a variant of εἰμί, in Latin *sum* 118
- Ἑκατόν, Aeolic for ἑκατόν 326
- Ἑκατόν, Attic variant of ἑκατόν 326
- ἦ, definite article, feminine 129
- ἦ, imperfect indicative (first person sing.) of εἰμί 129
- ἦμί, Doric for εἰμί 129
- ἦς, Doric imperfect indicative (second person sing.) of εἰμί 129
- ἦῶ, imperfect indicative (first person sing.) of εἰμί 129
- θεάομαι, "to look at/ upon; behold, watch, observe, contemplate" 125
- θεός, "God, the Deity" 125
- θεώ, "to run" 125
- θυγάτηρ, "daughter" 132
- ἴος, in Ionic and Epic. the masc. of εἷς, "one" 136, 325
- ἴα, Ionic fem. μία (fem. of εἷς, "one") 136, 325
- ἴω 325
- ἴων, plural genitive of ἴος 325
- καλέω, "to call" 326
- καρδία, "heart" 133
- κυνός, the genitive sing. of κύων, "dog" 101
- κύω, "to conceive, be pregnant, bear in the womb" 119
- μετάπτωσις, the acc. pl. of μετάπτωσις, "change, inflection" 248
- μήτηρ, "mother" 132
- μύλη, "mill" 98
- ὁ, definite article, masculine 129
- ῥα, "wife" 111
- οἶος, "alone" 136
- ὅλος, "whole, entire" 134, 135
- ὄν, "being" part. sing. neuter of εἰμί 135
- οὔλος, Ionic for ὅλος 135
- οὔλω, "to be whole, sound" 135
- παῖς, "child", here with relation to descent "son" 133
- παίω, a variant of *πάω, "to feed"; otherwise "to strike, smite" 133
- πατήρ, "father" 132, 133
- *πάω and πάειν "to feed, give food", not attested in ancient Greek 133
- πελασγιῶτις, "inhabitant of Pelasgiotis" in Thessaly 324
- ποιῶ, "to do" 133
- πολυθείας, the gen. fem. sing. of πολυθεία (i.e., 'polytheism') 134
- πῦρ, "fire" 111, 146
- σεαυτόν, "themselves" 104
- Σεκατόν, Attic variant of ἑκατόν 326
- σέλας, τό "light, brightness, flame" 93
- σελήνη, "moon" 93
- σκιαγραφία, "outline draft, sketch" (see *Oxford English dictionary*, s.v. skiagraphy I, 1) 313
- Σγύθαι, "Scythians" 205
- Σκύθης, "Scythian" 205
- Σκύθαι, "Scythians" 205
- συγκαταβάσει, the dative sing. fem. of συγκατάβασις, "condescension", here implying "the Incarnation" of Christ 314
- συνθήκην, acc. sing. fem. of συνθήκη, "agreement, convention" 251
- ὑας, acc. pl. of ὕς, "swine, pig" 158
- φάω, "to shine" 129
- φημί, "to speak, say" 129
- φορβή, "pasture, food" 325
- φθιῶτις, "the land of Phthia," here

