

A SHORT HISTORY OF WRITING INSTRUCTION FROM ANCIENT GREECE TO TWENTIETH-CENTURY AMERICA

Edited by James J. Murphy

The first systematic coverage of the teaching of writing through twenty-five centuries of Western culture.

Chapter		Page
	Preface	v
I	Writing Instruction in Ancient Athens After 450 B.C. Kathleen E. Welch	1
II	Roman Writing Instruction as Described by Quintilian James J. Murphy	19
III	The Teaching of Writing in Medieval Europe Marjorie Curry Woods	77
IV	Rhetoric and Writing in Renaissance Europe and England Don Paul Abbott	95
V	Writing Instruction in Great Britain: Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries Winifred Bryan Horner	121
VI	From Rhetoric to Composition: The Teaching of Writing in America to 1900 S. Michael Halloran	151
VII	Writing Instruction in School and College English, 1890-1985 James A. Berlin	183
	Appendix / Glossary of Key Terms	223
	Bibliography	235

DETACH AND MAIL

No. of Copies:

_____ paper @ \$9.95 ea. \$ _____
ISBN 0-9611800-6-4
_____ hardbound @ \$19.50 ea. \$ _____
ISBN 0-9611800-7-2
Calif. res. add 6 1/4% Sales Tax: \$ _____
Shipping: \$ _____
TOTAL: \$ _____

ORDER FORM

Method of Payment:

- Payment Enclosed
 Purchase Order Attached
 VISA / MasterCard

Card No.: _____

Exp. Date: _____

Signature: _____

Order From:

Customer Service
UCD Book Store
University of California
Davis, CA 95616
Phone Orders: 916/752-6846

Ship To: _____

Shipping is normally by U.P.S.
Shipping cost: \$3.00 up to 5 copies, 50¢ per copy over 5 copies.

THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY for the history of linguistic ideas

NEWSLETTER

Issue No.17

November 1991

CONTENTS

Editorial	1
Miscellaneous notes	3
Reports on Conferences	3
Forthcoming Conferences	10
Sweet, Europe and Phonetics, by Michael MacMahon	12
Notices of Books Received	19
Publications Received	27
News of Members	32

THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY
FOR THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC IDEAS

President: Professor Anna M. Davies, M.A., F.B.A.
Vice-President: Professor Ian Michael, C.B.E., Ph.D., Hon.D.Litt.

Executive Committee:

Chairman: Professor R.H. Robins, M.A., D.Lit., F.B.A.
General Secretary: Brigitte Nerlich, Dr.Phil.
Treasurer: J.L. Flood, M.A., Ph.D.
Editor (*Newsletter*): Andrew Wawn, B.A., Ph.D.
Conference Secretary: Vivien Law, B.A., Ph.D.
Librarian: Mrs Jean Robinson
Committee Members: Wendy Ayres-Bennett, M.A., D.Phil.
John Levitt, M.A.
Anneli Luhtala, fil. mag.
M.K.C. MacMahon, B.A., Ph.D.
Professor Rebecca Posner, M.A., D.Phil.
Professor J.L. Subbiondo, M.A.
Laura Wright, M.A., D.Phil.

The Henry Sweet Society was founded in February 1984 with the following aims:

'to promote and encourage the study of the history of all branches of linguistic thought, theoretical and applied, and including non-European traditions.'

Its fields of interest will include:

'the history both of the major subject-areas of linguistics and also of more specialised topics, such as writing systems, literacy, rhetoric, and the application of linguistic ideas within the professional and technical fields, such as medicine.'

The Society hopes to realise these aims by:

(1) keeping members in touch with one another by issuing regular Newsletters;

(2) arranging at least one meeting every year, either:

(a) a residential conference (but not normally in years when the International Conference on the History of the Linguistic Sciences is to meet), or

(b) shorter colloquia; in either case, such conferences or colloquia would be held in conjunction with the A.G.M. of the society.

Membership of the Society is open to all persons engaged in scholarly study and research appropriate to the society's aims; associate membership is open to undergraduates and to graduate students of not more than five years' standing since registration.

Applications for membership (which are subject to the approval of the Committee) should be made to the Treasurer: Dr J.L. Flood, Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London, 29 Russell Square, London, WC1B 5DP, and should be accompanied by the appropriate fee (see inside back cover), which provides for the cost of at least two newsletters yearly, postage and administration.

[continued on inside back cover]

THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY

for the history of linguistic ideas

Issue No. 17

November 1991

NEWSLETTER

EDITORIAL

The editorship changes, but there is no change in the aims of this and future issues of the *HSS Newsletter*. As members turn the pages of this new issue, and stumble upon errors of omission and commission, justifiable wrath at the new editor's assorted bunglings might charitably take the form of a deep sense of gratitude for the Herculean editorial labours of Professor Paul Salmon, under whose fastidious and energetic stewardship such errors would never have occurred! The Society owes Paul an enormous debt for much dedicated and fruitful work in developing the *Newsletter* as an important focus for scholarly contacts and information relating to all aspects of the history of linguistic ideas.

Andrew Wawn

AN INTRODUCTORY WORD FROM THE GENERAL SECRETARY.

When I came to Oxford in September 1984 to participate in the first colloquium organised by the Henry Sweet Society, I came as a simple PhD student, as a friend of Simone Delesalle, and a member of the *Société d'Histoire et d'Epistémologie des Sciences du Langage*. I never thought for a moment that I would take up a post at Oxford the next year, marry there and stay in England. However, all these events brought about an ever deeper involvement with the history of linguistic ideas and the Henry Sweet Society. The first becoming somehow my intellectual haven, the second my institutional one.

The years between 1984 and 1991 have seen a steady increase in the interest taken in the history of linguistics all over the world, but especially in England, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States, which all have now their respective societies. This increase is to no small extent due to the steady rise in the amount of work and effort put into the running of the *Henry Sweet Society* by Vivian Salmon. I am sure that I will not be able to match her energy (sapped quite substantially by my son Matthew) and her know-how. But I am sure that my enthusiasm is undiminished, and that I shall try to convey some of it to my work for the Society. I also want to exploit my German and French affiliations to extend and stabilise the rapport between the different national and international organisations which try to promote the cause of the history and historiography of the language sciences.

I would therefore like to invite all our members to stay in touch with me, send me newsworthy items, complain, if necessary, make suggestions and comments, and anything else that comes to mind.

Brigitte Nerlich

HSS COLLOQUIUM 1992: CALL FOR PAPERS

The next meeting of the Henry Sweet Society will be held on 4-7 September 1992 at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. Abstracts of approximately 200 words in length should be sent to the Conference Secretary, Dr Vivien Law, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge CB2 3HU, before 15 April 1992. Further information and a booking form will be provided in the next issue of the *Newsletter*.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

British Linguistic Newsletter.

The *British Linguistic Newsletter* is published monthly from October to June. Further details may be obtained from the Editor, Dr. Siew-Yue Killingley, 9 Rectory Drive, Newcastle upon Tyne NE3 1XT.

The Henry Sweet Memorial Appeal.

Members will be pleased to hear of an extremely generous donation from Professor Shunichi Noguchi, 1354 Kujo-Cho, Yamato-Koyiyama-shi, Japan. As reported in *Newsletter* 16, p.7, such contributions are devoted to the upkeep of Henry Sweet's grave. Vivian Salmon reports that a party from the September 1991 HSS Keble Colloquium found the grave and surrounds in 'excellent order'.

Antiquarian reprints.

Georg Olms have published a series of antiquarian reprints, with some linguistic items which may be of interest to members of the society - works by Bopp, Brockelmann, Schleicher, Schrader, Benfey and others. Details from Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hagentorwall 7, D- 3200 Hildesheim, Germany.

REPORTS ON CONFERENCES

HSS Eighth Annual Colloquium, Keble College, Oxford, 3-5 September 1991.

Papers were presented by:

Michael MacMahon, 'The IPA and the teaching of reading, 1886-1914'

L. Formigari, 'The mind-body problem in Herder's theory of language'.

Ineke Sluiter, 'Not a grammarian's grammar'.

Malcolm Parkes, 'Neglected evidence for linguistic analysis: scribal practice in manuscripts of the 8th to the 11th centuries'.

A. Luhtala, 'The nuclear clause in Priscians *Institutiones*'.

W. Hüllen, "'to learn shortly frenssh and englyssh": a close reading of William Caxton's *Dialogues* (1483)'.

Carol Percy, 'English female grammarians in the 18th century'.

Frances Austin, 'The best companions: basic essentials of English and letter-writing for young men 1681-1853'.

E.Poppe, 'Some features of early modern Welsh grammaticography'.

Rüdiger Schreyer, 'Facts into artefacts: savage speech and 18th-century theoretical history of language'.

Ian Michael, 'John Wallis and the influence of "sea-water"'.
 J.Beal, 'Thomas Spence and his *Grand Repository of the English Language* (1775)'.

Chris Stray, "'Une entente grammaticale cordiale": Edward Sonnenschein and the politics of linguistic authority in England c1880-1930'.

Wendy Ayres-Bennett, 'The distribution of symbols: some differences between Sweet and Passy'.

W.Terrence Gordon, 'Ogden and Richards' *The Meaning of Meaning*: early reception, current assessments, unwritten revisions'.

Konrad Koerner, 'Chomsky's readings of Saussure's *Cours*'.

