Protestantism be no bar to distinction and advancement. The invitation was renewed in the most gratifying and flattering manner a year later. Scaliger would not be required to lecture. The university only wished for his presence. He would be in all respects the master of his time. This offer Scaliger provisionally accepted. About the middle of 1593 he started for Holland, where he passed the remaining thirteen years of his life, never returning to France. His reception at Leyden was all that he could wish. A handsome income was assured to him. He was treated with the highest consideration. His rank as a prince of Verona was recognized. Placed midway between The Hague and Amsterdam, he was able to obtain, besides the learned circle of Leyden, the advantages of the best society of both these capitals. For Scaliger was no hermit buried among his books; he was fond of social intercourse with persons of merit and intelligence, and was himself a good talker.

For the first seven years of his residence at Leyden his reputation was at its highest point. His literary dictatorship was unquestioned. It was greater in kind and in extent than that of any man since the revival of letters—greater even than that of Erasmus had been. From his throne at Leyden he ruled the learned world, and a word from him could make or mar a rising reputation. The electric force of his genius drew to him all the rising talent of the republic. He was surrounded by young men eager to listen to and profit by his conversation, and he enjoyed nothing better than to discuss with them the books they were reading, and the men who wrote them, and to open up by his suggestive remarks the true methods and objects of philological and historical study. He encouraged Grotius when only a youth of sixteen to edit Capella; the early death of the younger Douza he wept as that of a beloved son; Daniel Heinsius, from being his favourite pupil, became his most intimate friend. But Scaliger had made numerous enemies. He hated ignorance, but he hated still more half learning, and most of all dishonesty in argument or in quotation. Himself the soul of honour and truthfulness, with a single aim in all his writings, namely, to arrive at the truth, he had no toleration for the disingenuous arguments, and the misstatements of facts, of those who wrote to support a theory or to defend an unsound cause. Neither in his conversation nor in his writings did he conceal his contempt for the ignorant and the dishonest. His pungent sarcasms were soon carried to the ears of the persons of whom they were uttered, and his pen was not less bitter than his tongue. He resembles his father in his arrogant tone towards those whom he despises and those whom he hates, and he despises and hates all who differ from him. He is conscious of his power as a literary dictator, and not always sufficiently cautious or sufficiently gentle in its exercise. Nor, it must be admitted, was Scaliger always right. He trusted much to his memory, which was occasionally treacherous. His emendations, if frequently happy, were sometimes absurd. In laying the foundations of a science of ancient chronology, he relied sometimes upon groundless, sometimes even upon absurd hypotheses, frequently upon an imperfect induction of facts. Sometimes he misunderstood the astronomical science of the ancients, sometimes that of Copernicus and Tycho Brahe. And he was no mathematician. But his enemies were not merely those whose errors he had exposed, and whose hostility he had excited by the violence of his language. The results of his system of historical criticism had been adverse to the Catholic controversialists, and to the authenticity of many of the documents upon which they had been accustomed to rely. The Jesuits, who aspired to be the expounders of antiquity, the source of all scholarship and criticism, perceived that the writings and authority of Scaliger were the most formidable barrier to their claims. It was the day of conversions. Muretus in the latter part of his life professed the strictest orthodoxy; Lipsius had been reconciled to the Church of Rome; Casaubon was supposed to be wavering; but Scaliger was known to be hopeless, and as long as his supremacy was unquestioned the Protestants had the victory in learning and scholarship. A determined attempt must be made, if not to answer his criticisms, or to disprove his statements, yet to attack him as a man, and to destroy his reputation. This was no easy task, for his moral character was absolutely spotless.

After several scurrilous attacks by the Jesuit party, in which coarseness and violence were more conspicuous than ability, in 1607 a new and more successful attempt was made. Scaliger's weak point was his pride. Brought up by his father, whom he greatly reverenced, in the belief that he was a prince of Verona, he never forgot this himself, nor suffered it to be forgotten by others. Naturally truthful, honourable, and virtuous in every respect, he conceived himself especially bound to be so on account of his illustrious ancestry. In 1594, in an evil hour for his happiness and his reputation, he published his *Epistola de Vetustate et Splendore Gentis Scaligeræ et J. C. Scaligeri Vita*. In 1607 Gaspar Scioppius, then in the service of the Jesuits, whom he afterwards so bitterly libelled, published his *Scaliger Hypobolimæus* ("The Supposititious Scaliger"), a quarto volume of more than four hundred pages, written with consummate ability, in an admirable and incisive style, with the entire disregard for truth which Scioppius always displayed, and with all the power of that sarcasm in which he was an accomplished master. Every piece of gossip or scandal which could be raked together respecting Scaliger or his family is to be found there. The author professes to point out five hundred lies in the *Epistola de Vetustate* of Scaliger, but the main argument of the book is to show the falsity of his pretensions to be of the family of La Scala, and of the narrative of his father's early life, and to hold up both father and son to contempt and ridicule as impudent impostors. "No stronger proof," says Mr Pattison, "can be given of the impressions produced by this powerful philippic, dedicated to the defamation of an individual, than that it has been the source from which the biography of Scaliger, as it now stands in our biographical collections, has mainly flowed." To Scaliger the blow was crushing. Whatever the case as to Julius, Joseph had undoubtedly believed himself a prince of Verona, and in his *Epistola* had put forth with the most perfect good faith, and without inquiry, all that he had heard from his father as to his family and the early life of Julius. It was this good faith that laid the way for his humiliation. His *Epistola* is full of blunders and mistakes of fact, and, relying partly on his own memory partly on his father's good faith, he has not verified one of the statements of Julius, most of which, to speak most favourably, are characterized by rhodomontade, exaggeration, or inaccuracy. He immediately wrote a reply to Scioppius, entitled *Confutatio Fabulæ Burdonum*. It is written, for Scaliger, with unusual moderation and good taste, but perhaps for that very reason had not the success which its author wished and even expected. In the opinion of the highest and most competent authority, Mr Pattison, "as a refutation of Scioppius it is most complete"; but there are certainly grounds for dissenting, though with diffidence, from this judgment. Scaliger undoubtedly shows that Scioppius has committed more blunders than he has corrected, that his book literally bristles with pure lies and baseless calumnies; but he does not succeed in

adducing a single proof either of his father's descent from the La Scala family, or of any single event narrated by Julius as happening to himself or any member of his family prior to his arrival at Agen. Nor does he even attempt a refutation of what seems really to be the crucial point in the whole controversy, and which Scioppius had proved, as far as a negative can be proved,—namely, that William, the last prince of Verona, had no son Nicholas, the alleged grandfather of Julius, nor indeed any son who could have been such grandfather. But whether complete or not, the *Confutatio* had no success; the attack of the Jesuits was successful, far more so than they could possibly have hoped. Scioppius was wont to boast that his book had killed Scaliger. It certainly embittered the few remaining months of his life, and it is not improbable that the mortification which he suffered may have shortened his days. The *Confutatio* was his last work. Five months after it appeared, "on the 21st of January, 1609, at four in the morning, he fell asleep in Heinsius's arms. The aspiring spirit ascended before the Infinite. The most richly stored intellect which had ever spent itself in acquiring knowledge was in the presence of the Omniscient" (Pattison).

Of Joseph Scaliger the only biography in any way adequate is that of Jacob Bernays (Berlin, 1855). It was reviewed by the late Mark Pattison in an excellent article in the *Quarterly Review*, vol. cviii. (1860). Mr Pattison had made many MS. collections for a life of Joseph Scaliger on a much more extensive scale, which it is greatly to be regretted he left unfinished, and in too fragmentary a state to be published. The present writer has had access to and made much use of these MSS., which include a life of Julius Cæsar Scaliger written some years since. For the life of Joseph, besides the recently published letters above referred to, the two old collections of Latin and French letters and the two *Scaligerana* are the most important sources of information. For the life of Julius Cæsar the letters edited by his son, those subsequently published in 1620 by the President de Maussac, the *Scaligerana*, and his own writings, which are full of autobiographical matter, are the chief authorities. M. De Bourousse de Laffore's *Étude sur Jules César de Lescale* (Agen, 1860) and M. Magen's *Documents sur Julius Cæsar Scaliger et sa famille* (Agen, 1873) add important details for the lives of both father and son. The lives by M. Charles Nisard—that of Julius in *Les Gladiateurs de la République des Lettres*, and that of Joseph in *Le Triumvirat Littéraire au seizième siècle*—are equally unworthy of their author and their subjects. Julius is simply held up to ridicule, while the life of Joseph is almost wholly based on the book of Scioppius and the *Scaligerana*. A complete list of the works of Joseph will be found in his life by Bernays. (R. C. C.)

