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1. Background

There is a current controversy among scholars researching early American English and the history of African American English as to the nature of slave speech. In present day scholarship on early African American English there are two competing hypotheses regarding its nature: the English dialects hypothesis and the Creolist hypothesis. The English dialects hypothesis, held by such researchers as Montgomery, Fuller and DeMarse (1993), Poplack and Tagliamonte (2001), as well as the contributors to Poplack (2000), maintains that the speech of slaves in the plantation South was rooted in the varieties of English spoken in the British Isles and brought over by white immigrants to America. On this hypothesis the speech of slaves would have resembled the dialectal speech of the surrounding poor whites with whom slaves would have interacted. Given that there was a relatively large number of poor whites of Irish and Scots Irish origins in the South this nonstandard speech would have been influenced by Irish and Scots dialects of English. Under the English dialects hypothesis, there would have been nothing special about the nonstandard dialectal speech of slaves that would have distinguished them from the nonstandard speech of the poor whites living in their midst.

On the contrary, the Creolist hypothesis holds that early African American English either was a creole language, or, was at least partially influenced by creole speech. Given that slaves from Africa spoke many different languages and given that some slaves in the South spent time in the Caribbean before their forced immigration to the American South, it would have only been natural for a pidgin and then a creole type language to develop on the plantations of the antebellum South. Pidgin and creole type speech is what develops in a situation of language mixture, as witnessed by the various creole languages of the Caribbean, such as the French-based Haitian Creole and the English-based Jamaican Creole. The strong version of the Creolist hypothesis, as argued by Dillard (1973), maintains that there was a common plantation creole
spoken among slaves in the antebellum period, the remnant of which can still be heard today in the Gullah (or Geechee) dialect of the old time African American inhabitants of the Sea Islands of South Carolina and Georgia. A weaker version of the Creolist hypothesis, advanced by Holm (1991) and Rickford (1997) and (1998), holds that while creole speech may not have been widespread throughout the plantation South it was nonetheless an important element present in the formative stage of the development of African American English.

This debate exists because scholars today do not really know what slaves in the plantation South truly spoke like, especially in their private communication with one another when they were not trying to accommodate their speech to the style or dialect of others. There exists no synchronous published documentation, academic in nature, that describes for us the vocabulary and grammatical peculiarities of the speech of slaves in the antebellum South. This should be contrasted, on the one hand, with documentation and academic discussion on Native American (i.e. American Indian) languages which, though, not very substantial until the 20th century, was a subject of academic discussion at least among some scholars in the early history of the United States. (See, for example, Andresen 1990 and Campbell 1997 for overviews on the early American scholarship on Native American languages.) And, on the other hand, it should be contrasted with the work on Americanisms (such as that of Pickering 1817 and Bartlett 1848) and regionalisms (discussed, for example, in Mathews 1931 and Miller 1983) during the antebellum period.

There are several possible reasons for the lack of academic discussion and observation on the speech of slaves during the antebellum period. One possibility, is that there was nobody in antebellum America who had both an academic knowledge about language and an intimacy with slave culture. However, there were individuals, such as Thomas Jefferson, who did write about language topics (see, for example, the discussion of Jefferson in Andresen 1990) and who no doubt had a familiarity with slave culture, but who never seemed to have made written academic observations on the nature of slave speech. A second possible reason, put forward by McWhorter (2000), essentially states there was nothing special or unique to observe about the
nature of slave speech in the American South. Specifically, McWhorter takes the lack of synchronous (academic) documentation of slave speech as negative evidence against the Creolist hypothesis, especially when the situation is contrasted with the existence of such documentation in the Caribbean and elsewhere during the same period where various creole languages were being spoken by slaves and slave descendants. McWhorter notes, "There are no grammars of slave language written in Mississippi, no dictionaries of slave 'lingo' from Delaware, and in the mountains of archival material, memoirs, and literary depictions of slavery in the United States, we do not find the slaves referred to as having their own kind of 'talk' that the white person must essentially learn as a new language" (p. 413). While this could be taken to argue against the Creolist hypothesis, it could just be a reflection that academically-oriented observations about slave speech were not being made in antebellum America, whether to indicate a possible creole type speech or a dialectal speech influenced by Irish settlers. A third possible reason for the lack of contemporary academic observation on the nature of slave speech, put forward in Davis (2003), was that the prevailing racial (i.e. racist) ideologies of antebellum America made it difficult for anyone to make meaningful academic observations on the nature of slave speech, whether public or private. Thus, it is significant that not only do we not find academic references to slave speech, but we find virtually no interest in antebellum America in the study of African languages, despite the fact there were many native speakers of African languages in America during most of the antebellum period. In other words, the speech of Africans and their descendants were just not worthy of serious academic comment. This should be contrasted with the academic interest in Native American languages during the same period mentioned above, where one finds individuals like the scholar Henry Rowe Schoolcraft who spoke several Native American languages and married a woman of Native American heritage.

In this light, it is noteworthy that we do find one academic in antebellum America who did make significant observations on the nature of slave speech in both his published and unpublished writings. That individual is Francis Lieber. Although Lieber's observations have gone unnoticed by current scholars examining the early history of African American English
(other than in Davis 2003), these observations inform us about its possible creolist and English dialectal origin. Lieber was probably unique in antebellum America in his ability to make significant comments and observations on the nature of slave speech. First, Lieber had an intimacy with slave culture, both through being an owner of several domestic slaves during his sojourn in South Carolina (1835-1856) and through his formal studies of comparative slavery (REFERENCE). Moreover, he had personal familiarity with slavery in the Caribbean from his visits (in the 1830s) and contacts there through his wife's family (Freidel). Second, Lieber, who was one of the few scholars in antebellum American to have received a Ph.D (in mathematics, from the University of Jena in 1820), was well-connected academically in Europe being a friend of both the renown German historian Barthold George Niebuhr and Wilhelm von Humboldt, whom some consider the founder of modern linguistics. Freidel (1947, 180) refers to von Humboldt as Lieber's mentor. Several of the letters between Lieber and von Humboldt appear in Müller-Vollmer (1998). From these letters, dating from the early 1830s, after Lieber's immigration to American in 1827, we learn that Lieber was sending manuscripts to von Humboldt on American Indian languages while receiving some of von Humboldt's writings on linguistics. Thus, Lieber was familiar with the current trends of the emerging academic discipline of linguistics in Europe. Third, one can argue that despite Lieber's being a slave owner, he did not accept the prevalent ideology of white supremacy assumed in antebellum America, at least not in an abstract sense. While Lieber never made his anti-slavery views publicly known during his sojourn in South Carolina, in his private writings during that period Lieber referred to slavery as "a nasty, dirty, selfish institution" (Freidel 1947, 236) and noted that it was destructive both for the institutions of family and property. Moreover, Freidel mentions (p, 256) a letter that Lieber wrote to the Boston Evening Journal on June 6, 1851 in which "he favored a college for Negroes in Liberia and ridiculed the idea that Negroes were incapable of higher education."

