

Universidade de São Paulo - Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas  
Programa de Pós-graduação em Filologia e Língua Portuguesa

# LINGUÍSTICA HISTÓRICA DO PORTUGUÊS

Disciplina de Pós-graduação

Apontamentos

## **Tema III**

O Conceito de língua portuguesa  
em textos fundamentais do século XIX -2  
O debate sobre as leis fonéticas

Maria Clara Paixão de Sousa

2014

## Sumário

## Sumário

---

O Debate sobre as "leis fonéticas" .....	3
Exame de textos .....	3
1. As regularidades fonéticas na tradição comparada .....	4
2. A regularidade como princípio e lei: os "Neogramáticos" .....	5
3. O Debate (?) da década de 1880.....	12
4. Pontos de fonética histórica portuguesa: Gonçalves Vianna .....	16

---

## O Debate sobre as "leis fonéticas"

“We must never lose sight of what is generally true,  
even in the most exacting particular study;  
we must immerse ourselves in science only to transcend it;  
we must serve science only in order to master it”.

H. Schuchardt, *Contra os Neogramáticos*, 1885.

---

### Exame de textos

1878: OSTHOFF, H. & BRUGMANN, K. - Prefácio a *Morphologische Untersuchungen...*

1879: F. DE SAUSSURE, *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles ...* (Excerto)

1880: HERMANN PAUL, *Princípios Fundamentais da História das Línguas*

1881: JULIO RIBEIRO, *Gramática Portuguesa*

1885: BRUGMANN, K. *Zum Heutigen Stand der Sprachforschung* (excerto)

1885: SCHUCHARDT, H. *Gegen die Junggrammatiker*

1892: GONÇALVES VIANNA, A. (i), *Exposição da pronúncia normal portuguesa...*

1892: GONÇALVES VIANNA, A. (ii), *Deux faits de phonétique historique portugaise ...* )

# 1. As regularidades fonéticas na tradição comparada

1819: GRIMM, Jacob. "Germanic Grammar". (Aula 6 - recordando)

- A "Lei de Grim"

p	t	k	>	f	θ	h
b	d	g	>	p	t	k
bh	dh	gh	>	d	d	g

Exemplos [cf. Campbell 2000:47]:

(i)	<i>espanhol</i>	<i>francês</i>	<i>inglês</i>
<b>*p &gt; f</b>	padre por pie	père per pied (<pié)	father for foot
<b>*t &gt; θ</b>	tres tu	trois tu	three thou
<b>*k &gt; h</b>	can ciento corazón coeur	chien (< kani) cien (< kent)	hound hundred heart
<b>*d &gt; t</b>	dos diente	deux dent	two tooth
<b>*g &gt; k</b>	- grano	genou grain	knee corn

(ii)	<i>Sânscrito</i>	<i>Latim</i>	<i>Inglês</i>
<b>*bh &gt; b</b>	bhrátar  bhára-	frater  fer- (Lat: *bh > f)	brother  bear
<b>*dh &gt; d</b>	dha-	facere (Lat *dh > f)	do, deed
<b>*gh &gt; g</b>	hamsa (<gh)	(h)anser	goose

## 2. A regularidade como princípio e lei: os “Neogramáticos”

### 2.1 Os Jovens Gramáticos de Leipzig e a fundação de um movimento

“By 1878 the young linguists at Leipzig were confident enough of their methodology to undertake investigations of virtually all Indo-European problems. To publish their views Osthoff and Brugmann founded a journal of their own, which continued until 1890.

The preface to this journal, written by Brugmann but also signed by Osthoff, states the principles which they and their colleagues followed. The central axiom, that sound laws have no exceptions, was first published by the oldest of the group, August Leskien in *Die Declination im Slavischlitauischen und Germanischen* (1876). With Leskien, Wilhelm Scherer, as the preface indicates, gave the initial impulse to the group. One of Scherer's contributions was his rejection of the old notion that the languages of today represent a decline from those of the past; in this way he freed linguistics from some of the burden maintained from the first part of the century”. (W. Lehmann, 2007, c. 14)

1878: OSTHOFF, H. & BRUGMANN, K. - *Prefácio a Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen I*. Tradução de Lehmann (2007); meus grifos.

“Since the appearance of Scherer's book *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache* (Berlin, 1868), and principally through the impulses that went out from this book, the physiognomy of comparative linguistics has changed considerably. A method of research has been instituted since then and is winning more and more supporters; it differs in essential respects from the method by which comparative linguistics proceeded in the first half-century of its existence.

**The older linguistics, as no one can deny, approached its object of investigation, the Indo-European languages, without first having formed a clear idea of how human speech really lives and develops**, which factors are active in speaking, and how these factors working together cause the progression and modification of the substance of speech. Languages were indeed investigated most eagerly, but the man who speaks, much too little.