SCAMMONY. Under this name the dried juice of the root of *Convolvulus Scammonia*, L. (σκαμμονία), is used in medicine.[1] It appears to have been known to the Greeks as early as the 3d century B.C., and is supposed to have been one of the medicines recommended to Alfred the Great by Helias, patriarch of Jerusalem (*Cockayne Leechdoms*, vol. ii. pp. xxiv., 289, 175; 273, 281). The scammony plant is a native of the countries of the eastern part of the Mediterranean basin, growing in bushy waste places, from Syria in the south to the Crimea in the north, its range extending westward to the Greek islands, but not to northern Africa or Italy. It is a twining perennial, bearing flowers like those of *Convolvulus arvensis*, and having irregularly arrow-shaped leaves and a thick fleshy root. The drug is collected principally in Asia Minor, and near Aleppo in Syria, although a little is obtained from the neighbourhood of Mount Carmel and the Lake of Tiberias. The principal places of export are Smyrna and Aleppo (Scanderoon), but the drug often bears in commerce the name of the district where it was collected, *e.g.*, Broussa, Angora, &c. Formerly Aleppo scammony was considered the best and commanded the highest price, but at present the purest article comes from Smyrna. The very variable quality of the drug has led to the use of the resin prepared directly from the root, which affords it to the extent of 5½ per cent., and an establishment for its manufacture was founded at Broussa in 1870. The dried root is also exported to England, and the resin prepared from it there. By purification the resin can be obtained almost white. The crude resin obtained from the root, being free from gum, does not present a milky appearance when rubbed with a wetted finger, and is thus easily distinguished from the natural product.

[1] It was formerly called diagrydion, probably from δάκρυ, a tear, in allusion to the manner the juice exudes from the incised root.

Scammony is used in medicine as a safe but energetic purgative, and is frequently prescribed in combination with calomel and colocynth. Its medicinal activity is due to the resin scammonin, which is also called jalapin from its occurrence in the root of the male jalap (*Ipomœa orizabensis*), and of Tampico jalap (*I. simulans*) (see JALAP). The export of scammony from Smyrna in 1881 was only 97 boxes, valued at £544, the amount having decreased of late years owing to the increased export of the root from Syria. More than half of this quantity was taken by England, about one-fourth by France, and the remainder by Italy, America, and Austria.

The drug is obtained from the root by slicing off obliquely one or two inches from the crown and allowing the milky juice which exudes to drain into a small shell (generally that of a freshwater mussel), which is inserted in the root just below the base of the incision. To prevent the juice from becoming soiled, the earth is scraped away so as to leave exposed four or five inches of the root. The shells are collected in the evening and their contents emptied into a copper or leathern vessel,—the scrapings from the surface of the root, consisting of partially dried tears, being added. On the average, about one drachm is afforded by each incision; a plant four years old may give two drachms; in rare cases as much as twelve drachms has been obtained from a single large root. The collection usually takes place when the plant is in flower towards the end of summer. The product of different roots naturally varies in quality, and the peasants therefore, on arrival at their homes, render it uniform by mixing it with a knife. It is then spread out in the air to dry. Sometimes the gathering of several days is allowed to accumulate, and then moistened, kneaded, and made up into cakes. During the drying it appears to undergo a kind of fermentation, which gives the drug a slightly porous appearance and dark colour. Frequently it is adulterated by adding 40 per cent. of flour and earthy matter. It then assumes a paler colour and opaque appearance, and loses its brittleness. This adulterated article is known as "skilip," and the pure article as "virgin" scammony. The latter is met with in the form of flattened pieces half an inch or more in thickness, with a blackish, resinous fracture, thin fragments being translucent. Externally it is often covered with a greyish powder. The odour, when a piece is freshly broken, is cheesy; when chewed, it leaves an acrid sensation in the throat. Scammony of good quality should yield to ether 80 to 90 per cent. of resin; the remainder consists of gum and mineral matter.

SCANDERBEG, *i.e.*, Iskander (Alexander) Bey, is the Turkish name and title of GEORGE CASTRIOTA, the youngest son of John Castriota, lord of an hereditary principality in Albania. He was born about the year 1404, and as a boy was sent as a hostage to the Ottoman court, where he was brought up as a Mohammedan for the Turkish military service. He early distinguished himself as a soldier and received high promotion under Amurath II. In 1443 he was of the expedition against the Magyars, but shortly after taking the field he heard of his father's death and resolved to strike a blow for freedom. Availing himself of the opportunity afforded by John Hunyady's defeat of the Turks at Nish, he forced from the principal secretary of the sultan a firman making him governor of Croya, his native town, and forthwith left the camp with 300 Albanian horsemen. Once master of the place, he abjured Islam and proclaimed his independence. The Albanians soon recognized him as their head, and flocked to his standard, and pasha after pasha was vainly sent to crush him. Amurath II. in person unsuccessfully besieged him in 1450, and Mohammed II. found it necessary to grant him favourable terms of peace in 1461. Instigated by the legates of Pius II. and the ambassadors of the Venetian republic, Scanderbeg again proclaimed war in 1464, and at least was successful in repelling the

sultan, who had invaded Albania. He died in January 1467 at Alessio, leaving an infant son named John, whom he commended to the care of the Venetians. After a twelve years' war, the Turks finally gained possession of Croya, the representatives of Scanderbeg settling in Calabria.

SCANDEROON (ISCANDERÛN), or ALEXANDRETTA, lies girdled by green hills on the picturesque bay of the same name, the ancient *Sinus Issicus*, at the extreme north of the Syrian coast, where it forms an angle with that of Asia Minor. Alexandretta succeeded an older town of Alexandria (Little Alexandria), founded by Alexander the Great, but does not perhaps occupy quite the same site. The harbour is the best on the Syrian coast, and steamers call at it regularly, but the town is scourged with fever and has only some 2500 inhabitants, mainly Greek Christians. It is the port of Aleppo, and would naturally be the port of an "Euphrates railway."

SCANDINAVIAN LANGUAGES. By this expression we understand the closely allied languages which are and have been spoken by the Germanic population in Scandinavia, and by the inhabitants of the countries that have been wholly or partially peopled from it. At present the territory of these languages embraces—Sweden, except the most northerly part (Lapland and inland parts of Vesterbötten, where Finnish and Lappish exclusively or chiefly prevail); certain islands and districts on the coast of western and southern Finland, as well as Åland;[1] a small tract on the coast of Esthonia, where Swedish is spoken, as it is also to some extent in the Esthonian islands of Dagö, Nargö, Nukkö, Ormsö, and Rågö;[2] Gammalsvenskby ("Galsvenskbi") in southern Russia (government of Kherson),[3] a village colonized from Dagö; the Livonian island of Runö,[4] where Swedish is spoken, as it formerly was on the island of Ösel; Norway, except certain regions in the northern part of the country, peopled by Finns and Lapps (diocese of Tromsö); Denmark, with the Faroes, Iceland, and Greenland, where, however, Danish is only spoken by a very small part of the population; the northernmost part of Schleswig; and, finally, several Scandinavian colonies in the United States of North America. Scandinavian dialects have besides been spoken for varying periods in the following places: Norwegian in certain parts of Ireland (800–1300 A.D.) and northern Scotland, in the Isle of Man, the Hebrides (800–1400, or longer), the Shetland Islands (800–1800), and the Orkneys (800–1800);[5] Danish in the whole of Schleswig, in the north-eastern part of England (the "Danelag"), and in Normandy (900–1000, or a little longer);[6] Swedish in Russia (from the end of the 9th to the beginning of the 11th century).[7] At what epoch the Germanic population settled in Scandinavia we cannot as yet even approximately decide. It is quite certain, however, that it already existed there before the Christian era,—nay, most probably as early as the beginning of the so-called Stone Age (three thousand years before Christ). If this view be correct, the Scandinavian languages have had an existence of more than four thousand years.[8] But we do not know anything about them during the period before the birth of Christ. It is only from that epoch we can get any information concerning the language of the old Scandinavians, which seems by that time not only to have spread over Denmark and great parts of southern and middle Sweden and of (southern) Norway, but also to have reached Finland (at least Nyland) and Esthonia. In spite of its extension over this considerable geographical area, the language appears to have been fairly homogeneous throughout the whole territory. Consequently, it may be regarded as a uniform language, the mother of the younger Scandinavian tongues, and accordingly has been named the primitive Scandinavian (*urnordisk*) language. The oldest sources of our knowledge of this tongue are the words which were borrowed during the first centuries of the Christian era (some of them perhaps even earlier) by the Lapps from the inhabitants of central Sweden and Norway, and by the Finns from their neighbours in Finland and Esthonia, and which have been preserved in Finnish and Lappish down to our own days.[9] These borrowed words, denoting chiefly utensils belonging to a fairly advanced stage of culture, amount to several hundreds, with a phonetic form of a very primitive stamp; as Finn. *terva* (O. Sw. *tiæra*, Germ. *theer*), tar; *airo* (O. Sw. *ar*), oar; *kansa* (O. H. G. *hansa*), people; *napakaira* (O. H. G. *nabagêr*, O. Sw. *navar*), auger; *nekla* (Got. *nêþla*, O. Sw. *nal*), needle; *ansas* (Got. *ans*, O. Sw. *as*), beam; Lapp *sajet* (Got. *saian*, O. Sw. *sa*), sow; *garves* (O. H. G. *garawêr*, O. Sw. *gör*), finished; *divres* (O. Sax. *diuri*, O. Sw. *dyr*), dear; *saipo* (O. H. G. *seifa*, Sw. *såpa*), soap. These words, with those mentioned by contemporary Roman and Greek authors, are the oldest existing traces of any Germanic language. Wrested from their context, however, they throw but little light on the nature of the original northern tongue. But a series of linguistic monuments have come down to us dating from the end of the so-called early Iron Age (about 450 A.D.),—the knowledge and the use of the oldest runic alphabet (with twenty-four characters) having at that period been propagated among the Scandinavians by the southern Germanic tribes. In fact we still possess, preserved down to our own times, primitive northern runic inscriptions, the oldest upon the utensils found at *Thorsbjerg*, dating back to about 300 A.D.[10], which, together with the MS. fragments of Ulfila's Gothic translation of the Bible, about two hundred years later in date, constitute the oldest veritable monuments of any Germanic tongue. These runic inscriptions are for the most part found on stone-monuments (sometimes on rocks) and bracteates (gold coins stamped on one side and used for ornaments), as well as on metallic and wooden utensils, weapons, and ornaments.[11] Up to this time there have been discovered more than one hundred, but of these only about one-half give us any information concerning the language, and most of them are only too short. The longest one, the stone-monument of *Tune*, in south-eastern Norway, contains only sixteen words. Their language is somewhat later in character than that of the oldest words borrowed by the Lapps and Finns: accented *é*, for example, is already changed into *a* (*cf.* *marir* = Goth. *mêrs*, renowned; but the Finn. borrowed word *nékla* = Goth. *nêþla*, needle), and the voiced *s* into a kind of *r* (*cf.* *dagar* = Goth. *dags*,

