
Addendum: is (Older) Scots an Anglic variety?

CHARLES-HENRI DISCRY

This addendum is intended to complement my *Scottish Language* article of 2022; it can even be seen as further evidence that strengthens points made there. Two elements will be treated in this shorter piece. The first is an additional occurrence of the term *Anglic* found in McClure (1986:85), which needs to be commented on and listed. The second is a parallel between August Schleicher's terminological choices (Koerner 1989a, 1989b, 1989c and 1989d) and some terminological suggestions I put forward in my article. Prior to discussing these two points, readers will be provided with a summary of the paper published in *Scottish Language* so as to give them context in which to place these two elements.

1. CONTEXT

The primary argument of my 2022 paper was to suggest that *Anglic* was a logical and practical term to refer to Scots and English. More than just a terminological innovation based on aesthetic criteria, *Anglic* was proved to have different purposes. These purposes were listed as a series of advantages in the 2022 article and will be reformulated here: *Anglic* is [1] unambiguous, [2] solves the problem and paradox of naming Scots and its older varieties 'English varieties', [3] drives towards greater economy in writing and [4] provides ground for discussion and offers new perspectives into Scots and English historical linguistics (see Discry 2022: 21–24). *Anglic* was also shown to be transferable outside the bounds of historical linguistics into pidgin and creole research as it can connect the two fields together. Finally, a parallel Romance-Germanic set of projections was drawn to identify and locate what was defined as a gap in the genealogical tree of Germanic languages of which Scots and English are part. These other two points were respectively ordered as [5] and [6] under section 5 in the original article (Discry 2022: 24–25).

In order to arrive at these advantages, preliminary work was necessary. The first step was to demonstrate that a considerable degree of ambiguity existed in the terms English and Anglic but not for the same reasons. Thus, English was proved to be inadequate on three grounds: one that was linguistic, a second that was historical and a third that was identity-linked. English is what was termed a *complex*, that is a complex semantic entity, and it is precisely that complexity that makes it inadequate as a means to describe and classify – in short, name – Scots and its ancient varieties. This complexity was shown to come across as polysemy, semantic ambivalence and homonymy. The second step in the research was to back up the assumption of an existing issue by showing the existence of some difficulty when describing and classifying Scots. Subsequently, a series of three strategies to cope with this issue was identified in the hands of Scotticists in scholarly writing. The third step was to turn the attention to Anglic, which was intuitively felt to be the key to the problem. But, as I have said, Anglic too was ambiguous. This ambiguity was down to the term having not been defined previously, with the notable exception of Tait (no date). Part of the problem also lay in the absence of any published and referenced paper on Anglic which could at least be used as a basis for future discussions on the term, its relevance and use. The research led me to the conclusion that a synthesis of all the occurrences of the term Anglic was necessary. The fourth and final step consisted in proposing a definition that would include all past uses of the term Anglic, thereby clearing up any ambiguity attached to its use and understanding. The opportunity was taken in that research to engage with the material so as to test the term Anglic. The article is thus not only a summary but also an effort to project Anglic into new directions and certainly into a firmer, more constant and more frequent usage as there seems to be every good reason to adopt it.

2. ANOTHER OCCURRENCE OF ANGLIC: MCCLURE

McClure (1986: 85) should be inserted under section 3 in the 2022 *Scottish Language* paper. His usage, albeit different, is structurally similar to what was noticed in Maguire et al. (2019) in the sense that he also chose to employ Anglic as part of a phrase. In Maguire et al., we had the phrase

‘pan-Anglic pressure’. In McClure, it is ‘non-Anglic’. If both occurrences are structurally connected to each other, as phrases, they are utilised in completely different contexts. In McClure, it appears as part of a discussion on the lexical structure of Scots whereby the various languages which make up the lexis of Scots are, if not compared in detail, at least mentioned to introduce the particular case of the Gaelic influence. McClure’s usage is innovative for at least two reasons. One: this occurrence makes him, to my knowledge, the first scholar to have used Anglic in a phrase. Two: it predates the OED record of the term Anglic being employed in a non-historic context and referring to the Angles or their language (cf. the discussion of the OED entry to the term Anglic in Discry 2022). Anglic, in McClure, means the same as Anglian and we can say this because it is contrasted with other languages that shaped Scots. The relevant passage reads as follows:

It is, after all, an established fact of linguistic scholarship that Scots owes relatively little to Gaelic, at least on the lexical level: that of the non-Anglic influences on the distinctive Scots vocabulary, Norse and Plattdeutsch have been the most important, French a rather poor third, and Gaelic not even in the running.