The human speech mechanism has a twofold aspect, a mental and a physical. To come to a clear understanding of its activity must be a main goal of the comparative linguist. For only on the basis of a more exact knowledge of the arrangement and mode of operation of this psychophysical mechanism can he get an idea of what is possible in language in general -- by that one should not think of the language on paper, for on paper almost everything is possible. Moreover, only through this knowledge can the comparative linguist obtain the correct view of the way in which linguistic innovations, proceeding from individuals, gain currency in the speech community, and only thus can he acquire the methodological principles which have to guide him in all his investigations in historical linguistics. Articulatory phonetics concerns itself with the purely physical aspect of the speech mechanism. This science is several decades old, and the older linguistics, since about the 1850's, has also profited by its results; for this we must give it great credit. But the matter is far from ending with articulatory phonetics alone, if one wants to acquire a clear understanding of man's speech activity and of the formal innovations that man undertakes in speaking. Even the commonest sound changes, as, for example, the change of nb to mb, or bn to mn, or the metathesis of ar to ra, are incomprehensible if one proceeds solely from the standpoint of the physical production of sounds. In addition, there must necessarily be a science which undertakes extensive observations of the operation of the psychological factors which are at work in countless sound changes and innovations as well as in all so-called analogical formations. The first outlines of this science were drawn by Steinthal in the essay "Assimilation und Attraction, psychologisch beleuchtet" (*Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, I, 93-179), which up to now has received little notice from linguistic science and articulatory phonetics. In the work named below (KZ 24,50f), one of the two authors will soon try to demonstrate fully, starting from this essay of Steinthal, how important it is to form a clear idea of the extent to which sound innovations are on the one hand of a purely psychomechanical nature and on the other hand the physical reflections of psychological processes. Further, the author will there examine thoroughly the effect of association of ideas in speech activity, and the creation of speech forms through the association of forms; and he will attempt to develop the methodological principles relative to it. The older comparative linguistics, while it readily accepted and utilized the teachings of articulatory phonetics, hardly concerned itself at all with the psychological aspect of the speech process, and as a consequence it fell into numerous errors. Only in very recent times is one becoming more aware of that neglect. Fortunately the movement starting with Scherer's efforts, the "neo-grammarians" movement, has already done away with some of the fundamental errors which dominated the entire older linguistics. These errors originated in that very failure to recognize the fact that even the changes and modifications taking place solely in the external speech form and affecting only the phonetic expression of thought are due to a psychological process which takes place prior to the materialization

of the sound by the vocal organs. In this regard future research will of course have to investigate many things more carefully and in more detail, and many other viewpoints important to the method of historical linguistics will presumably be disclosed through this association, when historical linguistics and psychology will have entered into a closer relationship with each other than they have maintained up to now.

**The insufficient investigation of the speech mechanism, especially the almost total disregard of its psychological side, was in itself a drawback which, in the older comparative linguistics, impeded and retarded the acquisition of correct guiding principles for the investigation of form change and formal innovations in our Indo-European languages.** But in addition there was something which had a far worse effect and which gave rise to an error that made the discovery of these methodological principles flatly impossible as long as it persisted.

Formerly the reconstruction of the Indo-European parent language was always the chief goal and focal point of the whole of comparative linguistics. The consequence was that all investigations were constantly directed toward this original language. Within the individual languages known to us through written documents, within the development of the Indian, Iranian, Greek languages, etc., almost exclusive interest was held by the oldest periods, those lying closest to the original language, such as Old Indic, here again especially Vedic, Old Iranian, Old Greek, here chiefly the Homeric dialect, etc. **The more recent language developments were thought of as stages of decay, of decline, of aging, and with a certain amount of disdain they were disregarded as much as possible.** From the forms of the earliest historically accessible periods the original Indo-European forms were constructed. And the latter were made the generally held criterion for evaluating the structures of attested language formations; so much so that comparative linguistics acquired its general ideas of how languages live, are maintained and change primarily on the basis of the original Indo-European forms. That this, however, was not the right way to arrive at correct guiding principles for the investigation of form change and form innovation in our Indo-European languages is so very obvious that one must be surprised at how many have not yet become clear about it. Is not, after all, the authenticity, the scientific probability, of the original Indo-European forms, which are of course all purely hypothetical creations, totally dependent on whether they agree in general with the proper conception of the development of linguistic forms and on whether they are constructed according to correct methodological principles? Thus the investigators went around in the most obvious circles, and even today many still do so, without knowing it or wanting to admit it.

We have a picture of the manner in which linguistic forms in general are maintained, not by means of the hypothetical reconstructions in the original language, nor by means of the oldest forms known to us of Indic, Iranian, Greek, etc., whose prehistory can be inferred only by way of hypothesis and reconstruction, but -- according to the principle that one has to start with the known and from there advance to the unknown -- by means of those linguistic developments whose previous history can be pursued at some length on the basis of texts and whose starting-point is directly known to us. The more linguistic material is made available for our observation in an unbroken written tradition extending through the centuries, the better off we are; and the farther, with reference to the present, a stage of a language is removed from the point where its historical tradition begins, the more informative it necessarily becomes. Therefore, the comparative linguist must turn his attention from the original language to the present if he wants to arrive at a correct idea of the manner in which language is maintained, and he must once and for all rid himself completely of the thought that as a comparative Indo-Europeanist one need concern himself with the later stages of the Indo-European languages only when they offer linguistic material that is of importance for the reconstruction of the original Indo-European language.

Language fields like Germanic, Romance and Slavic are without doubt the ones where comparative linguistics can most securely acquire its methodological principles. In the first place, the main condition is met here: we can pursue the development, the process of change of linguistic forms through many centuries on the basis of texts. Further we are here to a much greater extent involved with genuine popular speech, with the common language of communication and colloquial speech than in such languages as Old Indic, Old Greek, and Latin. What we know about the old Indo-European languages through the texts handed down to us is in such a way and to such an extent literarily influenced speech -- the word "literary" taken in its broadest sense -- that we scarcely get to know the genuine, natural, spontaneous, everyday language of the old Indians, Greeks, and Romans. But it is precisely this latter way of communication of thoughts which one must have clearly in mind in order to acquire the correct standpoint for evaluating the linguistic change taking place in the vernacular and especially for the evaluation of all prehistoric language development. Furthermore, the younger languages referred to are also by far superior to the ancient languages with reference to the purpose under discussion, because their development in everyday use, which can be pursued for centuries on the basis of texts, terminates in a living language abounding in dialects; but this language does not yet differ so sharply from the older state of the language of centuries ago, accessible solely in a written reproduction, that it could not furnish an excellent corrective against the errors that must necessarily creep in repeatedly with exclusive dependence on this written reproduction of the speech forms of earlier centuries. Everyone knows, for example, how we can establish the history of High German sounds in the individual dialects from the Old High German period up to the present day far more reliably than we can establish the history of Greek sounds in the Old Greek period, because the living sounds of the present permit the possibility of correctly understanding the characters through which the Germans tried to represent their sounds in past centuries. Letters are indeed crude and awkward, and very often actually misleading representations of the spoken sound. It is not possible

at all to get an exact idea of the course of the process of changes, for example, of an Old Greek or Latin dialect.