[1] See A. O. Freudenthal, *Om Svenska allmogemålet i Nyland*, 1870; *Ueber den Närpesdialect*, 1878.

[2] A. O. Freudenthal, *Upplysningar om Rågö- och Wichterpalmålet*, 1875; H. Vendell, *Laut- und Formlehre der Schwedischen Mundarten in den Kirchspielen Ormsö und Nukkö*, 1881.

[3] H. Vendell, "Om och från Gammalsvenskby" (*Finsk Tidskrift*, 1882). [4] H. Vendell, *Runömålets ljud- och formlära*, 1882–6.

[5] J. J. A. Worsaae, *Minder om de Danske og Nordmændene i England, Skotland, og Irland*, 1851; A. Laurensen and K. J. Lyngby, "Om sproget paa Hjaltlandsöerne" (*Ann. f. Nord. Oldkynd.*, 1860); P. A. Munch, *Samlede Afhandlinger*, iii., iv., 1875–76.

[6] Worsaae, *l.c.*; J. C. H. R. Steenstrup, *Danelag*, 1882; Es. Tegnér, "Normän eller Danskar i Normandie," and "Ytterligare om de nordiska ortnamnen i Normandie" (*Nordisk Tidskrift*, 1884).

[7] V. Thomsen, *Ryska rikets grundläggning genom Skandinaverna*, 1882 (*The Relations between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia*, 1877); S. Bugge, "Oldsvenske navne i Rusland" (*Arkiv for Nordisk Filologi*, ii. 1885).

[8] O. Montelius, "Om våra förfäders invandring till Norden" (*Nordisk Tidskrift*, 1884).

[9] W. Thomsen, *Ueber den Einfluss der Germ. Sprachen auf die Finnisch-Lappischen*, 1870.

[10] O. Montelius, *Die Kultur Schwedens in vorchristlicher Zeit*, 1885.

[11] See the plates in G. Stephens's *Handbook of Old Northern Runic Monuments*, 1884.

day; but Finn. *armas* = Goth. *arms*, poor). On the other hand, in all essential matters it is much earlier in character than the language of contemporary Gothic manuscripts, and no doubt approaches more nearly than any Germanic idiom the primitive form of the Germanic tongue. For the sake of comparison, we give a Gothic translation of one of the oldest of the primitive Scandinavian inscriptions, that on the golden horn of *Gallehus*, found on the Danish-German frontier, and dating from about 400 A.D.:—

Scand.: EK HLEWAGASTIR. HOLTINGAR. HORNA. TAWIDO;
Goth.: *ik hliugasts. hultiggs. haurn. tawida*;
Engl.: I, Hlewagastir, son of Holta, made the horn;

as well as the inscription on the stone-monument of *Järsbärg* in western Sweden, which is at least a hundred years later:—

Scand.: UBAR HITE. HARABANAR WIT IAH EK ERILAR RUNOR WARITU;
Goth.: *ufar hita, hrabns wit jah ik airils rûnôs writu*;
Engl.: In memory of Hitar. We both, Harabanar and I Erilar, wrote the runes.

Although very brief, and not yet thoroughly interpreted,[1] these primitive Scandinavian inscriptions are nevertheless sufficient to enable us to determine with some certainty the relation which the language in which they are written bears to other languages. Thus it is proved that it belongs to the Germanic family of the Indo-European stock of languages, of which it constitutes an independent and individual branch. Its nearest relation being the Gothic, these two branches are sometimes taken together under the general denomination *Eastern Germanic*, as opposed to the other Germanic idioms (German, English, Dutch, &c.), which are then called *Western Germanic*. The most essential point of correspondence between the Gothic and Scandinavian branches is the insertion in certain cases of *gg* before *w* and *j* (*ggj* in Gothic was changed into *ddj*), as in gen. plur. O. H. G. *zweiio*, O. Engl. *twega* (two), compared with O. Icel., O. Norw. *tveggja*, O. Sw., O. Dan. *tviggjæ*, Goth. *twaddjê*; and, still, in Germ. *treu*, Engl. *true*, compared with Sw., Norw., Dan. *trygg*, Icel. *tryggr*, Goth. *triggwa*. However, even in the primitive Scandinavian age the difference between Gothic and Scandinavian is more clearly marked than the resemblance; thus, for example—just to hint only at some of the oldest and most essential differences—Goth. nom. sing. ending in *-s* corresponds to primitive Scandinavian *-ar*, *-ir* (as Goth. *dags*, day, *gasts*, guest = Scand. *dagar*, *gastir*); Goth. gen. sing. in *-is* to Scand. *-as* (as Goth. *dagis*, day's = Scand. *dagas*); Goth. dat. sing. in *-a* to Scand. *-e* (as Goth. *haurna*, corn = Scand. *kurne*); Goth. 1st pers. sing. pret. in *-da* to Scand. *-do* (as Goth. *tawida*, did = Scand. *tawido*).

As early as the beginning of the so-called later Iron Age (about 700 A.D.) the primitive Scandinavian language had undergone a considerable transformation, as is proved for example by the remarkable runic stone at *Istaby* in the south of Sweden, with the inscription—

AFAR HARIWULAFA HAÞUWULAFR HAERUWULAFIR WARAIT RUNAR ÞAIAR;
Engl.: In memory of Hariwulfr, Haþuwulfr, son of Heruwulfr, wrote these runes.

Here, *e.g.*, we find nom. sing. in *-ar* changed into *-r* (*cf.* *haþuwulafr* with *holtingar* on the golden horn), and the plural ending *-or* into *-ar* (*cf.* *runar* with *runor* on the Järsbärg-stone). At the beginning of the so-called Viking Period (about 800 A.D.) the Scandinavian language seems to have undergone an extraordinarily rapid development, which in a comparatively short time almost completely transformed its character. This change is especially noticeable in the dropping of unaccented vowels, and in the introduction of a certain vowel harmony of different kinds ("Umlaut", vowel changes, caused by a following *i* (*j*) or *u* (*w*), as *kvæði* for *kwâði*, poem, and "Brechung", as *healpa* instead of *helpa*, to help), different assimilations of consonants (as *ll*, *nn* for *lþ*, *np*; *ll*, *nn*, *rr*, and *ss* for *lR*, *nR*, *rR*, and *sR*), dropping of *w* before *o* and *u* (as *orð*, *ulfr* for *worð*, word, *wulfR*, wolf), simplified inflexion of the verbs, a new passive formed by means of affixing the reflexive pronoun *sik* to the active form (as *kalla-sk*, to call one's self, to be called), &c.