“inhabitant of Phthiotēs” 324	<i>cor</i> 160	<i>iax</i> 136
χαῖρε, “hail, welcome”, imperat. of χαῖρω, “to be glad, rejoice” 324	<i>crinis</i> 160	<i>iox</i> 136
ὄν, “being” part. sing. masc. of εἶμι 122	<i>cutis</i> 160	<i>madar</i> 132, 141
ῥα, “hour” 129	<i>dens</i> 160	<i>phedar</i> 132, 141
-ῶτις, a suffix 324	<i>femur</i> 160	<i>star</i> 132, 141
	<i>genae</i> 160	<i>tehom</i> 132
	<i>geno</i> 94	
	<i>genu</i> 160	Phrygian
	<i>genus</i> 119	Βέδν 147
	<i>gula</i> 160	<i>bek</i> 146, 158
	* <i>guma</i> , “palate” 160	<i>Cybele</i> 146, 158
	<i>habeo</i> 118, 122, 128, 134	<i>Fruti</i> 146
Hungarian	<i>hora</i> 129	<i>Gallus</i> 146, 158
<i>bal</i> 119	<i>labium</i> 160	<i>kek</i> 146, 158
<i>birom</i> 136	<i>lobus</i> 160	πῶρ 146
<i>egy</i> , <i>eggy</i> 136	<i>lumbus</i> 160	<i>Strymon</i> 147
	<i>mendax</i> 97	
Italian	<i>molere</i> 98	Polish
<i>cuore</i> 133	<i>nasus</i> 160	<i>iedan</i> 136
<i>gaio</i> 118	<i>nutus oculi</i> 160	<i>smejati</i> 97
<i>smaltire</i> 97	<i>oculus</i> 160	<i>szmer</i> 97
<i>smorzare</i> 97	<i>paro</i> 103	
<i>spiare</i> 136	<i>pars</i> 103	Scythian
<i>spione</i> 136	<i>pellis</i> 160	<i>ar</i> 136
	<i>perennare</i> 129	<i>ari</i> 136
Latin	<i>pes</i> 160	<i>arima</i> 136, 145
<i>aetas</i> 129	<i>phallus</i> 160	<i>en</i> 145
<i>aeternus</i> 129	<i>solium</i> 160	<i>ett</i> 145
<i>aevum</i> 129	<i>solum</i> 160	<i>Gebeleize</i> 146, 150, 168
<i>affatim</i> 91	<i>ventus</i> 55, 130	<i>Graucasus</i> 145
* <i>annare</i> , “to last for many years” 29	<i>visire</i> , <i>vissire</i> 160	<i>Schyta</i> 145
<i>armus</i> 160		<i>spu</i> 136, 145
<i>auris</i> 160	Latvian	<i>ā</i> 145
<i>axilla</i> 160	<i>ween</i> 136	<i>ādrim</i> 145
<i>barba</i> 160		
<i>bucca</i> 160	Persian	Turkish
<i>canis</i> 101, 102	<i>band</i> 132, 141	<i>ana</i> 94
<i>culus</i> 160	<i>begrijst</i> 132	<i>bir</i> 136
<i>calvus</i> 160	<i>berader</i> 132, 141	
<i>calx</i> 160	<i>choda</i> 141	Welsh
<i>caput</i> 160	<i>dochter</i> 132, 141	<i>ball</i> , “plague” 119
<i>cauda</i> 160	<i>drog</i> 132	<i>bud</i> , “he was” 136
<i>cerebrum</i> 160	<i>griift</i> 132	<i>da</i> , “god” 131
<i>collum</i> 160		

Index V: Words in Semitic languages cited in the texts edited

Latin translations of Hebrew words are drawn from Stiernhielm's Hebrew-Latin-Swedish dictionary *Magog Gothus*, the photostat copy N. 24 at Royal Library, Stockholm, fol. 8r–19v and fol. 52r–60v. (For the original, see ms. XXXII. 1715, Wilhelm Gottfried Leibniz Bibliotek, Hannover.) In this dictionary, Stiernhielm mainly relied on Johannes Avenarius' Hebrew-Latin dictionary, *Liber radicum seu lexicon Ebraicum*, Wittenberg 1568.

In the below index, Latin translations of Aramaic and Syriac words are drawn from Valentin Schindler's *Lexicon pentaglotton* (Frankfurt am Main and Hanau 1612).