Precisely the most recent stages of the newer Indo-European languages, the living dialects, are of great significance for the methodology of comparative linguistics in many other respects too. Here I may especially emphasize only one other thing to which linguistic research has paid much too little attention until now, simply because of the belief that whenever possible it must turn its back on the language life of the more recent and of most recent times. In all living dialects the shapes of sounds peculiar to the dialect always appear much more consistently carried out throughout the entire linguistic material and maintained by the members of the linguistic community than one would expect from the study of the older languages accessible merely through the medium of writing; this consistency often extends into the finest shades of a sound. Whoever is not in the position of making this observation in his native dialect or elsewhere may refer to the excellent work by J. Winteler *Die Kerenzer Mundart des Kantons Glarus* (Leipzig and Heidelberg, 1876) where he can convince himself of the accuracy of what has been said. And should not they now take this fact to heart, who so willingly and so often admit of unmotivated exceptions of the mechanical sound laws? When the linguist can hear with his own ears how things happen in the life of a language, why does he prefer to form his ideas about the consistency and inconsistency in phonological systems solely on the basis of the inexact and unreliable written transmission of older languages? If someone wants to study the anatomical structure of an organic body, and if the most excellent preparations stand at his disposal, will he then take recourse to notoriously inexact diagrams and leave the preparations unexamined?

Therefore: **only that comparative linguist who for once emerges from the hypotheses-beclouded atmosphere of the workshop in which the original Indo-European forms are forced, and steps into the clear air of tangible reality and of the present in order to get information about those things which gray theory can never reveal to him, and only he who renounces forever that formerly widespread but still used method of investigation according to which people observe language only on paper and resolve everything into terminology, systems of rules, and grammatical formalism and believe they have then fathomed the essence of the phenomena when they have devised a name for the thing -- only he can arrive at a correct idea of the way in which linguistic forms live and change, and only he can acquire those methodological principles without which no credible results can be obtained at all in investigations in historical linguistics and without which any penetration into the periods of the past which lie behind the historical tradition of a language is like a sea voyage without a compass.**

The picture of the life of language that someone gets, on the one hand, through the study of more recent language developments and of the living dialects and, on the other hand, through a consideration of those things which an observation of the psychological and physical speech mechanisms place at his immediate disposal -- this picture differs in essential features from that other picture which comparative linguistics formerly saw arising out of the original Indo-European fog when it was still looking only for the primitive language; this picture is still the guiding form for many investigators today. And precisely because this discrepancy exists, there remains, we believe, no other choice than: to reform the previous methodological principles of our science and to abandon forever that hazy picture which can in no way disavow its foggy home.

That is by no means to say that the whole structure of comparative linguistics, as far as it has been erected till now, should be torn down and built up again from the beginning. In spite of the above-mentioned shortcomings of the method of investigation, such an abundance of important, and so it seems, permanently reliable results have been achieved through the discernment and industry of the investigators who have been active in our field, that one can look back with pride upon the history of our science so far. But it is not to be denied that many faulty and untenable things are mixed in with the many good ones, even though many investigators at present still regard the untenable components as certain conclusions. Before one builds further, the whole structure, as far as it now stands, has need of a thoroughgoing revision. Even the foundations contain numerous unsolid places. That part of the masonry which is already set on top of these must necessarily be brought down again. The other part of the masonry, which already towers fairly high in the air, can remain standing or need only be touched up because it rests on a good foundation.

As was already indicated above, it is Scherer's achievement to have effectively broached the question of how changes and innovations take place in a language. To the horror of not a few fellow investigators, but luckily for the discipline itself, Scherer in the book named above, made ample use of the principle of leveling in his explanations. Many forms of even the oldest historically accessible stages were suddenly according to him nothing other than formations by "false analogy";<sup>2</sup> until then investigators had always regarded these as purely phonetic developments from the original Indo-European forms. That was against all tradition and hence aroused distrust and opposition at the outset. Now, in many points Scherer was without doubt wrong; in not a few, however, also without doubt correct. And no one can contest his right to that one achievement which overshadows all errors and which can hardly be valued highly enough: because of him investigators were for the first time faced with the question of whether the way in which they had previously been accustomed to judging form changes in old stages of a language, as in Old Indic, Old Greek, etc., could be the right one, and of whether these languages did not have to be treated from the same point of view as the newer languages in which they had readily admitted "formations by false analogy" in rather great measure.

Some linguists, particularly a few most directly concerned passed over the question and, abruptly rejecting it, remained satisfied with the old way. No wonder. When serious attempts at upset are directed against a procedure that one is used to and with which one feels comfortable, one is always more readily stimulated to ward off the disturbance than to undertake a thorough revision and possible alteration of the accustomed procedure.

But with others, especially younger scholars, the seed scattered by Scherer fell on fruitful ground. Leskien above all seized upon the thought, and since he reflected on the concept of "sound law" and "exception to the law" more profoundly than had been done before, he arrived at a set of methodological principles which he at first made fruitful in his university lectures in Leipzig. Then other younger investigators, personally stimulated by him (among them also the authors of these Untersuchungen), tried and still do try to bring them to wider acceptance and recognition. These principles are based on a two-fold concept, whose truth is immediately obvious: first, that language is not a thing which leads a life of its own outside of and above human beings, but that it has its true existence only in the individual, and hence that all changes in the life of a language can only proceed from the individual speaker;<sup>3</sup> and second, that the mental and physical activity of man must have been at all times essentially the same when he acquired a language inherited from his ancestors and reproduced and modified the speech forms which had been absorbed into his consciousness.