Because this addendum is published in the latest edition of *Scottish Language*, it is important to update McClure’s statement on the composition of Scots lexis with more recent scholarship. My aim is not to go into much detail on this matter but merely to consider McClure’s comments on Scots lexis against more recent research and to highlight the fact that different studies can produce different results. The studies that will be discussed are Macafee and Anderson (1997) on the one hand and Millar (2018) on the other which display differences in approach/purpose/method and deal with Older and Modern Scots respectively. Macafee & Anderson was strongly numerically driven. Based on their work, Old English turns out to score first (no. = 340 out of 982 words) as the most substantial lexical ‘donor’, followed by French (no. = 271), then Scandinavian (no. = 82). Plattdeutsch and Dutch/Flemish (no. = 22) comes as fourth and Gaelic

(no. = 6) as fifth. The addition of elements from other Celtic sources to Gaelic does not change the ranking; the total for Celtic loans indeed still comes after Plattdeutsch and Dutch/Flemish. The random sampling, the details of which are to be found in Macafee & Anderson (1997: 189–97), shows that French is further up in the donor languages than initially assumed by McClure, at least in the Older Scots picture. The Macafee & Anderson order is: [1] Old English, [2] French, [3] Norse, [4] Plattdeutsch and Dutch/Flemish = other West Germanic languages and finally [5] Gaelic. The total of Romance borrowings is substantially larger than the Old English core element of the language but the gap goes down significantly if the figures from the other Germanic languages are added to that of Old English. In that case, the total number for Germanic is 444, which is nearly as much as the total Romance (no. = 459). Moving our attention now away and to Modern Scots leads us to notice that the order in which the formative languages are presented in McClure and Millar is identical (I call ‘formative languages’ the languages that formed Scots, in particular its lexis). The discussion is not the same, but the order is. The order in Millar is: [1] Old English, [2] Scandinavian, [3] Low German/Dutch, [4] French, [5] Gaelic and [6] other languages (Millar 2018: 97–137). Millar’s goal is not to rank the different formative languages to Scots lexis but rather to stress how influential some of these were and how discrete their input can be according to geography. Different languages were seeping through the Older Scots *Sprachraum* over the medieval period and beyond resulting in making some varieties of Scots more or less distant from what we would call ‘mainstream Scots’ nowadays. A paramount and well-known example of this is Insular and North Northern Scots. This element is key because it shows that talking about vocabulary composition in languages is not as straightforward as it seems. In a statistical analysis of American English, Roberts (1965:36) showed that the number of items that can be said to belong to a given source is not fixed but varies according to the type of language. In his study, the first decile of 1,000 words, which represents the core of the language, has a higher percentage of Old English than French items. By the last decile, i.e. 10,000 words, this order is reverted and French comes first.

3. SCHLEICHER

In a series of essays, Koerner (1989a: 82, 1989b: 214, 1989c: 237, 1989d: 251) wrote about August Schleicher (1821–68) and his preference for the term *Glottik*, which he devised and used as a synonym to *Sprachwissenschaft*, the other German term for linguistics. Koerner cites a number of Schleicher's writings including *Die Deutsche Sprache* (1860). The following extracts from that work have not been reproduced in any of the essays mentioned. They are presented in this addendum for a later parallel to Anglic. At this stage, they will shed light on why Schleicher discarded *Linguistik* as a name for the science of language(s). The excerpts have not been changed in any way except for the Gothic script and the double quotation marks. Any necessary commentary is flagged up through square brackets. The German originals are followed by an English translation.

Von der Sprachwissenschaft oder Glottik (γλῶττα, die Zunge, Sprache) zu scheiden ist vor allem die Sprachphilosophie, die Lehre von der Idee der Sprache, ebenso wie von der Naturwissenschaften die Naturphilosophie (Schleicher 1860: 118).

Linguistics or Glottik (γλῶττα, tongue, language) is to be separated in particular from language philosophy, which is the theory of the idea of language, just as the natural sciences are to be separated from natural philosophy.

Diese Disziplin [i.e. linguistics] findet man mit andern Namen genannt. Allein die Bezeichnung derselben als 'Sprachvergleichung' ist eben so schlecht, wie etwa Pflanzenvergleichung anstatt Botanik wäre; 'Linguistik', von Linguist (= Sprachforscher, Glottiker), welches Wort auf romanische Art mit einer griechischen Endung vom lateinischen *lingua*, die Sprache, gebildet ist (wie psalmista, dentiste, artiste, journaliste u.a.), mittels eines lateinisch-griechischen Suffixes, [...] ist demnach ein auf wesentlich moderne und etwas barbarische Art gebildetes Wort und steht also einem Glottiker übel an [...] (Schleicher 1860: 122, fn. 1).

Different names are given to this discipline [i.e. linguistics]. The term 'language comparison' itself would be as bad as 'plant comparison' for botany. As for the word linguistics, it is derived from linguist (= language researcher, Glottiker) and it is a word that is built following a Romance pattern with a Greek ending and the Latin root *lingua* 'language'. Similar examples of this pattern are to be found notably in psalmist, dentist, artist, journalist, which are all built with Latin-Greek suffixes. Subsequently, it is a word that has been built in a modern and barbarian way and which the Glottiker cannot approve of.

