

Tomislav Stojanov, tstojan@ihjj.hr, tstojan@gmail.com
Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistic
Republike Austrije 16, 10.000 Zagreb, Croatia

Orthographies in Grammar Books – Antiquity and Humanism

Summary

This paper researches the as yet unstudied topic of orthographic content in antique, medieval, and Renaissance grammar books in European languages, as part of a wider research of the origin of orthographic standards in European languages. As a central place for teachings about language, grammar books contained orthographic instructions from the very beginning, and such practice continued also in later periods. Understanding the function, content, and orthographic forms in the past provides for a better description of the nature of the orthographic standard in the present. The evolution of grammatographic practice clearly shows the continuity of development of orthographic content from a constituent of grammar studies through the *littera* unit gradually to an independent unit, then into annexed orthographic sections, and later into separate orthographic manuals. 5 antique, 22 Latin, and 17 vernacular grammars were analyzed, describing 19 European languages. The research methodology is based on distinguishing orthographic content in the narrower sense (grapheme to meaning) from the broader sense (grapheme to phoneme). In this way, the function of orthographic description was established separately from the study of spelling. As for the traditional description of orthographic content in the broader sense in old grammar books, it is shown that orthographic content can also be studied within the grammatographic framework of a specific period, similar to the description of morphology or syntax. We found that 4 out of 5 antique, 11 out of 22 Latin and 5 out of 17 vernacular grammarians describe orthographic content in the narrower sense.

Keywords: orthography, grammaticography, punctuation, antiquity, humanism

1 Introduction

According to Law (1997), looking into old grammar books has numerous interesting aspects: insight into the culture, the history of education, evolution of linguistic thought, reception of grammar books and the way they transformed into present-day manuals, observing the development of literacy, etc. The main motive for studying the orthographic content in grammar books in this research lies in the search of the relation between modern orthographic books and the orthographic content in old grammar books. Studying the historic development of orthographic literacy facilitates a better explanation of literacy in the 21st century. As we will see, the material, standard, and structure of orthographic manuals did not occur by themselves, but have their roots in the antique times. Moreover, the history of orthography is inseparable from the history of grammar books. The oldest preserved grammar in the West, the one of Dionysius Thrax, contains orthographic content. It is no coincidence that Dionysius Thrax got the motive to write a grammar book as a pupil of Aristarchus of Samothrace, the main librarian of the Library of Alexandria, in which ancient antique texts were kept and copied. “Inevitably, Alexandrian scholarship was forced to consider what represented the ‘correct’ version.”¹ “In fact, grammar’s entire value system is built upon the notion of correctness.”² The notion

¹ Reynolds (1996: 20)

² Reynolds (1996: 18)

of linguistic correctness and the connection of orthography and prescriptivism are the key characteristics of orthographic standard even today.

Linguistic historiography shows that the view of language is a changeable category and that each epoch leads to new knowledge. From the beginning of thinking about language, grammar books have been the medium with thousand-year old tradition which has best demonstrated the author's view of the language phenomenon, reflecting the spirit of its time. In the same way, grammar books have had the main role in the process of language codification.³ This applies also today. Due to their important historiographic role in the development of linguistic thought, and due to the fact that numerous grammar books contain orthographic content to a greater or lesser extent, the basic question arises as to which extent historical sociolinguistic studies of grammar books can contribute to the understanding of the contemporary perspective of the relation between writing and literacy.

Reviewing the orthographic material in old grammar books breaks the mould of current linguistic historiographic studies because orthography is not considered to be part of the linguistic theory or grammar philosophy. Žagar agrees with this, emphasizing that „[in] cultural, literary or linguistic reviews (...) the phenomenon of writing rarely attracts special attention“.⁴ Despite the fact that orthographic content relatively often is a constituent part of grammar books⁵, the history of linguistics discusses it only in the context of the development of spelling and of orthographic reforms, and not grapholinguistically or grammatically.⁶ Even when considering the orthography of Latin specifically, Mantello and Rigg (1996: 79–80) reduce orthography only to phonology and pronunciation. Since the topic of annexed orthographies or grammatical orthographies has barely been written about, and if, then foremost within the framework of a specific work or language, we do not know to which extent they paved the road for the orthographic standard and which of their elements have been inherited today.

The analysed historic grammar books differ considerably in content and form. If we only observe the 150 years of grammar books in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance Humanism, we can see that some grammar books have the form of a treatise, rather than that a language manual (Ramus), while others were written in the dialogical form (e.g. Nebrija, Valerius, and others). Some are rather modest in volume (Caucius with 78 pages), and some monumental (Vossius with 1500 pages). The criterion for the selection of grammar books was their prototypicality. Naturally, not all grammar books issued in all historic periods could be taken into account, but a selection was made according to the key of major grammatical periods.⁷ When looking for grammar books, we used either linguistic historiographic literature – Walch (1716) for Latin, Marsden (1796), Rowe (1974) for vernacular languages – or we collected the sources on our own (especially for Latin grammar books).

The history of grammar books is observed in periods which had the greatest influence on the development of grammatical orthography and its orthographic content. For each period reviewed, the historic

³ Other works participated in this, of course, such as dictionaries, language treatises and literary works; however, grammar books were central.

⁴ Žagar (2013: 343). Translated from Croatian.

⁵ The relation between orthography and grammar can also be expressed in quantitative terms. In the monumental *Lexicon grammaticorum*, spanning 1728 pages, the word *orthography* with its forms appears 485 times, as compared to 656 derivatives of *morphology*, 780 of *semantics*, 1305 of *phonetics*, 1236 of *dictionary* and 1385 of *syntax*.

⁶ See, for example, Koerner and Asher (1995), Seuren (1998), Verburg (1998), Auroux (2000, 2001, and 2006), Williams (2005), Chapman and Routledge (2009), Copeland and Sluiter (2012), or in other related works, such as glossaries of the history of linguistics (e.g. Campbell and Mixco 2007), sociolinguistic manuals (e.g. Ammon et al. 2004, 2005, and 2006), lexica (e.g. Stammerhöf 2009) and encyclopaedias (e.g. Malmkjær 2010).

⁷ It is pointed out when some prototypical grammar books for a specific language were not available.

context and the motive for creation of grammar books, as well as the broader sociocultural conditions of the particular time period are described. As to annexed orthographies, we were interested in their status and content. Although each period has a substantially different view of orthographies in grammar books, the epochs cannot always be clearly chronologically separated. Thus, for example, in Renaissance Humanism we can find typical orthographic patterns of medieval grammar books, rationalistic ones in the Enlightenment, and those from the Enlightenment far into the 19th century. The selected periods are (i) the Antiquity as the beginning of grammar studies in the West and (ii) Late Middle Ages and humanistic Renaissance with formulated orthographic content in which the first Latin and vernacular orthographic manuals appeared; (iii) Rationalism and (iv) the Enlightenment follow in Stojanov (forthc.).

2 Orthographic entities

The orthographic content in grammar books has changed over time. It is sufficient to open any orthographic manual to see that the orthographic content is heterogeneous. Terminological misunderstanding arises when the term "orthography" is contextualized in language standardization in which "orthographic" means "correct", while from the descriptive point of view "orthographic" means "written" or denotes the manner of writing. Insufficient terminological distinction leads to scientific ambiguity. Thus, for example, it is stated that the grammar of Kašić (1604) „deals with orthography, phonetics and declensions (...)", even though Kašić does not mention the word *orthographia* in his work at all.⁸

From the Antiquity to Rationalism, grammar books put great emphasis on speech. Writing was no more than speech written down. Today, we mostly communicate in writing and we need a description of language which clearly distinguishes these two dimensions. This is the basic reason for the need to distinguish orthographies and orthographic entities in the narrower and the broader sense. Traditional linguistic approach, which contrasts writing to speech, i.e. grapheme to phoneme, is called orthographic content in the broader sense. In other words, the issue of writing down sound segments differs from orthographic content in the narrower sense, in which the relation between grapheme and meaning is studied. Orthographic entities which "cannot be spoken out", but are expressed by typographic means are the subject of our studies. Those are, for example, punctuation, capital and minuscule letters, separate and compound writing, italics, symbols, etc. A similar (but not identical)⁹ epistemological approach was accepted by the Unicode Consortium¹⁰, which systematically describes characters as minimal distinctive units of a script. The computational approach, whose starting point is in the relation between grapheme and character, and not grapheme and sound, enabled a systematic description of all known and standardized antique and modern scripts and letters. Gallman (1985) also points to the distinction between graphemes in the narrower and the broader sense, however, in his case those are actually graphemes written independently or together with another grapheme (e.g. accent sign). The correlation between grapheme and phoneme is expressed also through a term *orthographic depth (shallow and deep orthographies)*, e.g. Malatesha Joshi and Aaron (2006), but we did not use it since we needed to establish relation to meaning.

⁸ Lepschy (1998: 119). Kašić deals with letters and sounds. Regarding orthographic content in the narrower sense (more below), Kašić only mentions the apostrophe in the fourth chapter of the first book (*De tono et apostropho*), as a sign for an omitted vocal („Apostrophus est nota haec s', rejectae vocalis...“).