**The two most important principles of the "neogrammarian" movement are the following:**

**First, every sound change, inasmuch as it occurs mechanically, takes place according to laws that admit no exception.** That is, the direction of the sound shift is always the same for all the members of a linguistic community except where a split into dialects occurs; and all words in which the sound subjected to the change appears in the same relationship are affected by the change without exception.

**Second, since it is clear that form association, that is, the creation of new linguistic forms by analogy, plays a very important role in the life of the more recent languages, this type of linguistic innovation is to be recognized without hesitation for older periods too, and even for the oldest.** This principle is not only to be recognized, but is also to be utilized in the same way as it is employed for the explanation of linguistic phenomena of later periods. And it ought not strike us as the least bit peculiar if analogical formations confront us in the older and in the oldest periods of a language in the same measure or even in still greater measure than in the more or most recent periods.

This is not the place for going into further particulars. Yet let us here briefly call attention to two other main points so that we may justify our method in the face of some objections made to it recently.

One of them is this. **Only he who adheres strictly to the principle of sound laws, this mainstay of our whole science, has firm ground under his feet in his investigations.** There are, on the one hand, those who needlessly, only to be able to satisfy certain desires, admit of exceptions to the sound laws governing a dialect, who except either individual words or classes of words from a sound change which has demonstrably affected all other forms of the same type, or who postulate a sporadic sound change which has taken place only in isolated forms and which has not affected all other forms of the same kind; and finally, there are those who will say that the same sound, in the very same environment, has changed in some words one way, in other words another. He who does this and who in addition sees in all these unmotivated exceptions which are favored by him, something very normal which he thinks follows from the very nature of mechanical sound change, and he who then even as very frequently happens makes these exceptions the basis of further conclusions, which are to abolish the consistency of the sound law that is otherwise observed, he necessarily falls victim to subjectivism and arbitrariness. In such instances he can indeed put out quite ingenious conjectures, but none that merit belief, and he must not then complain when he is faced with cold rejection. **That the "neogrammarian" movement is not yet in a position to explain all "exceptions" to the sound laws is, of course, no basis for an objection against its principle.**

And secondly, a few more brief words about the use of the principle of analogy in the investigation of the older periods of a language.

Many believe that analogical formations arise principally in those stages of a language in which the "feeling for the language" has "degenerated" or, as one also says, in which a "the awareness of language has grown dim"; and thus they believe that one cannot expect analogical formations in the older periods of a language to the same extent as in the later. A strange way of looking at things! This point of view arose among those who think that a language and the forms of a language lead a life to themselves, apart from the individual speakers and who permit themselves to be governed to such an extent by terminology that they continually regard metaphorical expressions as reality itself and even incorporate into the language concepts which are only the ways in which the grammarian looks at things. If someone could once and for all manage to get rid of these generally harmful expressions "youth" and "old age" of languages! These and many other in themselves quite innocent grammatical terms have so far been almost exclusively a curse, hardly a blessing. For the child who was born in Greece in the Homeric age, who became aware of the speech forms of his linguistic community by hearing them, and who then reproduced them in order to make himself understood by his fellow men for that child were these speech forms ancient? Did he feel and handle them differently from the way



in which a Greek of the Alexandrian age or someone of still later times felt and handled them? If today a Greek dialect of the 20th century B.C. or a Germanic dialect of the 8th century B.C. suddenly became known to a grammarian, would not he then immediately alter his conception of antiquity, which he associates with the Homeric and Gothic dialects, and henceforth call old things young? And would he not in all probability henceforth drop the notion that the Greeks of Homeric times and the Goths of the 4th century A.D. were people with a "degenerate feeling for language," with a "dim awareness of language"? And do such predications have anything at all to do with the thing itself? Or might the older Indo-European peoples, suspecting what was coming, not have analogized the forms of their time a great deal in order to satisfy the grammatical desires of their offspring and not make the business of reconstructing the Indo-European parent language too difficult? We believe: as sure as we are that our Indo-European forefathers had need, just as we do, of their lips, tongue, teeth, etc. for the articulation of the sounds of their language, just as sure can we be of the fact that the entire psychological aspect of their speech activity (the emergence of sound images preserved in the memory from a subconscious state, and the development of concepts of sounds to words and sentences) was influenced by the association of ideas in the same way and in the same measure as today and as long as people are people. One must also understand that the difference in overall make-up which exists between the individual old Indo-European languages, the descendants of the same original Indo-European language, would not be nearly so considerable if in prehistoric periods regular phonetic change of the original forms had only taken place and if reformations and new formations by analogy had not supplemented it to a very great extent. Therefore there is nothing to that difference between old and young.

