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0.0 INTRODUCTION. The aims of this contribution are rather modest ones: First, to give a complete reference list of the various French editions (including reprints with more or less substantial introductions) of the Port-Royal Grammar that have appeared between 1966 and 1973 as well as translations into English and Italian, together with some critical comments; second, to offer a solution to certain textual problems connected with this landmark in the history of linguistic thought, more precisely, to show how the various editions of the French original between 1660 (Paris) and 1703 (Amsterdam) should be evaluated with respect to their authority and genetic relationship. *Mutatis mutandis* the same will be attempted where the two existing translations of the *Grammaire générale et raisonnée* (henceforth GGR) are concerned.

1.0 RECENT EDITIONS OF THE GGR. In his informative review of recent re-editions and unchanged reprints of the Port-Royal Grammar, Mathiesen (1970) gives a fairly detailed evaluation of the following five titles, listed here in chronological order (see the References at the end of the present account for bibliographical details):

1.1 GGR Paris, 1676 (= Brekle 1966).
1.2 GGR Paris, 1660 (= Arnauld & Lancelot 1967 [1660]).
1.3 GGR Paris, 1780 (= Arnauld & Lancelot 1967 [1780]).
1.4 GGR Paris, 1846 (= Bailly 1968 [1846]).
1.5 *A General and Rational Grammar*, London, 1753 (= Arnauld & Lancelot 1968 [1753]).
Since the completion of Mathiesen's review the proliferation of new editions of the Port-Royal Grammar has continued; the historian of linguistics has now a total of ten editions/translations at his disposal. A few comments on these five more recent publications seem to be in order:

1.6 GGR Paris, 1830 (= Arnaud & Lancelot 1969 [1830]).

This reprint of the GGR also contains the Remarques (1754) by Duclos⁴ – they are also included in item 1.4 (above), together with the Réflexions by Abbé Fromant (1756) – and a valuable historically and philosophically oriented introduction by Michel Foucault (which appears to be identical with Foucault 1967).²

1.7 Grammatica generale e ragionata ..., Rome, 1969 (= Simone 1969).

This is the only modern translation of the GGR, and is based on the French text of the GGR Paris, 1676 (Brekle 1966). Simone's edition also contains an Italian translation of the Port-Royal Logic (Arnaud & Nicole 1662).³ To these two texts the editor added a 43-page introduction dealing with the historical setting of the GGR and the Logic and discussing critically a number of present-day attempts in which historical, theoretical, and philosophical interpretations of these two texts are proposed. Simone's introduction deserves a detailed analysis, something which would go beyond the present account. (See, however, Vincenzi 1970 and Brekle, forthcoming, for a preliminary treatment.)


I have thus far been unable to inspect a copy of this edition.

1.9 GGR Paris, 1660 (= Arnaud & Lancelot 1972 [1660]).

This reprint constitutes – after item 1.2 (above) – the second new printing of the first edition of the GGR. The volume also contains a reprint of the first printed version of the Port-Royal Logic (1662).⁴ There is no preface or introduction.

1.10 GGR Brussels, 1676 (= Arnaud & Lancelot 1973 [1676]).

This pocketbook-size reprint has at least the merit of making generally accessible the seemingly rarest edition of the GGR that appeared during the lifetimes of Arnauld and Lancelot. (See Mathiesen [1970:128] and my discussion of textual problems connected with this edition in section 2.0 of the present account.) In addition to the reprint of the GGR the volume contains a few remarks concerning the location of two copies of the original text⁵ plus some general statements regarding the authorship of Arnauld and Lancelot.

It appears that these ten recent editions or translations will meet the needs of both historians of linguistics and those linguists interested in getting hold of a readable and reliable text of the GGR. In order to consult a complete and authoritative text the latter should bear in mind that the editions listed above as Nos. 1.2, 1.9, and 1.10 are relatively unsatisfactory in comparison to the
other editions (see my discussion of such prints below). Furthermore, scholars interested in the overall linguistic doctrines that originated in the Port-Royal movement may be reminded that the more relevant semantic and syntactic aspects should be looked for in the first two parts of the Port-Royal Logic (not to mention the many other grammars of various languages written by Lancelot alone; see Brekle [1966:xxiiif.] for a select bibliography).