At this epoch, therefore, the primitive Scandinavian language must be considered as no longer existing. The next two centuries form a period of transition as regards the language as well as the alphabet which it employed. We possess some inscriptions belonging to this period in which the old runic alphabet of twenty-four characters is still used, and the language of which closely resembles that of the primitive Scandinavian monuments, as, for example, those on the stones of *Stentoften* and *Björketorp*, both from southern Sweden, probably dating from the 10th century, and being the longest inscriptions yet found with the old runic alphabet. On the other hand, inscriptions have come down to us dating from about the middle of the 9th century, in which the later and exclusively Scandinavian alphabet of sixteen characters has almost completely superseded the earlier alphabet, from which it was developed, while the language not only differs widely from the original Scandinavian, but also exhibits dialectical peculiarities suggesting the existence of a Danish-Swedish language as opposed to Norwegian, as the form *ruulf* on the stone at *Flemlöse* in Denmark, which in a Norwegian inscription would have been written *hruulf* corresponding to *Hrolf* in Old Norwegian literature. These differences, however, are unimportant, and the Scandinavians still considered their language as one and the same throughout Scandinavia, and named it *Dǫnsk tunga*, Danish tongue. But when Iceland was colonized at the end of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th century, chiefly from western Norway, a separate (western) Norwegian dialect gradually sprang up, at first of course only differing slightly from the mother-tongue. It was not until the introduction of Christianity (about 1000 A.D.) that the language was so far differentiated as to enable us to distinguish, in runic inscriptions and in the literature which was then arising, four different dialects, which have ever since existed as the four literary languages—Icelandic, Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish. Of these the latter two, often comprehended within the name of *Eastern Scandinavian*, as well as the former two, *Western Scandinavian*, or, to use the Old Scandinavians' own name, *Norrǫnt mál*, Northern tongue, are very nearly related to each other. The most important differences between the two branches, as seen in the oldest preserved documents, are the following:—(1) In E. Scand. far fewer cases of "Umlaut," as *vári*, W. Scand. *vǽri*, were; *land*, W. Scand. *lǫnd* (from *landu*), lands; (2) E. Scand. "Brechung" of *i* into *iu* (or *io*) before *ng(w)*, *nk(w)*, as *siungæ*, W. Scand. *syngva* (from *singwa*), to sing; (3) in E. Scand. *mp*, *nk*, *nt* are in many cases not assimilated into *pp*, *kk*, *tt*, as *krumpen*, W. Scand. *kroppenn*, shrunken; *enkiæ*, W. Scand. *ekkja*, widow; *bant*, W. Scand. *batt*, he bound; (4) in E. Scand. the dative of the definite plural ends in *-omen* instead of W. Scand. *-onom*, as in *handomen*, *hǫndonom*, (to) the hands; (5) in E. Scand. the simplification of the verbal inflexional endings is far further advanced, and the passive ends in *-s* for *-sk*, as in *kallæs*, W. Scand. *kallask*, to be called. In several of these points, and indeed generally speaking, the Western Scandinavian languages have preserved the more primitive forms, as may be seen in the

[1] For the interpretations we are principally indebted to Prof. S. Bugge's ingenious investigations, who in 1865 satisfactorily succeeded in deciphering the inscription of the golden horn, and by this means gained a fixed starting-point for further researches. A short review of their most important results is given by F. Burg, *Die älteren Nordischen Runeninschriften*, 1885.

oldest Eastern Scandinavian runic inscriptions, dating from a period before the beginning of the literature, as well as in many modern Eastern Scandinavian dialects. For, having regard to the Scandinavian dialects generally, we must adopt quite a different classification from that indicated by the dialects which are represented in the literature. We now pass on to review the latter and their history.

I. Icelandic.—In ancient times Icelandic was by far the most important of the Scandinavian languages, in form as well as in literature. To avoid ambiguity, the language before the Reformation (about 1530–40) is often called Old Icelandic.

1. *Old Icelandic* was spoken not only in Iceland, but also in Greenland, where Icelandic colonists lived for a lengthened period (983–about 1400). Our knowledge of its character is almost exclusively derived from the remarkably voluminous literature,[1] dating from the middle of the 12th century, and written in the Latin alphabet, adapted to the special requirements of this language. Nothing is preserved of older runic literature.[2] Indeed, Old Icelandic possesses only very few runic monuments (about forty), all of them almost worthless from a philological point of view. The oldest, the inscription on the church door of Valþjófstaðr, dates from the beginning of the 13th century,[3] and is consequently later than the oldest preserved manuscripts[4] in the Latin alphabet, some of which are as old as the end of the 12th century. A small fragment (Cod. AM. 237, fol.) of a *Book of Homilies* (of which a short specimen is given below) is considered the oldest of all. About contemporary with this is the oldest part of an inventory entitled *Reykjaholts máldage*. From about 1200 we possess a fragment (Cod. Reg. old sign. 1812) of the only existing Old Icelandic *glossary*, and from the first years of the 13th century the *Stockholm Book of Homilies* (Cod. Holm. 15, 4to), which from a philological point of view is of the greatest importance, chiefly on account of its very accurate orthography, which is especially noticeable in the indication of quantity; from the early part of the same century comes the fragment (Cod. AM. 325, 2, 4to) entitled *Ágrip* ("abridgment" of the history of Norway), probably a copy of a Norwegian original, also orthographically important. Among later manuscripts we may mention, as philologically interesting, the *Annales Regii* (Cod. Reg. 2087) from the beginning of the 14th century, orthographically of great value; the rich manuscript of miscellanies, *Hauksbók* (Codd. AM. 371, 544, 675, 4to), a great part of which is written with Haukr Erlendsson's (†1334) own hand; and, above all, three short essays, in which some Icelanders have tried to write a grammatical and orthographical treatise on their own mother-tongue, all three appearing as an appendix to the manuscripts of the *Prose Edda*. The oldest and most important of these essays (preserved in the Cod. Worm. from about 1330) is by an unknown author of about 115[?], and is probably intended to be a continuation of a lost work of the first grammarian of Iceland, Þóroddr Rúnameistari (who flourished at the beginning of the 12th century); the second (the oldest known manuscript of which is preserved in the Cod. Ups., *c.* 1290) is perhaps the work of the famous Snorri Sturloson (†1241); the third (the oldest manuscript in Cod. AM. 748, 4to, of the beginning of the 14th century) is by Snorri's nephew Ólafr Hvítaskáld (†1259), and is no doubt based partly upon Þórodd's work above mentioned, partly and chiefly upon Priscian and Donatus.[5]

The oldest form of the Icelandic language is, however, not preserved in the above-mentioned earliest manuscripts of the end of the 12th century, which are written in the language of their own age, but in far later ones of the 13th century, which contain poems by the oldest Icelandic poets, such as the renowned Egill Skallagrímson (about 930) and the unknown authors of the so-called Edda songs. In spite of the late date of the manuscripts, the metrical form has been the means of preserving a good deal of the ancient language. But, as already remarked, during the 10th and 11th centuries this dialect differs but little from Norwegian, though in the 12th this is no longer the case.

We may here contrast a specimen of the above-mentioned oldest Icelandic manuscript (from the end of the 12th century) with an almost contemporary Norwegian one (Cod. AM. 619; see below):—

Icel.—En þat es vitanda, at allt ma andlega merkiasc oc fyllasc í oss, þat es til kirkio bunings eþa þionosto þarf at haua, ef ver liuom sva hreinlega at vér sem verþer at callasc goþs mustere.

Norw.—En þat er vitanda, at allt ma andlega merkiasc oc fyllasc i os, þat er til kirkiu bunings eða til þionasto þarf at hafa, ef vér lifum sva ræinlega, at vér sem verðir at kallasc guðs mysteri.

Engl.—And that is to be known that all that is needed for the decoration of the church or the service may, spiritually, be found and imitated within us, if we live so cleanly that we are worthy to be called God's temple.

Apart from the fact that the language is, generally speaking, archaic, we find in the Icelandic text two of the oldest and most essential characteristics of Icelandic as opposed to Norwegian, viz., the more complete vowel assimilation (*þionosto, þionasto*; *cf.* also, *e.g.*, Icel. *kǫlloþom*, Norw. *kallaðum*, we called) and the retention of initial *h* before *r* (*hreinlega, ræinlegà*), *l*, and *n*. Other differences, some of which occur at this period, others a little later, are—in Icel. lengthening of *a, o, u* before *lf, lg, lk, lm*, and *lp* (as Icel. *hálfr*, Norw. and oldest Icel. *halfr*, half); later still, also of *a, i, u*, and *y* before *ng* and *nk*; Icel. *ǽ* and *ey* for older *ǿ* and *ǿy* (as in Icel. *dǽma, heyra*, Norw. and oldest Icel. *dǿma*, to deem, *hǿyra*, to hear); Icel. termination of 2nd plur. of verbs in *-ð* (þ) or *-t*, but Norw. often in *-r* (as Icel. *takið, -t*, Norw. *takir*, you take). These points may be sufficient to characterize the language of the earlier "classical" period of Icelandic (about 1190–1350). At the middle of the 13th century the written language undergoes material changes, owing in a great measure, no doubt, to the powerful influence of Snorri Sturloson. Thus in unaccented syllables *i* now appears for older *e*, and *u* (at first only when followed by one or more consonants belonging to the same syllable) for *o*; the passive ends in *-z* for *-sk*. The other differences from Norwegian, mentioned above as occurring later, are now completely established. With the beginning of the 14th century there appear several new linguistic phenomena: a *u* is inserted between final *r* and a preceding consonant (as in *ríkur*, mighty); *ǫ* (pronounced as an open *o*) passes into *ö* (the character *ö* was not introduced till the 16th century), or before *ng, nk* into *au* (as *lǫng, fjǫll*, pronounced *laung, fjöll*); *e* before *ng, nk* passes into *ei*; a little later *é* passes into *ie*, and the passive changes its termination from *-z*, oldest *-sk*, into *-zt* (or *-zst*) (as in *kallazt*, to be called). The post-classical period of Old Icelandic (1350–1530), which is, from a literary point of view, of but little importance, already shows marked differences that are characteristic of Modern Icelandic; as early as the 15th century we find *ddl* for *ll* and *rl* (as *falla*, pronounced *fáddla*, to fall), *ddn* for *nn* and *rn* (as *horn*, pron. *hoddn*, horn); about the year 1500 *ve* after *h* passes into *vo*, in other positions to *vö* (as *hvelpr*, pron. *χvolpur*, whelp; *kvern*, pron. *kvörn*, mill), etc.