⁹ The difference between the orthographic and the computational approach is in the way how the relation between grapheme and typography is perceived. From the computational standpoint, typography is separated from the character plane, i.e. there is no difference between *a* and *a* since this is the same grapheme, while from the orthographic point of view, these two characters make difference.

¹⁰ <http://unicode.org/>. Accessed on 21 February 2017.

In this paper, the name *orthography* refers primarily to the meaning of orthography in the narrower sense, unless otherwise stated.

The discipline of studying orthography does not have a generally accepted name. In Stojanov (2015) the term *orthographologia* was used, however the discipline needs to be elaborated more clearly. If grammatology and grammatography deal with grammar books, lexicology and lexicography with dictionaries, the same relation should be transferred to orthography. Thus, we could distinguish *ortographology* and *orthographographia*. While for the English term *orthographology* usage confirmation can be found very rarely, the second term – *orthographographia* – is not indexed in the Google search engine at the moment this text is written. Regardless of that fact, this *orthographographic* research investigates the art of writing orthographic content in the narrower sense within grammar books, or historical sociolinguistic development of orthographic rules, respectively.

3 Orthographic rules in antique and medieval grammar books

The basic philosophic question about language in the Antiquity was: Does the language represent the reality faithfully or does it deform it? In this context Plato and Aristotle discussed the correctness of names (*orthetēs onomatōn*) and the relation between names and things, which later led to the development of medieval language discussions on the relation between reason and authority.

Orthographic description can already be found in the Antiquity and in the first grammars. The grammatical description of language in the Antiquity is based on the description of rhetorical skills. Since speech had priority over writing, orthographic content, which primarily refers to the use of symbols we would today call punctuation, was in the service of public speaking for orators, in terms of written signs indicating the manner of speaking.

Antique texts were written in a continuous series of capital letters without blanks (*scriptura continua*), which required great effort to be read. Since the function of written text was to satisfy the needs of public reading and rhetoric, the readers (*oratores*) had to prepare by learning where the shorter and longer pauses in the speech were. Aristophanes of Byzantium (3rd/2nd c. BC) was the first to create textual marks – separators (Lat. *distinctiones*, Greek *théseis*) – which helped the reader read the written text by showing the level of completeness of the statement (i.e. clause pursuant to antique rhetoric), which at the same time represented the pause and the moment to breathe in.¹¹ The clauses were called period (Greek *περίοδος*), colon (Greek *κῶλον*) and comma (Greek *κόμμα*), and indicated the longest clause (*periodos*), which was marked by a high dot (Greek *στιγμὴ τελεία*), a medium long clause (*colon*), which was marked by a intermediate dot (Greek *στιγμὴ μέση*), and short clause (*comma*), which were marked by an underdot (grč. *ύποστιγμή*).¹²

Even though antique thinkers considered the dividing of a clause primarily in the context of sentence structure and complete discourse (*logos*), that is for the needs of rhetoric, the marks showed to be useful and evolved into the period, colon and comma. Already the appearance of minuscule and italics in late Latin manuscripts (3rd to 7th c.) demonstrated the need for a change in the writing of the dot at three levels. The etymology of the word punctuation comes from Latin *punctus* or dot as a separator mentioned by antique authors. When, in the early Middle Ages, the need for reading faster arose,

¹¹ Houston (2013: 5)

¹² Use of punctuation in manuscripts can, for example, be seen in the handwriting of Vatican Vergil (Lat. *Vergilius Vaticanus*) from around 400 AD in the possession of the *Digital Vatican Library*, kept under the mark Vat.lat.3225. Accessed http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.3225.

blanks started to be used between words, and the introduction of blanks affected a change in reading habits. As stated by Saenger (1997), the first blanks were used by Irish scribes of the 8th and 9th century.

When reading aloud for others ceased, and personal reading for oneself began, the existing punctuation was not needed to mark breathing pauses, but started representing parts of textual syntactic structure.

„[T]he first attempt at a systematic grammar made in the Western World, and for many generations a text-book in the schools of the Roman Empire“¹³ refers to Dionysus Thrax, who wrote the Art of Grammar (*Τέχνη γραμματική*)¹⁴, the oldest preserved grammar of Greek, at the turn of the 2nd to the 1st century BCE. The grammar consists of 25 parts, two of which relate to orthographic content: part (IV) on signs for clauses (*στιγμή*), pursuant to Aristophanes, and part (V) on the difference between the period and the comma (*τίνι διαφέρει στιγμή ύποστιγμῆς*) by the criterion of time, i.e. the pause.

Although it has been argued that the grammar of Dionysus Thrax showed normative tendencies in the description of language,¹⁵ the orthographic rules in the first grammar should be considered in the context in which Dionysus Thrax perceived grammar – not as a science (grč. *episteme*), but as a skill or art (Greek *tekhne*) of interpreting the experiential knowledge of poets and prose authors worth studying.¹⁶ Pursuant to him, Roman rhetorician Quintilian in his *Institutio Oratoria* (1.9.1) clearly divided grammar into two parts: *methodice* – the art of speaking correctly, and *historice* – interpretation of writers.¹⁷ *Grammatici*, the teachers at the medium level of education in old Rome, between the *litteratores* and the *rhetores*, taught language studies and reading of literary works from a prescribed canon.¹⁸ Such view of grammar was inherited by the Middle Ages. So, for example, St. Thomas Aquinas explains that all seven basic disciplines, among which grammar is the first of the teachings, are called liberal arts because for them, one needs not only knowledge, but the immediate production of the mind: arranging sentence sets (grammar), syllogisms (dialectics), discussion (rhetoric), numbers (arithmetic), measures (geometrics), melodies (music) and the calculation of the movement of stars (astronomy).¹⁹

Roman grammarian Aelius Donatus wrote two grammars of Latin, which are both placed in 350 CE. *Ars minor – de partibus orationis*²⁰ is a work which deals with eight parts of speech in the form of questions and answers, while *Ars maior*²¹ is an extended work with additional chapters on letters, accent, meter and figures of speech. The latter work includes a chapter *De distinctionibus*, which conveys the antique teachings on the clause and the three *distinctiones*.²² Donatus points out the three positions of the separation character in text: (1) high (Lat. *distinctio*), (2) low (Lat. *subdistinctio*) and (3) middle (Lat. *media distinctio*).

¹³ Davidson (1874: 3)

¹⁴ <https://goo.gl/oyQRVB> (Greek Wikisource page with the Grammar.). Accessed on 6 March 2017.

¹⁵ Shaller (2000: 792)

¹⁶ Matasović (2016). The first sentence of the *Art of Grammar* emphasizes this fact: „γραμματική ἐστιν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιητᾶς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων“ [„Grammar is the practical knowledge of the language used, for the most part, by verse and prose writers.“, translated by Anthony Alcock].

¹⁷ Amsler (1989: 17)

¹⁸ Matasović (2016)

¹⁹ Le Goff (2009: 110)

²⁰ <http://www.intratext.com/y/LAT0192.HTM>. Accessed on 16 November 2016.

²¹ <http://kaali.linguist.jussieu.fr/CGL/text.jsp?id=T27>. Accessed on 16 November 2016

²² <http://kaali.linguist.jussieu.fr/CGL/text.jsp?topic=de%20distinctionibus&ref=612,1-8%20H>. Accessed on 16 November 2016

Priscianus Caesariensis wrote *Institutiones grammaticae* around year 520.²³ The grammar is categorized in five disciplines relating to five basic units: phonology (sound or *vox*), orthography (letter or *littera*), prosody (syllable or *syllaba*), etymology (word or *dictio*) and diasyntetics, i.e. syntax (clause or *oratio*). Although Copeland and Sluiter (2012) do not mention phonology as unit of Priscian's grammar, it can be clearly distinguished in Priscian, who defines sounds as units smaller than letters²⁴, which he classifies into four groups (*articulata*, *inarticulata*, *literata*, *illiterata*). Medieval grammars will classify sounds in the chapter on orthography.

The first book *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville from the 6th/7th century is dedicated to grammar, which is interpreted as the skill of speaking (Lat. *loquendi peritia*, I.ii.1) and as knowledge of speaking correctly (Lat. *cientia recte loquendi*, I.v.1).²⁵ His grammar is divided into 44 chapters, six of which relate more or less to what we would today associate with orthography: *De posituris* (XX), *De notis sententiarum* (XXI), *De notis vulgaribus* (XXII), *De notis iuridicus* (XXIII), *De notis militaribus* (XXIV), and *De orthographia* (XXVII). *De posituris* is about punctuation, although Isidore, according to Aristophanes, continues to consider the terms *comma*, *colon*, and *periodos* to be also parts of sentences, not only characters. In his work *Ars grammatica* from the end of 8th century, Alcuin calls positions „points to distinguish meanings“.²⁶ *De notis sententiarum* deals with sentence marks, which mark critical reading (asterisk, paragraph, quotation marks, etc.). *De notis vulgaribus* describes symbols which mark syllables and words. *De notis iuridicus* and *militaribus* are acronyms in legal and military texts. *De orthographia* deals with pronunciation and the writing of sounds, e.g. distinguishing *ad* and *at*, depending on it being a preposition or conjunction. The division of the grammar into 44 chapters is not only structural, but can also be seen as division into grammatical types, and such classification of grammar will also be found in numerous other grammarians. Alcuin divides grammar into 26 types, among which are sound (*vox*), letter (*littera*), syllable, word, clause, sentence, foot, prosody, punctuation marks (*positurae*), critical marks (*notae*), orthography, analogy, etc. It is only in later periods that the grammatical teachings and the position of orthography in it will be systemized.

