der deutschen Rahmenbildung vergleichbar.

Die Beweglichkeit des Verbs im Polnischen ist hauptsächlich mit den usuellen und intentionellen Faktoren verbunden.

Der unterschiedliche Mitteilungswert, den der Sprecher dem einzelnen Satzglied verleihen kann, bewirkt, daß das Prädikat bzw. der Prädikatsteil verschiedene Plätze einnehmen kann. Als Einschränkung wirkt hier der Usus, das Prädikat möglichst nah den zweiten Platz in Sätze zu stellen.

Ganz anders liegen die Verhältnisse im Deutschen, wo die festen Stellungstypen des Verbs nur im begrenzten Maße durch den Einfluß der funktionalen Satzperspektive modifiziert werden können.

Anmerkungen

1. Büntig F.D.,Bergenholz H., Einführung in die Syntax. Königsstein/Ts.Athenäum 1979, S.94
2. Doroszewski W.,Wieczorkiewicz B., Gramatyka opisowa języka polskiego, PZWS, Warszawa 1968, t.II,S.257
3. Helbig G.,J.Buscha, Deutsche Grammatik, VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, Leipzig 1975, S.502
4. Jodłowski St., Podstawy składni polskiej,PWN, Warszawa 1977, S.178
5. Etwa 75% der nicht kontextgebundenen Sätze im Polnischen hat die Reihenfolge Subjekt – Prädikat. Vgl. Klemensiewicz Z., Lokalizacja podmiotu i orzeczenia w zdaniach izolowanych./w/ Składnia, stylistyka, pedagogika językowa, Warszawa 1982, S.282
6. Kuryłowicz J., La notion de l'isomorphisme,TCLC V, 1949, S.19
7. Jodłowski St., op.cit.4, S.101
8. Doroszewski W., Wieczorkiewicz B., op.cit.2,S. 259

Lubelskie Materiały Neofilologiczne—1987

Przemysław Łozowski

Some notes on Wulfstan's preference for 'dryhten' to 'hælend'.

It is a well-recognized fact that Wulfstan's characteristic vocabulary uses dryhten ('lord', Lat. dominus) rather than hælend ('saviour', Lat. iesus). The two terms, however, can be found side by side in other writers. The question arises whether Wulfstan's preference for one term over the other could be affiliated to a certain Old English prose tradition. In other words, is it Wulfstan alone who has dryhten but not hælend, or is it a definite Old English practice to prefer the former to the latter so that Wulfstan only conforms to the convention? To attempt to answer this question is the main purpose of this article. Yet, before considering Wulfstan's use of the two terms in particular, in the form of a survey of recent research on Old English vocabulary, we would like to relate Wulfstan's word usage in general to the practice of some other authors.

Wulfstan, Ælfric, Æthelwold, and Alfred. Characteristic differences in the vocabulary of Old English prose texts are usually assigned to the absence until the very end of the tenth century of a written standard language. Accordingly, one should not expect any dramatic differences in word usage between various authors unless their writings stay outside the attempt to standardize national vocabulary which was deliberately initiated under the episcopacy of Æthelwold (963–984) at the Old Minster, Winchester.[1]

Indeed, it is in terms of different literary traditions that some of the differences in word usage between Ælfric (d. 1020) and Wulfstan (d. 1023) are sought to be explained. Ælfric, master of novices at Cerne and abbot of Eynsham, not only acknowledges his gratitude to Æthelwold as his teacher, but also faithfully keeps to the vocabulary of his master's school. On the other hand, even if generally faithful to Standard Old English, Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York, feels himself at liberty to follow his own way in the choice of words.

Wulfstan's peculiarities of vocabulary have been known for some time now. In the search for the archbishop's canon, Jost (1950) noted a number of words characteristic of Wulfstan's

homilies. To quote some examples, Wulfstan uses geberan ('to give birth to') not cennan, gecnawan ('to recognize') not oncnawan or tocnawan, namian ('to give a name to') not hatan, lagu ('law') not æ, gesælig ('happy') not eadig. While it may be useful to show how persistent in his word usage Wulfstan was, unfortunately none of the non-Wulfstan words mentioned above could be labelled as the one characteristic of a usage that evolved in Winchester under Æthelwold.