At first glance another objection which has been raised against us recently in order to discredit our efforts makes more sense. It is said: whoever operates with the concept of analogy can here and there perhaps hit upon the right thing with a stroke of luck, but in the main he can only appeal to faith. Now, that latter statement is quite right, and everybody who deals with the principle of analogy is also clearly aware of it. But consider the following. First: if, for example, the suffixal ending of the nominative plural Gk *hippo*), Lat. *equi* can not be reconciled with that of Osc. *Nūvulanūs*, Goth. *vulfōs*, Old Ind. *açvās* on the basis of the sound laws, and if we have come to the conclusion that one of the two formations must be an analogical creation, is it such a bold stroke if we assume that *hippoi* and *equi* were formed according to the pronominal declension (such as originally *tai*, from *ta-*, Old Ind. *te*, Gk *toi*, etc.)? Of the same or similar simplicity are, however, countless other instances where we have recourse to our principle, whereas others arbitrarily stretch and bend the sound laws in order not to let the speaking peoples be bad grammarians who did not remember their forms and paradigms properly. Second: A principle which we strictly maintain, to the best of our ability, is: only then to take recourse to analogy when the sound laws compel us to. Form-association is for us too an "ultimum refugium." The difference is only that we see ourselves confronted with this much sooner and much more often than are the others, precisely because we are so punctilious about the sound laws and because we are convinced that the boldest assumption of the operation of analogy always has more claim to be "believed" than arbitrary evasions of the mechanical sound laws. Third: It was not long ago that the beginning was made to establish rights for the principle of analogy. Hence it is, on the one hand, very probable, indeed sure, that blunders have been made here and there in the assumption of form associations. But, on the other hand, it is also very probable that more general principles will gradually be found to cover the diverse tendencies of association, especially when the modern languages have been investigated more thoroughly with regard to their analogical formations. In this way a probability scale can also gradually be established for the assumption of association. The essential thing in the meantime is for people to have the good intention of permitting themselves to be instructed by the facts of modern language developments and then for them to conscientiously apply what they have learned to the older periods of a language.

Thus we believe that the objection that our work with the principle of analogy is reprobable because it terminates in mere conjecture has been proven to be unjustified, and we want to add one more thing in conclusion of this discussion. If the "neogrammarian" movement with its methodological principles gives up many of the original Indo-European forms which have circulated for a long time in our science and which are probably very dear to many, and if the movement is not now in a position to go along on the "idealistic flight" into the periods of primitive and pre-primitive language -- as this flight is now so often attempted -- and **if the neogrammarian movement with its skeptical attitude seems to lag behind those who are always looking toward the primitive language and if it appears inferior in its efficiency to the older movement, it can surely console itself with the thought that for a young science, as comparative linguistics is in spite of its sixty years, it must be of more concern to fly as safely rather than as far as possible.** On the other hand, it can cherish the hope that what it gives away in primitive and primitive-primitive linguistic niceties will be amply made up for through the attainment of a deeper understanding of the mental activity of human beings in general and of the individual Indo-European peoples.

We believed that we should preface the present *Untersuchungen* with our creed because they are to contribute primarily to bringing the "neogrammarian" movement into more and more general acceptance. We may also, however, here ask our several critics to keep in mind constantly the principles by which we have decided in favor of this or that assumption. In the last years people have unfortunately passed numerous unfavorable judgements on our movement or on some of the opinions advanced by this movement; they only prove that the judges in question have not considered at all what motives led us to follow just this method and no other. An understanding and agreement between the different movements in our science which are at present battling with each other can not be brought about by such occasional skirmishings which skirt the basic questions and not by directing

one's blame solely against details, but only by taking aim at the leading motives and principles. That is not to say, of course, that we, for our part, would not be heartily grateful for a detailed demonstration of mistakes and errors”.

## 2.2 As “Leis Fonéticas”

Resumo de Brugmann, *Zum Heutigen Stand der Sprachforschung*, 1885 (Wilbur, 1972):

- “1. Since all linguistic development takes place in the psychic realm, sound change is a psychic process.
2. It is at the same time a physiological process inasmuch as the activity of the speech organs also comes into consideration
3. The movements by which sounds are produced are never precisely the same either in the case of the various individuals of the same community or even in the case of the same individual.
4. These variations are however so slight that they are not perceived as differences by the speaker or the hearer.
5. As a rule, between the beginning and the end of a development, eg. k and h of the first Germanic sound shift, there lies a continuous series of minimal shifts in articulation which one can designate as k, k<sub>1</sub>, k<sub>2</sub>, k<sub>3</sub>, k<sub>4</sub>, ..., h. And some individuals can have advanced several stages in the direction of the new sound while others still retain the old sound.
6. The closer the circle of the speech community is drawn, that is, the smaller the number of speakers and the closer they live together, the smaller the differences are in the progress of the change.
7. All members of the community take part in the change, and even considering all differences in detail, the direction of the change is the same.
8. In the completion of the sound change, it is now inconceivable that different paths could be taken in different words.
9. Pronunciation is not acquired specially for every single word, but whenever the same phonetic conditions are present, there necessarily occurs the same kinetic feeling and with it the same pronunciation.
10. That is what one has to understand by the unexceptionability of the sound law.”

## 2.3 Exemplos - Algumas mudanças regulares nas línguas românicas

### 2.3.1 Alguns Tipos de Mudança Fonética

(Quadros adaptados de Campbell 2000:20-43)

[1] <b>Assimilação</b>	Lat. <b>octo</b> > It. <b>otto</b> ; Lat. <b>noctem</b> > It. <b>notte</b> ; Lat. <b>factum</b> > It. <b>fatto</b> .
[2] <b>Dissimilação</b> Lat. /r...r/ > romance /l...r/, /r....l/:	Lat. <b>peregrino</b> > It. <b>Pellegrino</b>
[3] <b>Deleção</b>  [3.1] Síncope (atata >atta)  [3.2] Apócope (tata >tat)  [3.3] Aférese (atata >tata)	Lat. <b>pópulu-</b> > Fr. <b>peuple</b> , Esp. <b>pueblo</b> Lat. <b>fabulare</b> > Esp. (fablar) > <b>hablar</b>  Lat. <b>pane</b> > Esp. <b>pan</b> Lat. <b>sole</b> > Esp. <b>sol</b>  Lat. <b>apoteca</b> > Esp. <b>bodega</b>
[4] <b>Epêntese</b>  [4.1] Prótese (tata >atata)  [4.2] Excrescência (amra > ambra; anra >andra; ansa > antsa)  [4.3] Paragoge (tat > tata)	Lat. <b>scutu</b> > Esp. (iskutu > eskutu) > <b>escudo</b> ; Lat. <b>scola</b> > Esp.(iskola) > <b>escola</b>  Lat. <b>hominem</b> > Esp. (homnem >homre) > <b>hombre</b> Lat. <b>camera</b> > Fr. (camera >camra) > <b>chambre</b>  Esp. <b>red</b> > LA Esp. <b>rede</b>
[5] <b>Rotacismo</b> (VsV>VrV)	Lat. <b>honor-is</b> (gen S), <b>honor-i</b> (dat S), <b>honos</b> (nom S) > <b>honor</b> (nom S)
[6] <b>Metástase</b>  (asta > atsa; asata > atasa)	Lat. <b>parabola</b> > Esp. <b>palabra</b> [r.l > l.r]
[8] <b>Aplogia</b> (simplificação)  (tatasa > tasa)	Lat. <b>nutrix</b> < <b>nutri-trix</b>