Thus, given Lieber's familiarity with slave culture, his knowledge of the current linguistics of the time, and his rejection of the prevalent racial ideology of the South (at least, arguably, in an abstract sense), Lieber's observations on slave speech become an important source on the nature
of early African American English. In Section 2 of this paper, I will overview Lieber's linguistic interests more generally so as to make clear why Lieber would at all be interested in the nature of slave speech. In Section 3, I will present various observations Lieber made regarding slave speech dividing them between comments pertaining to specific lexical (or vocabulary) usages and those pertaining to grammatical usage. In particular, I will relate his comments pertaining to grammatical usage to the controversy regarding the origins of African American English. Section 4 concludes the paper.

2. Lieber's language-related interests

There is little doubt that Francis Lieber was one of the most famous academics to the educated public in the United States during the antebellum period. Lieber was already well known in 1835 when he became a professor of history and political economy at South Carolina College. Lieber's name graced the cover of the commercially successful first edition of The Encyclopedia Americana which he had conceived and edited. The Encyclopedia came out in thirteen volumes between 1829 and 1832 and went through many printings. During the antebellum period, Lieber was most well known for his writings on political science and legal issues. These include his three seminal works: Manual of Political Ethics 1838 in 2 volumes, Legal and Political Hermeneutics 1839, and Civil Liberty and Self-Government 1853, the latter of which is considered as the first political science textbook. During much of the same period, Lieber was pursuing his academic interests in language and linguistics. His most well known language related publication of this period is his 1839 Dictionary of Latin Synonymes (Boston: Little & Brown). The Dictionary was a translation and an expansion of a similar dictionary from the German (Ramshorn's -----) and while Lieber did not personally profit from the Dictionary, it too was commercially successful going through several reprintings. One can reasonably speculate that it would not have been uncommon for a college-bound student in the United States in the 1840s to have been familiar with both Lieber's Dictionary of Latin Synonymes and his Encyclopedia Americana.
However, much of Lieber's language-related work during the antebellum period was either never published or fell into obscurity and is generally unknown to present-day linguists, even those who specialize in the history of the discipline. Certain aspects of Lieber's work have been made known by Heath (1982), Andresen (1990), and Campbell (1997), but the former two are very general with few quotes from Lieber's actual work while the latter focuses only on Lieber's interest in Native American languages. Nonetheless, it is worthy here to survey briefly some of Lieber's more salient language-related works in order to understand why Lieber would be interested in the speech of slaves (i.e. early African American English from a present-day perspective). Lieber's outlook on language was heavily influenced by the linguist Wilhelm von Humboldt (the brother of the more famous geographer Alexander von Humboldt). The von Humboldt tradition in linguistics is quite modern in the sense that it views every language as a system of unique concepts. The investigator would seek to explain how a language develops in its uniqueness and individuality. While each language is considered unique, the ways in which languages develop and change are subject to certain regularities and laws. These would apply to all languages, be they the languages of the American Indians, the languages of the African slaves, or the languages of the European colonizers. How languages develop and change is the theme that characterizes much of Lieber's diverse linguistic interests.

Of Lieber's published articles relating to language, probably the three most important ones are Lieber (1837) in the *Southern Literary Messenger*, Lieber (1852) in one of Henry Rowe Schoolcraft's mammoth volumes on Native Americans, and Lieber (1850) in *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*. The first article is arguably Lieber's most famous on a language-related topic. While the gist of the article defends the teaching of the classical languages in the schools, it is Lieber's discussion of the nature of Native American languages that had a lasting influence. In this article as well as in his shorter 1852 article, Lieber praised Native American languages, compared them favorably with the classical languages, and coined the term 'holophrastic' to describe their agglutinating or polysynthetic nature. Many Native American languages (especially those of the northeast part of North America with which early American
scholars were familiar) are characterized by expressing a whole phrase or combination of ideas by a single word. Lieber explained this phenomenon in his 1837 and 1852 articles and discussed previous terms used to describe it (including agglutinative and polysynthetic) and explained why his coinage 'holophrastic' was a superior term. Lieber's term 'holophrastic' was used in works on Native American languages during the remainder of the nineteenth century.

Lieber's (1850) article appearing in the prestigious *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge* is both peculiar and unique. The article is about the vocal sounds of Laura Bridgman, the first deaf-blind child to be successfully taught language. The peculiarity of the article is in its topic. Bridgman was taught tactile finger spelling becoming completely fluent in it; she was not taught oral language and could only make a limited range of vocal sounds. She could communicate rapidly with anyone else who knew tactile finger spelling. The appearance of Lieber's article in such a prestigious journal begs the question of what the relationship was between the professor in South Carolina and the deaf-blind child in Boston. If Lieber knew Bridgman well enough to be familiar with her vocal sounds, why did he not write about a more central facet of her language ability? The article, however, is unique for its time by presenting a study of a specific language aspect of one individual who was language impaired. While Lieber is briefly mentioned in the two recent biographies of Laura Bridgman, Freeberg (2001) and Gitter (2001), the story behind Lieber's relation with Bridgman and his involvement in her education is still to be written (though see Davis 2002 for a preliminary report).

In addition to the three important published articles described above, there is no doubt that at least some of the language-related articles in the *Encyclopedia Americana* were written by Lieber. although the articles in the *Encyclopedia* were unsigned. Most relevant for the present paper is that, in all likelihood, Lieber wrote the entry on creole dialects for the *Encyclopedia*. We can say this with a good deal of certainty because of the following personal anecdote in the article regarding the Napoleonic wars (*Encyclopedia Americana* v. 4, p. 13): "When the allied armies invaded France, and the Russian and German soldiers were often under the necessity of communicating with each other, and with the French, a kind of jargon came into use among
them, in which the writer observed that *mi*—the Low German for *me*, and pretty nearly resembling the French *moi*—was used by all parties to express the first person singular. The infinitive was also used instead of the finite modes, expressing only the gross idea of action without modification. *Flesh* from the German *Fleisch* (meat), *dobri*, from the Russian, for *good*, were also employed by all parties, as was also the word *caput*, to signify *broken down, spoiled*, &c. This last word is still in use among the lower classes of North Germany. *Mi flesh caput* meant in this military dialect, *my meat is spoiled*. Several of the modern European languages must have originated in this way, after the irruption of the northern tribes into the Roman empire." Both the specific anecdote and the linguistic commentary on it leaves little doubt that Lieber is the author of the passage. According to Freidel (1947), Lieber served in the Prussian army in 1815 at the very end of the Napoleonic wars and would have witnessed the interaction of French, Russian, and German speaking soldiers.