Dialects. Although dialectical differences are not altogether wanting, they do not occur to any great extent in the Old Icelandic literary language. Thus, in some manuscripts we find *ft* replaced by *fst* (*oft, ofst*, often); in manuscripts from the western part of the island there appears in the 13th and 14th centuries a tendency to change *lf, rf* into *lb, rb* (*tolf, tolb*, twelve; *þorf, þorb*, want), &c. To what extent the language of Greenland differed from that of Iceland we cannot judge from the few runic monuments which have come down to us from that colony.

Apart from the comparatively inconsiderable attempts at a grammatical treatment of Old Icelandic in the Middle Ages which we have mentioned above, grammar as a science can only be said to have commenced in the 17th century. The first grammar, written by the Icelander Runolphus Jonas (†1654), dates from 1651. His contemporary and compatriot Gudmund Andreæ (†1654) compiled the first dictionary, which was not, however, edited till 1683 (by the Dane Petrus Resenius, †1688). The first scholars who studied Old Icelandic systematically were H. K. Rask (1787–1832), whose works[6] laid the foundation to our knowledge of the language, and his great contemporary Jac. Grimm, in whose *Deutsche Grammatik* (1819 *sq.*) particular attention is paid to Icelandic. Those who since the time of Rask and Grimm have principally deserved well of Icelandic grammar are—the ingenious and learned Norwegian P. A. Munch, 1863,[7] to whom we really owe the normalized orthography that has hitherto been most in use in editing Old Icelandic texts; the learned Icelander K. Gíslason, whose works are chiefly devoted to phonetic researches;[8] the Danish scholars K. J. Lyngby (†1871), the author of an essay[9] which is of fundamental importance in Icelandic orthography and phonetics, and L. F. A. Wimmer, who has rendered great services to the study of the etymology.[10] The latest Icelandic grammar is by the Swede Ad. Noreen.[11] As lexicographers the first rank is held by the

[1] A complete catalogue of the literature edited hitherto is given by Th. Möbius, *Catalogus Librorum Islandicorum et Norvegicorum Ætatis Mediæ*, 1856, and *Verzeichniss der . . . altisländischen und altnorwegischen . . . von 1855 bis 1879 erschienenen Schriften*, 1880. Compare Iceland.

[2] See B. Magnússon Olsen, *Runerne i den Oldislandske literatur*, 1883.

[3] See Kr. Kålund, "Islands fortidslevninger" (in the *Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed*, 1882).

[4] An account of all the oldest Icelandic manuscripts (to about 1230) is given by J. Hoffory in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1884, p. 478 *sq.*

[5] A short review of the most important Old Icelandic manuscripts (and their editions), classed according to subjects, is given by O. Brenner, *Altnordisches Handbuch*, pp. 13 *sq.* The principal collections of manuscripts are—1, the Arnamagnæan (AM.) in Copenhagen, founded by Arni Magnússon (†1730); 2, the collection of the Royal Library (Reg.) in Copenhagen, founded by Th. Torfæus (†1719) and Brynjólfr Sveinsson (†1674); 3, the Delagardian collection (Delag. or Ups.) at Upsala, founded in 1651 by Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie; 4, the Stockholm collection (Holm.), founded by Jón Rugman (in 1662) and Jón Eggertson (in 1682).

[6] *E.g.*, *Veiledning til det Islandske sprog*, 1811; in a new, much improved Swedish edition, *Anvisning til Isländskan*, 1818.

[7] *Fornswenskans och Fornnorskans språkbyggnad*, 1849, and (along with C. R. Unger) *Norrönasprogets grammatik*, 1847.

[8] Especially *Um frumparta Íslenzkrar túngu í fornöld*, 1846.

[9] *Den Oldnordiske udtale*, 1861.

[10] *Fornnordisk formlära*, 1874.

[11] *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen*, 1884.

Icelanders Sv. Egilsson (†1852),[1] G. Vigfússon,[2] and J. Þorkelsson,[3] and the Norwegian J. Fritzner.[4]

2. *Modern Icelandic* is generally dated from the introduction of the Reformation into Iceland; the book first printed, the New Testament of 1540, may be considered as the earliest Modern Icelandic document. Although, on account of the exceedingly conservative tendency of Icelandic orthography, the language of Modern Icelandic literature still seems to be almost identical with the language of the 17th century, it has in reality undergone a constant and active development, and, phonetically regarded, has changed considerably. Indeed, energetic efforts to bring about an orthography more in accordance with phonetics were made during the years 1835–47 by the magazine entitled *Fjölnir*, where we find such authors as Jónas Hallgrímsson and Konr. Gíslason; but these attempts proved abortive. Of more remarkable etymological changes in Modern Icelandic we may note the following:—already about the year 1550 the passive termination *-zt* (*-zst*) passes into the till then very rare termination *-st* (as in *kallast*, to be called); *y, ý*, and *ey* at the beginning of the 17th century coincided with *i, í*, and *ei*; the long vowels *á, ǽ*, and *ó* have passed into the diphthongs *au* (at least about 1650), *ai* (about 1700), *ou* (as *mál*, language, *mæla*, to speak, *stóll*, chair); *g* before *i, j* is changed into *dj* (after a consonant) or *j* (after a vowel),—*e.g.*, *liggia*, to lie, *eigi*, not; in certain other cases *g* has passed into *gw* or *w*,—*e.g.*, *lágur*, low, *ljúga*, to lie; initial *g* before *n* is silent,—*e.g.*, (*g*)*naga*, to gnaw; *kn* has passed into *hn*,—*e.g.*, *knútr*, knot; *ps, pt* into *fs, ft*; *bb, dd, gg* are pronounced as *bp, dt, gk*, and *ll, rl, nn, rn* now in most positions (not, however, before *d, t*, and *s*, and in abbreviated names) as *dtl, dtn*,—as *fjall*, mountain, *björn*, bear; *f* before *n* is now pronounced as *bp*,—as *hrafn*, raven, &c. Both in vocabulary and syntax we find early, *e.g.*, in the lawbook *Jónsbók*, printed in 1578(–80), Danish exercising an important influence, as might be expected from political circumstances. In the 18th century, however, we meet with purist tendencies. As one of the leading men of this century may be mentioned the poet Eggert Ólafsson (†1768), whose poems were not printed till 1832. Worthy of mention in the history of Modern Icelandic language are the learned societies which appeared in the same century, of which the first, under the name of "Hið ósýnilega," was established in 1760. At this time archaic tendencies, going back to the Old Icelandic of the 13th and 14th centuries, were continually gaining ground. In our century the following have won especial renown in Icelandic literature:—Bjarne Þórarensen (†1841), Iceland's greatest lyric poet, and Jónas Hallgrímsson (†1845), perhaps its most prominent prose-author in modern times.[5]

Dialects. The dialectical differences in Modern Icelandic are comparatively trifling and chiefly phonetic. The Westland dialect has, for example, preserved the Old Icelandic long *a*, while the other dialects have changed it to the diphthong *au*; in the Northland dialect initial *kn* is preserved, in the others changed into *hn*; in the northern and western parts of the island Old Icelandic *hv* appears as *kv*, in a part of south-eastern Iceland as *χ*, in the other dialects as *χw*,—*e.g.*, *hvelpr*, whelp. As a matter of curiosity it may be noted that on the western and eastern coasts traces are found of a French-Icelandic language, which arose from the long sojourn of French fishermen there.

Grammatical treatment. Owing to the exclusive interest taken in the ancient language, but little attention is given even now to the grammatical treatment of Modern Icelandic. Some notices of the language of the 17th century may be obtained from the above-mentioned grammar of Runolphus Jonas (1651), and for the language of the 18th from Rask's grammatical works. For the language of our own time there is hardly anything to refer to but N. Friðriksson's works, *Íslenzk málmyndalýsing*, 1861, and *Skýring hinna almennu málfræðislegu hugmynda*, 1864, which, however, are not especially devoted to the modern state of philology; compare also B. Magnússon Olsen's valuable paper "Zur neuisländischen Grammatik" (*Germania*, xxvii., 1882).[6] A dictionary of merit was that of Björn Halldorsen (†1794), edited in 1814 by Rask. Cleasby-Vigfússon's dictionary mentioned above also pays some attention to the modern language. A really convenient Modern Icelandic dictionary is still wanting, the desideratum being only partly supplied by K. Gíslason's excellent Danish-Icelandic *Dönsk orðabók med Íslenzkum þýðingum*, 1851.

II. Norwegian or Norse.—The *Old Norwegian* language (till the Reformation) was not, like the modern language, confined to Norway and the Faroes, but was, as already stated, for some time spoken in parts of Ireland and the north of Scotland, the Isle of Man, the Hebrides, Shetland, and Orkney (in the last two groups of islands it continued to survive down to modern times), and also in certain parts of western Sweden as at present defined (Bohuslän, Särna in Dalarna, Jämtland, and Härjedalen).