### 2.3.2 Exemplo de analogia

lat. <b>reddere</b> , 'render';	port. <b>render</b> , fr. <b>rendre</b> , it. <b>rendere</b> ,  'render'
------------------------------------	--

> (**Reddere** não pode ser a origem de **render/rendre/rendere**, pois não há lei que justifique o aparecimento de um /n/ fechando a primeira sílaba. A origem dos termos românicos é \***rendere**, constituído por analogia com "**prendere**", 'tomar').

### 3. O Debate (?) da década de 1880

Obras relevantes do período:

1878: OSTHOFF, H. & BRUGMANN, K. - *Prefácio a Morphologische Untersuchungen...*

1880: HERMANN PAUL, *Princípios Fundamentais da História das Línguas*

1885: BRUGMANN, K. *Zum Heutigen Stand der Sprachforschung (excerto)*

1885: SCHUCHARDT, H. *Gegen die Junggrammatiker*

#### 3.1 Cotejo: Schuchardt vs. Paul

Tema/página	Paul	Schuchardt
Natureza da mudança	66-70	
Fatores Causais	64-65; 67 (cf nota 4)	49
A natureza das leis fonéticas	74-75	42-43
Gradualismo, Regularidade	61-64	47
Tendências, frequências, e mudança	62; 67-69; 70; 71-73	57-59
“as mesmas condições fonéticas”, “no interior de um mesmo dialeto”	74-75; 77	47-50; 50-57

##### 3.1.1 Paul

- A língua tem uma ordem própria, a lingüística, um objeto próprio:

“Die sprache ist wie jedes erzeugniss menschlicher cultur ein gegenstand der gechichtlichen betrachtung; aber wie jedem zweige der gechichtswissenschaft so muss auch der sprachgeschichte eine wissenschaft zu seite stehen, welche sich mit den allgemeinen lebensbedingungen des gechichtlich sich entwickelnden objectes bechäftig, welche die in allem wechsel sich gleich bleibenden factoren nach ihrer natur und wirksamkeit untersucht. Es fehlt für diese wissenschaft eine allgemein gültige und passende bezeichnung. Unter sprachphilosophie versteht man in der regel doch etwas anderes. Und ausserdem dürfte es vielleicht aus einem grunde geraten sein diesen ausdruck lieber zu vermeiden. Unser unphilosophisches zeitalter wittert darunter leicht metaphyshiche speculationen, von denen die historische sprachforschung keine notiz zu nehmen brauche. In wahrheit aber ist das, was wir im sinne haben, nicht mehr und nicht minder philosophie als etwa die physik oder die physiologie”.

- A lingüística é uma ciência privilegiada:

“Es gibt keinen zweig der cultur, bei dem sich die bedingungen der entwicklung mit solcher exactheit erkennen lassen als bei der sprache, und daher keine culturwissenschaft, deren methode zu solchem grade der vollkommenheit gebracht werden kann wie der sprachwissenschaft. [...] Diese eigentümlischkeit ist es hauptsächlich, wodurch sie als nähere verwandte der historischen naturwissenschaften erscheint, was zu der verkerthheit verleitet hat sie aus dem kreise der culturwissenschaften ausschliessen zu wollen”.

- As leis fonéticas não compreendem excessões:

“Aller lautwandel, so weit er machanish vor sich gehet, vollzieht sich nach ausnahmslosen gesetzes, d.h. die richtung del leutbewegung ist bei allen angehörigen einer sprachgenossenschaft, ausser dem fall, dass dialektspaltung eintritt, stets dieselbe, und alle wörter, in denen der der lautbewegung unterworfenen laut unter gleichen verhältnissen erscheint, werden ohne ausnahme von der änderung ergriffen”.

- A única ciência da linguagem é a ciência histórica:

“Es ist eingewendet, dass es noch eine andere wissenschaftliche betrachtung der sprache gäbe, als die geschichtliche. Ich muss das in abrede stellen. Was man für eine nichtgeschichtliche und doch wissenschaftliche betrachtung der sprache erklärt, ist um grunde nichts als eine unvollkommen gechichtliche, unvollkommen teils durch schuld des betrachters, teisl durch schuld des beobachtungsmaterials. Sobald man über das blosse constatieren von einzelheiten hinausgeht, sobald man versucht den zusammenhang zu erfassen, die erscheinungen zu begreifen, so betritt man auch den gechichtlichen boden, wenn auch vielleicht ohne sich klar darüber zu sein”

### 3.1.2 Schuchardt

- O objetivo de Schuchardt neste ensaio é questionar os pressupostos teóricos dos neogramáticos; ele o faz meticulosamente, examinando as contradições internas de propostas como a de H.Paul, e buscando demonstrar a inadequação explicativa das propostas:

“In the proposition "the sound laws operate without exception", both the subject and the predicate evoke weghty doubts. [...]