2.0 TEXTUAL PROBLEMS OF THE GGR RECONSIDERED. In my critical edition of the GGR (Brekle 1966:xvi) I think I have provided reasonably specific evidence in favour of the Paris 1676 edition as representing the most complete and authoritative version of the work under discussion.6

Mathiesen (1970:128-29), however, casted doubt on whether the Paris 1676 edition (henceforth P 1676) gives the text in its final form. Indeed, he suspects that the (until very recently scarcely accessible) Brussels 1676 edition (B 1676) together with the posthumous Amsterdam 1703 edition (A 1703) could possibly be of importance in the solution of the problem. As far as the status and textual merit of B 1676 is concerned Mathiesen’s judgment is rather carefully worded:

The precise relation of the Brussels printing to the Paris printings thus remains unclear, but it seems unlikely that the Brussels printing is an independent witness to any detail of the stage of the authors’ text. (Mathiesen 1970:128)

As to some possibly hidden qualities of A 1703 Mathiesen advances stronger claims:

The Amsterdam printing gives the same text of 1676 [= P 1676], but with at least one major addition to the chapter on tense. The source of this addition is not known: in view of the fact that in 1679 Arnauld exiled himself to the Low Countries, where he remained until his death, it is at least possible that this addition (and, presumably, any others which may be in the text) is authorial. (Ibid.)

Mathiesen (1970:129) concludes his observations with the complaint that “None of the five editions by itself provides a sure basis for the solution of these problems”, urging for a special study devoted to a clarification of these issues. I venture to offer my findings as a solution to Mathiesen’s desideratum.

2.1 In the following evidence is brought in for a definitive answer to the textual problems of consequence associated with the four Paris printings, with B 1676, and with A 1703.7 A painstaking search through B 1676 and A 1703 in connection with the list of textual variants of the Paris editions (i.e., P 1660, P 1664, P 1676, and P 1679) in Brekle (1966, Supplement) showed that Mathiesen’s conjectures cannot be substantiated.
The pattern displayed by the following types of textual variants shows convincingly that P 1664 represents the stage of text on which both the Brussels and Amsterdam printers based their editions. Two distinct classes of variants emerge: major, i.e., textually extensive variants lending overwhelming support to my argument (2.2), and minor, but still revealing, variants which offer clues to the possible textual relationship between B 1676 and A 1703 (2.3).

2.2 Major Variants

2.2.1 The following variants are identical in all editions (i.e., P 1660, P 1664, P 1679, B 1676, and A 1703) but P 1676; page references are to P 1676 (See Brekle 1966 II, left columns of the *apparatus criticus*):

9, 10, 37, 72, 72/73 (an entire page of text is missing in all other editions),
74 (half a page of text missing), 106, and 110.

2.2.2 The following variants are identical in all editions but P 1660:
68, 114, 140, 141, 144/45, 146-49 (in these last three places we find major additions, all of which appeared for the first time in P 1664).

The conclusions that may be drawn from these facts are: P 1676 contains the most complete stage of text of the GGR; in view of the nature of the additions made to this edition, namely, elaborations on rather special grammatical points, obviously made by Lancelot, it can safely be assumed to be authorial. Since under 2.2.2 we find a number of variants that are shared by all editions except P 1660, and since under 2.2.1 there are variants common to all editions except P 1676 it can be concluded that the textual basis for B 1676 as well as for A 1703 is P 1664.

2.3 Minor Variants

The case for P 1664 as representing the starting-point for B 1676 and A 1703 is further strengthened by the fact that there is a variant appearing only in P 1664, B 1676, and A 1703. Moreover, this variant appears within a passage running over more than a whole page which is first found in P 1664 (see Brekle 1966 II, 24; P 1676:78-79).