F.J.Stuurman, 'Grammar in the dictionary: the case of Poutsma's *Dictionary*'.

Richard C.L.Matthews, 'Modes, minds and meaning'.

Inaugural Conference of ESSE (The European Society for the Study of English). Vivian Salmon writes:

This conference took place in Norwich at the University of East Anglia, from 4 - 8 September, 1991, and attracted some 600 participants from most countries in Western, and several in Eastern, Europe.

The majority of members were specialists in literary studies, and the organisers expressed their regret that more papers on language were not offered. Nevertheless, several sections were devoted to topics which would have interested many of our members, for example, Translation, Lexicography, Linguistics and Literature, Linguistics and the teaching of English, the History of the English Language, and Specialised Englishes.

The section devoted to the History of English Linguistic Ideas was organised by Professor Hüllen and Vivian Salmon; two periods of one and three quarter hours each were allocated to five papers, the last paper being an addition to those already noted in *Newsletter* 15, (p.35). This paper, by a new member of the Society, Professor Terrence Gordon, filled a gap admirably, dealing with a topic (semantics), a period (twentieth century) and a scholar (Ogden), not previously catered for. The sections

attracted some 15 participants - an encouraging number in view of the plethora of sections being offered simultaneously. Most regrettably, the section on the History of English Language coincided exactly with the section on the History of English Linguistic Ideas, and participants in one or other expressed great regret that they could not have been present at both.

As noted in *Newsletter* 16 (p.16), papers of interest to our members were also offered in the section on Lexicography, so altogether there were seven papers on various aspects of the History of English Linguistic Ideas. The papers offered on Anglo-Saxon and Middle English would also no doubt have proved attractive to many members.

The organisers made a brave attempt to provide evening sessions which would be likely to interest all participants in the conference, whatever their specialisms. On one night they arranged a discussion on Contemporary English Drama, and on another a reading of his own poetry by Tony Harrison. Both events attracted large numbers, as did the final discussion meeting on various aspects of the conference. It was then announced that the next meeting will be held in 1993 at Bordeaux.

Everyone enjoyed the conference immensely, and warm thanks are due to the organisers, particularly the Chairman, Dr Robert Clark, of the University of East Anglia. Members may find brief abstracts of papers from the History of English Linguistic Ideas group of interest:

John Hart and Sixteenth-Century Orthography. (Vivian Salmon, Oxford)

The papers in this section provide a brief survey of the history of linguistic thought in Britain between the introduction of printing and the present day. In each century one linguistic topic is of primary importance and one scholar is taken as representative of the best linguistic thought of his or her time. The subject of crucial importance in the sixteenth century was the relationship of sound and written symbol - a topic with both theoretical and practical implications, the latter because of printers' need to adopt a spelling system comprehensible to speakers of differing regional accents.

The earliest published discussion of the issue was that of John Rastell, in a text which survives only in fragments. Thereafter, scholarly argument about the correct pronunciation of classical Greek led to similar discussions on the correct pronunciation and spelling of English, and the outstanding scholar in his fields was John Hart (d. 1574). Hart published two works on English orthography, left one in manuscript, and proposed a further text on the teaching of writing, which never appeared. His achievements lie especially in his accurate and intelligent grasp of phonetic theory and its application to English sounds, as well as the design of a new and attractive character in which one graph represented one sound, and vice versa. It has sometimes been claimed that there is no more intelligent phonetician until the nineteenth century; even if this is not altogether accurate, he was undoubtedly one of the most distinguished early linguists.

John Wilkins's universal language. Present day historiographical interests in a linguistic failure. (Werner Hüllen, Essen).

John Wilkins drew up the most detailed sample of the many universal languages current in the 17th century. It will be sketched and explained as a result of Ramist and Baconian thinking together with ideas typical of the founders of the Royal Society. Its treatment of lexis and word-formation, in the framework of a universalist grammar, will be held against subsequent and contemporary developments of scientific language which make John Wilkins's work not so much a forerunner of Esperanto etc., but of standardised means of scientific communication.

Robert Lowth and eighteenth-century grammar. (Carol Percy, Toronto)

A short introduction to English grammar was published anonymously in 1762, though the contemporary *Monthly Review* identified its author as Dr Robert Lowth, later the Bishop of London. The book's title echoes that of William Lily's Latin grammar, and in the later eighteenth century Lowth was to English grammar what Lily had been to Latin grammar in England since the sixteenth century. Lowth's numerous quotations illustrating the violation of grammar rules by 'our most approved authors' no doubt ensured the book's immediate success, its enormous influence on later works, and its present notoriety as the epitome of eighteenth-century prescriptive grammar.

The grammar was very much of its time. Literary and textual critics had already subjected Shakespeare's language to similar scrutiny. Lowth's plea for the formal study of the English language in schools can be read in the prefaces of many earlier works. His focus on elementary syntax, sustained through successive editions, can be anticipated elsewhere. Admiring references to treatises on universal grammar and on Anglo-Saxon, as well as Lowth's writings elsewhere on Hebrew, further help to place in context Lowth's concern with the simplicity and accuracy of the English language.

From Bentham to Basic English: the Applied Semantics of C.K.Ogden. (W.T. Gordon, Dalhousie)

The link between *The Meaning of Meaning* (C.K.Ogden and I.A.Richards) and Basic English is stressed in Richards' retrospective accounts of the book's genesis, though with the admission that Basic English was wholly Ogden's invention. Ogden originally drew together passages from *The Meaning of Meaning* and Bentham's linguistic thought to explain the principles on which Basic simplifies full English, but he later emphasised the Benthamic sources of Basic English almost exclusively. This paper examines those sources and the question of whether the contrasting emphases of Ogden and Richards imply any repudiation on Ogden's part of the principles articulated in *The Meaning of Meaning*.

Firth Conference

J. R. Firth (1890-1960) held the first Chair of General Linguistics in a British University at the School of Oriental and African Studies (University of London), and it was there that a centenary conference in his honour was arranged on 20 and 21 June

1991, attended by many of his own pupils, among some 70 scholars from all parts of the world.

The first day's proceedings were introduced by R. H. Robins with an account of Firth, the man and his work, and the papers on that day were concerned with the implications of his semantic theories. The notion of the contextual approach to situation and collocation underlay the papers, with the words 'pragmatic' and 'context' appearing in several of the titles. It is noticeable that Firthian concepts have become much more strongly formalized in the hands of the present generation of pragmatists, but his seminal principle that utterances have to be understood in what he called "the mush of goings-on" is shown to be fully justified: expression is conditioned by the physical environment shared by speaker and listener, which determines how much data can safely be omitted without injuring comprehension; and, in addition, the language system itself has built-in indicators which enable the speaker to convey a meaning without specifying each item, and enable the listener to interpret the reduced specification correctly. The exemplification was in English; many of the considerations, however, probably have a general application, and it would be interesting to see some comparative studies based on different languages.

The second day was introduced by F. R. Palmer, who spoke on "Prosodic analysis and its place in linguistics". Other papers dealt in detail with Firth's analysis of suprasegmental phenomena in English and other languages. There were, for example, illuminating illustrations of the way prosodic analysis can explain how confusions can arise between utterances which on a simple segmental analysis would appear to be adequately differentiated, or how such an analysis can be applied, with important social consequences, in the diagnosis and treatment of speech defects. Most striking of all for this writer, however, was a practical demonstration of speech synthesis, which subjected speech sounds to a rigorous quantifiable analysis using prosodic principles, and resulted in a most lifelike reproduction of spoken English word and sentence intonation far transcending the dreary monotone of most such devices.

Firth did not leave a consistent and large body of fully developed theoretical writings, and the relationship of the modern developments to Firth's original and highly individual approach was not always made explicit. Common to his semantic and phonetic theories was a sense of language as an ongoing process of coming to terms with a physical, mental and acoustic environment; this conference demonstrated that his ideas live on vigorously, and what might be called a 'third generation' of scholars vindicated them triumphantly.

Paul Salmon, Oxford

Colloque International: Universités Européennes, Sciences du Langage et Enseignement des Langues. Mouvements d'Innovation de 1880 à 1914. 26-28 September 1991.

The Colloque was part of the centenary celebration of the Ecole de Langue et de Civilisation Françaises of the University of Geneva, with the collaboration of a number of academic societies, and grouped together some fifty participants from Europe - Southern Europe seemed to be rather less well represented than other parts. It proved a highly successful occasion, superbly well organised, and facilitating animated discussion outside as well as inside the conference halls, within the modern central building of Uni Dufour. The weather, alas, did little to help the success of the colloquium, as it rained almost incessantly, but this did not dampen spirits.

Apart from the plenary sessions, addressed by René Amacker of Geneva, Willem Frijhoff of Rotterdam and Herbert Christ of Giessen, discussions were grouped under three thematic headings: 1. Universities, academics, scholarship and social demand for languages between 1880 and 1914; 2. Methodological debate on the teaching of languages between 1880 and 1914; 3. International circulation of linguistic ideas and policies between 1880 and 1914. Movement between the sections was made easy by the strictly enforced timetable - but one could only regret being able to hear only one-third of the papers. It was particularly instructive to discover that during the period in question the problems faced and solutions sought were similar all over Europe.