When a natural scientist hears for the first time about the unexceptionability of sound laws, he probably imagines sound laws that apply at all places and at all times. When we consider the uniform basic conditions of all speech activity, such laws are not only possible, they are to be expected. Why does not sound change - for the most part at least - adhere to the same direction (so that, for exemple, the media can develop from the tenuis or the monophthong from the diphtong, and not the other way round)? If that naive scientist is told that such general sound laws are still to be discovered, that, rather, a relatively narrow spatial and temporal limitation must be placed upon all hitherto defined sound laws, he will find that absolute necessity that would seem to be a pressuposition for exceptionless sound laws lacking. The spatial and temporal relativity of sound laws is not a simple one. Rather it is a complicated one. If, for example, within A and B the law (r)a prevails, within C and D (r)b, on the other hand within A (s)a, within B and C (s)b, within D (s)c - the limits of the sound laws for the two different elements not only contain each other, they intersect. The relationship of the sound laws to theyr external expansion is characteristically variable and fortuitous. This is the weakest point of the neogrammarians. It is on this point that they have been attacked the most vigorously. Here their defense turns to slow retreat”. (Schuchardt, 1885:46)

- Schuchardt argumenta contra a aceitação dos "fatores externos" como "excessões"; fundamentalmente, procura demonstrar que as limitações espaço-temporais abstraídas pelos neogramáticos não são excessões, são a regra.

“The exeptions that must be disregarded when considering the unexeptionability of the sound laws are:

- intersection with other sound laws
- dialect mixture
- the effect of conceptual associations” (Schuchardt, 1885:42)

- "Sound laws operate without exception **within the same dialect**"

“In the expression \*within the same dialect\* there is concealed an obscurity”.

“I assume language mixture even within the most homogeneous speech community. Paul does so only in the case of ethnic mixture, which he considers to be something quite exceptional. I must reject his latter notion. On the one hand, the fluctuation of population in every fairly large urban center is usually such that one may indeed designate it as a mixture even in the narrow sense. [...] One the other hand, the only case in which Paul (1880, p. 71) assumes speech mixture, namely "where in consequence of special historical causes fairly large groups of people are torn loose from their homes and are thrown together with others", is not so exceptional either. Going back from the formation of the Romance-speaking nations to the very beginnings of the Roman nation we find an almost unbroken

series of mixtures of the most varying kinds which not only Romance grammar, but also Latin grammar must take into account". (Schuchardt, 1885:51)

- "Sound laws operate without exception **within the same dialect** and **within the same period**"

"There has been an attempt to make the proofs of the two points less easily refutable by suspending the law of the unexceptionability of sound laws for transitional periods. This cannot be permitted. Every stage of a language is a transitional stage. One stage is just as normal as any other. What holds true for the whole holds true for each part. I cannot conceive of language as a mixture of complete and incomplete sound laws. This would mean mixing teleological notions into scientific consideration. When I speak about transitional stages, it is only in a relative sense, only in relationship to later, already established facts. We have no right to designate any present-day state of affairs as a transitional stage".

- A segunda linha de argumentação seguida por Schuchardt é dirigida aos argumentos internos dos neogramáticos, ainda que "abstráidas" as questões externas. Questiona, por exemplo, conceitos como "contextos fonéticos equivalentes":

"In the case of sound change within the same dialect, all individual cases where **the same phonetic conditions** are present are treated in the same manner"

"... the neogrammarians make the unexceptionability of sound laws dependent upon \*equality of phonological conditions\*, which in my opinion does not exist at all" (Schuchardt, 1885:51) .

"Taking into consideration what has been said, the doctrine of the unexceptionability of sound laws can just as little be demonstrated by deduction as by induction. Whoever adheres to it must confess to it as to a **dogma**". (Schuchardt, 1885:61)

### 3.2 Comentários atuais

R. Ilari, *Linguística Românica* (1992):

"Pela maneira mecanicista como representaram o funcionamento das leis da evolução fonética, os neogramáticos atraíram as críticas de autores que, ou por razões teóricas (como o lingüista alemão Hugo Schuchardt) ou por estarem em contato direto com a realidade multiforme dos dialetos (como o dialetólogo italiano Graziadio Ascoli) não estavam dispostos a aceitar a tese de que as leis fonéticas operam de maneira cega". (R. Ilari, 1992:20)

Terence H. Wilbur, *Hugo Schuchardt and the neogrammarians* (1972):

"Scholars in Romance-speaking nations always had before them the great diversity of the Romance world that had developed out of the relatively uniform Latin speech of the Empire. They were not forced to base social history upon linguistic reconstruction. The situation was quite the contrary. Since they were copiously provided with vast amounts of social and political data, the hard and fast legalism of the neogrammarians would naturally taste to them of extreme artificiality.

Schuchardt, a Romanist on German soil, was acutely aware of the fact that rigid formulation, doctrinal and practical, could only overlook and obscure the real dynamics of linguistic change. His insistence that the neogrammarians look closely at this reality and not allow themselves to be blinded by doctrinal statements was ignored. Schuchardt had an uncanny sense of the individual situation and he did not approach his subject matter with a preconditioned bias as to the nature of reality. It is this trait precisely that makes it difficult at times to find one's bearings in his writings. In comparison with the inflexible, clearly stated, abstract declarations of the neogrammarians with their doctrinaire assurance, his work draws a poor second, for his reasoning appears vague and devious. Although this cloudiness and uncertainty was always more apparent than

real, it robbed his arguments of their force. Next to the great neogrammarian simplifiers he would naturally seem to be a vacillant obscurantist.

Not until the twenties when the results of the study of dialect geography began to receive proper appreciation did he come into his share of praise and understanding, for what came to the world of Indo-Europeanists and Germanists as a new revelation was old hat for Romanists”.