Aramaic words	אם ('em), mater,	היה (hāyā), fuit, “to
חד (had), unus, “one”	“mother” 93, 133	be” 118, 122
135, 136	אמן (ʿāman), nutrire,	חי (hay), vivens,
עֵדָן ('iddān), tempus,	in the stem-form	vivus, “living”
occasio,	qal “to nourish;	(nominal
opportunitas	support” (and in	derivation of the
“time, occasion,	niph'al “to be	verb היה, hāyā)
opportunity” 129	confirmed”, in	119
	hiph'il “to tust,	יהוה (YHWH), the
Ethiopic words	believe”), 133	name of God (the
ahadu, unus, “one”	בד “by oneself, alone”	tetragrammaton)
136	136	121, 127, 175,
iddan, æddan “time”	דאב (dā'ab), tabuit,	180, 183
129	“dissolve, melt,	יְהוָה (y ^e hōvāh), the
	languish, be dry”	early modern
Hebrew words	with the alleged	translitteration of
אב ('āb), pater,	phonetic Swedish	YHWH 123
“father” 133	counterparts dāf,	קָבַל (hābal),
אבד ('ābad), periit,	dāfna, tō, tōija,	obstrictus,
“to perish” 94	dō, dōija 94	obligatus fuit aere
אדם ('ādām), homo,	דהה (dāhā), suffecit,	alieno, “to bind or
“human being”	“to be enough”	oblige by a debt”
336	125, reconstructed	110
אדמה (ʿ ^a dāmā), terra,	from the nominal	חֹשֶׁךְ (hōšāek), tenebrae
“soil” 118, 336	derivation דַּי (day)	obscuritas, “dark-
אור ('ūr), lux. “light”	by Schindler	ness, obscurity”
115	(1612): 367	199, compared
אחד ('æhād), unus,	דַּי (day), sufficientia,	with the obsolete
“one” 135, 136	“the state of being	noun hiske and the
אחז ('āhaz), cepit, “to	enough” 125, 131	adj. hiskelig 200
seize” 118	הודא (hōdā, the	כוח (kōah), facultas,
איל ('ayyāl), cervus,	hi'phil stem of	vis, vires, robur,
“deer” 80	(ידה), laudavit,	potentia, “power,
אלֹהִים ('elōah), Deus,	confessit, “to	force” 119
“God” 121	praise, confess”	מלט (mālaṭ), fuga sibi
	333	consuluit, ereptus

est, fugit in
campum
latissimum, “to
secure one’s
safety by flight, to
escape, to flee into
a broad field” 93
מִקְּדָם (*miqqædæm*) in
Gen. 11:2 “from
the east” 232, 270
נָאָר (*nā’ar*), in the
pi’el stem *ni’er*
abiecit, “to
reject”¹⁴⁹⁴ 9
נוּחַ (*nūah*), quievit
placide, consedit
tranquile, “to rest
quietly, sit down
quietly” 120
נָפַל (*nāphal*), cecidit,
corruit, “to fall,
collapse” 93
סִדִּין, a loanword from
Greek σιδών,
“siden, a fine
cloth” 93
עֲבַר (*ābar*), praeteriit
transiit, traiecit,
“to pass, cross”
234, 240, 273, 280
עָד (*ad*), adhuc, dum,
aeternitas, “still
(in this sense to be
vocalized עוֹד, *ōd*),
when, time,
duration” 129
עָדֵי (*ad ade*), in
aeternum,
“forever” 129
עָלַז (*ālaz*), laetus fuit
(Schindler 1612:
1328), exultavit,
exiluit prae

gaudio, “to be
happy, exult, jump
by joy” 93
עָלַס (*ālas*), exultavit
(Schindler 1612:
1333) “exult” 93
עֵת (*et*), tempus,
“time” 129
פָּלַג (*pālag*), divisus
est, dispartitus in
multas obliquas
partes. Proprie de
aquis. “to be
divided,
distributed in
many oblique
parts. In proper
sense about
water”, with the
alleged Swedish
counterpart *flyta*,
“to flow” 120
פָּלַה (*pālā*), separavit,
divisit (Schindler
1612: 1446), “to
separate, divide”
120
פָּלַח (*pālah*), dirupit,
discidit, “to break
through, to split”.
Gothice (that is, in
Swedish) *fläckia*
120
פָּלַט (*pālat*), evasit
liberatus, ereptus
est ut possit
evadere in
campum latiore,
“to escape after
having been
released, to be
delivered so that
one can escape to
a more spacious
field”, with the
alleged Swedish

counterpart *fly*, “to
fly, flee” 93
קָנָה (*qānā*), aquisivit
generando,
emendo, educando
vel quacunque alia
ratione fieri potest
“to acquire by
giving birth, by
purchasing, by
bringing up” 119
צִדָּה (*ṣedā*), “food
supplies for
travel”, but the
word intended in
the text is צָד
(*ṣad*), which
means “side” (of
object or body) 93
רָדָה (*rādā*),
imperitavit,
dominatus est, “to
order, command,
have dominion,
rule over” 93
שָׂית (*šāt*), posuit, “to
place, lay” 119
תְּהוֹם (*tēhom*), abyssus,
vorago, “deep,
sea, abyss” 374,
compared with the
Swedish adj. *tom*,
vacuitas, vacuum,
“voidness” 199