So far in this brief discussion of Lieber's published language-related articles, we observe his interest in Native American languages, creole languages, and the language of the deaf-blind child Laura Bridgman. Some of his unpublished language-related writings found at the Huntington Library are on similar themes. I will discuss three of his more important unpublished manuscripts so as to provide an appropriate context for Lieber's observations on slave speech. The three manuscripts that I consider include a book length manuscript on the language development of Laura Bridgman, a short manuscript on Pennsylvania German, and his collection in ten small volumes of Americanisms and Anglicisms documenting the development of an American English distinct from British English. The topics addressed in these manuscripts involve situations of language development and language change. I briefly overview each of these manuscripts.

Lieber first encountered Laura Bridgman in his summer visit to Boston in 1839 when Bridgman was eight years old during her second year of residency at the Perkins Institute for the Blind in Boston. Lieber describes his initial encounter with her in a letter to his young son Oscar dated August 10, 1839 [Huntington Library] where he details how Laura was initially taught
tactile finger spelling. Lieber was to maintain a relationship with Bridgman and her teachers over the next twelve years. Lieber was interested in all aspects of Bridgman's language development. His particular interests in her vocal sounds concerned how she assigned meanings to such sounds even though she could not have heard these vocal sounds. These could then provide clues to the origins on how certain sound symbolic words come about. This is one of the themes of Lieber's 1850 article about her vocal sounds that was published in *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*. While Lieber's (1850) article on Bridgman is known, what is not generally known was that after Lieber's first encounter with Laura Bridgman in 1839, he compiled a book-length manuscript between 1839 and 1841 focussed largely on Laura Brigman's language development; that is, it focused on her acquisition of the tactile finger spelling being taught to her (not her vocal sounds). The manuscript included an introduction that overviewed the history of the failed attempts in Europe to teach language to the deaf-blind. Lieber's manuscript also incorporated material about Laura Bridgman from the Annual Reports of the Perkins Institute for the Blind in Boston. These reports were written by the Institute's director, Samuel Gridley Howe, a well-known nineteenth century reformer and abolitionist. Lieber dwelled at length on various linguistic aspects of Bridgman's language development. After completing the manuscript in 1841, Lieber sent a copy of the finished manuscript to Howe and received Howe's approval to seek a publisher for the manuscript. Howe wrote the following to Lieber in a letter dated August 7, 1841 (Huntington Library). "I have read with great interest your M.S.S. on Laura Bridgman. You have given a most ingenious, and for the most part, satisfactory explanation of the intellectual phenomena presented by this remarkable child...As to your question whether I have any objection to the publication of your M.S.S., I certainly can conceive of none. Saving that you attribute too much to my efforts, and to little to the child's capacity, your essay is valuable, and must do good; for it not only is an ingenious philosophical speculation, but it contains a valuable moral..." To give a sense of what Lieber wrote about in the manuscript, the following are some of his titles for the sections within the manuscript: abstract words, preposition difficulties, Laura and rhythm, analysis is late: impressions are entire
[Footnote on the holophrastic connection], Laura's difficulty of the particle or, important aid we derive from analysis of language, and Laura's difficulty to analyze. The interest that is apparent from these section titles is how language development takes place in a deaf-blind individual who has minimal language input on which to base her developing language. In the end, Lieber was never successful at finding a publisher and the manuscript remains almost completely unknown.3

Another case reflecting upon Lieber's interest in language development is his attention to the German language in America. How does a particular language develop and change (i.e. German in Pennsylvania) when it is disconnected from its motherland completely surrounded by a different language? In 1835 Lieber wrote an eight page article entitled Notes on Pennsylvania German. In the article Lieber describes and comments on some of the peculiarities of the German spoken in Pennsylvania. While Lieber himself never published this article, the last half of the article appeared in Reichmann (1945); the first half of the article is apparently lost. (The Huntington Library seems to have only the second half of the article.) Lieber's article is historically important because it is one of the earliest commentaries on Pennsylvania German. In his 1835 monograph, Reminiscences of Barthold George Niebuhr, Lieber was explicit about pointing out the importance of a study of Pennsylvania German for the linguist. "The study of this barbarous dialect [Pennsylvania German] is of the highest interest to the student of the corruption of languages—a subject of paramount importance to every philologist; for it is to the process of corruption [i.e. language change] that the study of the formation of most of our languages naturally leads us. By an inquiry into the German spoken in Pennsylvania, we surprise a language in that moment of transformation through which most modern European idioms have passed... To the student of the English language, in particular, this degenerated daughter of the German idiom is interesting. He finds a repetition of almost every single process by which his own language was formed; though these processes are, in the case of the Pennsylvania German, often but in an incipient stage, and will never go farther, since it is impossible that this dialect can elevate itself of independence" (quoted from Lieber's Miscellaneous Writings, vol. 1: Reminiscences, Addresses, and Essays. 1881, p. 89-90). Thus,
Lieber connected the study of language corruption (i.e. language change) as valuable for the understanding of language development and that Pennsylvania German was of particular importance to the philologist. However, it was not until almost the end of the nineteenth century before Pennsylvania German became a topic of academic inquiry.  