M.C.P. Sousa, *Prefácio à tradução de Contra os Neogramáticos* (2010):

Fica evidente que o sentimento geral de que a doutrina dos neogramáticos constituía uma “revolução” nos estudos da linguagem não convenceu Schuchardt em nenhum momento. Nem mesmo o argumento, muito em voga na época, de que essas leis tinham utilidade ainda que meramente metodológica, por oferecer aos linguistas um método de análise mais rigoroso (segundo Schuchardt, a posição de um Bloomfield), convence Schuchardt. Ao contrário. Para ele, o pretensão “rigor” da doutrina das leis regulares é um rigor deslocado, como ele sugere no seguinte trecho:

“Nós que tomamos a expressão “leis fonéticas” num sentido distinto daquele que (infelizmente) se estabeleceu recentemente na nossa linguagem técnica não enfrentamos os problemas que nossos oponentes podem insistir em imputar à nossa prática de trabalho – refiro-me à prática de explicar e descrever palavras e formas linguísticas. Há entretanto quem defenda que a doutrina da infalibilidade trouxe um maior ‘rigor científico’ à pesquisa linguística. Defendem-no porque partem de uma premissa muito generalizada, mas fundamentalmente falsa. (...)”

**O rigor deve ser incutido aos sujeitos, não aos objetos.** O rigor não reside na estipulação de uma nova lei, mais severa; mas sim na observação mais severa daquela antiga lei sem a qual não há ciência, mas que por si só basta para que haja ciência: a lei da causa e efeito. O maior rigor na observação dessa lei emana diretamente do progresso consistente da atividade científica” .

A excepcional frase de Schuchardt sobre o lugar do rigor na ciência – “*O rigor deve ser incutido aos sujeitos, não aos objetos*” – resume o espírito de sua posição sobre o estado das investigações linguísticas na sua época (não se trata, de fato, de uma frase que gostaríamos de ver como epígrafe de muitas teses de doutoramento ainda hoje?).

Restaria aqui entendermos como ele avalia o fato – já bastante evidente em 1885 – de que o pêndulo daquele ponto em diante penderia mais para o lado dos neogramáticos que para o de seus críticos. Encontramos uma pista disto no seguinte trecho contundente:

“A grande popularidade da doutrina dos neogramáticos não pode ser contada entre os argumentos em seu favor. Poucos a adotam por terem chegado de modo independente às conclusões que ela advoga, ou mesmo por terem-na colocado à prova de modo conclusivo. A grande maioria a adota por conta do alento metodológico que ela fornece. Trata-se de uma doutrina que se encaixa muito confortavelmente na receita que se espera que uma ciência respeitável siga hoje em dia. Falamos aqui daquilo que W. Scherer denominou, com muita propriedade, a “mecanização dos métodos”: a mecanização reduz a demanda de pensamento independente ao mínimo possível, e assim possibilita que um número inacreditável de indivíduos medíocres sintam-se parte do ‘mundo da ciência’”.

Esse trecho nos permite compreender algumas das razões pelas quais Schuchardt não configurava a mais popular das figuras no ambiente acadêmico da sua época. Seu livro foi dedicado “aos neogramáticos” (em especial a seu amigo pessoal, Gustav Meyer), mas pelo que se saiba até hoje, nunca recebeu resposta. Como vimos, o século XX também não recebeu essa obra de Schuchardt com nenhum entusiasmo, nem na geração estruturalista, nem mesmo na geração sócio-variacionista da década de 1960.

Uriel Weinreich, *O Isolamento do idioleto*, em *Fundamentos empíricos para uma teoria da mudança lingüística*, 1968:

Muito antes do século XIX, já se havia notado que as línguas mudam, mas aquele século se distinguiu como o período mais vigoroso da lingüística histórica. **Os teóricos deste período se esforçaram por mostrar que a coerência do comportamento lingüístico, e em particular a regularidade das mudanças fonéticas, podia ser derivada de princípios mais gerais, de preferência psisológicos.** O ápice desta investigação foi atingido por Hermann Paul (1880), que desenvolveu a idéia de que a língua do falante-ouvinte individual encerra a natureza estruturada da língua, a coerência do desempenho falado e a regularidade da mudança. Isolando a língua do indivíduo do uso lingüístico do grupo, Paul desenvolveu uma dicotomia, que foi adotada por gerações de lingüistas posteriores e que subjaz, como tentaremos mostrar, na base dos paradoxos do século XX acerca da mudança lingüística. (Weinreich, Labov & Herzog 1968 (2006):39)

Charles Hutton, *Introdução* à redição fac-similada dos *Princípios* de Paul, 1995:

Paul's *Principien* is widely regarded as the "bible of the Junggrammatiker school", in which Paul summarized and organized the work of Brugmann, Leskien, Osthoff, Sievers and others. [...] As such, its fate has been to **represent 19th century linguistics to the 20th century**, summed up in the notion of the exceptionless nature of sound laws and a positivistic or atomistic philosophy of science based on methodological individualism. [...]

Koerner argues that this text [*Principien*] is important in particular for an understanding of the background to Saussure's *Cours* (he has in mind distinctions between *deskriptive* and *historische Grammatik*, *Spachchuss* vs. *individuelle Sprachtätigkeit*, the notion of *Sprachzustand* and the terminology of *Lautbild*). The problem that this book addresses, whether we accept its conclusions or not, is one that is still relevant to contemporary linguistics, namely that of point of view. It is all the more relevant now that Saussure's radical solution no longer commands the wide acceptance it once did. The questt whilst threrion is, how are we to describe language systematically, given the fact that language partakes of different realities (social, individual, psychological, physical)? We can observe that language changes, but can we isolate causes and effects from the great flux of experience that language represents?

## 4. Pontos de fonética histórica portuguesa: Gonçalves Vianna

*Exame:*

1892: GONÇALVES VIANNA, A. (i), *Exposição da pronúncia normal portuguesa...*)

1892: GONÇALVES VIANNA, A. (ii), *Deux faits de phonétique historique portugaise ...* )