Another variant seems to indicate – even if it is only a thin thread of evidence – that B 1676 served as a model for A 1703. (See Brekle (1966 II, 33), where in the list of the “Temps du Verbe avoir; ...” we read in P 1664 and P 1676 *Preterit parfait simple*, whereas B 1676 and A 1703 simply read *Preterit parfait*. P 1660 also has *Preterit parfait* but here in the right-hand column the example for the *conditionnel* is lacking.) A similar case can be seen in two other variants (see Brekle 1966 II, 20 and 22; P 1676:68 and 73) where pronominal references are made more explicit in the texts of P 1664 and P 1676 in comparison to P 1660, B 1676, and A 1703. This could mean that the
compositor of A 1703 followed B 1676 and that B 1676 followed a slightly deviating copy of P 1664. (There exist a number of copies of both P 1660 and 1664 that are bound together with other works by Lancelot; the title-pages differ accordingly. Cf. Brekle 1966:xix, for further reference.)

Finally, there are at least two instances that show that the compositor (or proof-reader) of A 1703 was more careful than his Brussels colleague: In P 1676:102 and A 1703:101 we have "... par l'union que les hommes ont faite ..." whereas in P 1660, P 1664, and B 1676 we discover the same error pertaining to gender agreement: in the Table des titres et chapitres P 1676 as well as A 1703 read "... pour apprendre à lire ..." whereas B 1676 prints: "... pour prendre à lire ...".

I have already referred to Mathiesen's (1970:128) qualms concerning "one major addition, to the chapter on tense". The answer to this question whether this passage⁹ is authorial or not is easy, once one consults A 1703:160 where the following publisher's note appears:

Le Libraire qui a fait faire cette édition demande pardon à l'Auteur & au public d'avoir osé faire une petite Addition au chapitre 15. [sic] de la seconde partie de cette Grammaire, qui traitte de divers temps du verbe. Il avoie que sa remarque est inutile à un François qui sçait sa langue, mais comme il demeure dans un pais où la langue Françoise n'est pas la langue régissante il a cru la devoir faire en faveur des Etrangers.

3.0 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN GGR EDITIONS. Having discussed a fair amount of detail respecting the textual variants of the editions of the GGR that were published between 1660 and 1703, I believe that the following stemma indicating their genetic relationships can now be set up (the dotted lines connecting P 1664 with A 1703 are meant to suggest a possible, though less plausible, alternative to the dependence of A 1703 on B 1676): see p. 228

The existing two translations of the GGR – the English translation of 1753 (= Arnauld & Lancelot 1968 [1753]) and the Italian translation of 1969 (Simone 1969) – are both based on P 1676, which represents probably the most reliable and authoritative edition of the GGR. A check on those textual variants that appear only in P 1676 reveals that Alston, in his short introductory note to the 1968 reprint of the English translation, is in error when he presumes that it was based on P 1664 because the "chapter on Impersonal Verbs [i.e., P 1676 II, chap.XIX] is included" in both P 1664 and the 1753 translation. A criterion of this nature cannot be regarded as a sufficient basis for such argument.
4.0 CONCLUSION. It is hoped that the above discussion has clarified the major questions surrounding the textual relationships between the various editions of the GGR which appeared between 1660 and 1703. It goes without saying, however, that much remains to be done by historians of linguistics with respect to the manifold repercussions and influences the Port-Royal Grammar produced during the 18th and early 19th centuries.
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NOTES

1) The Remarques by Charles Pinot Duclos (1704-72), "secrétaire perpétuel" of the Académie française, first appeared in his 1754 (Paris: Prault) edition of the GGR. The book-length Réflexions sur les fondements de l'art de parler, pour servir d'éclaircissements et de Supplément à la Grammaire générale et raisonnée by the Abbé Fromant were first
published in the latter's 1756 edition of the GGR (2nd ed., Paris: Delalain, 1769). Both Duclos' "Remarques" and Fromant's "Réflexions" were frequently reprinted in later editions of the GGR (see Brekle 1966:xix-xx, for details).

2) See also Chevalier 1970, in which Foucault 1967 and other recent publications on the subject are discussed.

3) Simone 1969 does not discuss a possible candidate for a much earlier Italian translation: La Logica, o l'arte del pensare (Venice: C. Zanè, 1728), of which a 1746 edition has been listed in Freytag Löringhoff & Brekle 1965-67 II, 23.

4) See Freytag Löringhoff & Brekle 1965-67, for an annotated critical edition of the Logic. It constitutes the only edition that includes the textual variants contained in a MS written before the first appearance of the Logic in 1662.