Our knowledge of it is due only in a small measure to runic inscriptions,[7] for these are comparatively few in number (a little more than one hundred) and of trifling importance from a philological point of view, especially as they almost wholly belong to the period between 1050 and 1350,[8] and consequently are contemporary with or at least not much earlier than the earliest literature. The whole literature preserved is written in the Latin alphabet. The earliest manuscripts are not much later than the oldest Old Icelandic ones, and of the greatest interest. On the whole, however, the earliest Norwegian literature is in quality as well as in quantity incomparably inferior to the Icelandic. It amounts merely to about a score of different works, and of these but few are of any literary value. A small fragment (Cod. AM. 655, 4to, Fragm. ix., A, B, C), a collection of legends, no doubt written a little before 1200, is regarded as the earliest extant manuscript. From the very beginning of the 13th century we have the *Norwegian Book of Homilies* (Cod. AM. 619, 4to) and several fragments of law-books (the older *Gulaþingslaw* and the older *Eiðsivaþingslaw*). The chief manuscript (Cod. AM. 243B., fol.) of the principal work in Old Norwegian literature, the *Speculum Regale*, or *Konungsskuggsjá* ("Mirror for Kings"), is a little later. Of still later manuscripts the so-called legendary *Olafssaga* (Cod. Delag. 8, fol.), from about 1250, deserves mention. The masses of charters which—occurring throughout the whole Middle Age of Norway[9] from the beginning of the 13th century—afford much information, especially concerning the dialectical differences of the language, are likewise of great philological importance.

As in Old Icelandic so in Old Norwegian we do not find the most primitive forms in the oldest MSS. that have come down to us; for that purpose we must recur to somewhat later ones, containing old poems from times as remote as the days of Brage Boddason (the beginning of the 8th century) and Þjóðolfr of Hvin (end of the same century). It has already been stated that the language at this epoch differed so little from other Scandinavian dialects that it could scarcely yet be called by a distinctive name, and also that, as Icelandic separated itself from the Norwegian mother-tongue (about 900), the difference between the two languages was at first infinitely small—as far, of course, as the literary language is concerned. From the 13th century, however, they exhibit more marked differences; for, while Icelandic develops to a great extent independently, Norwegian, owing to geographical and political circumstances, is considerably influenced by the Eastern Scandinavian languages. The most important differences between Icelandic and Norwegian at the epoch of the oldest MSS. (about 1200) have already been noted. The tendency in Norwegian to retain the use of the so-called *u*-Umlaut has already been mentioned. On the other hand, there appears in Norwegian in the 13th century another kind of vowel-assimilation, almost unknown to Icelandic, the vowel in terminations being in some degree influenced by the vowel of the preceding syllable. Thus, for instance, we find in some manuscripts (as the above-mentioned legendary *Olafssaga*) that the vowels *e, o* and long *a, æ, ǿ* are followed in terminations by *e, o*; *i, u, y*, and short *a, æ, ǿ*, on the other hand, by *i, u*,—as in *bǿner*, prayers, *konor*, women; but *tiðir*, times, *tungur*, tongues. The same fact occurs in certain Old Swedish manuscripts. When Norway had been united later with Sweden under one crown (1319) we meet pure Suecisms in the Norwegian literary language. In addition to this, the 14th century exhibits several differences from the old language[10]: *rl, rn* are sometimes assimilated into *ll, nn*,—as *kall* (elder *karl*), man, *konn* (*korn*), corn, *prestanner* (*prestarnir*), the priests; *i* passes into *y* before *r, l*,—as *hyrðir* (*hirðir*), shepherd, *lykyl* (*lykill*), key; final *-r* after a consonant is changed into *-er* or *-ær*, sometimes only *-e, -æ*,—as *hester* (*hestr*), horse; *bǿker* (*bǿkr*), books; the names *Þolleifær* (*Þorleifr*), *Guðlæifæ* (*Guðleifr*). About the beginning of the 15th century initial *kv* occurs for old *hv* (not, however, in pronouns, which take *kv* only in western Norway), as the local name *Qviteseið* (*hvítr*, white). During the 15th century, Norway being united with Denmark, and at intervals also with Sweden, a great many Danisms and a few Suecisms are imported into the language. As Suecisms we may mention the termination *-in* of the 2d pers. plur. instead of *-ir, -ið* (as *vilin*, you will), the pronoun *jak* instead of *ek*, I. The most important Danisms

[1] *Lexicon poeticum*, 1854–60.

[2] *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, based on the MS. collections of the late R. Cleasby, 1869–74.

[3] *Supplement til Islandske ordbøger*, 1876 and 1879–85.

[4] *Ordbog over det Gamle Norske sprog*, 1862–67; new ed., 1883 *sq.*

[5] See R. Arpi, "Islands yngre literatur och språk" (*Språkvetenskapliga sällskapets förhandlingar*, 1883–85).

[6] Notices of the Modern Icelandic pronunciation are also to be found in H. Sweet's *Handbook of Phonetics*, 1877, Chr. Vidsteen's *Oplysninger om Bygdemaalene i Hardanger*, 1885, and R. Arpi's above-quoted paper.

[7] For these see especially Nicolaysen, *Norske fornlevninger*, 1862–66.

[8] The oldest are those on the Valdby- (Larvik) and Strand- (Aafjord) stones, both from pagan times. The latest rune-stones are from the end of the 14th century. Owing to influence of the learned such stones appear again in the 17th century, *e.g.*, in Telemarken.

[9] On the Old Norwegian manuscripts see the works cited in notes 4, 5, page 368; for the literature hitherto edited see note 1, page 368.

[10] The present writer is indebted to Prof. Joh. Storm for the following remarks on the history of the Norwegian language and its dialects during the 14th and 15th centuries.

are the following: *b*, *d*, and *g* are substituted for *p*, *t*, and *k*,—as in the local names *Nabø* (earlier *Napa*), *Tvedæ sogn* (*þveita sókn*); *-a* in terminations passes into *-e*,—as *høre* (*høyra*), to hear, *søghe* (*sǿkja*), to seek; single Danish words are introduced,—as *jek* (*ek*), I, *se* (*sjá*), to see; *spørge* (*spyrja*), to ask, &c. Towards the end of the Middle Ages the Danish influence shows an immense increase, which marks the gradual decline of Norwegian literature, until at last Norwegian as literary language is completely supplanted by Danish. During the 15th century Norway has hardly any literature except charters, and as early as the end of that century by far the greatest number of these are written in almost pure Danish. In the 16th century, again, charters written in Norwegian occur only as rare exceptions, and from the Reformation onward, when the Bible and the old laws were translated into Danish, not into Norwegian, Danish was not only the undisputed literary language of Norway, but also the colloquial language of dwellers in towns and of those who had learned to read. For the rise in recent times of a new Norwegian language, employed in literature and spoken by the educated classes, see p. 373.

Dialectical differences, as above hinted, occur in great number in the Norwegian charters of the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries. Especially marked is the difference between the language of western Norway, which, in many respects, shows a development parallel to that of Icelandic, and the language of eastern Norway, which exhibits still more striking correspondences with contemporary Old Swedish. The most remarkable characteristics of the eastern dialects of this epoch are the following:—*a* is changed into *æ* in the pronouns *þænn*, this, *þæt*, that, and the particle *þær*, there (the latter as early as the 13th century), and later on (in the 14th century) also in terminations after a long root syllable,—as *sendæ*, to send, *høyræ*, to hear (but *gera*, to do, *vita*, to know); *ia* passes (as in Old Swedish and Old Danish) into *iæ*—as *hiærta* (Icel. *hjarta*), heart; *y* sometimes passes into *iu* before *r*, *l*,—as *hiurder*, shepherd, *lykiul*, key, instead of *hyrðir*, *lykyl* (older still, *hirðir*, *lykill*; see above, p. 369); final *-r* after a consonant often passes into *-ar*, sometimes only into *-a*,—as *prestar* (*prestr*), priest, *bøkar* (*bǿkr*), books, dat. sing. *brǿða* (*brǿðr*), (to a) brother; *tl* passes into *tsl*, *sl*, —as *lisla* (*litla*), (the) little, the name *Atslc*, *Asle* (*Atle*); *rs* gives a "thick" *s*-sound (written *ls*),—as *Bærdols*, genitive of the name *Bergþórr*; *nd*, *ld* are assimilated into *nn*, *ll*,—as *bann* (*band*), band, the local name *Westfoll* (*Vestfold*); and (as far back as the 13th century) traces occur of the vowel assimilation, "tiljævning," that is so highly characteristic of the modern Norwegian dialects,—as *voko*, *vuku*, for *vaku*, (Icel. *vǫko*, *-u*), accusative singular of *vaka*, wake, *mykyll* for *mykill*, much. On the other hand, as characteristics of the western dialects may be noted the following:—final *-r* after a consonant passes into *-ur*, *-or*,—as *vetur* (*vetr*), winter, *rettur* (*réttr*), right, *aftor* (*aftr*), again; *sl* passes into *tl*,—as *sytlla* (*sýsla*), charge; *hv* is changed into *kv* also in pronouns, —as *kver* (*hverr*), who, *kvassu* (*hversu*), how.