Lieber's interest in language formation extended to his observations on a thriving American language that was becoming in some ways distinct from the language of England. For example, Lieber thought that the emerging American nation influenced the English language: "In the history of the English language the present period will no doubt be pointed out, at some future days as one with renewed vitality in forming words... [A] new life in science, philosophy, religion and politics has naturally imparted a new vigour and a degree of independence to the use of language..." (written around 1850 on the cover of volume vi of his unpublished "Americanisms, Anglicisms, etc. etc." Lieber collection, Huntington Library). Arguably, the most important of Lieber's unpublished language related manuscripts is his "Americanisms, Anglicisms, etc, etc." The manuscript is mentioned by both Heath (1982) and Andresen (1990) under the title of "Notes on Language". This unpublished manuscript consists of 10 small notebooks (each about 6" x 5") with over 800 entries on nearly 400 pages altogether (but not including the index which comprises v. 10). The entries contain Lieber's observations and comments on words and expressions that he considered to be new (i.e., very recent) or whose usage was novel or unusual. Lieber also commented on local vocabulary, slang, and who used these forms. Lieber was particularly interested in words and usages that could be considered Americanisms (i.e., words or usages found in the United States but not in England) or Anglicisms (i.e., those found in England but not in the United States). The bulk of the manuscript was written between 1849-1851 but the later entries are as late as 1860. It is through the entries in this manuscript that we get Lieber's specific observations on the ways in which an American language was developing. 

In reviewing the topics of Lieber's language related writings, we have noted that he wrote about topics such as the German language in America, creole languages, the nature of Native
American languages, and the vocal sounds and language development of Laura Bridgman. He also commented on the developing American language. This range of topics is not opportunistic, but reflects Lieber's real interest in witnessing language development and language change as it occurs. Lieber believed that language change (i.e. the changes that occur in language over time) was inevitable. Normally, such change would be barely perceptible, but in certain circumstances (both at a societal level when major external changes are occurring and at an individual level as in the case of Laura Bridgman), language change and development can be witnessed. Lieber's view is expressed in the following two quotes both from his unpublished and undated notes in the Huntington Library, most likely written around 1835: "Geology shows us that creation is all the time going on, that is to say, we live in the very midst of constant changes, almost or wholly imperceptible at the moment, which, nevertheless at the end of thousands of years appears as one stupendous phenomenon and in beholding which our first idea is always that the thing was called into existence in the state in which we find it (just as formerly government, property, etc). This applies to languages. We see the processes of formation of languages constantly, but of course but slowly." And, along the same lines Lieber writes: "As the decline of languages is gradual, natural and according to certain laws, so their rise. This would not be a proof of itself, but is, I think, an additional proof with the many others we have of the gradual genesis of languages and progressive development of grammar." Given this, what unites the language topics that Lieber was interested in and wrote about is that, for the most part, they involve situations where language change and development were not gradual but could be witnessed. The coming together of different peoples in the Americas and witnessing the outcome of the mixing of languages and their development bore testimony for the language scholar for how languages change and develop took place. Lieber made this point explicit in his article on 'creole dialects' for the *Encyclopedia Americana* (v, 4, p, 13, 1829-1832): "That a careful investigation of the Creole dialects would lead to several interesting discoveries respecting the origin of some grammatical formations and modes of expression, is hardly to be doubted." Consequently, it is not surprising that Lieber would make observations on slave
speech and consider them to be important. Just as creole speech reflects a mixing of languages that could provide a window on the nature of language change and development, so too could that of the language of the southern slaves whose developing language may be influenced by African languages, Caribbean creoles, and the immigrant English dialects of the south, especially that of the Scots-Irish immigrants. In the next section, I will catalogue some of the specific references to slave speech (i.e. early African American English) in Lieber's writings.

3. Lieber's observations on early African American English

In this section I present a selection of the observations and comments that Lieber made regarding the speech of slaves. It is important to keep in mind that Lieber was only familiar with slave speech in South Carolina and his comments refer to the Columbia South Carolina area or other parts of South Carolina as he sometimes specifically indicated. I divide the present section into two parts. Section 3.1 focusses on word usage. I provide various words and expressions that Lieber considered characteristic of slave speech and his comments about them. Section 3.2 focusses on grammar. Here I provide Lieber's most salient observations concerning the grammar of slave speech. While these comments are few, they are most relevant for the issue discussed in Section 1 of this paper regarding the origins of African American English as it relates to the Creolist hypothesis and the English dialects hypothesis. In presenting Lieber's grammar comments I will relate them to this controversy. The general picture that emerges from Lieber's observations on slave speech was that the language situation of slaves in South Carolina was complex and dynamic.

3.1 Observations on word usage

In various writings, published and unpublished, Lieber made occasional observations and comments on the nature of slave speech. While Lieber's *Reminiscences of Niebuhr* and his work on Laura Bridgman have some reference to the speech of slaves, the source that contains the most information is his *Americanisms, Anglicisms, etc etc* compiled in the period from 1849 to
1851. As mentioned in Section 2, this substantial unpublished manuscript consists of 10 small notebooks with over 800 entries containing Lieber's observations and comments on words and expressions that he considered to be new (i.e., very recent) or whose usage was novel or unusual. Of the over 800 entries, roughly 40 make reference to the speech of "servants" or "Negros". Regarding who is being designated by the terms "servants" and "Negros", Lieber makes the following comments on these terms of designation in volume 2, p. 53 of his *Americanisms*. "Servant means here [in South Carolina] always a slave, and is preferred both by whites and coloured, to slave." "Coloured is used by negroes for all who have colour, and also by whites who wish to speak inoffensively. Properly speaking coloured people are mulattos. Negro is disrelished by negroes." Although it is clear from Lieber's comments that his use of "Negro" implies people of African origin (including free blacks no doubt), I will nonetheless assume that when Lieber uses the terms "servants" or "Negros", he is referring mainly to slaves since most of the people of African origin that Lieber would have encountered would have been slaves.

The first several terms used by slaves that I will present from Lieber's writings are terms considered to be of African origin (i.e Africanisms) today. One of these terms is recognized as such by Lieber. In his 1835 *Reminiscences of Niebuhr* Lieber identifies *bukra*, a term which slaves of African origin used to designate white people, as an Africanism. This term, still in use in South Carolina today (spelled 'buckra' in *Dictionary of American Regional English*), is indeed thought to be an Africanism. It occurs in Gullah (Turner 1949, 191) and in Jamaican Creole (Winford 2003, 322). The Oxford English Dictionary suggests that "buckra" comes from the West African language Efik. Lieber's discussion of *bukra* is found in the following passage from his 1835 article, *Reminiscences of Niebuhr*. The passage first presents a quote from Niebuhr followed by Lieber's commentary on it.

[Niebuhr] "It is a mistake to suppose that all the barbarous [borrowed] words in Italian have been introduced by the Teutonic tribes. There are many of Greek, African, and other origin, from Asia Minor and various parts of the world. They were brought by the slaves, became common among the vulgar, and when the
lingua volgare was elevated to the rank of a proper independent language, they, too, were retained."