Isidore of Seville mentions orthographic marks also in his other book on rhetoric and dialectics (*de rhetorica et dialectica*) in the 18th chapter *de colo, commate, et periodis*, which Barney et al. (2000: 74) translate as *clause, phrase*, and *sentence*. Isidore of Seville states both meanings of the three entities: besides the rhetoric one that a phrase consists of a combination of words, a clause from phrases and a sentence from clauses (*fit autem ex coniunctione verborum comma, ex commate colon, ex colo periodos*), there is also the orthographic explanation of the characters which delimit speech.

4 Orthography in Renaissance Humanism

The development of orthographic content in Renaissance Humanism has three key factors. The first factor is in any case the revitalization and the spreading of antique teachings on orthography and its adaptation to the Christian West. The second was induced by religious and political conditions on the European continent. The third factor was affected by technology through discovery of printing. Antique grammar teaching was represented by an analysis of numerous Latin grammars, while the religious

²³ <http://kaali.linguist.jussieu.fr/CGL/text.jsp?id=T43>. Accessed on 16 November 2016

²⁴ „Litera est pars minima uocis compositae, hoc est quae constat compositione literarum, minima autem, quantum ad totam comprehensionem uocis literatae.“ [„The letter is the smallest part of a compound sound, i.e. sound that consists of the combination of letters; it is “the smallest” with reference to the whole complex made up of literate sound.“, translated by Rita Copeland and Ineke Sluiter in Copeland and Sluiter (2012)] Prisciani *Institutiones* : GL 2,6,6

²⁵ <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/isidore.html>. Accessed on 16 November 2016. We also used the English translation by Barney et al. (2006).

²⁶ Copeland and Sluiter (2012: 281)

and political context is described in grammars of vernacular languages. The third factor is reflected in both, which is why it was not studied separately from the mentioned two frameworks.

4.1 Orthography in Latin grammar books

Antique teachings were inherited in medieval grammars, but only the invention of the printing press at the end of the 15th century affected a change of the social paradigm, and thus also grammatical teachings. Renaissance Humanism appeared in city-states of today's Italy because it was via them that antique texts from the East came by sea. The first humanists, such as Petrarch or Boccaccio, were also collectors of numerous manuscripts and it can be claimed that the interest into them induced the occurrence of the era of Renaissance Humanism. Davies claims that all humanists were consumers of manuscripts and that there is no humanism without books²⁷, while Verburg argues that humanism „may be regarded as a primarily language-oriented (or 'lingual') movement“.²⁸ Although there are some people of the church among the Renaissance humanists dealing with orthography, the trend is increasingly obvious that it is the secular scholars who write treatises and books on language.

Of the two most influential and mutually competitive grammarians – Priscian and Donatus, the orthographic teachings in grammars of the late Middle Ages was inherited directly from Priscian, not from Donatus. Donatus's orthographic part, as will be shown, refers to three antique punctuation marks, which were completely obsolete for this era. The reason why Donatus was considered to be “father of Latin grammar” lies in the influence of his grammar of reported speech (*grammatica permisiva*), which was used in the interpretation of antique texts. There is another important reason for the influence of these two grammarians on the grammatical teachings in the centuries to follow, as stated by Williams. Priscian and Donatus wrote for students whose native language was Latin. Later grammarians felt that it was easier to refer to native speakers than to create grammar rules for a language, which was not their native language.²⁹

Table 1 shows Latin grammar books in their first editions and their orthographic content. Printed Latin grammars were reviewed, from the oldest printed grammar found, Nebrija's from 1481, to the first half of the 17th century and the beginning of rationalism, which, with the Port-Royal Grammar, completely changed the grammatical paradigm again. We looked into how grammar is defined and if orthography is a constituent of the definition of grammar (column *Orthography in the definition of grammar*). Information on whether orthographic content is described, and if so, if there is a chapter on it, what the title of the chapter is, how large it is and where it is located, is described in the column *Chapter with orthographic content*. Then we looked if there is orthographic content in the narrower sense and if it is separated from the *littera* (column *Orthography in the narrower sense*). The last column (*Orthographic content*) gives descriptive information on orthographic content. If the author does not include an orthographic chapter, and the orthographic content is described somewhere else, this is specially noted.

Table 1. Overview of Latin grammars and the orthographic content in them

Work	Orthography in the	Chapter with orthographic content	Orthography in the	Orthographic content
------	--------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------

²⁷ Davies (2004: 47)

²⁸ Verburg (1998: 189)

²⁹ „When a language has no native speakers, nuances of expressions and structure are easily lost and difficult (if not impossible) to retrieve. Consequently, students and teachers during the Middle Ages had to rely on the Latin grammars produced by Donatus and Priscian to understand the form and function of the language.“ Williams (2005: 8)

		definition of grammar	narrower sense	
Nebrija (1481)	yes	yes, total 7 pages (<i>De erotymatis orthographia</i>) in book 3 of 5	yes (in a later edition)	Dialogical form. Teachings about letters and sounds. ³⁰
	no	yes, 6 pages (<i>De distinctionibus</i>) as the last chapter in which also syllables, meter and accents are described	yes	In the beginning of the book are the teachings about <i>littera</i> without mention of orthography. In <i>De distinctionibus</i> discussion on <i>distinctiones</i> with references.
	yes	yes, 9 pages (<i>Folio LXXVI</i>) as second to last chapter	no	Teachings about letters and sounds.
	no	/	/	Neither letters nor sounds are described.
	no	/	/	Letters and sounds are described, but without mention of orthography.
	no	/	/	Letters and sounds are described, but without mention of orthography.
	no	/	/	Neither letters nor sounds are described.
	no	/	/	Letters and sounds are described, but without mention of orthography.
	yes	yes, 8 pages (<i>De orthographia</i>) in book 4 of 5	yes	Letters are described in the first book and separate from orthography, in which chapter the types of letters (<i>forma</i>), the arrangement of letters (<i>series</i>), arrangement of parts (<i>symmetria</i>), punctuation marks (<i>distinctiones</i> ; period, comma, colon, question mark, brackets), diphthongs, pronunciation of consonants with the sound <i>h</i> (<i>aspiratione</i>), consonants and multiples (<i>ambiguis</i>) are described.
	no	yes, 1 page (<i>Partes periodi</i>) in the second part of the book + 19 annexed pages (<i>De orthographia</i>) at the end of the book	yes	The grammar begins with a short listing of the letters of the alphabet and the distinction between vocals and consonants, but without a definition of grammar and without mentioning orthography. The orthography chapter was written by Johannes Vasaeus and it describes orthography, but in the context of the four basic rhetoric categories of the figures of speech. ³¹ The description of sentence parts (<i>partes periodi</i>) as <i>periodus</i> , <i>colon</i> , and <i>comma</i> is not in the orthography chapter, but immediately after the description of syntax and before the part on accents and syllables.
Melancthon (1553)	yes	yes, 4 pages (<i>De periodis</i>) + 2 (<i>De distinctionibus</i>) + 16 annexed pages (<i>De orthographia</i>) at the end of the book	yes	The chapter on letters is separate from orthography. In the beginning, the definition of orthography and the teachings of letters and sounds are provided. Description of sentence parts (<i>periodus</i> , <i>comma</i> , <i>colon</i>) is immediately after the syntax, and is followed by a chapter on <i>distinctiones</i> (<i>subdistinctio</i> , <i>media distinctio</i> and <i>distinctio vocalis/finalis</i>). The orthography chapter in this edition was written by Joachim Camerarius. He describes the signs for accent, consonants, diphthongs, aspiration, the letters K

³⁰ In a later edition of his grammar, Nebrija (1515) adds a chapter to the first part of the book *De punctis clausularum* and describes on one page *comma*, *colon*, *periodus* (*nota punctus*), *parenthesis*, and *nota interrogationis*, mentioning also *accentus gravis*.