6) A rough textual evaluation of the GGR was already made by the Abbé Fromant as early as 1756 (see Brekle 1966:ix-xx); he too acknowledged the superiority of the Paris 1676 edition.

7) I would like to express my gratitude to Mrs. Vivian Salmon, University of Edinburgh, for having provided me with a copy of A 1703, and acknowledge - with thanks - my indebtedness to Mrs. Brigitte Asbach-Schnitker and Paul Köllner, both of the University of Regensburg, for having taken much pains to help me with bibliographical and textual details used in this paper.

8) Simone (1969:xlix) is simply mistaken when he speaks of P 1676 and B 1676 as "basia inalterata di tutti le edizioni successive".

9) For the sake of convenience I venture to cite this apocryphical passage from A 1703:108 in full; it would find its place in P 1676:109 after "... j'ay écrit cette nuit, &c."

Les Pronoms démonstratifs ce & cette, indiquant le temps present quoi qu'il y ait longtemps qu'il soit passé, on ne peut pas se servir du prêtérit indefini avec ces pronoms, ainsi on ne doit pas dire j'ecrivis cette semaine, j'ecrivis ce mois, j'ecrivis cette année, je l'ecrivis ce siecle; mais il faut se servir du pretérit parfait & dire, j'ai écrit cette semaine, j'ai écrit ce mois, j'ai écrit cette année, je l'ai écrit ce siecle. [In A 1703 the whole passage is printed in italics.]

REFERENCES

1967[1780]. "Grammaire générale et raisonnée, ...". 
*Oeuvres de Messire Antoine Arnault* ed. by Gabriel du Pac de Bellegarde (1717-89) and Jean Hautefage (1735-1816), 41.3-84. Paris: S. d'Arnay. 
(Repr., Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1967.)


[1703. *Grammaire générale et raisonnée,* ... . Amsterdam: E. Roger. (Referred to by the siglum "A 1703" in the present account; for a reference to P 1676, see Brekle 1966.)]


HISTORIOGRAPHIA LINGUISTICA

International Journal for the History of Linguistics
Revue internationale pour l'histoire de la linguistique
Internationale Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft

EDITOR
E. F. K. KOERNER, Bloomington, Indiana

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

Raimo Anttila, Helsinki
Herbert E. Brekle, Regensburg
G. L. Bursill-Hall, Vancouver, B. C.
Tullio De Mauro, Salerno
Shirō Hattori, Tokyo
Giulio C. Lepschy, Reading
Jadwiga Puzymina, Warsaw
J. F. Staal, Berkeley, Calif.
Barbara M. H. Strang,
    Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Zs. Telegdi, Budapest

Ranko Bugarski, Belgrade
Jean-Claude Chevalier, Paris
Rudolf Engler, Bern
Dell Hymes, Philadelphia
W. Keith Percival, Lawrence, Kansas
Luigi Romeo, Boulder, Colorado
Atsuyoshi Sakakura, Kyoto
Daniel J. Taylor, Urbana, Illinois
Karl D. Uitti, Princeton
V. A. Zvegincev, Moscow

AIM AND SCOPE

This periodical is intended to serve the ever-growing scholarly interest of linguists, psycholinguists, and philosophers of language of divergent persuasions in the history of linguistic thought.

Central objectives of HL are the discussion of the epistemological and methodological foundations of a historiography of the discipline and the critical presentation of particular areas or aspects of actual or potential research.

Three issues annually are envisaged, each containing at least three articles, one review article, a bibliography devoted to a particular topic in the field, and a number of reviews of recent publications.

SUBSCRIPTION

The prices for subscriptions to Historiographia Linguistica for one volume (3 issues, 128 pages each) are:

☐ Hfl. 75,- for institutions, postage and handling included.
☐ A reduced rate of Hfl. 45,-, postage and handling included, is offered to individual subscribers, provided that their prepaid order is placed directly with the publisher.
☐ Single issues cost Hfl. 25,-.

PUBLISHER
John Benjamins B.V.
Periodical Trade
Amsteldijk 44 — Amsterdam — Holland
Tel. (020) - 738156 — Telex: 15798 — BENJA