A few years later, Schabram (1965) came up with an extremely exhaustive and careful study of the Old English equivalents for Latin superbia. As far as Ælfric's usage is concerned, he gives the following summary:

"Von 129 Belegen entfallen 124 auf den jüngeren
südenglischen Typ 'modig-'... . Der ältere, im
Ws. bis um die Mitte des 10. Jhs. so gut wie
allein herrschende Typ 'ofermettu': 2; 'ofermod':
1. Je einmal begegnen schliesslich noch der Lehn-
typ 'prut-' ('pryte') und der anglische Typ
'oferhygd-' ('oferhygdig')" (Schabram, 1965: 92).

Wulfstan, in turn, selects either the native West Saxon ofermod (13 occurrences) or the imported prut (5 occurrences). As Wulfstan's preferences hardly overlap with those of Ælfric, the difference in word usage between the two may be assigned to their individual tastes.[2]

This, however, must immediately be questioned in the light of Gneuss's seminal paper (1972) on the standardization of Old English vocabulary at Æthelwold's school at Winchester. Namely, the differences in vocabulary between Ælfric and Wulfstan no longer hold between two individuals, but are rather between the Winchester group, with Ælfric as its greatest author, and Wulfstan. Thus, if the Winchester group uses leahtor, Wulfstan employs both leahtor and unþeaw ('vice'). He prefers cyrice instead of geladung ('congregation') in the Winchester group. For 'to burn', he employs forbærnan, not forswælan. Neither does he use gylt ('sin') nor modignes ('pride').

That Wulfstan's own word usage should be contrasted with the practice of the Winchester group as a whole, not merely with Ælfric's individual preferences, has been confirmed by Seebold's study (1974) on equivalents for Latin sapiens and prudens.

Specifically, if prudens and superbus appear, respectively, as snotor ('wise') and modig ('proud') in the Winchester group, Ælfric including, then Wulfstan's equivalents for the two Latin originals are wær and ofermod.

In his analysis, Seebold has also shown a surprising similar- ity between Wulfstan and Alfred (d. 899).[3] Namely, for prudens and superbus both authors have the same wær and ofermod. A similar coincidence has been observed by Schabram (1974). In the case of wlanc ('splendid') and its derivatives, he has found as many as 10 occurrences in both Wulfstan and Alfred, whereas not a single example can be spotted in Ælfric.

The parallel between Alfred and Wulfstan has also been emphasized by Ono (1988) in his study of three verbs of knowing (i.e., gecnawan, oncnawan, tocnawan) and three verbs of under- standing (i.e., ongytan, undergytan, understandan). For 'to know' both Alfred and Wulfstan employ gecnawan most of the time, whereas in Ælfric this verb is the least popular of the three. Conversely, if for 'to understand' Ælfric uses undergytan quite frequently, Alfred and Wulfstan do not employ it at all. Ono concludes that

"... it has been confirmed that there is some
difference of vocabulary between Ælfric and
Wulfstan and similarity between Wulfstan and
the Alfred-circle" (p. 87).

First of all, the question arises whether Wulfstan's peculiari- ty can be explained in terms of a coincidental preference of dryhten, or rather a deliberate rejection of hælend. In his hom- ilies, he does not use the latter at all, whereas the former seems to be quite common (41 occurrences). This alone would rather suggest Wulfstan's deliberate choice. Moreover, the arch- bishop certainly knew the Old English practice of rendering Jesus by hælend, and dominus by dryhten and hlaford. To exemplify this tendency, in the widely read first English prose translation

Wulfstan's use of 'hælend'. Thus, for Wulfstan's inclinations in the choice of words some explanation (or source?) may be found in early West Saxon tradition. If so, one should feel tempted to explore this possibility to account for Wulfstan's preference of dryhten at the almost total neglect of hælend.

of the gospels, dating from the turn of the tenth century, more than 90% of all the 605 occurrences of hælend have come as the source, and almost 97% of the 184 occurrences of dryhten can be traced to dominus in Latin.[4]

The best evidence for Wulfstan's actual rejection of hælend comes from his own rewritings and revisions of other authors's works. For our purposes here, Wulfstan's eight homilies (i.e., II, IV, V, VI, VII, IX, XII, XVIII in Bethurum, 1957) and the Corpus Christi 201 version of the Second Pastoral Letter (i.e., D in Fehr, 1914) have been collated with their original sources in Ælfric's writings. Two more homilies (i.e., XIV and XV) have been compared with an unknown translator's English version of Abbo's Latin 'Sermo in Cena Domini ad Penitentes' (i.e., Appendix I in Bethurum, 1957).