Syriac

עֶדְדָן (*’æddan*), *tempus*,
“time” 129
רָאן (*ra’an*), abiecit,
removit “to throw
away, remove” 94.
Stiernhielm likely
misspelled this
word.

¹⁴⁹⁴ In *Magog Gothus*
Stiernhielm renders it:
irritum fecit, abrogavit
“to make void, nullify”.

Illustrations

List of illustrations

Samples of manuscripts and early prints

- Figure 1. Diagram of language diversification. See p. 210 above.
- Figures 2a–2b. “Mysterium etymologicum”: first page of the treatise.
- Figure 3. *Runa Suethica*, ch. 20: etymologies of Biblical names.
- Figures 4a–4b. “Adelrunae conclusiones”: first page of these notes.
- Figure 5. Stiernhielm, *Anticluverius* (1685), title page.
- Figure 6. The conspectus of *Runa Suethica* (F.d. 6, 1r)
- Figure 7. The first printing of the conspectus of *Runa Suethica*.
- Figure 8. Scythian as the proto-language of mankind (F.d. 4:4:1, 50r)
- Figure 9. The antiquity of the Swedish language (F.d. 6, fol. 58r).
- Figure 10. The particularity of Swedish and its distinctive features in relation to Danish (F.d. 5, fol. 36r)
- Figure 11. Diagrams of language diversification and language merger (F.d. 6, fol. 10v)
- Figure 12a–12b. The official Swedish edition of *Codex Argenteus*, title page and frontispiece
- Figures 12c–12e. A selection from the printed text of “De linguarum origine praefatio”: pp. 2–3, 18–19, and 28–29.
- Figure 12f. A sample of the edition of *Codex Argenteus*, 1671.
- Figure 13. *Runa Suethica*, chapter 1 Stiernhielm’s programme for free linguistic research (F.d. 6, 68r)
- Figures 14a–14c. Gesner, *Mithridates* (1610), title page and insert.
- Figure 15. Stiernhielm, inventory of his linguistic library (F.d. 6, 33v)
- Figure 16a–16b. Stiernhielm, *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur* (1643), title page and insert.
- Figure 17. Swedish counterparts of Latin linguistic terms (F.d. 9:8, 5r)
- Figure 18. Horn’s preface to Boxhorn’s *Origines Gallicae* (1654).
- Figure 19. Boxhorn, *Originum Gallicarum liber* (1654). pp. 86–87.
- Figures 20a–20b. Casaubon, *De quatuor linguis*, pp. 14–15, 136–137.
- Figures 21a–21b. Stiernhielm, *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum* (1671).

Historical map and the painting of Vasula Manor

- Figure 22. Scandinavia and the Baltic Sea region in the 17th century.
- Figure 23. View of Vasula Manor from the north-east, 1783.




Figure 2a. "Mysterium etymologicum", ms. XXXII. 1715. *Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielm*, fol. 77r (Section 8.1.1), Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek – Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, Hannover.

CAPUT XX

Toces Ebraeas, cujus generis sunt Adam, Eva, Cain, Seth. etc.
quas p antiquitate linguae Ebraeae vulgo eis assertores adducunt,
non minus Scythicas, imo Suecicas esse magis quam Hebraicas.

firmissimum hoc et tantum argum. stabilis. Antiquitatis gloria
lingua. Horat., plur. annos. Optum id quam leve sit, et per
conjugium, fallax ipse Thesis, paucis demonstrabo.

Adam. *hinc ab initio*. domus. i. terra. non ita dicta a proprio
inde terra, sed ab accidenti subditis. non igitur pprio domus,
ita terra, sed terra rubra. ino verbo, Rubrica. Sufficit vero
Sam proprio qd Pulvis terrae, et Copia Pulvis. ut
Pulvis significet a domo. Ex-pulvere.

Eva. Hava, Chava": a מלך. Chajav. vivim. Mater recentium.
 a Simplicior, seu origini sua prius a מלך. haja, a מלך.
 Hava, Eff. Sed Simplicissime, a generalissime. Sive Thica & a.
 a הא. Eff. a Haba. Ibi formati aga, a הא, a Haba.
 a Brina a. Graecum est עו. Sine. ab aga EXEIV. a
 Hetr. מלך. ab Haba, Lat. habeo (gr. ἔχω) a Hetr
 מלך. מלך. Hava. hah. אהב. a מלך.

linguis communis) et hinc notione *vivendi* m. Nobis, q. Ger.
maxi vity q. ga, gal. Gall. Gay. Ital. Gaio. Teut. Gaj, & gar.
vivere, daceo, vegeto. (Chava, & ghavae) Notione generalis vita
habet nysy Gallo-celt. Galande, Brezans. Ger. Leb-anno,
abgehen. m. Chy. vita, ~~Chay~~ m. Chajah. ital. Vivere. Lus.
Vie. Esp. Viver. Eng. amuse. Rich. vieng. & hoch.
daceo, fortis, quiescunt & Hebr. m. chavah. Nullo possum huius
formae derivabile in nostris linguis significata, et ideoque receptum
ad demonstrandum talis sit vita nostra peregrina ex Hebraeo ac
Aethio. Emittit Lectores ad Clavum m. Lin. v. 1. 1. 1.

Die sufficiente indicator für Radium heißt Nominis p. - -

Cain, p. acquisitus, a J.P. Kanah. Sveth. ch. Pima a. p. nos. Nos. 11.

ἰδοὺ, gigno. kōn, Lat. genz. Gr. τὸν Q. Anal. kind. Lat. x Genz. Gr. x γενέσθαι.

Kind, proles. Et affinis notione, ut voc. Gaus, gina, communis affinis

Literari- Gall. gaizner. Sv. gagn. G. garm ^{frua, frua, frua, frua}
 Literari- Gall. gaizner. Sv. gagn. G. garm ^{Litteratur. Gewinn.}

Et in arbitris bona deferant a 113p. Radix & Annon. C.

Propenfa ee alieui. 21377 Gebel. Sued. 1890 "488

4 bel. 1. Vanitas. # ab 7211 nebel. 1. uth. Afl. vanitas. 2
 24. 6 " Pl. a constant & meclan- vlu' blura? c. 11. 10

Verbo aflas, vana cogitatio, & fingit. Den. pura. Sveth. val
solio. detinuer. Per x. ar. Ostrid. Bal. q. fiedel. molit

Jfr deficient; distinguish. Jfr def-
icient; distinguish. Deficient, very, malin

Is. Bf. dolor. G. verb. Bölsa. l. malod. carr. Hung. Bal. S. Lug. V.

Calvin. Cambr. Ball. Poftris.

Path. repository. à m^{rs} Ponere. South. Vatta.

Noah. (consolatory nos) d'icunt à m. Quiluit. Dueth-5 Noga. Jm

Por-^{gn}gnýyau. Satisfacior-
Luctum reddere. a Noq. Satis. Suff.

Polig (divinit)

Cnidaria, *Siphonophora*. - *Physalia*, *Puffinball*, *Portuguese Man-of-War*.

S. Flösa, 9. Hflingon. azatto defendere terram. Flösa aratr.

Flugg. Fossil, Cinnam. Black. Spined Lathyrus d. Jorran.

Liola. *Opiala*. in tabulis diffusor. Hinc *Opial*, tabula. f.

Fyl. sagitta Opila, Jucos. *Opila fissa* L. *Opalon. zixari*.

Figure 3. *Bunga Synthia*, ab. 20 on the stymol

Figure 3. *Runa Suethica*, ch. 20 on the etymology of *sueth*.