[Lieber] "What Mr. Niebuhr here asserts may appear bold to some, who cannot imagine how words These, then, might easily transplant a native word of theirs to Rome, and fix it in the new country to an object familiar to their trade and occupation. However, even without this latter explanation, it is quite possible that foreign words become generally used, though imported only by slaves of antiquity, and yet there are some entirely foreign words in general use among them, notwithstanding their origin from so many different countries in Africa. Thus the word Bukra, for white man, is common to all slaves held by owners of the English race."

While Lieber is able to identify bukra as an Africanism, there are other likely Africanisms that he does not identify as such. Consider Lieber's interesting entry for Cuffy in his Americanisms (v. 9, p. 304). "Cuffy (I do not know whether it is thus written) is a nickname for a negro. Formerly it was used without any intention of insult or teasing. But it is not relished now by the negros. Whence does it come? I found Cuffe as a family name in England: "The Reverend Tennison Cuffe, for some years past the minister of Carlisle Episcopal Chapel in Lower Kensington Lane..." [London Spectator Jan. 3, 1852]" The term cuffy to refer to someone of African origin is in all likelihood an Africanism. Turner (1949) mentions it in his work on Gullah and derives it from a common West African day name for Friday, Kofì. It is perhaps revealing as to why Lieber was able to identify bukra as an Africanism in writing in 1835 but not cuffy in his writing around 1850. One could speculate that by 1850 Lieber's interest in creole languages and possible Africanisms had faded as opposed to twenty years prior, a period in which he had written about creole languages and had visited the Caribbean.

Along these lines, it is interesting to consider Lieber's comments on the word tote. This is an old southernism whose origins remain controversial, but could very well be an
Africanism. In some unpublished notes on language written in the late 1830s and found in the Lieber collection at the Huntington, Lieber says the following: "The Southerner "totes' everything, instead of "carries." Yet this word is not improper, though confined to the negroes and those reared with them." Lieber, thus, considered the word tote to be primarily a characteristic of the speech of African descendants. However, more than a decade later, one gets a different sense from his entry for tote in his Americanisms (v. 5, p. 137) where he focuses on a particular use of it. "Tote, the well known southern word for fetching, pulling etc, but I did not know that it is used as a verb neuter, for toting one's self in which it is not quite unlike Dragging one's self. It is thus used at the beginning of the following clip, content of the Columbia Telegraph, June 1, 49... C. once toted into the village tavern." (Note that C. is short for someone's name.) The earlier entry comments on it being a term mainly used by African Americans. The later comment implies its widespread use in the South and discusses a grammar point regarding the verb's use. One way to reconcile the two statements is to suggest that at an earlier period tote was confined largely to those of African origin but by a later period it had become more prevalent in the general population. Such a scenario would be supportive of the view that the word tote is of African origin.

Lieber comments on a number of terms and expressions that he designates as either being used by slaves or by slaves and the "common" (i.e. poor) white people. Almost certainly most of these terms have their origins in the nonstandard English dialects of the British Isles and Lieber occasionally comments on such. One term that Lieber mentions in his 1835 Reminiscences of Niebuhr (p. 142) as characteristic of slave speech that almost certainly does not have an English dialects origin is "[t]he negro word Brautus, for cheap..." where a Spanish origin is suggested. This term does not seem to have survived. Another word used by slaves for which Lieber suggests an origin is his entry for biant in volume 5 (p. 163) of his Americanisms, Anglicisms, etc etc. The entry reads as follows (with the underlining reflecting the original): "Biánt, from beyond
or Be ánt?, a word much used by the negros of this region, perhaps of all S. Carolina. It means too bad, extravagant, beyond endurance, beyond corruption. So e.g. if they see a girl extravagantly dressed, or if a child is peculiarly naughty they will say: You are or she is biánt. They exclaim occasionally merely "biánt!" It is not a tasteless word and it must be owned, very convenient." Lieber adds the following in the margin. "That's biant" equivalent to that beats everything. Is not biánt perhaps Irish? and have not the negros adopted it from them? The common white people use it too, possibly only because it is very convenient." Lieber suggests that what he writes out as biánt might come from the word beyond and it could be an influence of Irish English since, according to Lieber, the common white people use it too. In all likelihood, Lieber's suggestions are correct.

Variants of beyond spelled out as 'beyant' or 'beyont' are found in the Scottish National Dictionary, the Concise Ulster Dictionary, and the English Dialect Dictionary where it is listed as being found in both Scotland and Ireland. The form beyant is also listed in the Dictionary of American Regional English as a chiefly Southern and South Midlands variant of beyond with a reference to 1837. Lieber's suggestion that biánt is an Irish influence is well supported. Thus, what we see in the passage about biánt is a feature that Lieber ascribes to the black speech of South Carolina that has its origins in the nonstandard dialects of the British Isles.

We list here some of the other entries in Lieber's Americanisms, Anglicisms, etc etc where Lieber suggests a particular word or expression is familiar to both slaves and common white people. While I will not discuss the possible source of origin for each term here that Lieber mentions, no doubt at least some of them reflect the nonstandard dialects of the British Isles brought over by Scots-Irish immigrants. As an example of an expression shared by slaves and "low white persons" Lieber mentions in volume 1, p. 32 of his Americanisms the odd sounding "most generally sometimes" which he describes as follows: "A very common expression in the South among negros and low white persons. "Do you go to church?" "Most generally sometimes". If I am asked what is the meaning,
I would answer just what it indicates... It means more than sometimes, less than most generally, brief it means generally."

Some of the words that Lieber ascribes to both slaves and "common white people" include *doty* (or *doddered*), *shed, a turn*, and *pullet*. Lieber gives the following entry for *doty* (volume 8, p. 245 of his *Americanisms*): "Doty is a very common expression here about (Colombia S. C.) for spongey rottenness inside a tree, among common white people and negroes. I do not know how far it extends, or may be provincial even in England." His entry for *shed* reads as follows (v. 8, p. 236 of his *Americanisms*), "I have heard negroes say "the hens shed eggs" and this day a white young man of Fairfield said to me "I want to get shed of this horse", i.e. rid — he wished to sell it." And in volume 4, p. 120 of his *Americanisms*, Lieber writes, "A turn of wood, a quantity carried at one time (in the arms). Our negroes and common white people use it."

His entry for *pullet* in his *Americanisms* (volume 3, p. 72) is interesting since it seems to assume a French origin, though it could be an old dialectal term brought over by Scots-Irish immigrants: "pullet  "From poulet, is used by the negroes etc in the South almost exclusively for all the individuals of the hen tribe, Perhaps a large cock would not be called so." A somewhat different comment regarding word usage can be found in Lieber's entry for *branch* in volume 6, p. 165 of his *Americanisms*: Here, Lieber comments on a term that would not be used or understood. "Branch, the universal term for a brook, a riverlet, in the South of the U. S. The English as well as the Americans oddly call the tributaries of a river, the branches, for instance, the Ohio is a branch of the Mississippi.... Brook would not be understood by our negroes and common people." What Lieber says about *brook* is almost certainly correct as early dialect studies of American English note that *brook* is normally restricted to New England (see, for example, Miller 1983).

In addition to words and expressions that Lieber ascribes to both "negros" and "common white people" there are others which he only ascribes to slaves. In all
likelihood, most of these would have also been used by others and probably have origins in the nonstandard dialects of the British Isles, though I will not include here discussion on the potential sources of these words and expressions. Five examples from Lieber include *ratching, dash, misery, name-a-sense*, and *study*. It is of interest that Lieber considers these terms to be found in the local slave speech and not likely to be widespread. The first of the terms, *ratching*, is mentioned in his article "Vocal Sounds of Laura Bridgman" (cited from p. 471-472 of the version in his *Miscellaneous Writings, vol. 1: Reminiscences, Addresses, and Essays.* "The negroes of the Carolina midland country use the word *ratching* for licking when speaking of cattle." The other words and expressions are mentioned in his *Americanisms*. Lieber says the following about *dash* in volume 1, p. 19: "The negros here use the word *dash*, for spilling, throwing etc". For *misery* he writes (volume 8, p. 237), "The Negros here (Columbia S. C.) say _misery_ for a specific bodily affliction, as "the misery has left my eye and is gone into the arm", i.e. an inflammation or something of the kind." And for *nam-a-sense* (or *name-o-sense*) he gives (volume 8, p. 264), "from name of common sense i.e. in the name of common sense, a negro exclamation of surprise. This is common here (middle of S.C.)." Finally, Lieber's entry for *study* as a term used among slaves is noteworthy because he almost certainly misunderstands it (volume 8, p. 259-260). "Negros here in Columbia, and I doubt not in much wider extent, call studying, when they stop in the middle of their work, as they frequently do, and dream or think nothing. A servant girl will occasionally stop in the midst of sweeping a room, and when asked what she is doing, will answer: _I was studying..._ They seem thus to take *studying* to be free from physical work..." It is quite possible that the use of *study* in this context has the meaning of "thinking" or "concentrating" about something. Such a meaning is attested at this period (Oxford English Dictionary) and its use with this meaning is common in contemporary African American English.
As a final related matter, Lieber occasionally mentions pronunciation features of words that he views as characteristic of slave speech. In volume 7, p. 216 of his *Americanisms* he states the following: "Our negroes say ligious for religious, piscopalian for episcopalian etc". This reflects the deletion of the first syllable of a word if it is stressless. This is a known characteristic of older African American English (see Vaughn Cooke 1987). Another observation involving pronunciation is mentioned by Lieber in his unpublished manuscript on Laura Bridgman written around 1840 where he writes, "You will remember how long a negro dwells upon the word little, when he says a leetle leetle bit in order to express the minimum of the thing." This observation is interesting both for the pronunciation of the vowel in the word little. Such a pronunciation is not uncommon today in southern varieties of American English (as spoken by both whites and blacks). It is also interesting because how the repetition (or reduplication) or the word adds to the meaning of the expression. This use of reduplication perhaps can be viewed as an Africanism.

3.2 Observations related to grammar

While most of Lieber's observations on slave speech refer to the usage of particular words and expressions, Lieber sometimes makes observations that pertain to grammar. As an example of a specific grammatical observation consider Lieber's entry for sawed in his *Americanisms* (volume 9, p. 347-348). "A negro said to me: I have sawed. I have heard it of common white people, too. 1. Imperfect for participle saw for seen as people here (S.C.) say: I have went  2. Participal form added to imperfect sawed. Now this is not more than was done with the Latin." Not only does Lieber make an observation on a nonstandard grammatical feature (i.e. the use of "I have sawed" instead of "I have seen") but he provides an explanation of its logic and notes a similar construction in Latin. Because of the nature of Lieber's observations and comments related to the grammar of slave speech they can be considered pertinent to the
contemporary issue discussed in Section 1 of this paper concerning whether the origins of
African American English lay in creole speech (the Creolist hypothesis) or in the English
dialects of the British Isles (the English dialects hypothesis). I will try to show that his
observations provide support for both the English dialects hypothesis which states that
African American English has its roots in the nonstandard dialects of the British Isles that
were brought over by the white immigrants and the weaker version of the Creolist
hypothesis which states that a pidgin/creole type speech was an element in the formative
stage in the development of African American English. In a sense, Lieber's grammar
comments are unique because they do seem to provide direct evidence for a pidgin/creole
influence on slave speech in the American South.

Certainly the most intriguing of Lieber's observations on the speech of slaves
occurs in his unpublished manuscript on Laura Bridgman, written between 1839-1841.
In the passage quoted below, Lieber is describing an early stage in the language
development of Laura Bridgman where she has active verbs and nouns, but no indication
of tense, plurality distinctions, or articles. That is, her language only contains the content
words and not the function words or suffixes. Lieber writes the following (p. 50): "All
this, as indeed many other peculiarities in Laura's language, which to this stage of her
education consisted chiefly in a juxtaposition of words, resembles very much the Chinese
language and manner of expression, etc, as on the other hand it is not unlike the language
of some of our most untutored field negroes, who likewise strip language of all inflection,
all expression of mood, nearly all of time, of gender, number or whatever else may serve
to express anything more that what I would feel tempted to call the roots of ideas and
depend almost wholly upon bare juxtaposition." Lieber's description in this passage of
the grammatical characteristics of the "most untutored field negroes" is striking. Lieber
seems to be describing a language spoken by some of the field slaves in the area of
Columbia South Carolina (where Lieber resided) that lacks the inflectional endings
(suffixes) and function words that indicate such things as tense and plurality; ideas are
expressed just by the juxtaposition of a sequence of content words without the functional
words and suffixes. Given that such grammatical features are often characteristic of
pidgin/creole type speech, the passage is of significance because it seems to suggest that
a pidgin/creole form of speech was spoken among some field slaves as late as 1840. One
can speculate that the "most untutored field negros" that Lieber refers to are those slaves
with the least amount of contact with the ambient white speech, perhaps acquiring their
language from field slaves who spoke English as a second language or who might have
been creole speakers. Lieber's observation concerning the speech of "untutored field
negros" is also noteworthy given McWhorter's (2000) claim that no contemporary
observations were ever made by travellers or others on the possible creole nature of
American slave speech outside the Gullah area (i.e., the low country of South Carolina
that includes Charleston and the Sea Islands; Columbia is not in the low country).
Lieber's comments would constitute such an observation made by an individual keenly
aware of language and familiar with Caribbean creoles. Lieber's observation, then, can
be taken as constituting evidence for at least the weak version of the Creolist hypothesis,
that is, that a pidgin/creole type speech was an important element present in the formative
stage of the development of African American English.