On the whole, it has emerged that in as many as 23 instances Wulfstan either apparently substituted hælend by (a) dryhten (14x), (b) crist (4x), (c) god (1x), or (d) godes sunu (1x), or simply (e) did not rewrite it at all (3x). There are however (f) three occurrences of hælend that survived in Wulfstan's rewriting, and they all can be found in the Letter. Here are the examples of (a), (b), and (f).

(a) hælend > dryhten
"Forðan-þe þa ofrunga ealle getacnodan ures hælendes slege þe wæs ofslagen for us and on rode ge-fæstnode for ure alysednysse" (after the Corpus Christi version in Fehr, 1914: 114).
"Forðam-þe ða ofrunga ealle getacnode ures drihtenes slege, þe wæs of-slagen for us and on rode gefæstnod for ure alysednesse" (after the Corpus Christi version in Fehr, 1914: 114).

(b) hælend > crist
"Ðonne cymð se Antecrist, se bid mennisc mann and sod deofol, swa swa ure Hælend is sodlice mann and God on anum hade" (after Thorpe, 1844: 4).
"He byd sylf deofol 7 deah mennisc man geboren. Crist is sod God 7 sod mann, 7 Antecrist bid sodlice deofol 7 mann" (after Bethurum, 1957: 128).

(f) hælend > hælend
"And Iohannes geseah, swa-swa we sædon ær, þone hælend ymbgyrdne æt his halgan breoste and Daniel geseah þa lændena begirde" (after CC 201 in Fehr, 1914: 84).
"Johannes geseah, swa-swa we sædon ær, þone hælend ymbgyrdne æt his halgan breoste and Daniel geseah þa lændena begirde" (after CC 190 in Fehr, 1914: 84).

Thus, it seems that Wulfstan was sure that he did not want hælend as much as he knew that his most immediate choice would be dryhten. In other words, Wulfstan's rejection of the former was just as his preference of the latter.

'Hælend' in Ælfredian texts. As mentioned earlier, there may be some similarity of vocabulary between Wulfstan and Alfred. Then, Wulfstan's obviously eccentric rejection of hælend in the late Old English period would be justified by his attachment to the early Old English tradition of the Alfred-circle. If at the turn of the 10th century Wulfstan safely changed one word for another despite original readings (e.g., those he found in Ælfric) and the prevailing practice (i.e., of having hælend for Iesus), then a similar process might have happened a century earlier.

Four translations of the end of the ninth century have been collated with their Latin originals in terms of names for GOD. In what follows some specification of the selection is given.

(i) Gregory's Dialogues (English after Corpus Christi 322 in Hecht, 1900-1907; Latin after Moricca, 1924)
(ii) Gregory's Pastoral Care (English after Hatton 20 in Sweet, 1871; Latin after Migne; 1849)
(iii) Bede's History (English after Miller, 1890; Latin after Colgrave, 1969)
(iv) Orosius's History (English and Latin after Sweet, 1883)

The report below concerns only the forms whose distribution in (i - iv) may possibly account for Wulfstan's rejection of hælend, i.e., Iesus and dominus in Latin and dryhten and hælend in West Saxon.[5] The figures quoted do not include the secular meaning of the terms, which is especially common in the case of the dominus-dryhten-hlaford correspondence.

In particular, out of the total of 48 hælend forms, 31 tokens have had Iesus as a source (Table 1), whereas out of the total of 37 Iesus forms, 31 examples have been found rendered by hælend (Table 2). No case of the Iesus-dryhten association has been found, most of the time dryhten being a translation for dominus.

Table 1. Latin sources for West-Saxon hælend and dryhten.

HÆLEND	48
- Iesus	31
- saluator	5
- redemptor	1
- veritas	1
- no latin source	10

DRYHTEN	394
- dominus	312
- deus	32
- christus	4
- veritas	3
- no latin source	43

Table 2. West-Saxon equivalents for Latin Iesus and dominus.

IESUS	37
- hælend	31
- no West-Saxon equivalent	6

DOMINUS	430
- dryhten	312
- god	73
- crist	13
- hlaford	1
- halga	1
- no West-Saxon equivalent	30

Clearly, as in the Alfredian texts hælend seems to be quite well attested, Wulfstan's own rejection of the term cannot be linked to the practice of the Alfred-circle. In other words, however similar the general vocabularies of Wulfstan and Alfred may be, this parallel does not hold in the case of the hælend-dryhten correspondence; both appear almost as often as is required by the Latin originals.