6, 43r (Section 9.1.1). Reproduction:

Engliga Biblioteket

ingiga Biblioteket.

Figure 3. *Runa Suethica*, ch. 20 on the etymology of Biblical names, F.d. 6, 43r (Section 9.1.1). Reproduction: Lina Löfström Baker, Kungliga Biblioteket.




Figure 4b. “Adelrunae conclusiones”, N. 24, *Adversaria Georgii Stiernhielm*, 37r (Section 10.3.1), photostat with inversion of black and white, the Royal Library, Stockholm. Reproduction: David Frederiksen, Kungliga Biblioteket.





Figure 5. G. Stiernhielm, *Anticluverius sive scriptum breve Johanni Cluverio Dantisco-Borussio oppositum*, Holmiae/ Stockholm 1685, title page. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark Cronstedt 2: 391).



Primi Systematis Capita sunt seqq.

- 523




Figure 8. Scythian as the proto-language of humankind: notes on 8 September 1651, F.d. 4:4:1, 50r (Section 11.3.2). Reproduction: Lina Löfström Baker, Kungliga Biblioteket.




Figure 9. On the antiquity of the Swedish language, *De antiquitate linguae Suedicae*, F.d. 6, fol. 58r (Section 11.5.1). Reproduction: Lina Löfström Baker, Kungliga Biblioteket.




Figure 10. *De proprietate linguae Suethicae*, F.d. 5, fol. 36r, cols. 1–2 (Section 11.5.2) and *Dialecti Danicae proprietas*, F.d. 5, fol. 36r, col. 3 (Section 11.5.3). In the middle and third columns, the final part of *Scrutinium literarum* (Vol. 1, Section 7.2.2) is written. Reproduction: Lina Löfström Baker, Kungliga Biblioteket.

D. N.
JESU CHRISTI
SS.
EVANGELIA
Ab
ULFILA

Gothorum in MOESIA Episcopo

Circa Annum à
Nato Christo CCC LX.

Ex

*Græco Gothice translata, nunc cum Paral-
lelis Versionibus, Sveo-Gothicâ, Norrenâ, seu
Islandicâ, & vulgatâ Latinâ
edita.*



STOCKHOLMIÆ.

Typis NICOLAI WANKIË Regij Typogr.
ANNO SALUTIS M. DC. LXXI.



Figure 12a. Title page of the first official Swedish edition of *Codex Argenteus*. The title reads in English translation: “The sacrosanct Gospels of our Lord Jesus Christ, translated by Wulfila, bishop of the Goths in Moesia, from Greek to Gothic about AD 360, now edited in parallel with the Sweo-Gothic, Norse or Icelandic, and Vulgate Latin translations”, Stockholm 1671. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark Cronstedt 6:57).



Figure 12b. Frontispiece of the official Swedish edition of *Codex Argenteus*. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark Cronstedt 6:57). The foreground scene is an illustration of the ancient motif “Time reveals the truth” or “Truth as the daughter of time”, which was a common emblem in the early modern period.¹ A winged old man representing Time (*Chronos*) removes a gravestone and an undressed young woman, the Naked Truth (*nuda veritas*), is resurrected from the tomb and the nimbus around her face illuminates the world. She holds a volume inscribed *Codex Argenteus* in her

¹ Its sources are Seneca the Younger, *De ira* XI, 22, 4 *Tempus veritatem aperit*, and Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* XII, 11, 7 *Temporis filia veritas*. Erasmus selected the latter maxim for his anthology of ancient proverbial sayings, *Adagia* (Basel 1500).

left hand, and with her right hand she points to the background scene: the learned bishop Wulfila in his chamber at his desk, working on his Bible translation. Above these scenes two cherubs hold a cartouche inscribed *Ulphila redivivus et patriae restitutus cura M. G. De la Gardie, R[egni] S[ueciae] Cancellarii, Anno 1669*, “Ulphila revived and restored to the fatherland through Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie, Chancellor of the Realm, in 1669”. At the top, the banderole reads: *Verbum Domini manet in aeternum*, “The word of the Lord endures forever” (Isa. 40:8, as quoted in 1 Pet. 1:25). The message is in agreement with the Protestant and Gothicist state ideology of the Swedish Great Power: just as the re-emerging Divine Truth – the Word of God – shows its eternal continuance across the passage of time, the rediscovered *Codex Argenteus* affirms that the migrant Goths and the homeland Goths – the Swedes – have always been a cultivated people. The copper-engraved frontispiece depicts the front panel of the binding of *Codex Argenteus*, designed by the court painter David Klöcker Ehrenstrahl and fashioned by the court silversmith Hans Bengtsson Sellingh. It was produced by the Dutch artist Dionysius Padt-Brugge.²