³¹ More on them to follow.

				and Q, double letters, Greek letters Z and Y, letter X, common mistakes in word declination and formation (<i>de derivativis</i> , npr. <i>demonstratio – demonstracio, affero – adfero</i>), spelling of old and archaic names (<i>de antiquis</i>), abbreviation of writing (<i>de scripturae brevitate</i> , e.g. <i>dra – differentia</i>), and sentence marks (<i>de notis distinctionum</i>). In one paragraph, Camerarius also mentions compound marks (<i>multiplices notae</i>): <i>paragraphus, asteriscus, and obeliscus</i> .
Ramus (1559)	yes	/	/	The grammar has a chapter about letters, but orthography is not dealt with separately.
Valerius (1560)	yes	yes, 1 page (<i>Quaedam de notis</i>) at the end of the first book on the basics of grammar, before etymology	yes	In the beginning, <i>littera</i> is defined as an orthographic unit and its division is described. He lists 9 punctuation marks: <i>comma, colon, periodus, interrogatio, parenthesis, apostrophus, hyphen, hypodiastole, and diaresis</i> , and 4 accent marks.
Crusius (1563)	yes	yes, 5 pages (<i>De orthographia</i>) in the beginning of the second part of the book + 8 pages (<i>De distinctionibus, et compositione orationis</i>) after the chapter on verbs and before the description of the calendar	yes	Dialogical book form. In the beginning of the first part (<i>pars prima</i>) orthography is defined as part of grammar and the division of letters as its units is described. The orthography chapter is dedicated to letters and sounds. Five punctuation marks are described as parts of speech: <i>subdistinctio, media distinctio, finalis distinctio, interpositio</i> (round brackets), and <i>nota interrogationis</i> (question mark).
Alvares (1572)	yes	no	no	Alvares describes letters on 3 pages in the chapter <i>Rudimenta, sive de octo partibus orationis</i> . Orthography is per definition part of grammar with its unit, but it is not discussed.
Caucius (1581)	yes	no	no	In this short grammar (78 pages), orthography is defined as part of grammar, and the letters are described in one paragraph.
Frischlinus (1586)	yes	yes, 8 pages (<i>De orthographia et prosodia</i>) in the beginning of the book	yes	In dialogical form; orthography is defined, and it describes sounds and letters, marks (<i>de notes</i>) and figures (<i>de figuris orthographicis</i>). Orthography is determined twofold (<i>duplex</i>): basic (<i>simplex</i>) – sounds and letters, and formed (<i>figurata</i>). Except for accent marks, the marks are not additionally described, and they are divided into five classes: <i>nota conjunctionis, n. disjunctionis, n. divisionis, n. aversionis, and n. accentus</i> . There are six separation marks (<i>notae distinctionum</i>): <i>comma (comma or virgula), colon (colon), period (punctus finalis), question mark (nota interrogationis), round brackets (nota parentheses) and small letters (litera majuscula)</i> . Regarding orthographic figures, Frischlinus mentions the 3 most common mistakes in correct spelling (<i>pugnant maxime cum recta scriptura</i>): <i>adjectio, detraction, and immutatio</i> , and he lists 11 figures of speech (<i>de figuris orthographicis</i>): <i>appositio, ablatio, interpositio, intercisio, productio, abscissio, contractio, divisio, transpositio, permutation, and dissectio</i> .

Sanctius (1587)	yes	no	no ³²	Santius defines orthography as a part of grammar, but there is no orthographic description. Teaching about letters is included and it is very shortly described.
	no	yes, 2 pages (<i>De orationis distinctione</i>) in the chapter on syntax, behind the part on exclamations and before syntactic figures	yes	Alsted divides grammar only into etymology and syntax. ³³ Despite the lack of an orthography chapter, there is a chapter on letters and sounds (<i>caput III. De literis</i>) spanning 8 pages, and a chapter on syllables (<i>caput IV. De syllabis</i>) spanning 3 pages. Parts of speech are divided into primary and secondary. Primary are respiratory marks (<i>nota respirationis</i>): <i>virgula</i> , <i>periodus</i> , and <i>duo puncti</i> . Secondary are marks of style change (<i>nota mutationis soni</i>): <i>parenthesis</i> , <i>signum interrogationis</i> , and <i>signum exclamationis</i> .
Alsted (1610)	no	no	no	Dialogical book form. Instead of orthography, grammar is divided into orthoepy (<i>sive regulae de recta literarum pronunciatione</i>) and the remaining three expected disciplines: prosody, etymology and syntax. The parts of speech (<i>partes orationis</i>) are divided into letters/sounds and syllables.
Scioppius (1628.)	no	no	no	Instead of titles, Vossius uses numbers as chapter marks. In addition to this, the grammar has the form of a treatise, so the material is also synthetically described in different places. On almost 1500 pages, Vossius writes about orthography basically in four places: in chapter 8 of the first book, in which it is established that both orthography and orthoepy have the same unit – letter/sound (<i>orthoepiae & orthographiae objectum sunt literae</i>), and at the end of the first book in three chapters. Chapter XLII is dedicated to the general discussion about several orthographic questions with references to authors who wrote about them, e.g. <i>ad/at</i> , <i>obsttit/opsttit</i> etc., and three „deviations from orthography“ (<i>orthographia receditur</i>) are described: <i>additione</i> , <i>detractione</i> , <i>immutatione</i> . In chapter XLIII he lists 62 disputable words taken over from Greek, and in chapter XLIV he writes on division of syllables.
Vossius (1635)	yes	yes, 4 pages (<i>liber primus</i> , <i>caput VIII</i>) + 3 pages (<i>liber primus</i> , <i>caput XLII</i>) + 12 pages (<i>liber primus</i> , <i>caput XLIII</i> , <i>XLIII</i> and <i>XLIV</i> – last three chapters of the first book)	yes	Orthographic chapter describes <i>littera</i> as the unit of orthography, and its division. It lists 8 rules on capital letters, dividing of words into syllables, and the writing of the accent on the last syllable. The chapter on punctuation is located as an annex to syntax, in which the division into <i>comma</i> , <i>colon</i> , and <i>periodus</i> is based on the criterion of breathing (<i>respiratio</i>), as is the division into five marks: <i>interrogationis</i> , <i>parentheseos</i> , <i>exclamationis</i> , <i>diaereseos</i> , and <i>connexionis</i> (hyphen between words, e.g. <i>ante-malorum</i> , <i>semper-lenitas</i>).
Golius (1636)	yes	yes, 4 pages (<i>De orthographia</i>) with which the book begins + 4 pages (<i>De ratione interpungendi</i>) as appendix to the book on syntax (<i>Appendix ad syntaxin prior</i>)	yes	

³² In the third book on syntax in the part on conjunctions, in one place *tropos*, *periodos*, *cola*, *commata* are mentioned as figures of the verb and the sentence.

³³ Grammar is determined as the art of speaking correctly (*ars pure loquendi*), not as the art of writing correctly.

Latin grammarians inherited the earlier teaching that the basis of the art of grammar is in the letters (*grammata* – Greek word for letters).³⁴ Letters are also given mystical meaning – for example, the interpretation that five Greek letters are mystical because of their symbolism (e.g. *theta* symbolizes death, and *upsilon* life). Traditionally, letters are typologically divided pursuant to their properties (*accidentia*), and their number increased in time. While Donatus only had the properties name (*nomen*), appearance (*figura*) and force/effect of pronunciation (*potestas*, i.e. vocals and consonants), Isidore of Seville adds the order in the alphabet (*ordo*), and Nebrija (1481) also the affinity (*cognatio*) with other letters. Instead of *potestas*, Curio (1546) mentions, besides *nomen* and *figura*, also the spirit (*spiritus*). These properties can be compared to grammar categories.³⁵

Teachings about *littera* are not only teachings about words, but also about sounds. *Littera* is the „sound which becomes separate by writing“ (*vox, quae scribi potest individua*)³⁶, and Vossius goes even further, arguing that orthoepy and orthography are full synonyms³⁷ which have the same basic unit *littera (orthoepiae & orthographiae objectum sunt literae)*.

Not addressing the relation between the terms *ars* and *scientia*, which in some authors have synonymous, and in others different meanings (*ars* as technique or skill, and *scientia* as knowledge or wisdom)³⁸, grammar is defined as *ars legendi & scribendi* (e.g. Vossius) or just as *ars loquendi* (e.g. Alstead). Orthography is basically determined as *ars (recte) scribendi* (art of writing correctly), e.g. Nebrija, Curio, Crusius, Frischlinus, and Golius³⁹, while prosody, etymology, and syntax are described as *ars (recte) loquendi* (art of speaking correctly).

The review of 22 authors of Latin grammars shows that 13 of them consider orthography a constituent part of grammar, equal with prosody, etymology⁴⁰ and syntax⁴¹ with their units *littera*, *syllaba* (syllable), *dictio* (word), and *oratio* (expression). Conditionally, another author (Clenardus) can be added, who does not define grammar, but whose book has a more extensive annexed orthography chapter „About some orthographic rules“ (*De orthographia praceptiunculae aliquot*) of author Johannes Vasaeus.

12 authors include an orthographic chapter, which spans from 1 to 22 pages.⁴² Among them, there are only two authors whose orthographic chapters are fully dedicated to orthographic content in the broader sense (Nebrija in the first edition, as the oldest grammar considered, and Cochlaeus). In other words, if we include Nebrija in the later edition, 11 of them (Manutius, Nebrija, Curio, Clenardus, Melanchthon, Valerius, Crusius, Frischlinus, Alsted, Vossius, and Golius) or half of the reviewed Latin grammarians from Renaissance Humanism, separate orthographic content in the narrower sense from

³⁴ Letters are symbols for things and represent power, because they refer to the words of those who speak to us while they are absent. (Isidore of Seville I.iii.1).

³⁵ Thus, among other, Donatus speaks about six properties (*accidentia*) of nouns: quality, comparison, gender, number, form, and case.

³⁶ Nebrija (1515)

³⁷ In the word index under the entry *orthoepy*, he states „orthoepy, spoken rather than orthography“ (*orthoepia dicitur potius, quam orthographia*).