Moreover, the pattern of having hælend for Iesus and dryhten for dominus seems to be equally popular among both the Alfred-circle and late West Saxon writers. This makes Wulfstan stand in contrast not only to his contemporaries but also to a circle of promoters of Old English prose in West Saxon territory at the turn of the ninth and tenth centuries.

FOOTNOTES

1. cf. Gneuss (1972), Godden (1980).

2. Any temporal and dialectal considerations must be ruled out as the two were contemporaries and used the same dialect.

3. A coincidence between the two was observed by Gneuss as early as 1972, when he wrote that in the Winchester group

"... the words for superbus and superbia are almost exclusively modig and modignes and occasionally the recent French loan pryte, but never ofermod and ofermodignes as in earlier West Saxon prose (and in Wulfstan!) ..."(p. 76).

4. In his homilies Wulfstan consistently avoids hælend. This is not because he merely mentions God (or Lord) in general and never specifically refers to Jesus himself. For examples, see II, IV, V, VI, VII, IX, XVII in Bethurum (1957).

5. In all, 772 English tokens have been traced to their Latin sources, and 954 Latin original forms have been matched with their English equivalents. The difference between the two figures is due to the fact that not every Latin form is necessarily rendered into English, but some are left untranslated. Neither can every English form be traced to a direct source in Latin.

REFERENCES

Bethurum, D. (1957) The Homilies of Wulfstan. Oxford.

Colgrave, B. and R.A.B. Mynors (1969) Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People. Oxford.

Fehr, B. (1914) Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics. Hamburg.

Gneuss, H. (1972) "The origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's school at Winchester". Anglo-Saxon England 1, 63-83.

Godden, M. (1980) "Ælfric's changing vocabulary". English Studies 61, 206-223.

Hecht, H. (1900-1907) Bischof Waerferths von Worcester Ueber-setzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen. Leipzig and Hamburg.

Jost, K. (1950) Wulfstanstudien. Bern.

Migne, J.P. (1849) Romani Pontificis Regulae Pastoralis Liber, ad Joannem Episcopum Civitatis Ravennae. Patrologiae Completus. Series Latina. Tomus tertius. Vol. 77.

Miller, T. (1890-1898) The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People. Early English Text Society 95, 96, 110, 111. London.

Morica, U. (1924) Gregorii Magni dialogi, libri IV. Rome.

Ono, S. (1988) "The vocabulary of Ælfric and Wulfstan: a review". Old English Newsletter. Subsidia 14, 75-88.

Schabram, U. (1965) Superbia: Studien zum altenglischen Wortschatz. München.

Schabram, U. (1974) "AE. wlanc und Ableitungen: Vorarbeiten zu einer wortgeschichtlichen Studie". Studien zur englischen und amerikanischen Sprache und Literatur: Festschrift für Helmut Papajewski. 70-88.

Seebold, E. (1974) "Die ae. Entsprechunhen von lat. sapiens und prudens: eine Untersuchung über die mundartliche Gliederung der ae. Literatur". Anglia 92, 291-333.

Sweet, H. (1871) King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care. EETS 45, 50. London.

Sweet, H. (1883) King Alfred's Orosius. EETS 79. London.

Thorpe, B. (1844-1846) The Sermones Catholici or Homilies of Ælfric. London.

Lubelskie Materiały Neofilologiczne—1987

Marek Piotrowski

Phonetic transfer in teaching English: towards individualized teaching of phonetics

Much recent discussion on the place of teaching phonetics within the framework of communicative approach to language learning is expressive of disappointment and frustration at the existing techniques and methods. The teaching of pronunciation at the university level is by no means free from this bitter feeling of certain futility of the teaching offered in classroom. There are some isolated views among the adherents to communicative approach to language teaching which stress that the aspect of meaning and not of form is of primary importance, and thus give low priority to teaching phonetics, but a considerable number of works assign the teaching of pronunciation a central role in language acquisition believing that it is not an optional luxury to be left to advanced level studies of the language at the university, but "should be an integral part of an English teaching programme from the early stages, just as the teaching of structures and vocabulary" (Hubbard et al. 1983:207). The actual practice, however, indicates that the first serious encounter with the pronunciation practice is usually made in the later stages of language instruction, often not sooner than at the university level, when the language learner is well past his/her optimal age for pronunciation acquisition (cf. Arabski 1985), and his habits of pronunciation are usually well formed and difficult to change.

The emphasis on the communicative aspect of second language