Figure 12c. “De linguarum origine praefatio”, in *Evangelia ab Ulfila [...] ex Graeco Gothice translata*, pp. 2–3. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark Cronstedt 6:57)

² For an interpretation of the front panel of *Codex Argenteus* and the frontispiece of the official Swedish edition of 1671; see Simon McKeown, “Recovering the *Codex Argenteus*. Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, David Klöcker Ehrenstrahl and Wulfila’s Gothic Bible” in *Lychnos* 2005, pp. 12–15. The copperplate frontispiece is also explained by Gunnar Broberg, “Vår upplysta tid” in idem (ed.), *Gyllene äpplen: svensk idéhistorisk läsebok*, Stockholm 1991, pp. 530–531.




Figure 12d. “De linguarum origine praefatio”, in *Evangelia ab Ulfila [...] ex Graeco Gothice translata*, pp. 18–19. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark Cronstedt 6:57).




Figure 12e. “De linguarum origine praefatio”, in *Evangelia ab Ulfila [...] ex Graeco Gothice translata*, pp. 28–29. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark: Cronstedt 6:57).




Figure 13. Stiernhielm's introduction to *Runa Suethica*: a programme for free linguistic research, independent of authority and tradition. See *Runa Suethica*, part 1, ch. 1, F.d. 6, 68r, corresponding to pp. 2 ff. in "De linguarum origine praefatio" (which is edited in Sections 12.3.3, translated in 12.3.4). Reproduction: Lina Löfström Baker, Kungliga Biblioteket.




Figure 14a. Conrad Gesner, *Mithridates exprimens differentias linguarum*, second edition, Tiguri/ Zürich 1610. Title page with the name of the owner of this copy. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (inventory number 58.XI.4).




Figure 14b. Conrad Gesner, *Mithridates exprimens differentias linguarum*. Tiguri/ Zürich 1610, pp. 32v–33r, on the origin of *alruna*, “soothsayeress”. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (inventory number 58.XI.4).



Figure 14c. Gesner, *ibidem*, pp. 73v–74r, on Sardinian, which he divides in a foreign urban variety (*Sardorum oppidanorum lingua*), which is Catalan, and a genuine rural variety (*genuina Sardorum lingua extra civitates*). Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (inventory number 58.XI.4).




Figure 15. Stiernhielm's inventory of his linguistic library: "Libri conducentes ad origines linguarum Georgii Stiernhielmi", F.d. 6, 33v (edited in Sections 15.2.2–5). Reproduction: Jens Östman, Kungliga Biblioteket.



Figure 16a. Stiernhielm, *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, Uppsala 1643, inside of the title page with the Latin title and list of lexicographic sources, and preface, p. 1 (Section 16.1). Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark Cronstedt 5: 158).




Figure 16b. Stiernhielm, *Gambla Swea- och Götha-måles fatebur*, Uppsala 1643, preface, 4v (Section 16.1) and the dictionary, p. 1. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark: Cronstedt 5: 158).




Figure 17. Swedish counterparts of classical rhetorical terms, F.d. 9:8, 5r (Section 17.1.3). Reproduction: Lina Löfström Baker, Kungliga Biblioteket.



Figure 18. Georg Horn's preface to Boxhorn's *Originum Gallicarum liber*, Amsterdam 1654, pp. 1–2; see my Section 3.4.3, pp. 49–50. Stiernhielm noted *Intentio Boxhorni* and *rectissime* in the margin, p. 1. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (inventory nr: Y. 117).