One slight criticism could be made by those from Northern and Eastern Europe whose second language was English, and who may have felt frustrated by the preponderance of French at the colloquium, in spite of the efforts of the organisers to give equal weight to both languages. However, the atmosphere was so cordial that non-Francophones soon found themselves at home.

The papers presented at the colloquium will be published in various revues and collections, according to their thematic coverage.

Interpretation und Rekonstruktion. IV International Colloquium of the *Studienkreis* "Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft".

The Fourth International Colloquium of the *Studienkreis* 'Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft' (SGdS), took place, as had already been decided before the reunification of the two German states, on September 17 and 18, 1991 in the East German university town of Halle a.d. Saale. The host was this time the Department of Romance Philology at the Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg. Professor Gerda Haßler had very kindly agreed to be in charge of the local organisation. She was supported in this task by the management of the *Studienkreis* in the person of K.D.

Dutz, a function he has exercised already at previous colloquia of the *Studienkreis*.

All in all this conference has been a rewarding experience for the 50 participants from the new and old *Länder* of the BRD, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Sweden and the USSR, and this in several respects. I am not just thinking of the increase in personal and general knowledge, which one can expect from any good conference, but also of the many lively and deep discussions which took place during the conference itself and around it (in most cases until late into the night). The choice of the conference venue gave everybody the additional possibility to get a direct insight into the problems involved in the 'growing together' of the western and eastern parts of Germany and to contribute to a better mutual understanding.

The general topic of the conference, "Interpretation and Reconstruction", was broad enough to accommodate any topic whatsoever as long as it contributed to the historiography of linguistics. But several clusters of subjects emerged when the applications arrived and the papers were skilfully allotted their slots in the conference. A first focus was a complex of the subjects concerning universal language with the two opening papers by David Cram (Oxford) and Jan Noordegraaf (Amsterdam). Two talks concerning particular examples of linguistics modelling itself on other disciplines (Bernd Naumann, Erlangen; Andreas Musolff, Birmingham) were followed by a more theoretical part on the historiography of linguistics in which Gerda Haßler (Halle), Angelika Rüter (Münster) and Peter Schmitter (Münster) analysed the problem of the relation between metaphor and model, the question of objectivity in the historiography of science, and the concept of narrativity as a metahistoriographical term. The first day of the conference came to a close with an instructive presentation of the linguistic theory of the generally unknown late scholastics Gabriel Biel and Florentius Diel by Ludger Kaczmarek (Münster), a witty reflection on the function of the 9th-century Irish commentaries on Priscian (Rijcklof Hofman, Utrecht), and an interesting insight into the history of Arabic linguistics (Klaus-Eberhard Pabst, Halle). After 10 papers and some welcoming addresses the participants deserved some rest and relaxation and visited the house where G.F. Händel was born, drank a glass of sparkling wine, savoured some cheerful music, and then went to a well-known wine-bar in Halle.

The second day was devoted almost exclusively to the 18th century, a century that seems to attract increasing attention after a long phase of neglect. Helmut Weiß (Regensburg), Wolfert von Rahden (Berlin), Corinna Ficke (Jena), Joachim Gessinger (Hannover), Dieter Cherubim (Göttingen), and Ludwig M. Eichinger (Passau) gave papers on the evolution of universal grammars, on the history of the psychology of language, the establishment of linguistic societies, and on certain specific grammarians, linguists and semioticians. The 19th century entered the scene with papers by Brigitte Bartschat (Leipzig) on Leskien and Lefteris Roussos' (Münster) discussion a certain modern type of Humboldt interpretation. Erika Hültenschmidt's (Bielefeld) report on

her research into the Franco-German transfer of science stayed within that period. Two other papers treated 20th-century subjects, that of Clemens Knobloch (Siegen) on the concept of speech act (*Sprechhandlung*) around 1930, and by Georgij Pocheptsov (Kiev) on Gustav Spet.

In accordance with the statutes of the *Studienkreis* no conference proceedings will be published. Most of the (in general very noteworthy) papers will appear in various collective volumes and journals. Because of the big interest in this and other conferences it was decided to continue the series of colloquia of the SGdS next year with two events: the Fifth International Colloquium will take place on April 23 and 24, 1992 at the Fryske Akademy in Leeuwarden (The Netherlands), while the Sixth Colloquium of the SGdS itself will be an autumn conference, taking place on September 29 and 30, 1992 at the University of Regensburg (BRD). Several participants at the colloquium in Halle hoped that only one thing would be changed in subsequent conferences: that the organisers will withstand the pressure to accommodate more and more papers and ensure that even during the *officiel* parts of the conference enough time will be allocated to intensive discussion. This would be the only way to preserve viz. to restore the special character of the SGdS-colloquia as working conferences and a forum for the exchange of ideas.

Peter Schmitter (Münster) (translated by Brigitte Nerlich)

La linguistique entre mythe et histoire: Journées d'étude en l'honneur de Hans Aarsleff. Paris, 4-5 June 1991.

The Sorbonne was the scene of a small but lively meeting in honour of Hans Aarsleff organised by Daniel Droixhe and Chantal Grell. The papers presented by some nineteen scholars from France, England, Italy, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and the USA covered a wide range of topics from the history of linguistics in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, virtually all of them touched upon at some time by Professor Aarsleff himself. The Adamic language, a recurring theme throughout the contributions, turned out to be the subject on which Professor Aarsleff is currently working. Locke, Leibniz, Herder and Humboldt also figured prominently. The proceedings of a conference of remarkably high quality will be published in due course. By far the most attentive and argumentative member of the audience was Professor Aarsleff himself, and scarcely a single contributor escaped without the benefit of his witty and penetrating comments. The conviviality of the meeting was furthered by the hospitality offered by the hosts, the Université Libre de Bruxelles and the universities of Paris-Sorbonne and Princeton. I hope that Professor Aarsleff enjoyed his meeting as much as this participant did.

Vivien Law, Cambridge.

FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES

15th International Congress of Linguists

The conference will be held in Québec, PQ, August 9-14, 1992: sessions devoted to Semantics, syntax, pragmatics; The word; Endangered languages; Theoretical approaches to language - the state of the art and prospects for the future. Inquiries should be sent to Pierre Auger, Département de langues et linguistique, Université Laval, Québec, PQ, G1K 7P4, Canada.

Fifth Euralex International Congress

This conference will be held at the University of Tampere, Finland, August 4-9, 1992. Sessions on Dictionaries from the users' perspective; Terminology and terminography; Computational Lexicology and Lexicography; Linguistics in Lexicography: The Dictionary-making process; Historical and Scholarly Dictionaries and other Lexicographical topics. Details from the organisers, Professors Hannu Tommola and Krista Varantola.

International symposium on Comenius

Université de Montréal, Canada, June 11-13 1992. For information contact, Dr Gilles Bibeau, Chairman, Département de didactique, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, succursale A, Montréal, Canada H3C 3J7.

From the ESSE Conference (September 1991)

SWEET, EUROPE AND PHONETICS

Michael K C MacMahon

Firstly, a request to those people who associate Sweet's name with Old English - and therefore possibly with Old Anguish: please do not go away! Sweet has certainly had a bad press amongst undergraduates who have had to do Old English through the medium of his *Anglo-Saxon Reader* or his *Anglo-Saxon Primer*. But this has more to do, I think, with what later editors of his works have done to his original exposition of the subject-matter, to the way in which Old English has been positioned in an university English curriculum and to the way it has been taught, than to the characteristics of Sweet's own original teaching materials.

If we could go back about 130 years, to the 1860s, and could ask people what they understood by the word phonetics, we would probably be told that it was to do with reforming the spelling system of English or with shorthand. Three people in particular in Britain were associated with it: Alexander John Ellis, Alexander Melville Bell and Isaac Pitman. Ellis was something of a polymath and as far as phonetics was concerned was particularly interested in the history of English pronunciation; he also spent an inordinate amount of time devising possible reformed orthographies for English, some of which could double as phonetic notational systems. Anyone dipping into his publications in phonetics a 130 or so years ago would have been confronted with some strange-looking phonetic symbols and with terminology that did not seem to relate to any other academic discipline: 'coalescents', 'explodents', 'guttural' vowels, and so on. Anyone looking at Bell's work would undoubtedly have been even more baffled. Bell combined the roles of phonetician, elocutionist and propagandist for spelling reform. His phonetic alphabet, known as Visible Speech, despite its very logical construction, looked quite unlike any roman-based alphabet. Isaac Pitman, for his part, as well as heading the family's shorthand business, edited a journal called the *Phonetic Journal*, which was not about phonetics at all as we would understand it today, but dealt instead with shorthand and spelling reform.

Altogether, phonetic work in Britain in the 1860's emphasized the need for there to be phonetic alphabets that people could use - and the question of which symbol-shapes to choose took up a lot of time and intellectual energy. The discipline, if we can

call it that, was seen as a useful, if pretty esoteric, technique, employed mainly for describing various historical forms of English or for working out orthographies for languages which were being analysed and committed to print for the first time.

There were certainly no university departments of phonetics - this was not to come until the 1900s with the establishment of a Department of Phonetics at University College, London. And even in this century, the second department was not established until just after the Second World War.