³⁸ E.g. Teeuwen (2003: 358-360) and Coomaraswamy (2007: 85-88). Curio, Valerius, and Camerarius use also the phrase *ratio* (explanation), and Manutius *ars* or *professio* (profession).

³⁹ A part from the orthographic definitions from the reviewed period can be found in Haßler & Neis (2009: 1716-1730).

⁴⁰ Etymology assumes morphology and word formation.

⁴¹ Following Priscian, Cochlaeus mentions *diasynthetic* instead of syntax.

⁴² We should note that Nebrija's book from 1481 is an incunabula, when the typographical and structural standards of printed books had not been established yet. The text is unstructured and without paragraphs, and chapters and their titles can only be recognized by small indentations within paragraphs.

the teachings about *littera*. Orthographic content in the narrower sense is described on 9 pages on the average. The oldest grammar with orthographic content in the narrower sense is Manutius (1507), however, he does not consider them to be orthographic units, but speech units.⁴³

Only one author includes an orthographic chapter with teachings about *littera*, without also describing orthographic content in the narrower sense (Cochlaeus).⁴⁴

Orthographic content in the broader sense is considered by Latin grammarians from 1481 to 1636 to include the following 11 units:

1. teachings about *littera*: division of letters and sounds, types of letters, difference between the letters K and Q, Z and Y, letter X, double letters, arrangement of letters, diphthongs, pronunciation of consonants with sound *h*
2. teachings on punctuation and the division of *distinctiones* into comma, colon and period
3. marks (*notae*): question mark, exclamation mark, round brackets, diaeresis, hyphen between words, hypodiastole, accent marks
4. apostrophe
5. capital and minuscule letters
6. abbreviation of writing
7. division of words into syllables
8. multiple spelling (e.g. *ad/at, obstitit/opstitit*)
9. deviations in writing or general spelling mistakes
10. rhetorical figures (*de figuris orthographicis*) and deviation from usual writing: *adjectio, detractio, transmutation, and immutatio*.
11. orthographic glossary with a list of Greek names which were transferred into Latin differently

Deviations from orthography (*orthographia receditur*) is a developed orthographic topic of Latin grammarians. Depending on who is writing and for what purpose, deviations in writing can either be an orthographic mistake to be fought (*qua pugnant maxime cum recta scriptura*) or a poetic stylistic element as a figure of speech. If in a non-poetic text, *set* is written instead of *sed*, this is *immutatio* as deviation from correct writing, but if a poet writes *optumus* instead of *optimus*, then this is *permutatio* as an orthographic-rhetorical figure. Clenardus, Frischlinus, and Vossius write about them, and Frischlinus tries to justify this orthographic ambivalence also typologically, claiming that orthography is in its nature ambivalent (*duplex*): the first is called simple (*simplex*) – those are all the usual places where orthographic rules apply, and the other one (poetically) „figurated“ (*figurata*). The latter is thus considered stylistic writing and is connected with rhetorical figures. Frischlinus and Vossius deal with three, Clenardus with 4, and Frischlinus with 11 „orthographic figures“. The close relation between orthography and rhetoric arises from antique perception of the connection of a word with its etymology. Letters can be added (*adjectio*), taken away (*detractio*), their order can change (*transmutatio*) or they can completely mutate (*immutatio*). Pursuant to Quintilian's teachings, Vasaeus describes barbarisms (poetism on word level) and solecisms (poetism at speech level) in this way. Copeland and Sluiter (2012: 366) argue that these four categories come from Aristotle's physics, and that they universally describe all types of changes of things.

⁴³ The fact that there is no chapter entitled *orthographia* in his grammar, although it would be expected due to his printing and translating experience, and due to the relation of printing and orthography, indicates that Aldus Manutius left this material intentionally out of his grammar because he wanted to publish a separate work on orthography. *Orthographiae ratio* was issued by his fourteen-year old grandson with the same name and surname in 1561. Knowing that extensive knowledge was necessary at that time to publish a work on orthography, we can assume that he used his grandfather's materials and notes.

⁴⁴ Here we can also include Nebrija's first edition which was later extended by the requested content.

The separators (*distinctions*) – *subdistinctio*, *media distinctio*, and *distinctio finalis* – are in the beginning viewed separately from punctuation characters or marks (*notae*). They were first parts of a sentence (e.g. Clenardus), inherited from the Antiquity as categories of integrity of discourse, and are thus described within the syntactic part or immediately after it. In other authors they are mentioned as parts of speech or pauses in speaking (e.g. Crusius, Alsted and Golius), and are thus closer to signs which point to differing pronunciation, such as signs for accent, question mark, brackets, etc. Melanchthon is the only one to describe both *distinctions* and *notae*, while Alsted divides them into two categories – respiratory and stylistic. The difference between *distinctions* and *notae* later became grammatically less relevant.⁴⁵ The first step, the beginning of the transformation of *distinctions* into the written characters which we today know as comma (*comma*), colon (*colon*), and period (*periodus*), occurs at a moment when orthographic content in the narrower sense started being described within an orthographic chapter, not outside of it. The first one to proceed in this way was Curio.⁴⁶

Distinctiones are characters which all grammarians (Vossius being a possible exception) describe as punctuation characters in the narrower sense. The turning point were Melanchthon and Valerius, who started including also other signs in punctuation marks, and thereafter no one considered punctuation marks to be only period, comma, and colon. For a more mature orthographic description in the narrower sense in Renaissance Humanism we could point to Frischlinus.

Like their antique sources, Latin grammars usually start with an orthographic description in the broader sense, while orthographic content in the narrower sense is by most grammarians described within syntax or immediately thereafter. (Frischlinus places it in the beginning of the book.) On the other hand, in two grammar books the orthographic chapters were written by other authors (Johannes Vasaeus in the grammar of Nicolaus Clenardus, and Joachim Camerarius in the grammar of Philip Melanchthon), which are added as annexes at the end of the grammar. This fact indicates that orthography was begun being separated from grammatical teachings.

Those who do not describe orthographic content (10 authors) can be divided into two classes, depending on whether they define orthography as part of grammar and if they include the teachings about *littera* in their grammars.

Table 2. Division of grammarians who do not describe orthographic content

Authors	Consider orthography to be part of grammar	Describe teachings about
		<i>littera</i>
Brassicanus, Lancilotus, Scalinger, Scioppius	–	+
Ramus, Alvares, Causius, Sanctius	+	+
Aventinus, Linacre	–	–

⁴⁵ It is interesting to note that this ambivalent view of punctuation marks, as sentential and as pronunciation characters, can also be found in contemporary grammars. Babić et al. (2004) distinguish the so-called sentential marks (Croatian: *rečenični znakovi*) from orthographic marks (Croatian: *pravopisni znakovi*); thus period, comma, and colon are (with other marks) described in both places. According to them, sentence marks are those separating sentences, while orthographic characters point to a particular pronunciation of a word.

⁴⁶ Also, he is the first of the reviewed grammarians to also describe his methodology: he observes orthography through the three „most obvious perspectives“ (*tribus rebus potissimum constat*): tradition (respecting old authorities; *autoritate*), etymology (noting the primary meaning of a word; *notatione*) and correctness (correctness of spelling the form of a word; *proportione*).

4.2 Orthography of first vernacular grammars

The categorization of orthographic content encompasses 17 first European vernacular grammars published in the 15th, 16th, and 17th century, as listed by Rowe (1974: 361-379).⁴⁷ We reviewed only languages which are today in official use on national level in one of the European countries, excluding minority and regional languages. Two additional grammar books should have been reviewed, but were unavailable.⁴⁸ Naturally, for a full description of the orthographic content in vernacular grammars it would be necessary to categorize also later grammar books (as was made for Latin), and not only the first ones to appear, but such research would have exceeded the set scope. This review already is considered to be able to contribute to making conclusions on vernacular grammars.

As in Latin grammars, the first vernacular grammars view orthographic content differently, although there are common points between them. First of all, the orthographic description is not original, but inherited from Latin grammars. Those grammars, which do have orthographic chapters, primarily describe letters and sounds, and only some of them take the next step to describe orthographic characters. Orthography mostly continues to be one of the components of grammars. Since Latin continued to be the language of science in the 15th and 16th century, it was the starting point for describing vernaculars. Moreover, the more the description of a language was similar to Latin, the more successful the grammars were.⁴⁹ The first Nordic grammars were even literally translated pursuant to Donatus's *Ars minor*.⁵⁰

Another common point of vernacular grammars is their function. While antique grammars were oriented towards the native speaker, the grammars of this period put the foreign language speaker into their centre.⁵¹ The first vernacular grammars were often written by native speakers of foreign languages, for foreigners who wanted to learn the respective vernacular language (examples are Arabian, Finnish, French, Polish, Russian and Turkish). This is particularly true for colonial languages, whose first grammars were written in Spanish or Portuguese. Even when vernacular grammars were written by native speakers, in most cases those were grammars whose metalanguage was Latin (as in Danish, Finnish, Croatian, Irish, Hungarian, New Greek, German, Polish, Russian, and Slovene), while smaller number of vernacular grammars were written in vernacular (Czech, Dutch, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish, and Italian).