It would be fallacious to transpose terms quoted from such distant, but in many respects still highly valuable, scholarship straight into the present time. Terminology is permeable to time and cultures (cf. Koerner 1989c: 233) and needs to be contextualised. In Schleicher's time, linguistics was indeed starting to be considered an independent discipline from philology. In that context, naming linguistics appropriately equated with 'officially' recognising its status as a separate *and* scientific field. When the word *Linguistik* is compared to the names of other scientific disciplines (e.g., *Botanik*, *Physik*, *Mathematik*), there is a clear disconnect in word formation, however. This point is also made in Koerner (1989c: 237). The first is Latin in origin while the others are all Greek. This must have appeared highly, if not unbearably, illogical to a man like Schleicher. This statement is no exaggeration: at the end of the second quote, he describes *Linguistik* as nothing less than a barbarism. This is no surprise from a scholar who was in constant search of paradigms and consistency and saw symmetry in language. Furthermore, in the context just described, *Linguistik* was indeed problematic. With such a name, that was structurally different from the names of the other scientific fields, a possible alienation and subsequent weakening of the status of linguistics might be envisaged. These two elements account for the strong dislike expressed by one of the most famous linguists of the nineteenth century towards one of the now accepted names of his own field.

Self-evident as this may appear today, Schleicher regarded linguistics as a science (cf. § above). Because of this, he wanted the linguistic science

not only to *be* scientific but to *sound* scientific too, notably through its designation. Coming up with a name that was accurate, concise and coherent was one of the best ways to put the science of language(s) on a par with the other fields of academic knowledge. Thanks to his commentaries from his own work, we know that finding a good name for linguistics must indeed have been an issue of importance or at least of interest for him. This argument goes far beyond the mere aesthetic judgment. Phonemes, as we know, can be combined to convey meaning but also automatic mental associations and classification. Thus, when he created the word *Glottik*, Schleicher must have appreciated the fact that it had Greek roots but also that it had a typical *-(ik)* ending and therefore very much echoed German words such as *Physik* and *Mathematik*. These two elements automatically conjure up a certain idea or classification in the mind. These are Saussurian premises: the *signifié* and the *signifiant*. The phonemic ornaments, i.e. the architecture of the *signifiant*, dress up a word as one member amongst other peers, as it were. The way it sounds makes a word a member of a particular mental category. Marketing does the same and is a very creative linguistic lens through which the same processes are to be observed: uses of Latin or Greek roots and/or typically scientific sounding suffixation. A by far non-exhaustive list contains brand names such as *Urgo*[®] (probably from Latin *urgeo* < *be insistent*, *be urgent*), *Elmex*[®] (with typical scientific sounding *-ex* ending also found in *Kleenex*, an obvious pun on *clean*). These brand names exclusively work by the sound. There is no need to know their etymology, they just *work*. This sounding value, or quality, probably was not the only or prime criterion motivating Schleicher to create *Glottik*. The driving force behind it was (etymological) consistency and coherence (cf. second quote). No absolute certainty can be reached about the extent to which Schleicher took the sounding pattern of *Glottik* into account when he created this new word. However, it is there and as such it cannot be ignored. On these grounds, Schleicher can be said to have addressed a terminological question by at least being aware of the sounds of this new word and of how it sounded next to the names of other sciences.

What is the link with Anglic? There are two possible connections based on what has been expounded and these are encapsulated in two words: **symmetry** and **sound**. **Symmetry** was key to Schleicher's approach to