What changed the situation here in Britain in the 19th century was partly the result of Sweet's own work, and partly the trans-national and academic context in which the subject developed. Europe played an important part in this. By the 1860s, physiologists in Germany and elsewhere had focused attention on the anatomical and physiological mechanisms of speech; and this 'medical' (if we can call it that) dimension of phonetics was to be a characteristic feature of European phonetics. In Britain, thanks to Sweet, the medical was subordinated to a linguistic and a deliberately superficial anatomical type of study. Another factor which helped to change the face of phonetics, as it were, was the founding and rapid development and influence of the IPA, the International Phonetic Association, based in Paris, from the mid 1880s onwards.

How, then, did Sweet achieve preeminence in the phonetics field when the native British tradition seemed in various respects, arcane and somewhat utilitarian? The answer lies, I think, in two factors. One was that in many respects Sweet was a self-taught man in linguistic matters - he taught himself Old English and Old Icelandic whilst he was still at school, for example - and this meant he was not beholden to any particular person for instruction in a subject. He could think and discover things for himself. What drew him to phonetics, we do not know. But he did take lessons in the subject from Alexander Melville Bell in London. What that gave him was the confidence to listen to the speech of people around him and talk about it in objective, analytical terms. The second factor was his ability to cut through what he regarded as the dead or dying wood of the subject (or simply the irrelevant material from his point of view) and identify the real issues for phonetics. What he saw in the European tradition of work by people like Brücke, Czermak and Merkel was a style of phonetic study which was far too physiologically based for his particular purposes, which were to describe the contemporary and earlier pronunciations of languages. Knowing about the cartilages and muscular structure of the larynx or the shape of the hyoid bone could be justified as part of the study of how speech is produced - as part of a wider concept of phonetics - but it would not necessarily help someone attempting to grasp the

linguistic uses to which the physiological actions of the speech mechanism were put. For Sweet, then, phonetics had to get away from the underlying biology of language and focus instead on an understanding of the surface postures and movements of the vocal tract and how they signal the linguistic and indexical features of speech. It is this that makes Sweet so very different from many of his European predecessors and contemporaries.

His first, and major, publication in phonetics was his *Handbook of Phonetics* of 1877. This was subsequently slimmed down into the *Primer of Phonetics* of 1890. Even now the *Handbook* is a work that undergraduates can be sent away to consult. The terminology and symbology differ in many respects from current IPA practices; but what makes the work accessible still is the quality of its perception of the nature and scope of phonetics, which is very much in line with the way the subject is perceived now, more than 100 years after the *Handbook* was first published. Sweet produced what we would nowadays call a work of general phonetics - or at least something approaching it - not one on the phonetics of any particular language. Developments since his time, though, have shown that his concentration on articulatory phonetics alone is too limited for phonetics to be able to genuinely claim that it is a scientific theory of speech production. The work in anatomy and physiology, as well as acoustics, of 19th century Europeans and what has developed from them since, are absolutely vital. And this is where the non-articulatory branches of phonetics have been reintegrated into the modern discipline.

So, we have an excellent statement from Sweet in his *Handbook* of 1877 of the nature of phonetics and how speech is analysed phonetically. What influence did he and the book exert? In Britain, the work did not lead to a sudden discovery of the subject by hordes of students or to the publication of comparable works by other phoneticians. It had its devotees, but they were restricted to mainly members of the Philological Society. Sweet had the advantage, though, of being able to publish the work under the imprint, and with it the cachet, of the Clarendon Press in Oxford, where indeed almost all of his books were published. He also had the advantage that there were no competitors: Ellis's and Bell's works were not pitched, like his, at the level of students and intellectuals with only a passing interest in phonetics. So why did the work not make the impact that it deserved? There were various factors at work.

Firstly we have the almost complete absence of any wide-spread understanding and acceptance of phonetics as a serious academic study. Publish a book - any book - in the late 19th century in the field of classics, for example, and there would be a ready-made audience for it. With phonetics, it was quite the reverse. Secondly, there was the

unfortunate situation that, despite being backed by the Clarendon Press, Sweet was regarded by many members of the academic community as something of a black sheep, if not the blackest sheep in the flock. As a student at Oxford, he could have got a First, if he had really wanted to study Latin and Greek - which is what he went to Oxford to get a degree in in the first place. But he did not; he regarded them as chores that distracted him from his real interest, which was the history of the Germanic languages - and he began publishing in this field whilst still an undergraduate. In the event, he got a Fourth Class. He never taught at Oxford - or indeed at any other university on a full-time contract - until 1901, when he was 56 when Oxford made him its Reader in Phonetics. So he never had a steady supply of students on whom he could try out his ideas. The wonder is, then, that he could produce such a lucid account of phonetics in the *Handbook*, eminently suitable for undergraduate readers, when he had had practically no experience of teaching the subject.

But what about Europe: what did they think of the work? The reception he got there was considerably more enthusiastic than he received in Britain. His European colleagues, both in correspondence and in published reviews, praised the work without exception. Within just a few years of its publication, he was being invited to lecture abroad - in Norway, for example. Further afield still, Johns Hopkins University in America tried to get him to accept a Chair of English - but he turned it down. (I will return to this in a moment.) There is some suggestion that the University of Berlin also wanted to offer him a Chair. Phoneticians and language-teachers paid tribute to the excellence of his work and recommended it to their students. In the 1880s he was made the first President of the International Phonetic Association, a post he held for 24 years until his death. In 1886, he was given an honorary PhD by Heidelberg University for his work in Anglo-Saxon studies and phonetics.

But there was one other work which helped establish his reputation in Europe and introduce his ideas to an even wider public. This was a book he wrote in German, his *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch*, which first appeared in 1885. This *Primer of Spoken English* - and that was its title when he published it five years later in English - was something of a revelation to the language-teachers at whom it was aimed. English was described as it really was, not as many members of the Victorian middle classes would have wished to have seen it described. There is a section in it on phonetic theory, plus some simple grammatical information, followed by texts, in phonetic notation, of colloquial and conversational English. The assimilations, the elisions, the weak forms, even the intrusive /r/ are all there. Here at last was a description of English pronunciation based on what people actually said, not on what people thought they said or on what they thought they ought to be saying. The big

difference between the *Elementarbuch* and the *Handbook* was that the *Elementarbuch* focused specifically on the pronunciation of English, not on a wider theory of phonetics, as the *Handbook* had done.

It was the *Elementarbuch* which helped increase yet further the huge following Sweet already had in Europe and contributed, alongside other works by other phoneticians and language-teachers, to a revolution in language-teaching methods. Out went Grammar and Translation, and in came what was known as the Phonetic Method. Sweet's ideas were taken up and practised by modern-language teachers in many countries, including France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. If you look in the EFL manuals of people like Western, Franke, Swoboda, Jespersen and Schröer, you will find eloquent testimony there to the inspiration provided by Sweet. Indeed, when I hear the excellent command of spoken English by today's Continental Europeans, I think of the line that leads back to the quality of the teaching-methodology provided in part by Sweet's *Elementarbuch* of 1885.

Sweet's phonetic work was not restricted to English, though. In his papers to the Philological Society, he reveals his knowledge of the phonetics of other languages, including Dutch, Welsh, modern Icelandic, Danish, Norwegian and Swedish - knowledge he had acquired by analysing the speech of native informants. (Notice the absence of any lengthy accounts of French or Spanish or Italian: for whatever reason, Sweet was not as interested in these languages as he was in the more northerly languages of Europe.) Late in life, when he was Reader at Oxford, he tried to get away with teaching the phonetics of Hungarian to his students of English. Not surprisingly, the English Faculty put a stop to it.

One big question about Sweet's life is this: why, given his experiences at the hands of the academic establishment, mainly the Oxford one, and given the adulation he received abroad, why did not he accept the job at Johns Hopkins or even the one in this country which Liverpool were keen for him to accept? Why did he insist on going back to Oxford in the 1890s, where he had few supporters, let alone friends? Why did he believe that he could set up a rival School of English to the one in the University, where the right subjects would be taught, and where the teaching would be done by colleagues who were competent in their fields? The clues that come through in his correspondence and in comments from people who knew him fairly well are that deep down he had an emotional tie to England, and rather perversely to Oxford, a tie which could not be broken. Emotionally and intellectually, he could not bear to be outside the country, even though he would take himself off to Europe for weeks on end for skiing or fishing holidays with people like Johan Storm in Oslo or Alois Brandl in Innsbruck. Perhaps

he thought - misguidedly I believe - that eventually he would beat the Oxford English Faculty at their own game, and that the Sweet approach to the study of contemporary and historical English would triumph. As we now know, it was in Continental Europe that his ideas were seized upon, discussed and used. In Britain, he had his band of supporters - George Bernard Shaw was one of them - but it was nowhere near as large or as influential as those in Europe and North America. At Oxford, phonetics more or less died out after his death in 1912. Daniel Jones did some locum teaching for a while, but then resigned to concentrate on his work in London. J R Firth also helped out for a time. It is only in recent years, in the 1980s, that phonetics has been revived in Oxford as an autonomous academic unit.

It is easy to lapse into a hagiographic mode when talking about Sweet and his achievements. But we should not overlook the fact that, as a person, he certainly had his faults. He could be distinctly disagreeable and downright rude to colleagues, especially those who did not appreciate and go along with his view that any and every student of language must study phonetics first: phonetics was the indispensable foundation of all study of language, as he said in the *Handbook* of 1877, and as he went on saying in other publications right to the end of his life.

In conclusion, then, what can we see as the virtues in his conception of phonetics?