A second intriguing observations of Lieber's that relates to grammar is found in
his entry for the word *done* in his unpublished *Americanisms, Anglicisms, etc. etc.*
(volume 6, p. 167). Lieber comments on what English dialectologist today refer to as
'perfective done' a feature common in southern American English as well as in
contemporary African American Vernacular English. Perfective *done* refers to the use of
*done* instead of *have* (or in addition to *have*) to express the perfective as in "They done
gone" (or "They have done gone"). Dialectologists know that perfective *done* originated
in the American South in the nineteenth century. It is an Americanism in that it is not
found with the same meaning in English dialects of the British Isles. Lieber's comments
are almost certainly the earliest explanation on the development of perfective *done* in
southern English. The relevant part of the entry reads as follows (with the original underlining): "Done is the word by which the negros of the southern U.S. form the participle past, similar to the process by which the modern languages substituted the auxiliary have with the participle of the simple form of the ancient perfect... Now the negros use this done either with the participle present which is rare of past or the infinitive, and often, may generally leave out the auxiliary have, thus for I have gone there they say: I have done going there; I done going there, I done gone there, I done go there (rather thaaar). The lower white persons have much adopted this done, which is an amplification and still further fixing of the idea of the past, the completion of an action."

Lieber then adds the following in a side note. "Nothing is more common for a negro man to say: "I done do it", i.e. I have done it, "I done dig" I have dug, I have finished digging. The negros of the "low country" (near Charleston etc) will say "I done for go" i.e. "I have been going there."

Lieber's last sentence is important. "I done for go" reflects older Gullah speech and is found in Turner (1949). By specifying "the low country (near Charleston etc)" Lieber is indicating that the speech here is different than in other parts of South Carolina. The low country is the area associated with the creole-like Gullah speech. On the strong version of the Creolist hypothesis mentioned in Section 1, a creole type speech was widespread throughout the plantation south in the antebellum period; the Gullah dialect today, spoken in the Sea Islands of South Carolina by elderly African Americans, would be the last remnant of that plantation creole. However, Lieber's specific mentioning of a feature that is known to be Gullah (i.e. "I done for go"), and restricting it to the South Carolina low country, suggests that a Gullah type speech was always restricted to the Sea Islands (as suggested in the works of McWhorter 2000 and Mufwene 2000). This argues against the strong version of the Creolist hypothesis that a Gullah type creole was widespread in the plantation South.
While Lieber's comment on *done for* can be taken as arguing against the strong version of the Creolist Hypothesis, his comments on perfective *done* can be interpreted as providing an interesting argument for the weak version of the Creolist Hypothesis which maintains that some pidgin/creole speech was an element in the formative stage of African American English. In fact, Lieber's specific comments are suggestive that perfective *done* was shaped by both an English dialectal source and a creole source. As discussed by Winford (1998, 132) perfective *Done* is known to have potential sources both in English creoles and British dialects. Different researchers have ascribed *done* in African American English to these sources. For example, Dillard (1972, 219) claims a pidgin/creole source for *done*. Schneider (1982, 25) maintains that *done* is a long-standing dialectal feature of English that was brought over by British settlers, and, according to Feagin (1991), the Scots-Irish settlers were instrumental in its diffusion. Lieber's comments on perfective *done* can be seen as supporting both views and that the Dialectologist Hypothesis and the weak version of the Creolist Hypothesis are not mutually exclusive even with respect to a single feature. Notice that Lieber cites both the forms "I done gone there" and "I done go there" for "I have gone there". In the side note he also observes that it is common for blacks to use forms such as "I done do it" and "I done dig". One difference noted by Schneider (1982) and Winford (1998) between creole *done* and settler dialectal *done* is that an uninflected verb stem after an auxiliary and the perfective meaning reflect the creole construction whereas the past participle form after *done* (and the optional use of *have* before *done*) is reflective of the settler dialects. That Lieber cites both "I done gone there" and "I done go there" as coexistent suggests a British dialect source for the former and a creole source for the latter. This can be taken as supporting the weak version of the Creolist hypothesis, that a pidgin/creole type speech was an important element present in the formative stage of the development of African American English. (See Davis 2003 for further discussion on perfective *Done.*
While Lieber's observations on grammatical features of slave speech discussed above can be taken as evidence for a weak version of the Creolist hypothesis, other observations provide evidence for the English dialects hypothesis. Clearly, some of the words and expressions discussed in Section 3.1 (such as bıant) have the origins in Scots-Irish or other nonstandard dialects of the British Isles. An interesting observation that relates to grammar that supports the English dialects hypothesis concerns Lieber's discussion of the meaning and grammatical use of the preposition till. He provides the following anecdote and discussion in volume 6 (p. 179) of his *Americanisms*. "I just had to read a letter to Rose our black girl. It was dictated by her lover to McDonald, an Irishman. In this letter till was invariably used for to, e.g. tell till Lucy etc. Is this negroish or Irish? I know children and illiterate persons frequently use till applied to space instead of restricting it to time. They would say: "This road goes clear till Roxbury." In German bis means both; nor is there any clear distinction between the two in the mind, time and space being so very analogous. Indeed length of time is always imagined in our mind as extension in space — as a long space. But the English language makes the distinction between the two adverbs and one must obey." This passage is interesting for at least a couple of reasons. First, Lieber gives a rather sophisticated linguistic explanation for why the meaning of till and to can be confused. It reflects upon Lieber's linguistic awareness and thinking. More to the point, however, the passage reflects the difficulty in ascribing a feature of black speech as something specifically characteristic to blacks or to the influence of the ambient white dialects. Thus, Lieber wonders whether the peculiar use of till is "negroish or Irish." It almost certainly originates with the latter. The *Scottish National Dictionary* notes that till for to is confined to Scotland and northern England. The variation between these two forms is also noted in the *Concise Ulster Dictionary*. Thus, this particular usage of till found in slave speech is supportive of the English dialects hypothesis.
In this section I have presented a selection of Lieber's observations and comments regarding the nature of slave speech. In Section 3.1 we focussed on his comments on words and expressions and in Section 3.2 we focussed on his comments related to grammar. I have maintained that Lieber's observation on slave speech can be seen as providing evidence for both the English dialects hypothesis and the weak version of the creolist hypothesis. Taken together, Lieber's observation on slave speech paint a complex picture of the language situation of slaves in South Carolina. On the one hand, as illustrated by the anecdote in Lieber's entry for *till* mentioned above, many slaves were in close contact with whites and interacted with them. In the anecdote related by Lieber, there is an African American male dictating to an Irishman a personal letter. Lieber, of German origin, reads the letter to his domestic servant. Such close contacts between blacks and whites makes for mutual language influence. It is that type of situation where one can easily understand how features of Irish English can have a significant influence on slave speech. On the other hand, given Lieber's observations about the "most untutored field negros" who "strip language of all inflection, all expression of mood, nearly all of time, of gender, number or whatever else may serve to express anything more that what I would feel tempted to call the roots of ideas and depend almost wholly upon bare juxtaposition",