devising terminology. It is interesting to point out that the same symmetrical desire was present in the Anglic paper in various places. The projections proposed in my 2022 Anglic paper and the suggestion to adopt an alternative *-ic* terminologies for some of the oldest varieties of English both stem from a desire to be coherent and symmetrical. Coherence was also expressed in the very definition of the term because the absence of any published definition equated with a definitional vacuum which may be a source of erratic uses of the term. The importance of the **sound** quality in Anglic appears on different tiers. As a whole word, Anglic is devoid of any ambiguity and therefore has some advantage which the term English cannot have in some specific linguistic contexts (cf. Discry 2022: 23). Any confusion between Anglic and English is impossible in speech and hearing and this clarity turns out to be practical, if not quasi-essential, when trying to describe (socio)linguistic situations. When the word Anglic is fragmented into different entities for analysis, the same paradigm as for the Schleicher discussion emerges, that is that the root and the suffix are isolated. In the ending, Anglic displays one of the typical endings for language adjectives/names (cf. *Germanic*, *Cumbric*). This ‘typicality’ is what makes an item belong to a class of other similar items: Schleicher used the suffix *-ik* to make linguistics sound just like the other sciences and belong to that category. In a same way, Anglic has a suffix that makes it fit to be a language adjective. The reason why *-ic* was preferred in the word formation over other endings is obvious for *-sh*, *-ch*, *-(i)an*. A *<-sh> = /ʃ/* suffix would have given **Anglish* and made the term close to English, phonemically speaking, whilst the *<-ch> = /tʃ/* ending, which we observe in some pronunciations of *French* is rarer. Subjective as such statements may be, I think it can safely be said that a term like **Anglich* would have sounded bizarre. As to *<-(i)an> = /i(ə)n/*, it would have been too close to *Anglian*, which already existed. It is more difficult, however, to find a cogent reason as to why *<-ese> = /i:z/* did not make it as it appears in a few language adjectives/nouns such as *Faroese*, *Portuguese*, *Chinese*, *Japanese*. In that particular case, the *-ic* ending was probably supported by the fact that it is frequently used for languages in and around the British Isles as well as in historic contexts (cf. *Icelandic*, *Celtic*, *Gaelic*). Even though it is impossible to tell whether the creation of the word was natural and

spontaneous, or thought through, or both – a sort of informed intuition, followed by some reflexion; the actual form of Anglic does not seem to be coincidental.

There remains, however, a final point to address to complete the discussion of the Schleicher section. A strong case was made about the qualities that were born out in the word *Glottik* but *Glottik* did not make it through as the normal term to talk about linguistics in German; it could therefore serve as a counter-example to the success that a term such as Anglic could have. Yet, there is a sharp distinction between these two terms. When considered carefully, *Glottik* did not have any **function** *per se* except, of course, the desire to model the name of linguistics on that of some other sciences. But it does not fill any gap and can be said to have been produced, partly at least, on sheer aesthetic grounds. Anglic does have a function and, indeed, more than one (see my 2022 paper).

4. CONCLUSION

This addendum has provided space to comment and categorise an additional occurrence of the term Anglic in scholarly prose (McClure). The validity of the classification of Anglic uses and occurrences proposed in the original 2022 paper has been assessed successfully as McClure's usage could be inserted into it effortlessly. In order not to leave the work unfinished, the commentaries made by McClure on Scots lexis have been placed into the context of wider research by comparing his statements first with those made by Macafee & Anderson on the lexis of Older Scots and second with those written by Millar on Modern Scots. In so doing, an attempt has also been made to see Scots lexis through past and present perspectives.

The second major point discussed was a focus on the term *Glottik*, devised by August Schleicher as a terminological innovation to re-/displace *Linguistik*. Close observation was made on three levels: *Glottik* itself, Schleicher's own comments of the term, and finally Koerner's remarks on the term. This observation has allowed insights into key factors that played a role in Schleicher's creation. These factors were in turn transferred to Anglic and to some of the discussions held in the 2022 paper. In this comparative exercise, similarities and differences have been systematically

laid out. It emerged from that discussion that coherence and function were powerful factors in terminology. Another key point was that the sound a name has is *significant* but cannot be regarded as the sole actor in adopting new terminology.

REFERENCES

- Discry, C-H. 'Is (Older) Scots an Anglic variety?'. *Scottish Language* 41: 1–39.
- Koerner, E. F. K. 1989. *Practicing linguistic historiography*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Koerner, E. F. K. 1989a. 'The neogrammarian doctrine: Breakthrough or extension of the Schleicherian paradigm. A problem in linguistic historiography'. In Koerner (1989): 79–100.
- Koerner, E. F. K. 1989b. 'Schleichers Einfluß auf Haeckel: Schlaglichter auf die wechselseitige Abhängigkeit zwischen linguistischen und biologischen Theorien im 19. Jahrhundert'. In Koerner (1989): 211–32.
- Koerner, E. F. K. 1989c. 'On the historical roots of the philology vs. linguistics controversy'. In Koerner (1989): 233–44.
- Koerner, E. F. K. 1989d. 'Pilot and pirate disciplines in the development of linguistic science'. In Koerner (1989): 245–56.
- Macafee, C. and A. Anderson. 1997. 'A Random Sample of Older Scots Lexis'. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 95:2. 247–78.
- McClure, J.D. 1986. 'What Scots owes to Gaelic'. *Scottish Language* 5: 85–98.
- Millar, R. McC. 2018. *Modern Scots: An Analytical Survey*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Roberts, A. H. 1965. *A Statistical Linguistic Analysis of American English*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Schleicher, A. 1860. *Die Deutsche Sprache*. Stuttgart: Cotta.
- 'urgeo'. Entry in the *Online Latin Dictionary*, www.online-latin-dictionary.com/latin-english-dictionary.php?lemma=URGEO100