The reason for appearance of vernacular grammars can naturally be searched in the argument of the need for the description of the vernacular language, which had increasing civilizational application in the 15th and 16th century.⁵² So, for instance, in the preface to the Russian grammar, the usefulness of learning Russian for trade is clearly emphasized. A subtype of this civilizational argument can be found in the strengthening of the influence of vernacular languages in their colonial environments. It is a well-known story that the grammarian Nebrija met the Spanish queen Isabella II whom he asked for support in issuing a grammar stating arguments that the citizens must be civilized and must know the language

⁴⁷ We made two exceptions from Rowe's list. Instead of the Portuguese grammar of Barros (1539), we took into account the seven-year older grammar of Oliveira (1532). Also, instead of the Hungarian grammar of Molnár (1610), we studied Sylvester (1539). Kamusella (2009: 122) mentions author Dévai Bíró Mátyás as having written the first grammar in 1538, however we were unable to find it.

Rowe's selection criteria were title and integrity of the grammar, and reference in other authors, but he pointed to possibility of mistakes, not having investigated many of the grammars in person.

⁴⁸ The first French grammar (written in English) by Barclay (1521) and the English grammar of Bullokar (1586).

⁴⁹ Law (2003: 234)

⁵⁰ Hovdhaugen et al. (2000: 10)

⁵¹ Law (1997: xi)

⁵² The tendency noted in Latin grammarians continues also in vernacular grammarians: the grammatical description is increasingly the task of secular, not ecclesiastical men of learning (8 of the reviewed 17 grammarians were not men of the church): Nebrija, Fortunio, Sylvester, Albrecht, Spieghel, Ludolf, Portius, and Jónsson.

of their ruler. Nebrija states clearly in the preface to his grammar: „(...) que siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio“ [language always accompanies the ruler].

However, an important motive for learning a foreign language was also the need to spread religion. Evangelization is an important socio-cultural (and political) initiator in Europe of that time, especially in countries with expressed religious issues. Besides, the first vernacular grammars of European languages appear in the period of Reformation, or Counter-Reformation (Catholic Revival). As a reaction to Catholic promotion of the prestige of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, Protestants promoted the doctrine that every faithful person must approach religion in their own language. This also affected the attitudes of the Catholic Church, which realised that no (re)evangelization could take place without preaching the faith in vernacular languages, and it should not be surprising that it was due to the missionary needs of the colonial great powers of that time that the first grammars of Spanish and Portuguese came into being.

Of the reviewed 15 vernacular grammars, three came from the ranks of the Catholic church (as compared to 6 Protestant) – Portuguese (Oliveira 1532), Croatian (Kašić 1604) and Irish (Maolmhuaidh 1677). The orthographic and grammatical work of the Catholic Counter-Reformation and the Catholic Revival can be well represented using the example of Croatian. It was precisely due to the need for spreading the faith, led by the Jesuits, that the first Croatian grammar came into being. Kašić speaks of the Jesuits' influence clearly in the preface: “Those who must not be objected” (*authoritas quorum voluntati nefas est repugnare*) decided that a grammar is to be written so the Illyrians, “due to a long-term and unfavourable company of enemies of the Catholic faith” (*ob diuturnam, ac miseram cum Religionis Catholice hostibus consuetudinem*), could be instructed on the Christian faith. As Kašić says, „the most widespread language among the majority of the people“ (*plurimos populos latissime patet*) was chosen – the Illyrian, that is the Croatian language. The Illyrian language, according to Vinko Pribojević, whose influential and widespread theory about the origin and the history of the Slavs appeared in 1525 (printed in Latin in 1532 and in Italian in 1595), referred to Croatian as the “purest” Slav language.⁵³ The Pan-Slavic idea, which emphasized the connection of Slavs with the antique Illyrians, spread especially to other authors in the 16th and 17th century, and was included in the programme of the Catholic Revival, which wanted to spread its activities among all Slavs under Turkish rule.⁵⁴ The need for standardization of an idiom, which would be understandable in the largest area possible, had a major influence on the progress of linguistic standardization of people who lived in Croatian territories and the parts of Balkans under Turkish rule.⁵⁵

In the Counter-Reformation and the Catholic Revival, the main order in charge of evangelization were the Jesuits.⁵⁶ The role of the Jesuits, as well as the influence of their printing press *Typographia Polyglotta*, established in 1626 in Rome, in the standardization of spelling and orthography of different languages, still needs to be researched.⁵⁷ Wishing to facilitate missionary activities as much as possible, the Jesuits decided to typify the Latin grammar and to complement it with data from local languages. The result was Alvares (1572), which became the mandatory manual for Jesuit schools in 1591 and was

⁵³ The author of the first Croatian dictionary, Faust Vrančić, calls this language *Dalmatian* and establishes it in the title of his dictionary of 1595 as „one of the five most dignified European languages“ (*Dictionarium quinque nobilissimarum Europae linguarum, latinae, italicae, germanicae, dalmaticae et ungaricae*).

⁵⁴ Francić (2013: 36), Matasović (2015: 472-473)

⁵⁵ It could be said that the consequence of Pan-Slavism from the 16th century is also the Yugoslav unitarian language ideology from the 19th century.

⁵⁶ Except for Croatian, the first grammars of Breton and Lusatian were also written by Jesuits. (Julien Maunoir and Jakub Xaver Ticin).

⁵⁷ A good contribution to this research is Jahreiß (1990), however this refers primarily to German.

therefore printed in more than 400 editions.⁵⁸ If Alvares's grammar had had any orthographic content, this would certainly have been transferred to vernacular grammars which were modelled on it. For a grammar written with the goal of (re)evangelization of the faith, orthography in the narrower sense was only of secondary importance. The Jesuits adapted the grammars methodologically to the goal of their missionary needs. The function of those who used the grammars was to learn the vernacular, starting from Latin. Since most of the population was illiterate, preaching primarily referred to speech, so the rules of learning languages neglected the written side. None of the vernacular grammars coming from the ranks of the Catholic Counter-Reformation and the Catholic Revival has any orthographic content (this is also true for the Breton and Lusatian grammar).

On the other hand, Protestantism relied heavily on printing and spreading the written word. In the period from 1521 to 1545, 30.2% out of 5651 printed books related to reformation, and 17.6% to the Catholic doctrine. In the first half of the reviewed period, as much as 46% of all printed books related to reformation.⁵⁹ Vernacular grammars intended for spreading the written word gave more importance to the orthographic content in the narrower sense. Most of the first vernacular grammars whose authors were among the ranks of Protestant priesthood contain orthographic content in the narrower sense to a smaller or to a greater extent.

Thus, the Czech Protestant grammar Optát et al. (1533), written in Czech, includes a 15-page orthographic chapter, which the grammar begins with.⁶⁰ Orthography is divided into two units: one encompassing the alphabet, letters and sounds, pronunciation, diphthongs, abbreviation of words, and the other punctuation (period, comma, colon, question mark, hyphen (in the end of a line) and brackets). Adam Bohorič, Slovene Protestant, is the author of a grammar from 1584, which also begins with an orthographic chapter spanning 35 pages, and which describes orthographic content in the narrower sense on four pages (writing of the apostrophe, two signs for accent and five punctuation marks – comma, period, question mark and brackets). The Danish grammar Pontoppidan (1668) is divided into orthography, etymology and syntax. The chapter *Observationes orthographicae* extensively describes on 94 pages the teachings on the letters and the sounds, and regarding orthographic content in the narrower sense, on six pages the orthographic signs *comma, semicolon, colon, punctum, signum interrogationis, signum admirationis, parenthesis, diaeresis, diastasis, hyphen, circumflexus*, and *apostrophus* are described. It is similar with the Swedish Protestant grammar Tiällmann (1696), whose orthographic content in the narrower sense includes 4 pages, which refer to punctuation. It describes all signs as the Danish grammar, but omitting *diaeresis, hyphen*, and *circumflexus*.

On the other hand, two Protestant authors of the first Polish and Finnish grammar—Statorius (1568)⁶¹ and Petreus (1649), respectively – do not have any orthographic content.

Table 3. Review of vernacular grammars and the orthographic content in them

Work	Language	Metalinguage	Grammatical background	Description of orthographic characters
Nebrija (1492) Giovanni Francesco Fortunio (1516) ⁶²	Spanish	Spanish	Secular	No
	Italian	Italian	Secular	No

⁵⁸ Demo (2008).

⁵⁹ Crofts (1985: 373)

⁶⁰ Digitalized to be found at <http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/moduly/mluvnice/digitalni-kopie-detail/NamGram1533/strana-A0v%20%93A1r>. Accessed on 4 January 2017.

⁶¹ Digitalized to be found at <http://wwwdbc.wroc.pl/dlibra/docmetadata?id=5446&from=publication>.

⁶² First edition from 1516, however we used the edition from 1545.