it does seem that a certain proportion of the slave population had very little contacts with whites which then would be conducive for the maintenance of pidgin/creole type speech. This observation of Lieber's is interesting because it may help us understand the source for certain features of contemporary African American Vernacular English in which there is a tendency to drop inflectional endings (in comparison with standard English) and use juxtaposition to expressive the possessive. Wolfram (2000, 2003) provides evidence from the speech of elderly African Americans and the speech of African Americans in isolated rural communities that these are "distinctive long-term ethnolinguistic structures" in African American English. It is intriguing to speculate that such features go back to a
pidgin/creole type speech that go back to field slaves that had very little contact with whites and the ambient English. Lieber's observation suggest a complex picture of the speech of slaves in the antebellum South

4. Conclusion

In this paper I have presented a substantial number of Francis Lieber's observations on slave speech. These observations relate to both word usage and grammar. I have tried to show that Lieber's observations are an important source for the nature of early African American English, especially as it relates to the controversy over its origins. In Section 2 of this paper I provided a background summary on Lieber's language-related interest so as to supply a context for his interest in slave speech. As discussed in that section, Lieber was interested in the process of language change and development and took particular note of how various external factors affected the development of the European languages in America. This connects his interest in the creole languages of the Caribbean with the speech of the Germans of Pennsylvania and with his observations on Americanisms. Given his sojourn in the South and his familiarity with slave culture, it would seem only natural that Lieber would make meaningful observations about slave speech. But Lieber is unusual among academics of the antebellum period. He is a southern academic, European educated, who never truly embraced the racial ideology of the South. [Footnote: See O'Brien this volume regarding this] The prevailing racial ideology made it difficult for any scholar in the South who was intimate with slavery to make meaningful observations on the nature of slave speech, whether public or private. In conclusion, Lieber is probably unique. It is unlikely that we will find private academic writings as an untapped source for reference on early African American English other than what we find amongst the writings of Francis Lieber.
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1. Lieber's favorable comparison of the Native American languages to the classical languages was probably best put in his 1845 article "The First Constituents of Civilization" (p. 221-222 of the version reprinted in his Miscellaneous Writings, vol. 1: Reminiscences, Addresses, and Essays, 1881) "When we contemplate a perfect language, such as the Greek or Sanscrit, or the surprising character of the holophrastic idioms of our Indians, we are lost indeed in amazement, and cannot conceive how man, unaided by superior intellect, should have ever invented so stupendous a scheme."

2. [Footnote: Lieber entitled the manuscript "Laura Bridgman or an Account of the Education of a Girl Blind, Deaf and Dumb Founded upon the Report of S. G. Howe M. D. with a Portrait and Facsimile By Francis Lieber in Letters to his Son". The manuscript contains a very full 84 pages with each page being approximately 9"x13". In writing the manuscript, Lieber used the literary device of framing sections of the manuscript as individual letters addressed to his young son Oscar. Lieber had used a similar device with some success earlier in the 1830s in his Stranger in America, an account of his travels in upstate New York in letters addressed to a friend in Germany]

3. There is a somewhat involved story as to why the manuscript was never published that includes it being lost and then found, and Howe wanting to co-author with Lieber a different manuscript on Laura Bridgman. Some of the specifics are traced in Davis 2002.

4. Around the same time that Lieber was compiling notes on Pennsylvania German he was also writing German grammar for English speakers entitled"A Brief and Practical German Grammar on a New Plan with Particular Reference to the Grammatical Affinities Between the German and English Idioms Together with a Copious Collection of Extracts from Some of the Best German Writers (Part II)". In this work there are 33 lessons and three appendices. The grammar was
never published but not for lack of trying. Lieber engaged his two well-connected Massachusetts friends, Charles Sumner and John Pickering, to help him find a publisher. Sumner mentions the lack of success in finding publication for the manuscript in a letter to Lieber dated January 9, 1836. (See Palmer, Beverly *The Selected Letters of Charles Sumner* (v. 1) Boston: Northeastern University Press, p. 18. [year]). More than a year later, John Pickering pointed out in a letter to Lieber, "Dr. Follen's grammar being now in the market would be something of an impediment and would tend to limit the circulation of yours." [Letter of John Pickering to Francis Lieber April 19, 1837, Huntington Library] The reference here is to the German emigré and Harvard professor Charles Follen's German grammar which was used in college German classes at the time (and went through many subsequent printings). Lieber's grammar was never published and remains almost completely unknown today.

5. Not surprising, Lieber was also interested in language origins. See Catalano (this volume).

6. One possibility that needs to be considered is that Lieber's comments regarding untutored field slaves is a stereotype held by those familiar with slave speech (especially those also familiar with the language situation in the Caribbean) and not on actual observation of the speech of field slaves. However, Lieber had personal interactions with slaves and kept fairly detailed notes on slavery in his private writings.

7. The discussion of perfective *done* here is abbreviated from Davis (2003).