Firstly, he took a wider view of the nature of articulatory phonetic data than almost all of his predecessors and, unfortunately, quite a few of his successors did. Like everyone else, he isolated the articulatory segments (the vowels and consonants) from the non-segmental features. But unlike many others, he drew attention to the phonation types and voice quality dimension of speech performance. Only fairly recently, in the past 25 years or so, has there been much serious work done on this subject. He may not have analysed the intonation system of English in anything like the detail that later phoneticians such as Jones, Ward, Halliday, O'Connor and Arnold have done; but he did say much more about it than any of his contemporaries, and he made it clear that this was a topic not to be dismissed. Look in his *New English Grammar*, and you will find remarks there on intonation. Today's discourse analysts and pragmatists emphasise the entwined role of intonation with grammar in the structure of conversation. Sweet was saying the same thing, albeit in more general terms, over a century ago.

Secondly, Sweet was too much of an objective analyst of contemporary speech to be led into the deception of there being a single so-called standard accent of English.

Where others have used the term RP and used it in the sense of some sort of standard to which the natives of England defer, Sweet was careful to point out that he was describing a particular regional and social variety of English - middle class suburban London might be a modern label for it. (He never used the term RP in fact.) This meant that the much wider and unanalysed area of non-RP speech could be acknowledged to exist and deemed worthy of analysis. Sweet made the occasional comment on varieties of English outside London, but never attempted a full-scale survey of them. (Even now, the picture of what is going on phonetically in accents other than RP is still unclear - even in RP itself.) For foreign learners, Sweet recognized the practical need of having a standard or model form of English they could aim towards. In his opinion, this should be, quite simply, the form used in the metropolis. Even so, he cautioned his readers in the following terms: 'do not appeal to the authority of an imaginary 'correct' or 'careful' speaker; 'it is absurd to set up a standard of how English people ought to speak, before we know how they actually do speak - a knowledge which is still in its infancy'.

Thirdly, he was one of a group of phoneticians and linguists in the 1870s who, independently of one other, recognised the necessity of what we would call the 'phonemic principle' in the organisation of sound patterns. He saw that the sound layer of language had to be analysed twice: firstly as phonatory and articulatory activity, and secondly as phonological patterns.

And fourthly, he was able to get away from the clutter of notational systems that people like Ellis and quite a few European phoneticians inflicted on their readers and students. He saw ever so clearly that there had to be different types of phonetic notation for different purposes. It was not a case of there being a single, correct notation.

These four points are things we now accept as self-evident in the phonetics world. But it needed Sweet to spell them all out for us in the first place.

Text of a paper read to the Inaugural Meeting of ESSE,
[European Society for the Study of English],
University of East Anglia,
7 September 1991

Dr Michael MacMahon,
Department of English Language,
University of Glasgow,
Glasgow G12 8QQ.

NOTICES OF BOOKS RECEIVED

Helmut Gneuss, *Die Wissenschaft von englischen Sprache: Ihre Entwicklung bis zum Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Munich. Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Professor Gneuss has published a study for which there has long been a need. The history of English linguistic scholarship has been well served by studies of individual topics, such as the account of English grammars by Ian Michael, of dictionaries by Starnes and Noyes, and orthography by Scragg; but until now there has been no general survey of the field nor any bibliography devoted exclusively to this topic. In Kennedy's bibliography, now some seventy years old, the history of linguistic scholarship is one field among many; Alston's comprehensive bibliography of writings on the English language from 1500-1800 is devoted to a record or original texts, with only occasional references to modern commentaries. *The Year's Work in English Studies* publishes a fairly comprehensive account of relevant scholarship year by year, but the first detailed report did not appear until 1983, while less specialist bibliographies have included details of publications, but without any critical comment.

The absence of a general survey would not perhaps be so unfortunate were it not for the amazing growth in the historiography of linguistic scholarship in recent years. As Professor Gneuss points out in his introduction, the last few decades have not only seen a substantial increase in publication, but also the foundation of specialist groups and societies, among which he mentions in particular our own, founded in 1984.

Pages 1-73 record, in narrative form, the development of English linguistic scholarship; pages 74-125 contain a bibliography; and the study finishes with an index of names (mainly of original authors) occupying pages 126-129.

The narrative survey contains six sections: sections I-IV allocated to chronological divisions (Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English, and the nineteenth century); section V deals with disciplines fairly recently established; and section VI refers briefly to twentieth century developments. The sections are not further subdivided, each of them being (silently) arranged under topics; no doubt the absence of internal headings enables a student to see the development as a whole in an interesting and coherent fashion. The newer disciplines discussed in section V comprise phonetics, semantics, and dialectology (including the study of national varieties of English). Section VI is extremely brief; while pointing out that there is often no clear divisions between nineteenth and twentieth century linguistic scholarship, Professor Gneuss specifically eschews any account of the revolutionary developments in linguistics of this century, pointing out merely the new models of grammar, new methods in lexicography, and new technical aids.

The Bibliography is arranged on different lines; like the survey, it is generally chronological, but it is explicitly devoted to individual topics, there being as many as 70 of these. It is preceded by a list of works (with abbreviated references) which are cited in many different sections, and a note by the author pointing out that this is a select bibliography, with a necessarily somewhat subjective character. In fact, however, the present writer has failed to discover any significant omissions, and clearly the author has made an excellent choice. What is so surprising is that Gneuss has even managed, together with his many citations of works from the 1980s, to list a few items written almost a century ago, but which are still highly relevant. Inevitably, of course, some of

these entries are now, or soon will be, superseded. For example, on another page of the current *Newsletter* will be found a review of a study of the use and teaching of French in England before 1600 which subsumes practically all of the titles mentioned in the relevant section here.

It is astonishing that a single scholar, whose previous publications have been largely in the field of Old English language and literature, should have produced such an informed and judicious survey as well as such a valuable bibliography, which should be in the hands of every scholar working in our discipline. Is it too much to ask for an English translation?

Vivian Salmon, Oxford

Erik Heijerman & H. Walter Schmitz (Eds.), *Significs, Mathematics and Semiotics. The Signific Movement in the Netherlands. Proceedings of the International Conference Bonn, 19-21 November 1986*. Münster: Nodus, 1991. 208pp. DM 48.-.

This conference on significs, mathematics and semiotics was held during the hey-day of the rediscovery of the Dutch Signific Movement (largely inspired by H. W. Schmitz' articles written from 1983 onwards). The articles published here are the English* versions of the papers given at the conference, minus two and plus one (van Dalen). For those who are (still) unfamiliar with the Signific Movement, this book provides a good starting-point, as it contains a masterly introduction by Schmitz, and four sections dealing with all aspects of significs (with special emphasis on significs and the philosophy of mathematics). (1) "Significs as a Starting Point of Research", with contributions by Thiel, van Dalen, Heijerman, and Alberts on Brouwer, mathematics as a pseudo-problem, and van Dantzig's dream of a practical significs. (2) "On the History of Significs", with contributions by Horstman on Lady Welby as a moralistic pragmatist, and by Bergmans on Gruppe as a possible precursor of the significians. (3) "Significs Compared" contains contributions by Eschbach on Morris, Mannoury, semiotics and significs, by Martin on significs and logical empiricism, and by Visser on significs in linguistic philosophy (although he concentrates more on linguistic philosophy itself). (4) In the last section "On the Topicality of Signific Methods for analysis" Schmitz proposes empirical methods of signific analysis of meaning, and De Groot and Medendorp present a modern continuation of signific analysis: concept analysis, a method which should ensure that sciences use concepts properly and avoid conceptual confusion. Finally, Heijerman gives a summary of the final discussion concerning questions such as the possible contribution of questions in the field of language and communication, the state of investigations into significs and the coordination of further research.

The papers are generally of a high quality. However, the first article by Thiel suffers somewhat from a lack of clarity. It also presupposes a good deal of prior knowledge concerning the life and work of the mathematician Brouwer. The following article by van Dalen on Brouwer's dogma of languageless mathematics clarifies the issues to a large extent.