	Portuguese	Portuguese	Catholic	No
Oliveira (1532)	Czech	Czech	Protestant	Yes
Optát et al. (1533)	Hungarian	Latin	Secular	No
Sylvester (1539)	Polish	Latin	Protestant	No
Statorius (1568)	German	Latin	Secular	Yes
Albrecht (1573)	Dutch	Dutch	Secular	No
Spieghel (1584)	Slovene	Latin	Protestant	Yes
Bohorič (1584)	Croatian	Latin	Catholic	No
Kašić (1604)	Modern Greek	Latin	Secular	No
Portius (1638)	Finnish	Latin	Protestant	No
Petraeus (1649)	Icelandic	Latin	Secular	No
Jónsson (1651)	Danish	Latin	Protestant	Yes
Pontoppidan (1668)	Irish	Latin	Catholic	No
Maolmhuaidh (1677)	Swedish	Swedish	Protestant	Yes
Tiällmann (1696)	Russian	Latin	Secular	No
Ludolf (1696)				

Of the 17 reviewed grammars, only 5 grammars do have orthographic content. The only secular grammar with description of orthographic content is the German one, whose orthographic content in the narrower sense spans 5 pages and deals with abbreviation of writing (*De abbreviaturis*) and the description of orthographic characters (period, comma, colon, question mark, and brackets). If we take a wider perspective of orthography, as seen by the grammarians of that time for Spanish, Italian, Hungarian, Russian, and Dutch, who viewed orthography as the part of grammar describing letters, sounds, and pronunciation, the number of grammars with orthographic content in the broader sense increases to 10. The description of punctuation is the expected constant among them, however from orthographic content in the narrower sense, abbreviations, apostrophe, and accent signs occur in some places. The orthographic teachings of vernacular grammars are completely inherited from Latin grammars and they do not introduce new content. As many as two thirds of the reviewed vernacular grammars were written in Latin, which clearly indicates their intended purpose for foreigners. As compared to them, a quantitative and qualitative reduction of orthographic description is observable, which leads to the conclusion that they were written for the practical reason of learning a new language of literacy in specific social and religious conditions. The function of learning a language replaced the antique discussions on grammatical questions and the reference to antique literary idols, by which grammar books continue their evolution into practical manuals.

5 Conclusion

The research of orthographic content in grammar books pursued the goal to show in which way a certain historic period looked at written language and the concept of literacy. Since grammars were considered to be central language manuals, it is logical to expect that they would include instructions for writing and reading. The basic function of orthography is to establish the connection between written and spoken language. The greater the distance between them, the more necessary orthographic content became. The motive for occurrence of first orthographic texts lies in the ever increasing chasm between Homer's language of 8th century BCE, which was considered to be "elevated", "uncorrupted", and "ideal", and the one spoken a thousand years later, at the time of great antique grammarians such as Herodian and Theodosius in 3rd century CE. The antique school elevated the reading of Homer not only because of its moral lessons, but also due to the reputation of his "pure" language.⁶³ Correct writing primarily refers to the spelling of old Greek names, which were often used

⁶³ Williams (2005: 3)

as references in learned texts. The aspiration towards the “correct” language also continues in Renaissance Humanism (and this tendency is especially noticeable in the Enlightenment).

The Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages describe orthographic content in grammar books in the context of rhetorical skills and the spreading of written texts. Orthographic entities primarily comprise punctuation marks and critical marks. Latin grammars in Renaissance Humanism also have more characteristics of instructions for reading old texts, rather than serving the function as manuals for Latin. The interest of grammarians and prominent orthographers was intrinsically bound to Greek and its written history: Camerarius was a translator and teacher of Greek language and history, Johannes Vasaeus a librarian and historian, Crusius studied Greek literature and history, etc. It should thus not be surprising that many Latin grammars took over the antique teachings on orthography and adopted it to the era of the written book (e.g. Camerarius who continues to write about *subdistinctio*, *media distinction*, and *distinctio finalis*).

Printing and the reformation made a major contribution to the occurrence of vernacular grammars and the change of position of orthography in grammars. It was during the time of the first descriptions of vernacular languages that orthographic contents started being noticeably extracted from grammar books, continuing the tradition which had already been noticeable in Latin grammars. The orthographic entity was marked by the utilitarianism of the printed language for the needs of spreading the faith or the vernacular. By spreading printed books, the language started to be used also by reading, which lead to the expansion of the number of orthographic characters specific for the printed text.

One of the most obvious constants in orthographic and grammatical teachings through the reviewed period is that there is basically no distinction between the letter (grapheme) and the sound (phoneme). The concept of orthography in grammars was closely connected to speaking and pronunciation, and the description of sounds was necessary for the rules of writing. The teachings on orthography were the beginning of the grammatical description with its unit *littera*. Moreover, in the Antiquity and in medieval Latin grammars, orthography (in the broader sense) and the *littera* unit were part of the definition of grammar, and such practice was maintained in most reviewed grammarians of Renaissance Humanism. Almost all Latin grammarians include the teachings about *littera* in their works (20 of 22) and describe in detail the correct spelling of Greek names, the adaptation of the Greek *littera* to Latin (letters K and Q, Z and Y, letter X, aspirated sound, diphthongs, etc.). Thus, it is not surprising that already in Nebrija we can notice the concept of the phoneme.⁶⁴

In the context of orthographic content in the narrower sense in grammar books, perception of orthography as an autonomous language system first occurred in the middle of 16th century in Curio’s Latin grammar, while those vernacular grammars with orthographic chapters had already adopted that concept. Half of the reviewed Latin grammarians discern both in their content and in their structure, between orthography in the broader and the narrower sense.

Orthography in the narrower sense regularly refers to *distinctiones* (period, comma, and colon), and, to a significantly smaller extent, to the writing of capital and minuscule letters, acronyms, apostrophes, and the division of words. Under the influence of antique grammars, *distinctiones* are handled as syntactic or speech units, separate from *notae* or other characters (the most common characters are the question mark and the round brackets, while later the apostrophe, hyphen, exclamation mark, etc. appeared). In the middle of the 16th century, vernacular grammars ended the process of transformation from proto-punctuation marks to written characters and orthographic units. In other

⁶⁴ Haßler and Neis (2009: 1730)

words, they dealt with different orthographic content in the narrower sense in their orthographic chapters in an integrative way. The tendency of separate description of orthographic content in Renaissance Humanism led to the occurrence of annexed orthographies in grammars, whose authors were not the authors of the grammatical part. After reviewing orthographic content in the narrower sense in vernacular grammars, it can be concluded that it does not differ significantly from the Latin ones. This was also to be expected since most vernacular grammars were written in Latin.

The answer to the question about orthographic constants from the Antiquity until today is not in the orthographic content. This research confirms its change and adaptation to periods in which orthographic content occurred. Only a historical sociolinguistic research framework can adequately describe the orthographic phenomenon and point to a constant in the form of an interesting relation between language and authority – behind each orthographic norm there always is an authority or ideal. It seems that standards cannot be fully understood without this constituent. In the Antiquity and in the Middle Ages those were the great speakers who discussed language (Aristotle, Plato, Quintilian, and others). In Renaissance Humanism those were literary ideals (Italian), the language of the court and the aristocracy (French) or the language of the Bible (German, Swedish, Danish, and Finnish examples). In the Enlightenment, the authority was transferred to authorized grammarians, language academies, committees or influential linguists. Since orthographic content is highly characterized by the time of its occurrence, the question arises as to what contemporary orthographic contents say about our time and about us. It is an even more relevant and provocative question if contemporary orthographic content is aligned with the current status of literacy, or if those are just remnants of a past time which we need to create a relation with at the level of language ideology. Regarding this and similar questions, historical sociolinguistic studies will be able to provide an important review on modern standardology.

6 Bibliography

6.1 Primary

Antiquity

Alcuin. *Ars grammatica*

Dionysius Thrax. *Τέχνη γραμματική* [Art of Grammar]

Aelius Donatus. *Ars minor – de partibus orationis*

Aelius Donatus. *Ars maior*

Isidore of Seville. *Etymologiae*

Priscianus Caesariensis. *Institutiones grammaticae*

Renaissance Humanism

Albrecht, Lorenz. 1573. *Grammatick oder Sprach-kunst*

Alsted, Johann Heinrich. 1610. *Compendium grammaticae latinae*

Alvares, Emmanuel. 1572. *De institutione grammatica libri tres*

Aventinus, Johannes. 1515. *Grammatica nova fundamentalis juvenibus utilissima*

Barclay, Alexander. 1521. *Here begynneth the introductory to wryte, and to pronounce French*

Barros, João de. 1539. *Grammatica da lingua portuguesa*

Bohorič, Adam. 1584. *Aricae horulae succissivae*

Brassicanus, Joanis. 1518. *Institutiones grammaticae elimatissimae*

Bullokar, William. 1586. *Bref grammar for English*

Caucius, Antonius. 1581. *Grammatica latina*

Clenardus, Nicolaus. 1551. *Institutiones grammaticae Latinae*

Cochlaeus, Johannes. 1514. *Grammatica rudimenta ad latinae linguae*

Crusius, Martinus. 1563. *Grammatica graeca, cum latina congruens*

Curio, Coelius Secundus. 1546. *De literis doctrinaque puerili, libri quinque*

Fortunio, Giovanni Francesco. 1516. *Regole grammaticali della volgar lingua*

Frischlinus, Nicodemus. 1586. *Grammatica latina*

Golius, Theophil. 1636. *Grammatica latina*

Jónsson, Runólfur. 1651. *Recentissima antiquissimae linguae septentrionalis incunabula; id est grammaticae Islandicae rudimenta*

Kašić, Bartol. 1604. *Institutionum linguae Illyricae libri duo*

Lancilotus, Curius. 1518. *De arte grammatica libri octo*

Linacre, Thomas. 1532. *De emendata structura latini sermonis libri VI*

Ludolf, Heinrich Wilhelm. 1696. *Grammatica russica*

Maolmhuaidh, Froinsias Ó [O'Molloy, Francis]. 1677. *Grammatica Latino-hibernica*

Melanchton, Pilip. 1553. *Grammatica latina*

Molnár, Albert Szenczi. 1610. *Novae grammaticae Ungaricae*

Nebrija, Elio Antonio de. 1481. *Introductiones latinae cum commento*

Nebrija, Elio Antionio de. 1492. *La gramática que nuevamente hizo el maestro Antonio de Lebrixia sobre la lengua castellana*

Nebrija, Elio Antonio de. 1515. *Grammatica cu[m] quarta editione.*

Manutius, Aldus. 1507. *Institutionum grammaticarum libri quator*

Oliveira, Fernão de. 1532. *Grammatica da lingoagem portuguese*

Optát, Václav Beneš, Gzel, Petar, Philomathes, Václav. 1533. *Grammatyka česká v dvojí stránce*

Petraeus, Eskil. 1649. *Linguae Finnicae brevis institutio*

Pontoppidan, Erik Eriksen. 1668. *Grammatica danica*

Portius, Simon. 1638. *Grammatica linguae Graecae vulgaris*

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*

Ramus, Petrus. 1559. *Scholae grammaticae*

Sanctius, Franciscus Brocensis. 1587. *Minerva sive de causis linguae latinae*

Scaliger, Julius. 1540. *De causis linguae latinae libri tredecim*

Scioppius, Gaspar. 1628. *Grammatica philosophica*

Spieghel, Hendrick Laurenszoon. 1584. *Twe-spraack van de Nederduydsche letterkunst*

Statorius, Pierre. 1568. *Polonicae grammatices institutio*

Sylvester, János. 1539. *Grammatica hungarolatina*

Tiällmann, Nils. 1696. *Grammatica Suecana*

Valerius, Cornelius. 1560. *Grammaticarum institutionum libri IIII*

Vossius, Gerardus. 1635. *De arte grammatica libri septem*

6.2 Secondary

Ammon, Ulrich, Dittmar, Norbert, Mattheier, Klaus J, Trudgill, Peter (eds.) 2004. *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Vol. 1 (2004), vol. 2 (2005), vol. 3 (2006). Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter

Amsler, Mark. 1989. *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Babić, Stjepan, Finka, Božidar, Moguš, Milan. 2004. *Hrvatski pravopis* [Croatian Orthography]. 8th edition. Zagreb: Školska knjiga

Barney, Stephan A, Lewis, W. J., Beach, J. A., Berghof, Oliver with the collaboration of Muriel Hall. 2006. *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, Lyle and Mixco, Mauricio J. 2007. *A Glossary of Historical Linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press

Chapman, Siobhan and Routledge, Christopher (eds.). 2009. *Key Ideas in Linguistics and the Philosophy of Language*. Edinburgh University Press

Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. 2007. *Figures of Speech or Figures of Thought?* World Wisdom

Copeland, Rita and Sluiter, Ineke. 2012. *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300 – 1475*. Oxford University Press

Crofts, Richard A. 1985. Printing, Reform, and the Catholic Reformation in Germany (1521–1545). *Sixteenth Century Journal* 16(3), Fall 1985, 369–381

Davidson, Thomas. 1874. *The Grammar of Dionysios Thrax. Translated from the Greek*. St. Louis

Davies, Martin. 2004. Humanism in script and print in the fifteenth century. In Jill Kraye (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, 6th edition, 47–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Demo, Šime. 2008. *Valentnost glagolâ u hrvatskim gramatikama latinskoga* [Verbal valency in the Croatian grammars of Latin]. Zagreb: University of Zagreb dissertation

Frančić, Andela. 2013. *Pregled povijesti hrvatskoga jezika* [The overview of history of Croatian language]. In Ante Bičanić, Andela Frančić, Lana Hudeček, Milica Mihaljević. *Pregled povijesti, gramatike i pravopisa hrvatskoga jezika* [The overview of history, grammar and orthography of Croatian language], 7-126. Zagreb: Croatica

Gallmann, Peter. 1985. *Graphische Elemente der gesriebenen Sprache*. Tübingen: Niemeyer

Garber, Daniel and Ayers, Michael with the assistance of Roger Ariew and Alan Gabbay (eds.). 2008. *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy. Vol. II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Haßler, Gerda and Neis, Cordula. 2009. *Lexikon sprachtheoretischer Grundbegriffe des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter

Havdhaugen, Even; Karlsson, Fred; Henriksen, Carol; Sigurd, Bengt. 2000. *The History of Linguistics in the Nordic Countries*. Helsinki: Societas Scientarum Fennica

Jahreiß, Astrid. 1990. *Grammatiken und Orthographielehren aus dem Jesuitenorden. Eine Untersuchung zur Normierung der deutschen Schriftsprache in Unterrichtswerken des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter & Universitätverlag

Kamusella, Tomasz. 2009. *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan

Koerner, Ernst Frideryk Konrad and Asher, Ronald E. 1995. (eds.) *Concise Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences. From the Sumerians to the Cognitivists*. Pergamon

Kovachich, Martin Georg. 1786. *Merkur von Ungarn: oder Litterarzeitung für d. Königreich Ungarn u. dessen Kronländer*. Pest

Law, Vivien. 1997. *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages*, London and New York: Longman

Law, Vivien. 2003. *The History of Linguistics in Europe. From Plato to 1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Le Goff, Jacques. 2009. *Intelektualci u srednjem vijeku* [Intellectuals in the Middle Ages]. Translation from French *Les intellectuels au Moyen Age*, Paris 1985. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.

Lepschy, Giulio. (ed.) 1998. *History of Linguistics. Volume III: Renaissance and Early Modern Linguistics*. Routledge

Malatesha Joshi, R., Aaron, P. G. (eds.) 2006. *Handbook of Orthography and Literacy*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Malmkjær, Kirsten. (ed.) 2010. *The Routledge Linguistics Encyclopedia*. Third edition. London and New York: Routledge

Mantello, Frank Anthony Carl and Rigg, Arthur George (eds.). 1996. *Medieval Latin : An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press

Marsden, William. 1796. *A Catalogue of Dictionaries, vocabularies, grammars, and Alphabets. In Two Parts*. London

Matasović, Ranko. 2016. *Lingvistička povijest Europe* [Linguistic history of Europe]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska

Pribojević, Vinko. 1532. *De origine successibusque Slavorum*

Pribojević, Vinko. 1595. *Della origine et successi degli Slavi*

Reynolds, Suzanne. 1996. *Medieval Reading : grammar, rhetoric and the classical text*. Cambridge University Press

Rowe, John Howland. 1974. Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Grammars. In *Studies in the History of Linguistics. Traditions and Paradigms*. Editor Dell Hymes. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press

Saenger, Paul. 1997. *Space between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading*. Stanford University Press

Seuren, Pieter A. M. 1998. *Western Linguistics. An Historical Introduction*. Blackwell Publishing

Shaller, Helmut. 2000. Frühe grammatische Beschreibungen slawischer Sprachen. In Sylvain Auroux, E. F. K. Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe, Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the Language Science. An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present* (Handbook of Linguistics and Communication Science), Volume 1, 792–799. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter

Stammerjohann, Harro. 2009. *Lexicon grammaticorum. A Bio-Bibliographical Companion to the History of Linguistics*. Second Edition. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag

Stojanov, Tomislav. 2015. Jezikopisno planiranje i elektronička pismenost na hrvatskome jeziku [Linguographic Planning and E-literacy in the Croatian Language]. Unpublished PhD thesis at University of Zagreb

Stojanov, Tomislav. forthc. *Orthographies in Grammar Books – from Rationalism to the Enlightenment*

Teeuwen, Mariken. 2003. *The Vocabulary of Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages*. Turnhout Belgique: Brepols

Verburg, Pieter Adrianus. 1998. *Language and its Functiones*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Vrančić, Faust. 1595. *Dictionarium quinque nobilissimarum Europae linguarum, latinae, italicae, germanicae, dalmaticae et ungaricae*

Walch, Johann Georg. 1716. *Historia critica latinae linguae*. Lipsiae, sumtu I. F. Gleditschii B. filii

Williams, James Dale. 2005. *The Teacher's Grammar Book*. Second edition. New Jersey & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Žagar, Mateo. 2013. Hrvatska pisma i pravopisi u 17. i 18. stoljeću [Croatian scripts and orthographies in 17th and 18th centuries]. In Ante Bičanić, Radoslav Katičić and Josip Lisac (eds.) *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika. 3. knjiga: 17. i 18. stoljeće* [History of Croatian Language. Volume 3rd: 17th and 18th centuries], 343–370. Zagreb: Croatica