Figure 19. Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn, *Originum Gallicarum liber*, pp. 86–87. The notes *recte* and *rectissime* in the margin of p. 86 show that Stiernhielm approved the theory of a common origin of Greek, Latin and German. (See p. 49, note 111.) On the opposite page, Stiernhielm compares Welsh *mer*, “marrow, medulla”, to Swedish *merg* (*märg*), which means the same thing. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (inventory number: Y. 117).




Figure 20a. Meric Casaubon, *De quatuor linguis commentationis pars prior*, Londini/ London 1650, pp. 14–15, with Stiernhielm's notes. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (inventory number 58. XI. 3).




Figure 20b. Casaubon, *ibidem*, pp. 136–137, with Stiernhielm's notes. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (inv. nr. 58. XI.3).




Figure 21a. Stiernhielm's revised edition of Franciscus Junius' Gothic dictionary, *Glossarium Ulphila-Gothicum* [...], Holmiae/ Stockholm: Wankijf, 1671. Title page. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark Cronstedt 5:158).




Figure 21b. Sample from the dictionary, s.v. *haban*, pp. 78–79. I have edited the derivation of Gothic *haban* “to have” from Swedish *hava* (Vol. 2, Section 9.5.2) and the comparison between Gothic and Latin verbal conjugation of the verb “to have” (Vol. 1, Section 8.4.2). Reproduction: Uppsala University Library (shelfmark Cronstedt 6:57).

Historical map and the painting of Vasula Manor



Figure 22. Scandinavia and the Baltic Sea region in the 17th century. Source: Bengt Y. Gustafson (ed.), *Atlas till historien*, 3rd edition, Stockholm 1970, p. 29. Reproduction: Uppsala University Library. The map mainly depicts the Kingdom of Sweden including Finland and the Baltic provinces, and the Kingdom of Denmark-Norway. It shows the locations and names of cities, fortified cities, castles, towns and fortresses. In the Swedish realm, cities founded during 1612–1680 are marked by red lines, cities with universities are marked by black lines, while cities with courts of appeal are dotted.



Figure 23. View of Vasula Manor from the north-east, 1783. Watercolour painting by lieutenant Carl Otto von Gyllenschmidt.³ The heading reads: “Prospect des Gutes Wassula im Dörptischen Kirchspiel, von der Nord Ost Seite, aus der Gyllenschmidtschen Sammlung”. Source: Johann Christoph Brotze, *Sammlung verschiedener Liefländischer Monumente, Prospective, Wapen, dritter Theil*, c. 1782–1792, fol. 137r (Latvian Academic Library, BM03137A). Courtesy of the Library of the University of Latvia, Riga.

In the middle to the right, the painting shows houses arranged along three sides around a square courtyard – the manor in the middle background and beside it a hay barn with a stair – in front of Amme Jogi river, across which there is a bridge. To the left, a pavilion is situated in a garden. To the far left there are annexes. If the central complex of buildings expresses a medieval architectural tradition, the pavilion seems to depict an interest in nature.⁴

Stiernhielm lived at Vasula Manor in 1640–1642, 1645–1648, and 1655–June 1656. After being burnt down in the Swedish-Russian war of 1656–1659, it was probably rebuilt in the same style as before. After the peace with Russia in 1661, Johan Markvard Stiernhielm leased the estate, and in 1672 he inherited it. The architecture most likely remained the same until the 1780s, when the manor was depicted. At that time it was possessed by major Otto Vilhelm Stiernhielm (1755–1829), whose grandfather’s brother captain Carl Erdtman Stiernhielm (1675–1750) recovered it in 1724 after it had been bestowed to general Sjeremetjev during the Great Northern War (1700–1721). Vasula Manor stayed in the possession of the Stiernhielm family until 1919, when it was expropriated by the Estonian state.

³ There is a replica by Vladimir Fjod. Ivanov, St. Petersburg, 1954, at Estonia History Museum, Tallinn (AM 4646:21 G 6930. See www.muis.ee, s.v. Vasula.

⁴ Heinz Pirang, *Das baltische Herrenhaus*, 1 Teil, Riga 1926, p. 38.