This reviewer especially enjoyed Schmitz' introduction, in which he tells us how significs came from England to the Netherlands (mainly through a friendship between Lady Welby and Van Eeden), and what the defining features of the significs movement in the Netherlands are (its internationalism, interdisciplinarity, the wish for

scientific synthesis and social reform). He points out the continuities and discontinuities between Wely and her Dutch followers, and finally states the reasons for the dissolution of the movement in the 1950s. The article by Alberts stands out for its clarity. It deals with one of the most important aspects of the work of the significians: their wish to *do* something, change the world, language, thoughts, help others to "make their ideas clear" as Peirce would say and, like Dantzig, even help with dam-building projects through the application of new ideas into statistics. Dantzig's dream of a "signific advice bureau", or, as Alberts calls it, consultation bureau, still seems worth dreaming. Would it not be wonderful if those who write articles in, e.g. literary criticism, would first go and get some signific advice on the language and concepts they use! The article by Bergmans on Otto Friedrich Gruppe is witty (a trait the writer seems to share with his subject), and should stimulate further research into this 19th century campaigner for a linguistic critique of philosophical language (especially Hegel's). This research, would, I suspect, discover affinities between Gruppe and other independent thinkers of the 19th century, not only significians. Eschbach's article is noteworthy for its *criticisms* of significs, and his plea for a 'critical semiotics', repeated in the final discussion (see p.201). Eschbach questions the validity of signific thinking on three points: (1) its wish to solve social problems by a critique of language, not by a straightforward social critique; (2) its wish to establish classifications for their own sake (e.g. of types of meaning, etc.), more a 19th than a 20th century type of enterprise; and (3) its ahistorical conception of the sign. The last two points of criticism also apply to the semiotics of Morris, for example. Martin's article on significs and logical empiricism gives a first-hand insight into the *non*-communication between the two movements, as witnessed by Martin himself. He studied under Carnap and Morris, but went to the Netherlands to get a better insight into the signific movement, and, in the course of his studies, came to know Mannoury quite well. Martin points out that both significs and logical empiricism have a utopian strain and emphasise conceptual reform, but with quite different objectives in mind ('to make the world better' as opposed to 'to understand the world better'), and using different methods (the analysis of the complete act of communication as opposed to symbolic logic). In the last section on the topicality of signific analysis of meaning, Schmitz advocates a renewed attention to the empirical analysis of meaning by signific methods, as, for example, the transformation and exhaustion of linguistic acts. By linguistic acts significians mean the concrete and complete linguistic act (not sample sentences dreamed up by speech-act theorists). In contrast with the normal semantic analysis of meaning, significians do not want to find the common thought contents of concepts associated with words, but the actual associations of word with thought in the communicating individual (and here there is a difference between the spoken meaning and the heard meaning*). Significians study the 'dispersion' of meaning or "the variability of word and linguistic act meanings for different individuals or for one and the same individual as influenced by mood and surroundings" (p. 151), in order to establish the intra- and interindividual range of meaning, and in order to identify meaning elements (see p. 149). These ideas deserve to be followed up by modern linguists. They should reexamine (signific) methods of *empirical* meaning analysis, an approach to meaning which was quite common in the first half of the 20th century, but is all too much neglected in the second.

Brigitte Nerlich, Nottingham

* To publish the articles in English was commendable, especially since the reception of signific ideas was hampered by the fact that most of the texts were only available in Dutch. However, the translations or transpositions into English (from German and Dutch) are not all of equal quality. Some are admirably well written, some less so (those of Thiel and Hartman, for example). There are also a

number of typing errors, not spotted by the otherwise scrupulous editors. And finally, "the present-day reader" is not necessarily male! ("... him ...", p.15)

* Significians could have found inspiration for this new focus on the hearer in Noreen and Wellander, Lazarus, Paul and Wegener, Marty, Dittrich and Oertel, to mention just a few.

Johannes Lucas Maria Hulsker, *Petrus Montanus' Spreeckonst (1635) nader besproken*. Renkum, The Netherlands: the author [Theophile de Beckweg 8, NL-6871 EH Renkum (Postgiro 2819754)]. 334 pp. Dfl. 75.00

Montanus' *Spreeckonst* is an account of linguistic sounds, made in the experimental spirit of the seventeenth century, which draws on a detailed anatomically-based account of the speech organs. The text is written in Dutch, and discussion is based on the speech sounds of the Dutch of its day, but the fact that its theoretical basis allows for up to 2520 distinctive sounds justifies the claim that the principles have a more general, even universal application. The large total of sounds results from a combination of features determined by manner and place of articulation, voicing and other acoustic properties, tongue configuration, tenseness or laxness, and qualities which Montanus describes as instantaneous or steady. Most of these distinctions correspond to modern expectations, but Montanus had, of course, to rely entirely on introspection and a sense of touch, not on instrumentation. The book did not gain wide currency--it was not reprinted until a critical edition was made in 1964, and surviving copies of the original edition are rare--perhaps because Montanus' highly individual terminology militated against the general acceptance of his work. For example, the manners of articulation are described as oopendeurig ('open-door'), toedeurig ('closed-door'), vrij, verhindernd ('interruptive'), trillend, gespleeten ('split', i.e. lateral), neusig (nasal), gesmoord ('choked', i.e. plosive). The distribution into classes of sounds is unfamiliar, and at times perhaps confusing, e.g. the oopendeurig category includes vowels and oral (but not nasal) continuants, while liquids are considered to be 'interruptive'. Montanus' analysis of the places of articulation is surprisingly subtle, and is divided into a more general system of gutturals, buccals (binnenmondletter), extrabuccals (uitermondletter, presumably labials) and dentals in that order, each group being subsequently refined (buccal sounds, for example, into velars, palatals and alveolars); and the positional scheme, derived by a sequence of binary oppositions, may be interpreted in terms of a distinctive features grid. The discussion of Montanus' hoochte des geluits concludes that 'height' relates to volume rather than pitch, but it is clear that Montanus was aware of the importance of stress-patterns in phrases and sentences, as well as in words.

Dr Hulsker's monograph begins with biographical and bibliographical studies, including an interesting emblematic interpretation of the titlepage. He considers that *Spreeckonst*, in spite of the very detailed analysis it offers, is a pedagogical work (at least as a teacher's book) as well as a theoretical one. He notes that the work received honourable mention in Morhof's *Polyhistor*, from which secondhand references derive; but few, if any, important theorists can be shown to be directly indebted to him. The final chapters deal with the place of *Spreeckonst* in the history of phonetics.

Montanus' *Spreeckonst* is an early specimen of a proud tradition of Dutch linguistic scholarship, and it well deserves this new judicious, meticulously detailed analysis in the light of modern theories.

Paul Salmon, Oxford

Douglas A. Kibbee. *For to Speke French Trewely: the French language in England, 1000-1600: its status, description and instruction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1991. (Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 60). 268pp. \$65

This monograph brilliantly validates the author's claim (p.168) that: 'The study, practical or theoretical, of a language, native or second, cannot be divorced from the cultural context in which that study takes place. Furthermore, the nature of that study, down to the very language used to express it, is further evidence of the complex relationship between language, language study, and the central currents of intellectual discourse of any period.'

Kibbee's consistent and explicit promulgation of these views is one of the main differences between the present volume and the previous most comprehensive study of the relationship between English and French in England; this was the work of Kathleen Lambley, which is also differentiated from Kibbee's in respect of the period covered. While Kibbee begins his study in the eleventh century and ends in 1600, Lambley deals with the Tudor and Stuart periods. A third, and obviously crucial difference between the two studies, is that Lambley's was written some 70 years ago, and a mere glance at Kibbee's bibliography will show the extent to which subsequent scholarship has contributed to our knowledge of Anglo-French linguistic relationships during the Middle Ages and the sixteenth century. Lambley's work was, for its time, an outstanding achievement; Kibbee's will now, justly, take its place as the standard text, at least up to 1600.

Kibbee divides the 600 years of Anglo-French linguistic relationships in the United Kingdom into five periods:

- Period I: From the marriage of Emma to Ethelred in 1004 to Henry II's marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine (1152)
- Period II: From Henry's marriage (1152) to the *Provisions of Oxford* (1258);
- Period III: From the *Provisions of Oxford* (1258) to the parliamentary statute that all governmental legal affairs be conducted in English (1362);
- Period IV: From the statute of 1362 until the introduction of printing (1470s);
- Period V: The Age of Printing, Humanism and Reformation.

These periods, which are often delimited by political events, also correspond, as Kibbee points out, to changes in the relative status of French and English, and in the nature of the pedagogical materials available. In every period, Kibbee deals, therefore, both with the external history of French in England, and the internal history as revealed in the grammars, dictionaries, and dialogues available to Englishmen wishing to learn French. In dealing with the external history, Kibbee considers several specific questions:

- a) For what purposes was French necessary
- b) How many people spoke French? Who were the French speakers? What type of French did they speak?
- c) Who needed to learn French as a second language? How do the pedagogical materials relate to these needs?

In dealing with the text books of French which were available to English-speaking students, Kibbee reveals how extraordinarily sophisticated some of them were. They dealt not only with the segmental phonemes of French, but also offered

detailed discussions of liaison, elision, and intonation. These texts are particularly enlightening for the historian of linguistic ideas because, during the sixteenth century, the grammar of English was not thought worthy of study until 1586, when Bullokar provided a rather uninspired account of the language in the light of Latin categories. The French grammar books show just how aware speakers of English would have been of the characteristic features of their own language, if they had thought to record them. An interesting question is whether some English grammarians, in particular John Hart, may even have been indebted to studies of French grammar and pronunciation for their own sophisticated approach to features such as elision in English which might, without French models, have gone unnoticed.

Kibbee's treatment is so comprehensive and detailed, that it seems churlish to suggest that anything could be added. One area, however, which is not strictly within his remit, but which is of immense interest, is the relationship between English and French Crown Lands outside the mainland. Several interesting questions arise from the relationship of the two languages in Calais and in the Channel Islands; and in England itself, with respect to the Anglican liturgy in French.

Although the Act of Supremacy was imposed on all the royal domains, including the Channel Islands, it was not easy to ensure compliance because of the remoteness of some of these regions and the lack of a printing press there with which to disseminate information about the introduction of the new English Bible and liturgy. The most accessible of these royal possessions was Calais, governed as it was by the King's Deputy and frequently visited by royal officials; and it was for Calais that the English liturgy was first translated into French vernacular, the Bible already being available in several French translations.