This splitting of the language into dialects seems to have continued to gain ground, probably with greater rapidity as a Norwegian literary language no longer existed. Thus it is very likely that the present dialectical division was in all essentials accomplished about the year 1600; for, judging from the first work on Norwegian dialectology,[1] the Søndfjord (Western Norway) dialect at least possessed at that time most of its present features. A little clog-calendar of the year 1644 seems to prove the same regarding the Valders (Southern Norway) dialect. How far the Old Norwegian dialects on the Faroes, in Ireland and Scotland, on the Scottish islands, and on the Isle of Man differed from the mother-tongue it is impossible to decide, on account of the few remnants of these dialects which exist apart from local names, viz., some charters (from the beginning of the 15th century onward) from the Faroes[2] and Orkneys,[3] and a few runic inscriptions from the Orkneys (thirty in number)[4] and the Isle of Man (fourteen in number).[5] These runic inscriptions, however, on account of their imperfect orthography, throw but little light on the subject. Of the Orkney dialect we know at least that initial *hl*, *hn*, *hr* still preserved *h* in the 13th century,—that is, two hundred years longer than in Norway.

Old Norwegian grammar has hitherto always been taken up in connexion with Old Icelandic, and confined to notes and appendices inserted in works on Icelandic grammar. A systematic treatise on Old Norwegian grammar is still wanting, with the exception of a short work by the Danish scholar N. M. Petersen (†1862),[6] which, although brief and decidedly antiquated, deserves all praise. A most valuable collection of materials exists, however, in the Norwegian charters, carefully and accurately edited by the Norwegian scholars Chr. Lange (†1861) and C. R. Unger,[7] and in a few texts edited with diplomatic accuracy.[8]

1 Chr. Jensen's *Norsk dictionarium eller glosebog*, 1646.
2 See *Diplomatarium Norvegicum* vol. i. n. 589 and 591.
3 See *Dipl. Norv.*, i. n. 308.
4 See P. A. Munch, *Samlede afhandlinger*, iv. 516 *sq.*
5 See Munch, *Saml. afh.*, iii. 181 *sq.*
6 *Det Danske, Norske, og Svenske sprogs historie*, part ii. pp. 1-96 (ed. 1830).
7 *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, 1857 *sq.*; 10 vols. have already appeared.
8 Compare the prefaces to Vigfússon's edition of the *Eyrbyggjasaga* (1864),

III. Swedish.—The Pre-Reformation language is called Old Swedish.

1. *Old Swedish.*—The territory of the Old Swedish comprehended—(1) Sweden, except the most northerly part, where Lappish (and Finnish?) was spoken, the most southerly (Skåne, Halland, and Blekinge—see below, p. 373), and certain parts of western Sweden (see above, p. 369); (2) extensive maritime tracts of Finland, Esthonia, and Livonia, with their surrounding islands; and (3) certain places in Russia, where Swedish was spoken for a short time. The oldest but also the most meagre sources of our knowledge of Old Swedish are those words, almost exclusively personal names (nearly one hundred), which were introduced into the Russian language at the foundation of the Russian realm by Swedes (in 862), and which are for the most part somewhat influenced by Russian phonetic laws, preserved in two Russian documents of the years 912 and 945,[9]—as *Igor* (O. Sw. *Ingvar*), *Rurik* (*Hrørikr*), *Oleg* (*Hialge*, secondary form of *Helge*), *Olga* (*Hialga*, *Helga*). Of about the same date, but of an infinitely greater variety, are the runic inscriptions, amounting in number to about two thousand, which have been found cut on stones (rarely wood, metal, or other materials) almost all over Sweden, though they occur most frequently (about half of the total number) in the province of Uppland, next to which come Södermanland, Östergötland, and Gotland, with about two hundred each. For the most part they are tombstones or monuments in memory of deceased relatives, rarely public notices. Their form is often metrical, in part at least. Most of them are anonymous, in so far that we do not know the name of the engraver, though, as a rule, the name of the man who ordered them is recorded. Of the engravers named, about seventy in number, the three most productive are Ubir, Bali, and Asmundr Karasun, all three principally working in Upland; the first-mentioned name is signed on about forty, the others on nearly twenty stones each. These inscriptions vary very much in age, belonging to all centuries of Old Swedish, but by far the greatest number of them date from the 11th and 12th centuries. From heathen times—as well as from the last two centuries of the Middle Ages—we have comparatively few. The oldest are probably the Ingelstad inscription in Östergötland, and the Gursten one found in the north of Småland.[10] The rune stone from Rök in Östergötland probably dates from the first half of the 10th century. Its inscription surpasses all the others both in length (more than one hundred and fifty words) and in the importance of its contents, which are equally interesting as regards philology and the history of culture; it is a fragment (partly in metrical form) of an Old Swedish heroic tale.[11] From about the year 1000 we possess the inscriptions of Asmundr Karasun, and from about 1050 the so-called Ingvar monuments (about twenty in number), erected most of them in Södermanland, in honour of the men who fell in a great war in eastern Europe under the command of a certain Ingvar; the stones cut by Bali belong to the same period. Somewhat later are the inscriptions cut by Ubir, and about contemporary with them, viz., from the beginning of the 12th century, is the remarkable inscription on the door-ring of the church of Forsa in Helsingland, containing the oldest Scandinavian statute[12] now preserved, as well as other inscriptions from the same province, written in a particular variety of the common runic alphabet, the so-called "staflösa" (staffless, without the perpendicular staff) runes, as the long genealogical inscription on the Malstad-stone. The inscriptions[13] of the following centuries are of far less philological interest, because after the 13th century there exists another and more fruitful source for Old Swedish, viz., a literature in the proper sense of the word, which was only in a limited degree written in runes. Of the runic literature hardly anything has been preserved to our days,[14] while the literature in the Latin letters is both in quality and extent incomparably inferior to Old Icelandic, though it, at least in quantity, considerably surpasses Old Norwegian. In age, however, it is inferior to both of them, beginning only in the 13th century. The oldest of the extant manuscripts is a codex of the *Older Vestgötalaw* (Cod. Holm. B 59), written about the year 1290, and philologically of the greatest importance. Not much later is a codex of the *Uplandslaw* (Cod. Ups. 12) of the year 1300. Of other works of value from a philological point of view we only mention a codex of the *Södermannalaw* (Cod. Holm. B 53) of about 1330, the two manuscripts containing a

Keyser's a Unger's editions of the legendary *Olafssaga* (1849), and *Barlaam. Saga ok Josaphats* (1851), Unger's ed. of *þidrekssaga* (1853), and Th. Möbius's essay *Ueber die altnordische Sprache*, pp. 15-18 (1872).
9 See V. Thomsen, *Ryska rikets grundläggning*, especially p. 114 *sq.*; S. Bugge, "Oldsvenske navne i Rusland" (*Arkiv f. Nord. Filol.*, ii.).
10 Kindly communicated by Prof. S. Bugge.
11 See S. Bugge, "Tolkning af runeindskriften pa Rökstenen" (*Antiqvarisk Tidskrift f. Sverige*, v., 1878).
12 See S. Bugge, *Runeindskriften paa ringen i Forsa Kirke*, 1877.
13 For the runic inscriptions in general, see above all J. G. Liljegren, *Run-urkunder*, 1833; J. Göransson, *Bautil*, 1750; R. Dybeck, *Svenska runurkunder* 1855-59, and *Sveriges runurkunder*, 1860-76; and the *Journals* of the antiquarian societies in Sweden.
14 See L. F. Leffler, "Fornsvenska runhandskrifter" (*Nordisk Tidskrift*, 1879).

collection of legends generally named *Cod. Bureanus* (written a little after 1350) and *Cod. Bildstenianus* (between 1420 and 1450), and the great Oxenstiernian manuscript, which consists chiefly of a collection of legends written for the most part in 1385. The very numerous Old Swedish charters, from 1343 downwards, are also of great importance.[1]

Old Swedish, during its earliest pre-literary period (900–1200), retains quite as original a character as contemporary Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian. The first part of the inscription of the Rök-stone running thus—

AFT UAMUÞ STĄNTA RUNAʀ ÞAʀ IN UARIN FAÞI FAÞIʀ AFT FAIKIĄN SUNU,[2]

and probably pronounced—

æft Wámód stąnda rúnar þóʀ; en Warenn fáðe faðeʀ æft fæighian sunu,

would, no doubt, have had the same form in contemporary Icelandic, except the last word, which would probably have had the less original form *sun*. The formal changes of the Swedish language during this period are, generally speaking, such as appear about the same time in all the members of the group,—as the change of soft ʀ into common *r* (the Rök-stone *runaʀ*, later *runar*, runes; this appeared earliest after dental consonants, later after an accented vowel), and the change of *sþ* into *st* (in the 10th century *raisþi*, later *reisti*, raised); or they are, at least, common to it with Norwegian,—as the dropping of *h* before *l*, *n*, and *r* (in the 10th century *hraur*, younger *rör*, cairn), and the changing of nasal vowels (the long ones latest) into non-nasalized. A very old specific Swedish characteristic, however, is the splitting up of *i* into *iu* before *ngw*, *nkw*,—as *siunga*, to sing, *siunka*, to sink, from primitive Scandinavian *singwan*, *sinkwan* (Icel.-Norw. *syngva*, *sǫkkva*). But the case is altogether different during what we may call the classical period of Old Swedish (1200–1350), the time of the later runic inscriptions and the oldest literature. During this period the language is already distinctly separate from the (literary) Icelandic-Norwegian (though not yet from Danish). The words of the *Older Vestgötalaw*—

FALDER KLOCKÆ NIDER I HOVOÞ MANNI, BÖTI SOPCN MARCHUM ÞRIM, EN HAN FAR BANÆ AF—[3]

would in contemporary Icelandic be—

fellr klukka niðr í höfuð manni, bœti sókn mörkum þrim, ef hann fær bana af.

These few words exhibit instances of the following innovations in Swedish:—*d* is inserted between *ll* (*nn*) and a following *r* (as *b* between *m* and *l*, *r*, and *p* between *m* and *t*, *n*,—as *hambrar*, Icel. *hamrar*, hammers, *sampt*, Icel. *samt*, together with); an auxiliary vowel is inserted between final *r* and a preceding consonant; *a* in terminations is often changed into *æ*; a *u* in the final syllable causes no change of preceding *a*; the present tense takes the vowel of the infinitive (and the preterite subjunctive that of preterite indicative plural). Other important changes, appearing at the same time, but probably, partly at least, of a somewhat older date, are the following:—all diphthongs are contracted (as *ögha*, Icel. *auga*, eye; *dröma*, Icel. *drøyma*, to dream; *sten*, Icel. *steinn*, stone—traces of which we find as early as the 12th century); *é* has passed into *æ* (as *knæ*, Icel. *kné*, knee); *ia* into *iæ*, as in Eastern Norwegian (as *hiærta*, Icel. *hjarta*, heart); *iu* into *y* after *r*, and a consonant +*l* (as *flygha*, Icel. *fljúga*, to fly); the forms of the three persons singular of verbs have assimilated (except in the so-called strong preterite); the 2d pers. plur. ends in *-in* for *-ið*, and the passive voice in *-s* for the earlier *-sk*; the dat. plur. of substantives with suffixed article ends in *-umin* (Icel. *-onom*, as *sunumin*, *sunonom*, to the sons). The transition to the 14th century is marked by important changes:—short *y*, *e.g.*, passed into *ö* in many positions (as *dör* for *dyr*, door, &c.), and the forms of the dative and the accusative of pronouns gradually became the same. The number of borrowed words is as yet very limited, and is chiefly confined to ecclesiastical words of Latin and Greek origin, introduced along with Christianity (as *kors*, cross, *bref*, epistle, *skoli*, school, *præster*, priest, *almosa*, alms). At the middle of the 14th century the literary language undergoes a remarkable reform, developing at the same time to a "rikssprák," a uniform language, common to the whole country. The chief characteristics of this later Old Swedish are the following:—the long *a* has passed into *å* (that is, an open *o*), and *io* (except before *rd*, *rt*) into *iö* (as *siö*, sea, lake); at the same time there appears a so-called law of vowel balance, according to which the vowels *i* and *u* are always found in terminations after a short root syllable, and—at least when no consonant follows—*e* and *o* after a long one (as *Gudi*, to God, *til salu*, for sale, but *i garþe*, in the court, *for visso*, assuredly); *g* and *k* (*sk*) before

1 The Old Swedish monuments are for the most part published in the following collections:—*Svenska fornskriftsällskapets samlingar*, 84 parts, 1844–84; C. J. Schlyter, *Samling af Sveriges gamla lagar*, vols. i.–vii. and x.–xii., 1827–69; *Svenskt Diplomatarium*, 6 vols., 1829–78, new series, 2 vols., 1875–84.
2 In memory of Wámód these runes stand; and Warenn, his father, wrote them in memory of his son, (by destiny) condemned to death.
3 If the bell fall down on anybody's head, the parish pays a fine of three marks should he die from it.

palatal vowels are softened into *dj* and *tj* (*stj*); *k* and *t* in unaccented syllables often pass into *gh*, *dh* (as *Sverighe* for *Sverike*, Sweden, *litedh* for *litet*, a little); the articles *þæn* (or *hin*), the, and (a little later) *en*, a, come into use; the dual pronouns vanish; the relative *ær*, that, is changed with *sum*; the present participle takes a secondary form in *-s* (as *gangandes*, beside *gangande*, going). A little later the following changes appear:—a short vowel is lengthened before a single consonant, first when the consonant belongs to the same syllable (as *hat*, hate), afterwards also when it belongs to the following one (as *hata*, to hate); an auxiliary vowel is inserted between *l* or *n* and a preceding consonant (as *gavel*, gable, *öken*, desert); short *i*, ending a syllable, passes into *e* (as *leva*, to live); *th* passes into *t*; a new conjugation is formed which has no infinitive termination, but doubles the sign of the preterite (as *bo*, *bodde*, *bott*, to dwell, dwelt, dwelt). Owing to the political and commercial state of the country the language at this period is deluged with borrowed words of Low German origin, mostly social and industrial terms, such as the great number of verbs in *-era* (*e.g.*, *hantera*, to handle), the substantives in *-eri* (*röveri*, robbery), *-inna* (*förstinna*, princess), *-het* (*fromhet*, piety), *be-* (*betala*, to pay), and a great many others (*klen*, weak, *smaka*, to taste, *grover*, big, *pung*, purse, *tukt*, discipline, *bruka*, to use, *tvist*, quarrel, *stövel*, boot, *arbeta*, to work, *frokoster*, lunch, &c.). Owing to the political circumstances, we find towards the end of the period a very powerful Danish influence, which extends also to phonetics and etymology, so that, for example, nearly all the terminal vowels are supplanted by the uniform Danish *e*, the hard consonants *p*, *t*, *k* by *b*, *d*, *g* as in Danish, the second person plural of the imperative ends in *-er*, beside *-en* (as *tagher*, for older *takin*).

Dialectical differences incontestably occur in the runic inscriptions as well as in the literature; in the former, however, most of them are hidden from our eyes by the character of the writing, which is, from a phonetic point of view, highly unsatisfactory, indicating the most different sounds by the same sign (for example, *o*, *u*, *y*, and *ö* are denoted by one and the same rune); in the literature again they are reduced to a minimum by the awakening desire to form a uniform literary language for the whole country, and by the literary productivity and consequent predominant influence of certain provinces (as Östergötland). This question, moreover, has not hitherto been investigated with sufficient care.[4] Only one distinct dialect has been handed down to us, that of the island of Gotland, which differs so essentially from the Old Swedish of the mainland that it has with good reason been characterized, under the name *Forngutniska*, as in a certain sense a separate language. Materials for its study are very abundant[5]: on one hand we possess more than two hundred runic inscriptions, among them a very remarkable one of the 12th or 13th century, counting upwards of three hundred runes, cut on a font (now in Aakirkeby on the island of Bornholm), and representing the life of Christ in a series of pictures and words; on the other hand a literature has been preserved consisting of a runic calendar from 1328, the law of the island (from about 1350), a piece of traditional history, and a guild statute. The language is distinguished from the Old Swedish of the mainland especially by the following characteristics:—the old diphthongs are preserved (*e.g.*, *auga*, eye, *droyma*, to dream, *stain*, stone), and a new triphthong has arisen by the change of *iú* into *iau* (as *fliauga*, to fly); the long vowels *e*, *æ*, *ö*, have passed into *i*, *e*, *y* (as *kni*, knee, *mela*, to speak, *dyma*, to deem); short *o* rarely occurs except before *r*, being in other positions changed into *u*; *w* is dropped before *r* (as *raiþi*, wrath); the genitive singular of feminines in *-a* ends in *-ur* for *-u* (as *kirkiur*, of the church). Owing to the entire absence of documentary evidence it is impossible to determine how far the dialects east of the Baltic, which no doubt had a separate individuality, differed from the mother-tongue.

Forngutniska.

The first to pay attention to the study of Old Swedish[6] was the Swedish savant J. Buræus (†1652), who by several works (from 1599 onwards) called attention to and excited a lively interest in the runic monuments, and, by his edition (1634) of the excellent Old Swedish work *Um Styrilsi Konunga ok Höfþinga*, in Old Swedish literature also. His no longer extant *Specimen Primariæ Linguæ Scantzianæ* gave but a very short review of Old Swedish inflexions, but is remarkable as the first essay of its kind, and is perhaps the oldest attempt in modern times at a grammatical treatment of any old Germanic language. The study of runes was very popular in the 17th century; M. Celsius (†1679) deciphered the "staffless" runes (see above, p. 370), and J. Hadorph (†1693), who also did good work in editing Old Swedish texts, copied more than a thousand runic inscriptions. During the 18th century, again, Old Swedish was almost completely neglected; but in the present century the study of runes has been well represented by the collection of the Swede Liljegren (†1837) and by the Norwegian S.

4 See especially K. J. Lyngby, *Antiqu. Tidskr.*, 1858–60, pp. 242 *sq.* and 260 *sq.*; J. E. Rydqvist, *Sv. Språkets lagar*, iv. 153 *sq.*; L. F. Leffler, *Om v-omljudet*, 1877, pp. 37 *sq.*, 55, 76; S. Bugge, *Runeindskriften fra Forsa*, p. 49 *sq.*; A. Kock, *Studier i Fornsvensk ljudlära*, i., 1882, pp. 55 *sq.*, 144 *sq.*, 159 *sq.*, 238.
5 See C. Säve, *Gutniska urkunder*, 1859; J. G. Liljegren, *Runurkunder*, 1833.
6 See A. Noreen, "Aperçu de l'histoire de la science linguistique Suédoise" (*Le Muséon*, ii., 1883).