Sir Hough Paulet had the Prayer Book of 1549 translated into French for the use of the inhabitants of Calais and the Channel Islands, and at about the same time, a French Protestant refugee in London proposed to set up a printing press to publish this and other religious texts. But a licence was refused by Bishop Cranmer on the grounds that the financial rewards should rightfully belong to those who had first translated the Prayer Book. For a 1552 Prayer Book, the Lord High Chancellor employed one of his 'dependents', one Francis Phillippe, 'carefully to correct the former French book by this English new one'. This version was frequently reprinted, and revised by John Durel, a native of Jersey, for the 1662 version of the Prayer Book.

Kibbee provides some extremely useful material supplementary to the 189 pages of text. He provides, first, an appendix of biographical sketches of the grammarians noticed (190-202), and secondly, selected introductions and dedications from their works which are of the utmost interest, particularly since the texts themselves are often not available. A bibliography, (221-244) provides many references to original material in the form of medieval manuscripts, as well as epistolaries and chartularies, and printed works of the Renaissance. Kibbee provides indexes on names, of titles, and of subjects, the whole volume being a standard text which will hardly be improved on for many decades to come. It is a work which will be read, not only with profit, but also with enjoyment, by historians of both French and English language, and it will undoubtedly prove stimulating and approachable to those who have no specialized interest in the topic.

Vivian Salmon, Oxford

Brigitte Nerlich, *Change in Language*. Whitney, Br—al, Wegener. London and New York: Routledge, 1990. xiv + 213 pp.

This study is divided into two parts—the longer first one being a comparative and complementary exposition of the ideas of Whitney and Br—al, the second using the results of the first to present theories of Wegener. It is based on a comprehensive and very well documented examination of linguistic theory within the timespan (approximately 1865-1916) of the three subjects' activity, from the period immediately preceding the neogrammarians to the (coincidental) appearance of Saussure's *Cours*. The work, indeed, ranges even more widely, illuminating as it does the linguistic debate in the light of evolutionary theory in the nineteenth century, particularly the Darwinian principle of natural selection (the contribution of which is seen unusually but properly as providing an acceptable explanation of a phenomenon which had been noted or hinted for fifty years or more). However, Schleicher, who most explicitly applied Darwinian principles to the study of linguistic (pre-)history, is seen as an oppositional figure, most importantly for his concept of language as an autonomous entity which could be studied, like a physical or more particularly a biological science, without reference to human speakers.

The authors analysed here never lost sight of the human and psychological element in language; language has indeed evolved, but it has evolved by infinitesimal stages from tentative beginnings (against the view that analytical languages had degenerated from an earlier synthetic stage). The object of language was, from the outset, communication; this, however, can never be infallibly achieved on the base of invariable meanings, but always entails a degree of accommodation—reformulation by a speaker, adjustment, through the medium of connotation, of preconceived or overlapping denotations by a listener. Themes of this kind are common to the three authors, and it is the great merit of this book that the general agreement and differentiation in detail are so lucidly explained.

The approach outlined here gives a valuable insight into the way languages work in society, and an appeal to processes by which meanings may be generalised or extended can explain individual instances of semantic change. Yet the changes themselves do not occur in any predictable way—so that semantic change cannot be used, as phonological change can, to establish etymologies or linguistic affiliations: for these, something like the old certainties still appear to be valid. The realisation that language is never finally codified, but has to be understood in an ever-changing social environment, makes for a subtle and humane study; the principles expounded by the authors presented here inform much later thought, instanced by such remarks as '[Br—al's] functionalist view of language is closely comparable to Wegener's, and beyond Wegener to the neo-Firthian tradition in England'.

This compact book is a stimulating and invaluable guide to a set of principles whose value is being increasingly realised.

Paul Salmon, Oxford

De Witt T. Starnes and Gertrude E. Noyes, *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson 1604-1755*. Reprint of 1946 edition, with introduction and select bibliography by Gabriele Stein. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991. cxi + 299.

The reissue of a seminal text on monolingual lexicography such as the Starnes and Noyes 1946 study is much to be welcomed, particularly when the pioneering study is itself put into an historical perspective by the editor. In her excellent introduction Gabriele Stein provides a critical frame within which to view the author's achievement. She argues that Starnes and Noyes broke new ground in outlining the lexicographical characteristics of individual English dictionaries, thereby initiating a study of the growth and changes of vocabulary use on the basis of this evidence. She notes developments in the field subsequent to the publication of *The English Dictionary* - the advances in bibliographical data and the increased availability of modern reprints of lexicographical works. On the theoretical side, she observes, there has been a widening of the subject to include influences from monolingual glossaries and bilingual and polyglot dictionaries of Renaissance Europe.

Two very useful lists complete the updating of the text. The first comprises a chronological catalogue of editions and locations of the dictionaries under discussion, an enormous improvement on the Starnes and Noyes account of solely American holdings. Information is also helpfully given about modern reprints and facsimile copies. The Select Bibliography represents an accessible resource of secondary material, complementary to the list compiled by Starnes and Noyes. The new Bibliography itself bears witness to the expansion of interest in the subject, and contains many relevant publications, though recent essays on the influence of the orthoepists and schoolmasters on English lexicographical studies are overlooked. Overall, the edition is a fitting and important tribute to the two original scholars and the discipline which they sought to define.

Edwina Burness, Cambridge.

Amongst the books for review in future issues of the *HSS Newsletter* are:

Bechert, Johannes; Bernini Guiliano, and Buridant, Claude (eds.)
Toward a Typology of European Languages. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1990.

Comrie, Bernard (ed.)
The Major Languages. 4 vols. London: Routledge, 1990-91.

Crowley, Tony
Proper English? Readings in Language, History and Cultural Identity. London: Routledge.

Davis, Hayley G. and Taylor, Talbot J.
Redefining Linguistics. London: Routledge, 1990.

Isermann, Michael
Die Sprachtheorie im Werk von Thomas Hobbes. Münster: Nodus, 1991 (Studium Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 15).

Jensen, Kristian
Rhetorical Philosophy and Philosophical Grammar. Julius Caesar Scaliger's Theory of Language. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1990 (Humanistische Bibliothek; Reihe I, Band 46).

Koerner, Konrad (ed.)
First Person Singular II. Autobiographies of North American Scholars in the Language Sciences. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1991.

Murphy, James J. (ed.)
A Short History of Writing Instruction from Ancient Greece to Twentieth-century America. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1990.

Scott, Izora
Controversies over the Imitation of Cicero in the Renaissance. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1991.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Society is extremely grateful to Mrs Gretchen Seiffert for the gift of some 50 volumes, donated in memory of her late husband, Dr. Leslie Seiffert, first Chairman of the Society's Executive Committee. These volumes are distinguished by an asterisk in the list below. The Society also continues to be grateful to those who donate books and articles, whether their own or those published by scholars not members of the HSS.

Source material

Anon. [1651]
Sefer na-Bahir (A Kabbalistic source for F.M. van Helmont). [Photocopy].

Hemsterhuis, Tiberius
De originibus Linguae Graecae. Halbertsma, J.H. *Letterkundige Naoogst II*. Deventer: Lange. 1845. [Photocopy].

Books and Pamphlets

***Aarsleff, Hans**
The study of Language in England 1780-1860. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota, 1983.

- *Aarsleff, Hans; Kelly, Louis G.; Nederehe, Hans-Josef
Papers in the History of Linguistics. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1987. (SIHoLS 38).
- Agius, Dionisius
Diglossic Tension: Teaching Arabic for Communication. Folio Scholastica (Leeds), 1990.
- *Arens, Hans
Sprachwissenschaft, 2 vols. Frankfurt: Fischer. 1969.
- *Ayres-Bennett, Wendy
Vaugelas and the Development of the French Language. London: MHRA. 1987.
- Bochorishvily, Natalia.
On the relation of the art of rhetoric and word borrowing in Shakespeare's Language. Moscow. 1981.
- Word specificity in Shakespeare's rhetorical devices*. Moscow. 1982.
- Word in Edmund Spenser's poetry*. Moscow 1986.
- *Bloomfield, Leonard
Language (1935). London: Allen and Unwin. 1950.
- *Boas, Franz (ed. Stocking, George)
Reader: The shaping of American anthropology 1883-1911. Chicago: Chicago University Press. 1974.
- *Breivik, Leiv Egil
Existential 'there'. Bergen: Univ. of Bergen. 1983.
- Bucher, Stefan
Zwischen Phänomenologie und Sprachwissenschaft: Zu Merleau-Pontys Theorie der Sprache. Studium Sprachwissenschaft 18. Münster: Nodus Publikationem, 1991.
- *Bursill-Hall, Geoffrey L.
Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages. The Hague: Mouton. 1971.
- *Buzzetti, Dino; Ferriani, Maurizio
Speculative Grammar, Universal Grammar, and the Philosophical Analysis of Language. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1987. (SIHoLS 42).
- *Courtenay, Baudoin de
Ausgewählte Werke. Munich: Fink. 1984.
- *Cowan, William; Foster, Michael; Koerner, Konrad, (eds.)
New Perspectives in Language, Culture and Personality. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1986. (SIHoLS 41).
- *Durkheim, Emile, (trans. D.F. Pocock)
Sociology and Philosophy. New York: Free Press. 1974.

- *Formigari, Lia
Linguistica ed empirismo nel seicento inglese. Bari: Laterza. 1970.
- *Garvin, Paul L.
A Prague School Reader. Washington: Georgetown University Press. 1964.
- *Greenberg, Joseph H.
Essays in Linguistics. Chicago: Phoenix. 1957
- Language Universals*. The Hague: Mouton. 1966. (JL: Series Minor 59).
- Hall, Robert A.
Leave your Language alone! Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1950.
- Haugen, Einar and Bloomfield, Morton.
Language as a Human Problem. London and Guildford: Lutterworth. 1975.
- Hayden, Donald E. and Ashworth, E. Paul, (eds.)
Essais linguistiques. Paris: Eds. de Minuit. 1971.
- Prolegomènes à une théorie du langage*. Paris: Eds. de Minuit. 1968-71.
- Hoenigswald, Henry M.
The European Background. Dordrecht: Foris. 1979.
- Hoinkes, Ulrich.
Philosophie und Grammatik in der französischen Aufklärung. Studium Sprachwissenschaft 13. Münster: Nodus Publikationem, 1991.
- Hulsker, J.L.M.
Petrus Montanus Spreekonst (1635) (Dissertation Nijmegen), 1991. [in Dutch].
- *Hunt, R.W.
Collected Papers on the Theory of Grammar in the Middle Ages. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1989.
- *Hymes, Dell.
Studies in the History of Linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 1974.
- Ishibashi, Kotaro, ed.
Henry Sweet. Phoenix English Grammar Library, vol.1. 1974 [1967]. [in Japanese].
- *Jakobson, Roman
The Framework of Language. Michigan Studies in the Humanities: University of Michigan. 1980.
- *Jakobson, Roman (trans. John Mephram)
Six Lectures on Sound and Meaning. Hassocks: Harvester. 1978.
- *Jespersen, Otto
Mankind, Nation and Individual. London: Allen and Unwin. 1946.

- The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: Allen and Unwin. 1946.
- Language*. London: Allen and Unwin. 1946.
- Analytic Syntax*. London: Allen and Unwin. 1946.
- *Joos, Martin, ed.
Readings in Linguistics. New York: American Council of Learned Societies. 1963.
- *Junker, Heinrich
Sprachphilosophisches Lesebuch. Heidelberg: Winter. 1948.
- *Kelly, Louis G.
25 Centuries of Language Teaching. Rowley: Newbury House. 1976.
- *Koerner, Konrad (ed.)
Progress in Linguistic Historiography. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1980 (SIHoLS 20).
- First Person Singular II*. Autobiographies by North American Scholars in the Language Sciences. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. 1991. (SIHoLS 61).
- *Lenneberg, Eric H.
New Directions in the Study of Language. Cambridge (Mass.): M.I.T. Press. 1966.
- *Leroy, Maurice
Le grandes courants de la linguistique moderne. Bruxelles: P.U.F.
- *Martinet, André; Weinreich, Uriel
Linguistics Today. New York: Linguistic Circle. 1954.
- *Nonno, M.de
La grammatica dell anonymous bobiensis. Rome: Ed. di Storia e Letteratura. 1982.
- Paolis, Paolo de
Macrobian Theodosii. De Verborum Graeci et Latini Differentiis vel Societatibus Excerpta. Urbino: Quattro Venti.
- *Parret, Hermon (ed.)
Discussing Language. The Hague: Mouton. (JL: Series Maior 93). 1974.
- *Pinborg, Jan (ed. Ebbesen, Sten)
Medieval Semantics. London: Variorum Reprints. 1984.
- *Rieux, Jacques; Rollin, Bernard E. (eds.)
The Port-Royal Grammar. The Hague: Mouton. (JL: Series Minor 208). 1975.
- *Salus, Peter H.
On Language: Plato to von Humboldt. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1969.

- *Sapir, Edward (ed. David G.Mandelbaum)
Selected Writings. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- *Saussure, Ferdinand de (ed. Tullio de Mauro)
Cours de linguistique generale. Paris: Payot. 1973.
- *Saussure, Ferdinand de (trans. Harris, Roy)
Course in General Linguistics. London: Duckworth. 1983.
- Schmitter, Peter, ed.
Sprachtheorien der abendländischen Antike: Geschichte der Sprachtheorie 2. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 1991.
- Multum - non multa ? Studien zur 'Einheit der Reflexion' im Werk Wilhelm von Humboldts*. Studium Sprachwissenschaft 14. Münster: Nodus Publikationem, 1991.
- Scott, Izora
Controversies over the Imitation of Cicero in the Renaissance. Davis, Cal.: Hermagoras Press. 1991.
- *Seiler, Hans Jakob, ed.
Language Universals. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 1955.
- Siertsema, B.
A Study of Glossematics. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1955.
- *Stam, James H.
Enquiries into the Origin of Language. New York: Harper and Row. 1976.
- Sweet, Henry (translated into Japanese by Y.Ogawa)
The Practical Study of Languages. Tokyo: Eichosa Pub. Com. 1988 [1899].
- *Taylor, Daniel J.
Declinatio: a study of the Linguistic Theory of Marcus Terentius Varro. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1975. (SIHoLS 2).
- Varro (ed. E.H.Warmington, trans. Roland G.Kent)
De lingua latina. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1967.
- Verburg, Pieter A.
Stand en Zin van de Historie der Taaltheorieen. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff. 1975.
- Articles and Reviews**
- Erich Poppe, "Über die Keltischen Wörter in der *Dissertatio de origine Germanica Latinae Linguae* des J.L.Prasch", in *Deutsche, Kelten und Iren. 150 Jahre Deutsche Keltologie: Gear'oid Mac Eoin zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. Hildegard L.C.Tristram, pp.293-309. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1990.

Wawn, Andrew, 'Picts and pathemes: Þorleifur Repp and Enlightenment linguistics', Papers from the Twelfth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics, Reykjavik, June 14-16, 1990, pp.461-71. Reykjavik: Linguistic Institute, University of Iceland, 1991.

NEWS OF MEMBERS

New Members

Bex, A.R. Eliot College, University of Kent, Canterbury CT2 7NS. [Standardisation and Correctness in English]

Jaszczolt, Katarzyna, St.Hugh's College, Oxford OX2 6LE.

Kerecuk, Nadia, 25, Avenue Road, London W3 8NH. [Grammatical theory, philosophy of linguistics]

Lucas, Dr P.J., Department of English, University College, Belfield, Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland.

Murphy, Professor James J., P.O.Box 1555, Davis, California 95616.

Rash, Dr Felcity J., Department of German, Queen Mary and Westfield College, Kidderpore Avenue, London, NW3 7ST

Richards, Graham, 1 Claremount Road, Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN1 1SY

Rüter, Frau Dr, Postfach 5725, Lingener Strasse 7, D-W-4400, Münster, Germany

Stubbs, Mrs Elsin, 70 Hodford Road, London NW11 8WG

Stuurman, Dr Frits J., Engels/DTS Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht, Trans 10, NL-3512 JK Utrecht, The Netherlands

van Marle, Professor J., K.N.A.W., P.J. Meertens-Instituut, Keizersgracht 569-571, Postbus 19888, NL-1000, GW Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Change of Address

Atherton, Mark. Institut de Phonétique, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Avenue F.D.Roosevelt 50, B1050 Brussels.

Heron, Philip. 9, Cliff Side Gardens, Woodhouse, Leeds LS6 2HA.

News

Professor Helmut Gneuss has become Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The subscription year begins on 1 November. Members joining later will receive publications for that year. Payments should be made as follows, by means of cheques or drafts payable to THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY and sent direct to the Treasurer at the following rates:

(1) for members in the United Kingdom, and for members paying by Eurocheque or Sterling draft:

Full members: £9.00 (standing order £8)

Associate members: £4.50

U.K. members should note that subscriptions may be claimed against Income Tax: the tax reference is: H.O. Ref. T 1644/78/1186/MT.

(2) For members paying in a currency other than sterling:

Full members: US \$20.00 or equivalent

Associate members: US \$10.00 or equivalent

Members in the U.S.A. should send their subscriptions to Professor J. Subbiondo, Vice-President, Office of Academic Affairs, University of the Pacific, 3601 Pacific Avenue, Stockton, CA 95211.

(3) For Institutions: Subscription rates are available from the Treasurer.

It is hoped to include in each Newsletter details of new members of the Society, and it would therefore be very helpful if applicants could provide the following information, for inclusion (where appropriate) in the next issue:

- (i) Full name, title (Prof./Dr/Mr etc), degrees and address to which correspondence should be sent;
- (ii) Name of employing institution (if any), and address if different from (i) above;
- (iii) Bibliographical details of any of their publications, including forthcoming articles or books, relevant to the interests of the Society;
- (iv) Interests in general (teaching or research) related to the aims of the Society.

PLEASE ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE AS FOLLOWS:

1. *Applications for membership:*
Dr.J.L.Flood, Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London, 29 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DP
2. *Correspondence about conferences:*
Dr.Vivien Law, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, CB2 3HU
3. *Contributions for the 'Newsletter':*
Dr Andrew Wawn, School of English, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT
4. *Gifts of publications for the H.S.S.Library:*
Mrs Jean Robinson, Librarian, Keble College, Oxford, OX1 3PG
5. *Guest Rooms at Keble College:*
The Steward, Keble College, OX1 3PG. Telephone (0865) 272777 (mornings) and 272704 (afternoons).
6. *Correspondence on other matters:*
Dr.Brigitte Nerlich, General Secretary HSS, Department of Linguistics, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD