REVIEWS

Frederick J. Newmeyer. *Generative Linguistics. A Historical Perspective.* London & New York: Routledge, 1996. [Routledge History of Linguistic Thought Series.] x + 218 pp. ISBN 0-415-11553-1.

In the present book (henceforth *GL.AHP*) N(ewmeyer) has collected thirteen pieces that he (co-)authored: Chapter 2, 'Bloomfield, Jakobson, Chomsky, and the roots of generative grammar' (originally 1988, previously unpublished); Chapter 3, 'The structure of the field of linguistics and its consequences for women' (first published 1990); Chapter 4, 'Has there been a 'Chomskyan revolution' in linguistics?' (first published 1986); Chapter 5, 'Rules and principles in the historical development of generative syntax' (first published 1991); Chapter 6, 'Chomsky's 1962 programme for linguistics: A retrospective' (first published 1992); Chapter 7, 'Linguistic diversity and universal grammar: Forty years of dynamic tension within generative grammar' (first published 1995); Chapter 8, 'The steps to generative semantics' (first published 1986); Chapter 9, 'The end of generative semantics' (first published 1986); Chapter 10, a review of Huck & Goldsmith (1995) (written for *GL.AHP*); Chapter 11, 'Review of *The Best of CLS* ...' (first published 1989); Chapter 12, 'The ontogenesis of second language learning research' (first published 1988); Chapter 13, 'The current convergence in linguistic theory: Some implications for second language acquisition research' (first published 1987); Chapter 14, 'Competence vs. performance; theoretical vs. applied: The development and interplay of two dichotomies in modern linguistics' (first published 1990). There is a dedication, 'To Marylin', the Table of Contents, a 'Note on Text' (i.e. specification of the pieces' provenances) (v-x), and an introductory Chapter 1; and, at the end, all the end-notes, the references, and two indexes, of names and of subjects.

The pieces collected in *GL.AHP* originate from a variety of sources: a previously unpublished paper (Chapter 2), and a review written specifically for this volume (Chapter 10); reprints of articles published or in press (Chapters 3-7 and 11-14); and sections from an earlier book, *Linguistic Theory in America* (2nd edition, 1986), henceforth *LTA* (Chapters 8 and 9). Two chapters were originally articles with joint authorship (Chapter 6, with Stephen R. Anderson, Sandra Chung and James McCloskey; Chapter 12, with Steven H. Weinberger). The fourteen chapters are organized into three parts: 'General trends' (Chapters 2 through 7); 'The linguistic wars' (Chapters 8 through 11); and 'Grammatical

theory and second language learning' (Chapters 12 through 14). Although this is supposed to reflect N's decision to use a "thematic" rather than a "chronological" arrangement (1), N also admits that the partition is carried out "to a certain extent arbitrarily" (3). Incidentally, N does not discuss why, *within* each thematic part, he has opted to deviate from chronological order as well: 1988 - 1990 - 1986 - 1991 - in press - in press (meanwhile 1995); 1986 - 1986 - original - 1989; and 1988 - 1987 - 1990, respectively.

Given the original diversity, for the purposes of this review the main question is whether there is any substantive justification, beyond N's (co-) authorship, for collecting these pieces in the first place. It does not seem quite feasible to simply turn for such justification to the word 'generative' in the book's title. As is suggested by the omission of 'generative' from the title of Chapter 3, 'The structure of the field of linguistics and its consequences for women', in at least one of the pieces, generative grammar is not specifically in focus; this paper (quite correctly) casts its net more widely (although not outside the USA). Incidentally, apart - obviously - from as yet unpublished material, this paper represents the only chapter in the book whose original is not available in the present reviewer's local university library: this seems to obviate the "obscure locations" that N (1) attempts to slip in as another prevalent reason for papers to have been re-published in this collection.

From such an important researcher as N, one would hope *a priori* that, if "This collection assembles *all* of my papers on the origins and development of generative grammar" (1, emphasis added), this would only remain accurate for a limited period of time. In fact, N has since published another review, in *Historiographia Linguistica* 23 (1996). As witness its medium of distribution, this review falls squarely into *GL.AHP*'s historiographical domain, and it is unfortunate that the piece could not be included in N's book as "in press", like Chapter 6, and Chapter 7 (also meanwhile published, 1995). Otherwise, one wonders why N should have excluded a (1982) article of his, given that the paper that was included as Chapter 14, from 1990, duplicates a passage from this earlier work: (1982:94) and *h.l.*, 173. In any case, if completeness was the aim, *GL.AHP* should have contained all of *LTA* (which would of course not have been a viable option), or none.

Perhaps, then, the collection's true justification resides in some inherent thematic unity shared by all the various constituents. Since his *LTA. The First Quarter-Century of Transformational-Generative Grammar* boosted the

development of the historiography of generative linguistics in 1980, N has occupied a seminal position in the discipline. However, when he merely re-titled his next historiographical book *LTA. Second Edition*, in 1986 N seems to have preferred to play down any extent to which he might have continued to renovate his contribution.[1] As it happens, unless Newmeyer (1982) is indeed improperly excluded, N did not in fact produce separate historiographical work between the two editions. Since the second edition of *LTA*, however, N certainly *did* do separate work, and this has now been collected in this new book. Saliently enough, N has again opted nevertheless to graft this work onto *LTA*: by including Chapters 8 and 9, reprinted from *LTA*\2.[2] As a matter of fact, N also explicitly advertises that "since 1980 ... I have felt no particular need to re-evaluate profoundly my earlier positions" (1). In any case, the pivotal position that N himself insists on according *LTA* will inform the present review accordingly.

---

[1] The only review of *LTA*\2 that I am aware of is Barton (1988). Barton seems to take it for granted that *LTA*\2 does indeed essentially replicate the relevant parts of *LTA*\1. For the historiography of historiography, it is an interesting question to which extent such replication does actually obtain; it is beyond the scope of the present review, however.

[2] N himself uses the term "reprint" (7). Actually, there are some changes. Mostly these concern ostensible stylistic differences, like "fall" (1986:82) - "autumn" (101), "favored" - "favoured" (ibid.); perhaps also "George Lakoff's conclusion (1970b)" (1986:91) - "the conclusion (G. Lakoff 1970b)" (111): but even here, does not the latter formulation allow for more wide-spread support of the conclusion at issue?
    Moreover, N has used italicization to reinstate capitalization in *LTA*\1 which had been lost in the 2nd edition (*abstractness*, 101 (cf. ABSTRACTNESS, 1980:94 - abstractness, 1986:83); *understood*, 106 (cf. 1980:98, 1986:87); *assumptions*, 110 (cf. 1980:112, 1986:90-91); *between* and *within*, 111 (cf. 1980:112, 1986:91); *sufficient* and *necessary*, 114 (cf. 1980:127, 1986:127); *underlying* and *total*, 115 (cf. 1980:166, 1986:129). In the case of *convey* and *entail*, 119, there was no capitalization in (1980:216), either (cf. 1986:131)); conversely, 1980 capitals have not always been thus revived by italics: e.g. AFTER (1980:114), cf. after, 1986:92 and *h.l.*, 112; ALL (1980:128), cf. 1986:127 and *h.l.*, 115; DESTROYED ITSELF, EXPLAIN, twice ANY and NECESSARY (1980:167), cf. 1986:133 and *h.l.*, 120.
    Even more conspicuously, scare-quotes have been introduced, or reinstated from 1980: "shallow" (1980:96) - shallow (1986:85) - 'shallow', *h.l.*, 104; 'interpretivists', 113 (cf. 1986:126); 'global', 117 (cf. 1986:130); 'fuzzy grammar', 121 (cf. 1980:168, 1986:133); 'rule of grammar' and 'homogeneous', 123 (cf. 1980:170, 1986:135); 'requirement' and 'naturalness', 124 (cf. 1980:170-171, 1986:136).
    And what are we to make of "George Lakoff (whose positions, *for better or worse*, came to be identified with the "official" generative semantic line)" (1980:162, 1986:130; emphasis added) *vs.* "George Lakoff (whose position came to be identified with the 'official' generative semantic line)" (*h.l.*, 117)?

If constancy through *LTA.* and beyond was indeed intended to constitute *GL.AHP*'s overall unifying factor, N seems to run into a problem here; one of the chapters in *GL.AHP* (Chapter 5) has explicitly the contrary "purpose ... to challenge the accretionist interpretation of the history of generative syntax ... [which] I have endorsed myself (Newmeyer 1986a[*LTA\2*]:198)" (40). His earlier 'accretionist' position that N *does* profess to have 're-evaluated profoundly', and to have come to challenge, is aptly characterized as an "essentially linear progress-through-accumulation view"; instead of which N proclaims to have since adopted "a more cyclical view" (ibid.). It needs to be noted, however, that *GL.AHP* actually does still retain linear historiography: viz. of Chomsky's own views, rather than those of the field at large. Thus, in the conclusion to the co-authored Chapter 6, historiographically "the picture that emerges is one of foundational stability and continuity" (79); and N's commentary in his own right, in the introductory first chapter, on Chapter 6 is that it argues for the linearity of "an amazing core of overall consistency" (5). What seems to sit less well with an ostensible limitation of the linear view to Chomsky is the fact that on page 160 of *GL.AHP*, in Chapter 13, N does in fact (if without acknowledgement, and in excerpted form) essentially retain the very passage from *LTA\2*, page 198, in which he endorsed linearity for "the work" in general, without Chomsky as an idiosyncratic individual being mentioned (160; a similar unacknowledged duplication of an entire passage obtains between *LTA\2* (1986:38-39) and Chapter 4 (31)).

In any case, it seems curious that N should attribute the linear view to Noam Chomsky: at least, N omits to ponder this attribution in the light of the fact, which N himself records (85), that Chomsky is the originator of the essentially *non*-linear view that the history of generative grammar has seen two conceptual shifts: its genesis, and its non-linear shift from rules to modularly interacting principles. It would seem possible for N to have represented his cyclical re-interpretation as an elaboration of Chomsky's view: because N incorporates Generative Semantics, which he identifies as an earlier principle-oriented cycle, there is a pendulum swinging from rules to principles to rules to principles.

Given the possible confusion as to whether linearity or cyclicity is to be taken to prevail as the eventually adopted view in the collection, and the concomitant opaqueness of the situation with respect to continuity or change in N's views, it seems inevitable to conclude that *GL.AHP* does not quite attain

an overall basis of internal consistency which would have given an added value to the papers as they were already individually available. Note also that the issue of linearity or cyclicity runs right across chapters from all three ostensibly thematically separate parts: Chapters 5 and 6, 8 and 9, and 13, respectively.[3]

Of course, the fact that they have now been collected does not in itself detract from the *original* value of the individual pieces in the book, as they were published separately.[4] Only, discussion of the pieces on that basis seems to go beyond the occasional purposes of the present review. Rather, I will finally provide some discussion of the two pieces in the collection not (to be) published elsewhere, to assess whether their inclusion, at least, amounts to an added value of the book. Of course, one would be hard put to it in the first place to justify a book of 228 pages merely on the basis of just two papers amounting to just 17 pages (7.4%) between them.

---

[3] I am afraid that the lack of added value even extends to the additional editorial apparatus, which seems somewhat shoddy. Thus, in identifying the sources of the papers, apart from "9911" for 1991, the year "1996" is twice an error for 1986; and *Hidtoriographia* misrepresents *Historiographia* (ix-x). On one page in the Bibliography, Jakobson's first name is changed from Roman to "Robert", and italicization has run over from the title of Joos (ed.) (1957) to the place of publication and the publisher's name (201). Finally, in the Index of Names Gerald (Gazdar) becomes "Gerlad", Maurice (Gross) "Maruice", (Joseph E.) Emonds "Edmonds" (212), and (Betty P.) Skolnick "Skolnik" (215); and with unindexed occurrences of N himself on page 32, of Thomas Kuhn on page 23, and of George A. Miller on page 26, and with (Bernard) Bloch instead of (Emmon) Bach being indexed as occurring on page 33, indexing cannot be trusted in the first place. By contrast, the actual texts seem to have been (re-) produced quite carefully; I only spotted one error, "such ... rules such as ..." (186 *n*6).

[4] I have one reservation, however. Juxtaposition of individual papers may be mildly irritating if overlap leads to repetitiveness. In the present case, N disarmingly acknowledges that "The material in the following paragraphs is treated in greater detail in Newmeyer (1991) (reprinted in this volume)" (189 *n*2). But other similar cases are *not* acknowledged: e.g. on Robin Lakoff's 'feminist' linguistics (21 *and* 185 *n*50); on Chomsky's 1949 undergraduate thesis (11-16 in Chapter 2 (see main text below), *and* 179 *n*5); or on Chomsky's "published remarks on /the topic of/ second language acquisition" (155 *and* 179). Saliently, in one such case of repetition, of the quotation "the time has come to return to the tradition of informal descriptions of exotic languages", the source is cited alternately as "G. Lakoff (1974a:169)" and, correctly, as "G. Lakoff (1974a:153)" (51 *and* 149, respectively; incidentally, in the original, *informal* was emphasized by italicization, and the quotation was embedded under just "I think" rather than as N has it (149) under "I think that").

As to the first original paper, in Chapter 2 N presents a convincing analysis of the influences on Chomsky's juvenile work *Morphophonemics of Modern Hebrew*. As far as I can judge, N's arguments that the major influence was Zellig Harris, and not either Leonard Bloomfield or Roman Jakobson, are fully adequate. However, as N admits (14), influence from Harris, who was one of Chomsky's earliest teachers, "should hardly come as a surprise". Conversely, N conspicuously fails to specify any actual proponents of influences from Bloomfield and/or Jakobson; he leaves it vaguely at "generally regarded", or "it is natural to enquire whether" (12). Without specific claims to the contrary being cited in evidence, one cannot help asking whether N's demonstration that such influences do not obtain perhaps remains somewhat quixotic.

Interestingly, Huck & Goldsmith (1995:145-146 *n*6) to a large extent duplicate the results of N's Chapter 2, at least with respect to Bloomfield and Harris. In the second original piece in his book, the review of Huck & Goldsmith (1995) in Chapter 10, N does not acknowledge this close coincidence, but it might well be due to the fact that N was actually among those to whom the reviewees express being "especially grateful ... for stimulating commentary" (1995:x);[5] cf. also from N "p.c., May 1992" (1995:146 *n*10). At all events, N hardly seems to have had occasion to review Huck & Goldsmith (1995) in the orthodox sense of the word:[6] Chapter 10 reads more — and in the context of a book perhaps more appropriately — like a polemic against the reviewees' rejection of the "standard story [which] is by and large the one that is told in

---

[5] The others named are Huck & Goldsmith's major protagonists themselves: Chomsky, George Lakoff, and James McCawley.

[6] If it were an orthodox review, one would have to wonder whether it would be a good idea to abandon the traditional practice of publishing reviews in periodicals rather than in books, on the assumption that the former are more likely to be disseminated as widely as reviews are presumably intended to be. In any case, N's 'review' lacks such routine elements of a review as publisher, number of pages, ISBN, a survey of the book's contents, or a discussion of any editorial shortcomings. For the latter, N had plenty of scope, some of which even applies on a personal level: his occurrence on (1995:30) is not acknowledged (nor are any of his occurrences in the end-notes; but then Huck & Goldsmith seem to have only five entries from the notes in their index: *s.vv.* formalization, Goodman, Predicate Raising, Relational Grammar, and VSO); and when quoting from *LTA*, they (154 *n*42) end up with a particularly confused hotch-potch from the two editions, (1980:169-170) and (1986:135), respectively. Incidentally, the four occurrences of Newmeyer in end-notes *are* recorded in the revised index of Huck & Goldsmith (1996), though the continuation of one from p. 154 to p. 155 is still unacknowledged; and the other points remain unrevised. See Stuurman (in preparation) for related discussion.

Newmeyer's (1980, 1986 [*LTA*]) historical survey" (1995:2). Curiously enough, N thus finds himself re-affirming the 'standard' linear historiography of *LTA*; in the present chapter, there is no evidence of the more cyclical reinterpretation; and N does not even point out the anomalous reference by Huck & Goldsmith (1995:143 *n*2), in ostensible substantiation of *LTA*'s standard (linear) view, to N's (1990) paper that is Chapter 14 in *GL.AHP*, and which adopts the cyclical view contrary to *LTA*.

My conclusion will probably be clear. An important voice like N's always deserves to be heard by anyone seriously interested in the historiography of generative linguistics. But his new book does not seem to me to serve much purpose in making N's historiographical *oeuvre* more audible or more forceful than it already was.

References

Barton, Ellen L. (1988) 'Review of F.J. Newmeyer (1986) *Linguistic Theory in America. Second Edition* ',*Word* 39, 71-74.

Huck, Geoffrey J. & John A. Goldsmith (1995) *Ideology and Linguistic Theory. Noam Chomsky and the Deep Structure Debates*. London & New York: Routledge [Routledge History of Linguistic Thought Series].

Huck, Geoffrey J. & John A. Goldsmith (1996) *Ideology and Linguistic Theory. Noam Chomsky and the Deep Structure Debates*, paperback edition. London & New York: Routledge [Routledge History of Linguistic Thought Series].

Matthews, Peter H. (1993) *Grammatical Theory in the United States from Bloomfield to Chomsky*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. (1980) *Linguistic Theory in America. The First Quarter-Century of Transformational-Generative Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. (1982) 'On the applicability of transformational generative grammar', *Applied Linguistics* 3-2, 89-120.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. (1986) *Linguistic Theory in America. Second Edition*. New York: Academic Press.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. (1996) 'Review of P.H. Matthews (1993) *Grammatical Theory in the United States from Bloomfield to Chomsky*', *Historiographia Linguistica* 23-1/2, 200-209.

Stuurman, Frits (in preparation) 'Review of Geoffrey J. Huck and John A. Goldsmith (1996) *Ideology and Linguistic Theory. Noam Chomsky and*

the deep structure debates, paperback edition'. To appear in
Historiographia Linguistica.

Frits Stuurman, *Utrecht*[7]

Geoffrey J. Huck and John A. Goldsmith. *Ideology and Linguistic Theory. Noam Chomsky and the Deep Structure Debates.* London and New York: Routledge, 1995. [History of Linguistic Thought series]. x + 186 pp. ISBN 0-415-11735-6.

Ostensibly, this book is about the rise and fall of Generative Semantics. It covers approximately two decades in the history of generative linguistics from the early sixties of this century to the late seventies. At the beginning of the period Generative Semantics looked to many to be the direction in which linguistics was going to develop, whereas by the end of it, the movement seemed to have run out of steam, and was all but moribund. A period of fragmentation and stock-taking - marked, not inappropriately by Moravscsik and Wirth (1980) - followed.

The book starts from the apparent paradox that - on the one hand - the Generative Semantic paradigm is taken to have been defeated by that of Interpretive Semantics, while - on the other - a number of the central tenets of Generative Semantics can be seen in retrospect to have established themselves in mainstream generative thinking. The main conclusion will be that the triumph of one theory over another is not always due to proven superiority, but is also determined by ideological and psycho-social processes and considerations.

On another level, however, the book can be read as a discourse on Chomsky and his personality, which emerges as an underlying theme). The focus of the book is then on when, why and how the conflicts arose between Chomsky on the one hand, and the major proponents of Generative Semantics - Lakoff, McCawley, Postal and Ross - on the other. The authors' hope that their book will "help ... to chart a more productive course for research in the years to come" (p. 95) may be taken more as a pious wish. Although we do try to use history as a guide to projected action, things rarely seem to work well that way: rather, the main role of historiography appears to be to facilitate retrospective analysis and explanation.

The book is built up in five major sections. The authors begin by defining two opposing views of the function of grammar: the "mediational" view, which sees the role of linguistic analysis as being to discover and explain the relationship between sound and meaning, and the "distributional" view, according to which the linguist's central task is to explain the patterning and distribution of the formal elements of a language (Ch. 2). Against this

background, the major developments in the debate are presented as more or less successive steps: *The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory* (= Chomsky 1975, but completed 1955-56); the move towards a mediational orientation; the rise of Generative Semantics; the reorientation of the Chomskyan programme towards psychology (constituting a move away from the mediational and distributional positions); the Interpretive response to Generative Semantics; and a convergence of the mediationalist and distributionalist positions. The chapter thus provides a foundation of essential facts, intended as a backcloth against which the strategies of the two sides in argument can be highlighted, not with the aim of exposing one side or the other, but in an attempt to "see beyond the received view" (p. 60). This is done in the following chapter (Ch. 3), in the form of three case studies, in which the reader's attention is specifically directed to the distinction between the logical content of the dispute on the one hand, and the rhetorical language in which it is couched, on the other. The three particular cases examined are events at the Conference on Universals in Linguistic Theory, held in Texas in 1967; the reaction to Lakoff's 1972 paper "Linguistics and Natural Logic"; and, finally, the reception of Postal's 1969 paper "On the surface verb 'remind'".

The three remaining sections of the book are devoted to an account of the apparent demise of the Generative Semantics programme together with an attempt to provide an explanation for it (Ch. 4), Conclusions (Ch. 5), and finally a substantial Appendix containing transcripts of interviews with Lakoff, Jackendoff, Postal and Ross.

In this latter section, attention turns away from the main thread of argument, to focus rather on MIT's powerful and successful research programme, from which the four leading "generative semanticists" originally emerged (p. 82f.). It is interesting that the four interviewees in the Appendix are not identical with the major figures chosen to represent Generative Semantics. No reason seems to be given why there is no published conversation with McCawley, nor - alternatively - why Jackendoff is the only representative of Interpretive Semantics. In the (comparatively) brief Conclusions the authors summarise the situation in Generative Semantics towards the end of the 1970s, by which time the main protagonists had begun to wander off into other areas such as pragmatics, Montague grammar and formal semantics, or elsewhere. The authors' attempt to resolve the initial paradox ("if the theory of Generative Semantics had been falsified, why are its central claims ... still accepted?" (p. 92)) is not, however, entirely plausible, their argument seeming to turn rather on the

question, if Generative Semantics offered such plausible arguments, how could it come to be defeated by Chomskyan Interpretive Semantics? They conclude that the differences between the two major movements lie rather in their methodological approach than in questions of substance (pp. 94f.).

The authors well illustrate how the failure of Generative Semantics to establish itself as the dominant paradigm was due not only - or not even predominantly - to scientific causes (empirical falsification) but to quite different factors. The role of scientific argument about intellectual issues emerges as somewhat reduced in importance, whereas the significance of place and time, of communication networks, of psycho-social processes, teacher-student relations, of institutions and institutional ties is correspondingly enhanced.

Altogether, the book offers a fascinating exposition of scientific processes at work - of how particular linguistic tenets are filtered out and passed on, to reappear later, perhaps in a different context. The authors - positively - attempt to reappraise events independently and dispassionately, explicitly rejecting the "standard story" (p. 3) of recent linguistic history put forward by, among others, Newmeyer (1980). The particular format they have chosen allows those linguists working or studying during the period concerned to re-experience the sense of excitement that was in the air at the time, without obscuring the arguments. The format also helps to bring out the importance of social and communicative networks, for the pursuit of the debate and its outcome. For future scholars the book will prove a valuable source of material: it includes the names of many participants in the discussion, extracts from correspondence, and (re-constructed and lightly edited) transcripts of the conversations already referred to (Appendix). I found the bibliographical references to topics mentioned in the conversations particularly useful (e.g. pp. 98, 101, 102, 103 and passim). The notes also make it easy to check (most) sources rapidly.

The book is rounded off with References and an Index.

What lessons can we learn from this episode in linguistic history? Taking a step back, the Generative Semantics versus Interpretive Semantics debate may be seen as a problem of "uncomfortable" data. Some aspects of history would seem to be plausibly capturable within a theoretical framework not unlike that offered by Castastrophe Theory: one explanation (e.g. Newton's) continues to dominate a field, even while small bits of evidence appear to contradict it. Over

a period of time this evidence accumulates until a point is reached when the whole edifice begins to topple over, and one either has to repudiate the evidence as a whole or undertake a major re-adjustment of the theory (as e.g. Einstein did). One could then see Generative Semantics as one response to the accumulation of uncomfortable evidence, with Chomsky continuing to repudiate the data which his theory could not accommodate, while other linguists were engineering re-adjustments to the system (leading to e.g. Construction Grammars, Cognitive Semantics etc.). And there is some evidence that these are the terms in which some of the protagonists, too, perceived or perceive these events (cf. Postal's contribution, p. 135, and cfl. p. 94f.).

Written history not only presents but also helps to define - even create - the "history" written about. It is interesting to see how quick generative grammarians have been to write and document the history of their own movement - i.e. to help establish for the future what the history of linguistics looked like in the second half of the 20th century. The less welcome aspects of this undertaking (for which the present authors are not necessarily to blame) is that they offer little or no evidence of life outside the generative paradigm. Even when discussing the pre-Chomskyan context - the mediational-distributional opposition - there is no indication that these questions might have occupied other linguists, such as Jespersen, Fries, Nida etc. The presentation, in other words, is of an isolated event in linguistic history: the authors are more interested in establishing an outer boundary and describing events within it, than in looking beyond it to take account of a wider context.

What the book loses (through its structure) in coherence of argument, it gains in variety of approach and, in particular, in immediacy - through the interviews and, partly, the case studies. It has been edited to a high standard - the main weaknesses are in the indexing, and in a few instances of formulation (e.g. p. 95), presumably the result of the fluent, conversational style and/or speed of production. Otherwise this is an informative, stimulating and attractively presented publication.

References

Chomsky, N. (1975)[1955-56] *The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1972), "Linguistics and Natural Logic". In: D. Davidson and G. Harman (eds.) *The Semantics of Natural Language*. (Synthese Library, 40). Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 545-665.

Moravcsik, E.A. and J.R. Wirth (eds.) (1980) *Current Approaches to Syntax. Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 13. New York: Academic Press.

Newmeyer, F.J. (1980) Linguistic Theory in America: The First Quarter-Century of Transformational Generative Grammar. New York: Academic Press. 2nd edition, 1986.

Postal, P. (1969), "On the surface verb 'remind'." *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 37-120.

John Walmsley, *Bielefeld*

Michaelis de Marbasio. *Summa de modis significandi*. Critical edition with an introduction by L.G. Kelly. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1995. [Grammatica speculativa. Sprachtheorie und Logik des Mittelalters. Theory of Language and Logic in the Middle Ages, 5]. 61 pp. ISBN 3-7728-1689-4.

Remarkable attempts were made in the Middle Ages to construct a coherent grammatical theory in line with the then current scientific principles. The traditional grammatical method was renovated in order that grammar should answer more explicitly questions concerning the relationship between language, thought and reality, which were only alluded to in grammar. The importance of interaction between grammar and logic is well-known in this pursuit which involved even theological concerns. It usually took the form of a commentary on Priscian's massive *Institutiones grammaticae* which became the object of philosophical commentary early on, inspired initially by the study of the *logica vetus*, and later on by the study of a number of Aristotelian texts. Among Aristotle's works, not only those on logic played a part in the development of grammatical theory (such as *Topics*, *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics* and *Sophistici Elenchi*), but even such works as *Nicomachean Ethics*, *Metaphysics*, *De Anima* and *Physics* were influential when grammar was adapted to the tenets of a speculative science. The medieval search for a truly scientific grammatical theory culminated in the modistic theory whose most famous representatives are such late 13th and early 14th century authors as Boethius Dacus, Martinus Dacus, Radulphus Brito, and Thomas of Erfurt. The modists cast their theories in the form of *summa* or *quaestiones*, which are independent texts with a structure of their own (see various articles in Ebbesen 1995).

When Michel of Marbais wrote his introduction to theoretical grammar - the *summa de modis significandi* which has now been edited - there was no need to assert that grammar is a science, as the pursuit of a universal scientific grammar had been going on for well over a century. Language was regarded as a natural phenomenon to which similar principles could be applied as to the study of physics (p. xv). Although Michel does not discuss the status of grammar as a science, he shows consciousness of his method by quoting Aristotle's tenet of universal principles of science (*Phys.* I.1) and the idea of a science in progress towards a perfection by accretions which correct past misreadings (*Met.* II.i 993b1-3). According to Michel's optimistic interpretation, later scholars always find what their predecessors have missed. So where are we

to place Michel's *summa*, a mixture of innovation and tradition, in the progress of the science of grammar to perfection?

According to recent historiographies, Michel was active ca. 1280-1285, writing after Boethius Dacus and Martinus Dacus (ca. 1270), and a couple of decades before Thomas of Erfurt and Radulphus Brito (ca. 1300) (Maierù 1994:290). While Boethius and Martin tend to be seen as the initiators of the modistic theory, and Radulphus and Thomas as those who brought it to its completion, Michel has been seen as a representative of the middle group which served to consolidate the proposals of their predecessors (Bursill-Hall 1995: 132). Michel's role in the development of modistic theory is viewed differently by Kelly, according to whom internal evidence suggests most kinship with the doctrine of Martinus Dacus and Joannes Dacus. But, as Kelly maintains, Michel would seem to be writing *before* them, probably in the late 1260s or early 1270s. Pointing to Michel's air of apology in applying novel terms such as *modus significandi active et passive*, which are used confidently by Boethius, he questions the teacher - pupil relationship between Boethius and Michel and suggests that Michel wrote before the appearance of the *Quaestiones super Priscianum maiorem* of Boethius Dacus (ca. 1272) (p.xliv-xlv).

Summa is an introductory text which presents merely the general tenets of speculative grammar. In his *summa* Michel presents the doctrine of the parts of speech (preceded by discussions on *vox, dictio* and *pars*), organized neatly around a theory of modes of signifying. Though crucial for medieval theories of language, syntax is not discussed as a separate topic in this *summa* being however treated in Michel's other works, the *Quaestiones super Priscianum minorem* and the *Tractatus super grammaticam* (unedited). Michel presents the *modi essentiales generales et speciales* and *modi accidentales* of each part, using a language which is philosophically systematic and consistent. His view of language is dominated by the so-called 'motus' model, drawn from the physical theory of process. In characterising language as a series of processes, Michel was not introducing anything new, but was pushing the familiar model to a higher level of abstraction. On the whole, his system is relatively simple, and less abstract than those of Radulphus and Thomas.

Michel of Marbais is a shadowy figure whose whereabouts remain obscure. Kelly makes a tentative association between Michel and a Frater Mychael de Helenchines, a member of the Cistercian Abbey of Villers (p. x). Michel was well known to the humanists, who attacked him as the

representative of the modistic theory. This makes sense if we think of Michel more as an innovator of the modistic movement than as an imitator of Boethius. It is then no surprise that Gansiniec credits Michel with being the founder of *grammatica speculativa*. An edition of Michel's *summa* (from ten manuscripts) by an editor who superbly masters the many difficult skills necessary for medieval scholarship, is highly welcome for the students of the history of medieval theories of language who still find so many of the relevant texts unedited. The introduction to this edition discusses the central concepts of the modistic theory as well as medieval ideas of grammar as a science in a very readable way. It moreover throws light on the nature of this grammatical text as an instrument of teaching which at the time was predominantly oral.

References

Bursill-Hall, G.L., 1995. "Linguistics in the Later Middle Ages" in E.F.K. Koerner - R.E. Asher (eds.) *Concise History of the Language Sciences. From the Sumerians to the Cognitivists.* Elsevier Science Ltd., pp. 130-137.
Ebbesen, S. (ed.), 1995. *Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter. Geschichte der Sprachtheorie 3.* Narr Verlag.
Maierù, A. 1994. "Mediaeval Linguistics. The Philosophy of Language" in G. Lepschy (ed.) *History of Linguistics II. Classical and Medieval Linguistics.* Longman.

Anneli Luhtala, *Helsinki*

Paul J. Thibault. *Re-reading Saussure. The Dynamics of Signs in Social Life.*
London & New York: Routledge, 1997. xxii + 360 (Includes a Name Index and
a Subject Index).

This book finally brings to the attention of the Anglo-American public a reading
of Saussure that has been circulating (rather piecemeal) on the European
continent for some 20 years (e.g. Jäger 1975; Stetter 1976; Wunderli 1981;
Nerlich 1986; Berardi 1989; Simone 1995; Thibault only mentions Coseriu 1981
and de Mauro's excellent Italian translation of the *Cours*). However, Thibault
goes beyond these older re-readings of Saussure insofar as he reads Saussure in
the light of modern linguistic theories, such as Langacker's conception of
schemata (1987), Kress's (1993) views on the social production of signs,
Lemke's (1988) theory of social semiotics, Potter & Wetherell's (1987)
discourse based social psychology, Gibson's ' affordances', as well as in the
light of insights from complexity theory, topology and many more. The author
also goes beyond the older attempts at re-reading Saussure insofar as he
discovers forgotten links and similarities, for example between Saussure's view
of the act of *parole* and Brentano's act psychology, between Saussure's
conception of the speech circuit and Dewey's conception of the reflex arc, and
so on. And finally, and most importantly, he extends Saussure's only embryonic
semiological theory of the life of signs embedded in social life into a more or less
fully worked out social semiotics of linguistic and visual signs.

This new theory of the dynamics of signs in social life can only be
constructed if we destroy some well entrenched misconceptions about the work
of Saussure, which Thibault summarises as follows: "According to this
conventional wisdom, Saussure sees the language system as formal and
autonomous. He separates individual from society, and language from other
non-linguistic sign systems. Society is an anonymous and coercive totality
which is external to the individual. The speech practices of individuals are
separate from, or external to, the language system. The former have no
systematic relationship to the latter. The language system is a closed and static
system which makes no contact with the world. Saussure is unable o explain
variability and change in the linguistic and other signs that we use in social life.
Language is a code by which the speaker 'encodes' and then transmits non-
linguistic ideas and thoughts to the listener in the speech circuit; in turn, these
are 'decoded' by the listener. The sign is not systematically shaped by its uses
in concrete acts of meaning-making". (p.xvii-xviii)

Thibault undermines all these misconceptions by a thorough reading of the *Cours* in its canonical and critical editions, as well as Godel's manuscript sources. He attacks most vehemently a dichotomous view of *langue* and *parole* as separated by differences which are supposed to be found *in re*. Far from it, the aim of the *Cours* was to *delimit* and thus *constitute/construct* a number of objects, which can only be studied if they are properly distinguished from each other according to certain metatheoretical perspectives. The objects thus constituted are *langue* and *parole* and so on. Saussure also wished to distinguish the linguistic study of these objects from the psychological, social etc. study of these objects. This does *not* mean however that the phenomena that correspond ontologically to the objects of linguistic study which have been delimited and constructed by the linguist, are not related to each other in various ways and interact in various ways. From a synchronic perspective, the interplay between *langue* as (individual, virtual) knowledge of a language and *parole* as (actual, social) acts of discourse, enable speakers to engage in acts of meaning-making. From a diachronic perspective, the interplay between *langue* as a (virtual) social fact or system and *parole* as (actual, individual) use we make of its possibilities drives linguistic change. It does *not* mean either that *langue* and *parole* should be studied *exclusively* in a linguistic way. In fact Saussure envisaged studying these objects in a hierarchy of embedded disciplines, one throwing light on the other, namely linguistics, semiology, and social psychology. I want to provide just one quote that sheds some light on the constructive metatheory that Saussure developed for linguistics: "Dans la langue, <aussi bien que> dans tout autre système sémiologique, <il peut pas y avoir> de différence entre ce qui caractérise une chose et ce qui la constitute. [...] [...] Ne parlons ni d'*axiomes*, ni de principes, ni de thèses. Ce sont <simplement et > au pur sens étymologique des aphorismes, des *délimitations*. - <mais [b.]> des limites entre lesquelles se retrouve constamment la vérité, d'où que l'on parte [ ]." (Saussure 1974: 42).

As I indicated above, Thibault undermines some very general misunderstandings about Saussure's metatheory, but he also eradicates some more specific errors in the reception of Saussure's theory of language. Some examples will suffice: He shows that Saussure's concept of *value* was *not* influenced by Pareto, as many assumed, but can be better understood in the light of complexity theory, as well as in the light of Rossi-Landi's marxist theory of an homology between linguistic and monetary value (use-value and exchange-value) (cf. already Haßler 1991, chapts 4.4.1 and 2). He shows that

Saussure's *circuit de la parole was* influenced by research into aphasia (Lichtheim, Wernicke), and not developed in a vacuum, as many assumed; he also demonstrates that it cannot be compared to Locke's telementational view of language. He shows that Saussure favoured mathematical analogies, but not in an attempt to formalise linguistics, and so on.

The book is organised into six parts. Part I: "Constructing a science of signs", sets out Saussure's metatheory; Part II: "Langue as social-semiological system" provides us with a new theory of *langue* as a system for meaning-making, that can be studied from three interconnected perspectives, the system of pure values, the system of regular lexicogrammatical patterns, and the system of typical meaning-making practices. These three layers are later related to modern theories of schematicity, prototypicality and indexicality. This part also demonstrates that *langue* has not only a static nature, but is characterised by system dynamics and evolutionary change; Part III: "*Langue* and *parole*: re-articulating links", establishes links between *langue* and *parole* which explain linguistic change and linguistic meaning as products of a dialogic and embodied view of *parole*, that is, it tries to give an answer to the question: "La langue n'est créée qu'en vue du discours, mais qu'est-ce qui sépare le discours de la langue, ou qu'est-ce qui, à un certain moment, permet de dire que la langue *entre en action comme discours*?" (Saussure, Ms.fr.3961; quoted by Wunderli 1981:47); Part IV "Linguistic value", shows how *langue* construes the world through the exchange of signs in social and symbolic interaction, and that signification cannot be reduced to value; Part V: "Sign and Signification" provides a fresh analysis of sign, signifier and signified, where signs are seen as both the product and the process of the practices of social meaning making; Thibault also considers the possibilities and limitations of a Saussurean theory of signs in social life; Part VI "Sign, discourse and social meaning-making", develops all these strands of thought; Thibault provides an analysis of the dynamic mechanism of *langue*; he redefines syntagmatic and associative relations as two dimensions of contextualising relations which characterise the operations of *langue* in relation to *parole*; he supplies a fresh answer to the age-old question concerning the arbitrariness and motivation of the sign and demonstrates that one has to assume a continuum of possibilities ranging from the absolute arbitrariness of *langue* (as the system of pure values) to the interplay of arbitrariness and motivation in *parole*; and finally he sketches a theory of how we make and motivate signs in discourse, texts and pictures. This chapter closes with a preview of how a theory of signs in social life could look

like. Most of the points made in these six parts are illustrated by the analysis of well-chosen examples.

It would have been helpful to the uninitiated reader to be given an overview of the main points of this re-discovery of Saussure, written less densely than the rest of the book, together with a short overview of the main theories in whose light Saussure was re-read. The many excellent diagrams go a good way towards providing such a helping and guiding hand. But this is only a minor quibble. In general, this is an exciting book that everybody interested in Saussure as well as in a modern theory of the life of signs in social life (semiotics, discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics) should read and re-read. It will revolutionise our views of Saussure and contribute to a new understanding of semiotics.

References

Berardi, Gabriele (1989). *Studien zur Saussure-Rezeption in Italien.* Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.

Coseriu, Eugeniu (1981). *Sincronia, diacronia e storia: il problema del cambio linguistico,* italian transl. Paola Mura, Turin: Boringhieri. [Original Spanish-language edition, 1958.]

Haßler, Gerda (1991). *Der semantische Wertbegriff in Sprachtheorien vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Jäger, Ludwig. *Zu einer historischen Rekonstruktion der authentischen Sprach-Idee F. de Saussures.* Dissertation, Düsseldorf.

Kress, Gunter (1993). "Against arbitrariness: the social production of the sign as a foundational issue in critical discourse analysis". *Discourse and Society* 4:2, 169-291.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar,* vol. 1: *Theoretical Prerequisites.* Standford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Lemke, Jay L. (1988). "Towards a social semiotics of the material subject", *Working Papers* 2, 1-2, 1-17, University of Sydney: Sydney Association for Studies of Society and Culture.

Nerlich, Brigitte (1986). "Saussurean linguistics and the problem of meaning - from dynamic statics to static dynamics". *Language & Communication* 6:4, 267-276.

Potter, Jonathan & Margaret Wetherell (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour.* London and New Delhi: Sage.

Saussure, Ferdinand de 1974. *Cours de linguistique générale.* Edition critique par Rudolf Engler, tome 2, fascicule 4. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Simone, Raffaele (1995). "The language user in Saussure (and after)". *Historical Roots of Linguistic Theories,* ed. by Lia Formigari & Daniele Gambarara. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stetter, Christian, 1976. "Die Idee der Semiologie bei F. de Saussure. Ein Beitrag zur Klärung des linguistischen Erkenntnisinteresses". *Deutsche Sprache* 4, 289-295

Wunderli, Peter (1981). *Saussure-Studien.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Brigitte Nerlich & David D. Clarke, *Nottingham*

M.J. van der Wal. *De moedertaal centraal; standaardisatie-aspecten in de Nederlanden omstreeks 1650.* The Hague: Sdu Uitgevers, 1995. [Nederlandse cultuur in Europese context; monografieën en studies, 3. IJkpunt 1650]. 161 pp. ISBN 90-12-08298-6. NUGI 941.

This book, *De moedertaal centraal,* is part of a series evaluating a cross section of Dutch culture at four significant points of time. 1650, which marks the peak of Dutch colonial expansion and the beginning of the independent Republic of the Seven Provinces, proved to be a particularly interesting point to consider the development of the vernacular which led to modern Dutch.

It may seem odd to remark but one of the effects of the shifting national and dialectal borders means that it is sometimes unclear which language a particular writer may have in mind and, in investigating earlier stages of the Dutch language, one first has to establish just which language is actually meant by *Duyts, Nederduyts, Nederlandtsch* or *Lingua Belgica.* The name '*Duyts*', for instance, was used for both Dutch and German throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is one of the strengths of this book that the reader is always accurately informed and is spared the disappointment of a George Hickes, the English grammarian of early Germanic languages, who, in 1691, bought what he thought to be a "High Dutch" dictionary only to discover it was of the "inferior German" (Bodleian, Ballard MS. 12, f.68). Ironically in this context, the dictionary in question "Kiliaan's" was probably the first scholarly dictionary of Dutch.

In *De moedertaal centraal,* Van der Wal makes a two pronged approach to the subject of the recognition and acceptance of Dutch as a language in its own right. On one line she elaborates on, recasts, and carries into the seventeenth century, the pioneering work in which Van den Branden (1956) investigated sixteenth-century attempts to promote and improve the Dutch language. On the other tack she uses Haugen's more recently proposed, and now generally used, criteria for measuring language status, namely, selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance, in order to provide the reader with a clearly depicted mosaic of the state and role of the language. To do this, she first provides a framework of images from the parallel stages of development of the four geographically nearest Western European vernaculars and then takes us into the microcosmic world of the Dutch representatives of various disciplines ranging from mathematics to music. After a chapter providing Haugen's criteria and a description of the structure of her argumentation, chapter two

demonstrates the progress of standardisation with respect to those criteria for the languages of Italy, France, England and Germany, in that order, in keeping with the chronological development of scholarly interest in the mother tongue. None of the information presented in this chapter is new; being used to provide points of reference and comparison, it is a distillation of knowledge from secondary sources as can be evidenced of the fact that contemporaneous works dealing with languages other than Dutch are not to be found in the bibliography. I am sure this was a deliberate policy; it avoids overloading the bibliography with references irrelevant to the main topic: the state and status of Dutch, and thereby allows the scholar to home in on that. Van der Wal adroitly avoids reinventing the wheel, but yet provides easy reference to a mass of related material within this chapter and there is also a comprehensive index of people, institutions and titles of books which cannot be readily assigned to particular authors. As with all simplification and condensation of knowledge, some inaccuracies are inevitable, but, as far as this reviewer can tell, Van de Wal's meticulous scholarship has ensured that there is nothing more serious than the implication that Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755) was the first extensive/comprehensive (*omvangrijk*) dictionary of the English language.

Chapter 3 deals with the topic in general starting from the first impulses towards the standardisation of Dutch and moving to a discussion of attitudes expressed and works published in the vernacular towards the end of the sixteenth century in the context of selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance, but also in the context of the paths taken by the other languages with respect to these. Again Van der Wal does an admirable job of paring information to fit the space available, or maybe even to stimulate her reader to further his studies, but I would have appreciated the note to provide a summary of critical opinion on the authorship of the first Dutch grammar rather than a further reference, to "Peeters (1990)".

In common with other historiographers of Dutch language studies, Van der Wal has concentrated on the vernacular views of those favourably disposed to the language. She considers the likes of the Antwerp doctor, Becanus and the mathematician, engineer Simon Stevin, who were most concerned to promote the cause of the Dutch language for practical purposes. In using this sociolinguistic bias, she has tilted her main focus away from the more sober contributions of humanist scholars publishing in Latin who investigated early medieval Germanic texts such as Flacius' edition of Otfrid von Weissenburg's

Gospel paraphrase, or Van Merula's etymological work. Nevertheless, even though it was probably not representative of mid-sixteenth-century Dutch attitudes to the language, I was beguiled by being informed of Becanus' view that Dutch was the oldest language as it was the language of the barbarians and therefore older than Greek or even Hebrew. Becanus makes the claim for Dutch on the basis of his proposed etymology of the name *Duyts = doutst* (the oldest) and proposes that it must have been the language of the Cimmerians, who, not having been involved in the construction of the Tower of Babel, were allowed to keep the one original tongue. Another proposal by the architect, Verroten, proposed that the Dutch of Classical Antiquity had been subject to continual improvement in scholarly debate and had ultimately been called *Duids* on account of its lucidity (*duidelijkheid*). Indeed, German humanists, we are told, were also convinced of the venerability of their identically named language, but they used its overwhelming monosyllabicity in support of their claims.

Despite the desire of mostly southern printers for standardisation of spelling and the existence of Kiliaan's dictionary reflecting the language of Brabant, selection of a standard Dutch dialect echoed something of the Italian situation in that the final choice of the northern, dialect of Holland had to do with both shifting political power, prestige and other social factors. Immigration from the South provided for doublets still to be seen today, but Eastern forms tended to be rejected even then by the influential Dutch Authorised Version of the Bible published, like the English King James Bible, in the course of the first half of the seventeenth century.

Dutch was seen as a language which had been neglected and had therefore become inferior to Latin for expressing thought. Codification therefore involved the application of Latin grammar rules apparently without anyone seeing the irony, although the six cases, inappropriate as they were, were solemnly given vernacular names. Purification however involved the rejection of loan words, especially from Latin, not because they smelled of the inkhorn as the English saw them, but because they were seen as hybridising and therefore contaminating. Elaboration, which would require naming new concepts, could best proceed by neologism and compounding. However, despite the practical advantages, grammars and a dictionary, even the logicians of the late sixteenth century failed to have Dutch introduced as a university language.

Chapter four provides detail on contemporary attitudes to languages in general and Dutch in particular. The German grammarian, Schottel considered English as insubstantial, while the Dutch philologist and dominee Van der Mijle saw the Scandinavian languages as less pure than Dutch because of their contact with the Lapps. Criteria for language prestige such as age, monosyllabicity euphony, inflectional capacity, onomatopoeia and even learnability are discussed. Interestingly, in the section assessing seventeenth-century translators' views, Van der Wal casts her net beyond literary translations and translations of the Classics to translations of contemporary social concerns, sermons, law, medicine and education. There is a section devoted to Verroten as a lover of the Dutch language and an comparative assessment of the attitude to Dutch in two grammars published in 1649 and 1653. The chapter ends with a consideration of the influence of the then extant grammars, and spelling book, and dictionaries on the ultimate choice of dialect and its spelling.

In Chapter 5, there is a critical evaluation of the justice for seeing Dutch as a language of learning able to cater to the needs of contemporary scholarship. The perceived capacities of Dutch are compared with those of Latin and with other contemporaneous European languages. We are given a glimpse of seventeenth-century problems of finding suitable vocabulary and the attempts to introduce Dutch terminology for the field of music. This too can be seen as a stimulus to the reader to extend his studies since the appendix listing music terms from Ban (‡1597/8-†1644) in comparison with Meijer (1669), is preceded by a 150 item bibliography of seventeenth-century Dutch translations and a 32 item bibliography of seventeenth-century scholarly publications in Dutch.

In short, this slim volume of a scant hundred pages is packed with a wealth of material invaluable to any scholar interested in investigating the historiography of the Dutch language. Matching volumes for other languages similarly treated would be an asset to the discipline.

References

Branden, L. van den. *Het streven naar verheerlijking, zuivering en opbouw van het Nederlands in de 16de eeuw.* Ghent: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde, 1956. [Reeks V1, nr 77].

Dekker, C. *"The light under the bushel" Old Germanic studies in the Low Countries and the motivation and methods of Jan van Vliet (1622-1666).* Leiden: ?1997 (forthcoming).

Peeters, L. *Taalopbouw als Renaissance-ideaal. Studies over taalopvattingen en taalpraktijk in de sestiende en zeventiende eeuw*, ed. by G.R.W. Dibbets, J. Noordergraaf and M.J. van der Wal. Amsterdam: Buijten & Schipperheijn, 1990.

Robin D. Smith, *Leiden*

Harro Stammerjohann (main ed.). *Lexicon Grammaticorum. Who's Who in the History of World Linguistics.* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996, xxvii + 1047 pp. ISBN 3-484-73018-8. DM 586.00.

This book is extraordinary in many respects: one editor, assisted by one English-language editor, 20 co-editors, all of them with well-known names in the historiography of linguistics, and 421 authors who wrote more than 1500 entry-articles on 1047 pages, printed in two columns, of varying length. The (most likely) shortest is 10 lines (on Lee S. Hultzén), the longest some 620 lines long (on Panini). There is a list of as many as 520 abbreviations of reference works.

Without any doubt, this is a very valuable and useful book. Entry-articles are divided into a life-oriented and a work-oriented part, with a bibliography added which distinguishes between primary and secondary titles. The life-oriented part regularly starts with some five to ten lines mentioning the name of an author, the dates and places of birth and death, and a 'tag' of varying length which gives him or her a place in linguistics like, for example, 'structural linguist' (for Leonard Bloomfield), 'pioneer anthropologist and student of Am[erican] Indian lang[uage]s, largely responsible for developing Am[erican] structuralism' (for Franz Boas) or 'peripatetic commentator and translator, author of mathematical, theol[ogical] and philos[ophical] writings' (for Boethius). It goes without saying that, given this general pattern, entries vary a lot in almost all respects, depending on the author under description and probably also the taste of the entry-author. Moreover, the editor seems to have given the liberty to his contributors to develop their own style. Extreme cases are an entry of 16 lines on 'Funk, Isaac Kauffmann [...], lexicographer' with no reference to literature at all, and one of some 240 lines on Isidore of Seville with references which cover a quarter of the whole text. The main task of a book like the *Lexicon,* namely to identify a great number of authors or otherwise expert representatives in the field of linguistics and to indicate where more information can be found, is certainly fulfilled in all entry-articles (as far as I could read them). Experts will almost certainly query the many general statements made, but they (i.e. the experts) need not consult a Who's Who, anyway. The *Lexicon* envisages readers who are ignorant, and we are all experts who are ignorant in many areas of the linguistic domain. I did not make an exact count, but I admit that the *Lexicon* contains several hundreds of names which I read for the first time and which I am glad to be able to identify, if and when the need should arise to do this. So far, so good.

But there are some queries.

The subtitle 'Who's Who' indicates that the book is person-orientated. Indeed, entries are arranged alphabetically according to authors' names. However, there are six entries of unusual length (Alexandrian grammarians; Etymology, ancient Greek; Greek and Latin rhetoricians; lexicographers, ancient Greek; and Stoicism) which have topical headlines. This flouting of the system indicates that the editor was between the horns of a dilemma. Just like 'literature' in ancient periods, 'linguistics' is occasionally not represented by authors (and their works) but by works whose authors are unknown or too unimportant to be mentioned outside a 'school'. The editor could either violate the Who's-Who-system, i.e. the arrangement by names, or could refrain from representing certain anonymous but not unimportant productions of the history of linguistics. He did the former, but to a certain extent also the latter. In addition to the topical entries mentioned, this led to three entries under 'Anonymous', seven entries (between 'Antoine Arnauld' and 'Roger Ascham') starting with 'Ars' ('Ambianensis', 'Ambrosiana', Bernensis', Berolinensis', 'Brugensis', 'Laureshamensis', and 'Vaticana') and, furthermore, an entry 'Declinationes nominum' (between DeCamp, David' and 'De Cosmi, Giovanni Agostino'). There may be more of the latter kind which I did not find. It remains uncertain whether they will be found by readers without any advice in the book that such entries are there. (I found the ones mentioned by good luck, but may have missed others.) Why not list them all under 'Anonymous' or print an index of entries which do not have a name but the first word of a title as their headword? Besides, if the arrangement by name is disrupted at all, the question arises whether this is a useful procedure only for Greek and Latin linguists. Many Egyptian or other Near-East glossaries, grammars or translation-books, for example, do not have known authors. This is the same with the all-important Anglo-Saxon glossaries. There was, furthermore, in the 16th and 17th centuries, a Europe-wide literature of onomasiological dictionaries and didactic dialogues, often combined with grammars and collections of proverbs, which would have deserved to be enlisted in the *Lexicon* under some topical title ('Introito e porta' or 'Solenissimo Vochabulista' or 'Dilucidissmus dictionarius'), because they mostly appeared anonymously (see Rossebastiano Bart 1984).

The subtitle also explains that the book is devoted to 'world linguistics'. This is certainly a high floating ambition. The division into 19 'areas according to historical, geographic or linguistic criteria' (not 20 as the preface says) with their

own sub-editors shows what this means. Twelve pertain to Europe, basically determined by the language criterion which coincides with the geographical one. Of these, one (France) is connected with areas outside Europe; another one (Italy) is connected with ancient Greek and Rome. and thus has a historical dimension. A thirteenth 'area' pertains to medieval linguistics in Europe. This leaves six areas outside Europe (North America, Japan, Korea, China, India, Arab countries). The obvious European preponderance seems not unfair given the fact that most of the readers of the book will be occupied with European linguistics anyway. But - with South America, the Caribbean, Africa (except the Arabic speaking areas), Australia and the South Sea missing, this is not 'world linguistics'. Even English speaking countries like Australia or New Zealand have their indigenous linguistic history. Moreover, in this way the *Lexicon* is cut off from missionary linguistics and missionary grammar, which are an important part of European linguistics. There is, for example, a first Samoan grammar by George Pratt (1817-1894), sponsored by the London Missionary Society (see Hovdhaugen 1996). These curtailings are certainly regrettable. However, more than the divisions it is perhaps the ambitious title of the book which should be criticised.

Last not least, it is a real pity that Finland has not been allocated an area of its own (or perhaps together with Hungary). The author of the first Finnish grammar, the Swede Aeschillus Petraeus (1593-1657), would certainly have deserved an entry.

Even more than the subtitle, the title *Lexicon grammaticorum* itself gives rise to some doubts. Of course, for most of the centuries which the *Lexicon* covers 'grammar' would be synonymous with the as yet non-existent term 'linguistics'. The wish to have a Latin title which is, as it were, in equal distance to at least many of the languages dealt with, is understandable. But the use of English as the language of the *Lexicon* would have justified an English title and saved the editor from using a word which may be right in its historical meaning but which is plainly wrong in the present-day one. I am convinced that many readers of the title who are not interested in grammarians, but for example in lexicographers, will dismiss the book as not relevant, until they know better. What about 'The Lexicon of Linguists'? Or: 'The Who's Who in the History of (World) Linguistics'?

But even so, the selection of authors to be included is a problem in its own way. In the opening lines we find such widely differing 'tags' like 'greatest

representative of humanism[!] in Northern Europe' (Erasmus), 'art theorist, who also wrote a comprehensive grammar of It[alian]' (Carl Ludwig Fernow), 'jurist, writer, linguist, founder of a lit[erary] society that worked towards a reform of the G[erman] language' (Harsdörffer), 'philosopher and political theorist' (Hobbes), 'rhetorician, political speech writer' (Isocrates), and simply 'lexicographer' (in many cases), or even 'grammarian'. This is not to say that some of the people mentioned should have been excluded, it is to show how difficult it is to draw the limits of linguistics. Was Christoph Martin Wieland, 'poet and (prose) writer, prominent representative of the G[erman] Enlightenment', a linguist, because he opposed Adelung's language standardisation programme? And Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, 'poet, who contr[ibuted] to the standardization of N[ew] H[igh] G[erman]'? Their achievements in linguistics are less than marginal in their works and their life dates can be found in many other places. If Hobbes and Leibniz are mentioned, why not Hegel or Fichte? I.e., if we count philosophers of language among the linguists, as is done in these and many other entries, must we not do it consistently then? Admittedly, these are border cases but they gain some weight vis-à-vis the fact that many names, which should have doubtlessly included, are indeed missing. To mention but a few (and, of course, only from the fields which I can pretend to know): Raimundus Lullus, Adrianus Junius, Daniel Adam à Weleslavin, Johannes Murmellius, Nicodemus Frischlin, Sir Thomas Elyot, John Florio, Elizabeth Elstob, Noel de Barlaimont, Daniel Jenisch, Richard Paul Wülcker, Eduard Adolf Sonnenschein, Ludwig Lazarus Zamenhof, Yehoshua Bar-Hillel. A series like this opens up a whole volley of questions, because each of the authors would deserve an entry in the *Lexicon* for different reasons. There are producers of ideas versus writers of practical handbooks, there are people of world-wide (or culture-wide) fame versus people cf national importance, there are innovative versus applicative authors, there are original writers versus antiquarians and editors. Which of them is more in the centre of linguistics? These questions need to be answered only because of the fact that a selection must be made if you compile a Who's Who. Otherwise they are futile. And what is the function of a Who's Who? To give all the canonical names, or just the opposite, to give the names of such authors as can hardly be found anywhere else?

Contrary to other editors (e.g. Kürschner 1994), Harro Stammerjohann does not explain his ideas as an editor. It seems to me that too liberal an editing policy (certainly a virtue in itself) made him underestimate the difficulties he would encounter in deciding which author deserves a place among the first 1500 world-linguists.

Concerning the selection of authors, there is one more problem which should concern a German editor and a German reviewer more than others. The generation of linguists who worked in Germany in the first half of this century is well represented - *sub specie* 'world-linguistics' almost too well. But the involvement of many of them in politics goes almost always unmentioned. Eugen Lerch's antifascism and Alfred Götze's profascism are mentioned; of Hans Sperber and Leo Spitzer we read that they were dismissed out of racist reasons. No mention of the problem is made in the entries on Eduard Hermann and Walter Porzig. And the really awful cases of Hermann Günthert, Hans Naumann, Georg Schmidt-Rohr, Walter Wüst, and others are not mentioned at all (see Maas 1988). But they must be made available for critical research and should therefore not have been left out.

Finally, there is the significance of the length of entry-articles. If this is a direct mirror of the importance of the authors under discussion, the most important ones are: Epicurus, Panini, Giambattista Vico, Dante Aligheri , Graziadio Isaia Ascoli, Giacomo Leopardi, John Wallis, John Wilkins, Dionysius Thrax, John Hart, Alessandro Manzoni, Abû Bišr 'Amr ibn 'Uthmân Sîbawayhi, and Henry Sweet. On much lower ranks we find Priscian, Boethius, Firth, Aristotle, Grimm, Humboldt, Erasmus, Wittgenstein, Vives, Comenius, etc. The problem is very much the same as with the selection of authors. Where are the criteria, except the enthusiasm of entry-authors for their topic? Rigorous restriction to several formats (e.g., two columns, one column, half a column of 60/30 lines each) would have been much better. And again: What is the function of a Who's Who? To give introductions to Epicurus, Panini and also the others who seem to have been misplaced here like Gautamo, Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, or just the opposite, to give sketches of the works of such authors who can, if at all, only be found in expert literature, but not in general reference works?

All these questions and deliberations do not diminish my estimation of the *Lexicon* as something extraordinary and very useful. During the time when I was working on this review I needed some information, in the course of my normal work, on Amara, because he was mentioned by Humboldt. All my reference books let me down, even the chapter on Indian linguistics in a recent *History*. I looked up the *Lexicon* and found: 'Amara, shortened form of Amarasimha, probably 6th c. A.D. (or even older by one or two cents.); Buddhist lexicographer of the Skr. lang., according to the tradition also a

celebrated poet, to whom some stray verses are ascribed.' - plus 60 lines, i.e. one column, of explanatory text, two references to editions, two to secondary treatments. This was exactly what I needed!

References

Bart, Alda Rossebastiano (1984): *Antichi vocabulari plurilingui d'usu populare: la tradizione del 'Solenissimo vochabulsita'* Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Hovdhaugen, Even (ed.)(1996): *...and the Word was God. Missionary Linguistic* and Missionary Grammar.* Münster: Nodus. Studium Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 25.

Kürschner, Wilfried (ed.)(1994): *Linguisten-Handbuch. Biographische und bibliographische Daten deutscher Sprachwissenschaftlerinnen und Sprachwissenschaftler der Gegenwart. 2 vols.* Tübingen: Narr.

Maas, Utz (1988): 'Die Entwicklung der deutschsprachigen Sprachwissenschaft von 1900 bis 1950 zwischen Professionalisierung und Politisierung'. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 16:253-290.

Werner Hüllen, *Essen*

Christopher Stray (ed.) *The Mushri-English Pronouncing Dictionary.*
Available from the author, c/o Department of Classics, University of Wales
Swansea SA2 8PP. 1996. vii +82 pp. ISBN 07049 0 774 7.

Dr Stray's slender volume has the subtitle 'A chapter in 19th-century public
school lexicography', and reproduces the essence of the text, and manuscript
amendments, of the several editions over two decades of a work whose final
edition appeared in 1901. It purported to list, in scholarly form and with an
apparatus of learned criticism, more than 200 examples of the idiosyncratic
mannerisms and speech forms (especially pronunciation) of Edmund Morshead
(1849-1912), an assistant master at Winchester College for 31 years until 1903,
and was the work of groups of his pupils. Though Morshead had been at the
school himself and also at the associated New College at Oxford, his accent
retained, like many public school masters (and headmasters) of this period, traces
of his regional origins, since it was not until after a preparatory school education
became c. 1870 the almost universal prior experience that RP in both its marked
and unmarked forms became the rule among public school products.

Especially valuable are Dr Stray's 40 pages of introduction, which set the text in
the context of the development of public schools (though he does not deal with
prep schools) during the century. He draws attention to some 40 works
appearing between 1842 and 1893 which claimed to list or explain the famous
Winchester terminology known as 'notions', and sees this linguistic
self-consciousness as evidence of the need to assert distinctiveness and indeed
antiquity in a period of competition among schools. We must, however, dispute
Dr Stray's suggestion that the first list of Notions, as early as 1842, may have
reflected this particular kind of reaction to competition from new proprietary
schools — apart from Cheltenham, there were relatively few such schools by
that date, and their proliferation was for the future. Part of his explanation of the
Morshead phenomenon is the plausible suggestion that the cultivation of
eccentricity among schoolmasters — which at some schools went to
considerable lengths — expressed resistance to the cult of uniformity for which
by now the public school system in general stood. He could have added that
Morshead's strenuous anglicisations of French words was part of the typical
Englishman's resistance to French culture. Dr Stray also shows how the
influence of comparative philology — and indeed the philological concerns of
the *OED* — reached down into such schools, and he brings together valuable
examples of other private languages in the Britain of this period — an important
but untilled field of research — including the 'Glynnese' of the

Lyttelton/Gladstone family connection and the 'Phluddiphry' of the Hercules West coterie at Cambridge in the 1870s. Less obviously related is Cornewall Lewis's Latin spoof *Inscriptio antiqua* (1862), though it is useful to have it printed here as an appendix.

That the author feels it necessary to comment that some of Morshead's weird pronunciations sounded suspiciously close to vernacular forms is slightly surprising. Such a tendency was, indeed, a general characteristic of the distinctive upper-class dialect which I have termed the 'hyperlect' - its *awf* and *crawss,* its *huntin* and *shootin,* and its use of *ain't* and *don't it* was shared, across the great divide of middle-class correctness, by grandee and scullery-maid alike. These common features were possible because everything else about their lifestyles loudly trumpeted their differences of station.

Several members of the Henry Sweet Society are acknowledged as having contributed to the research which went into the making of this short book, and for linguists it has, as a rare contribution to the sociology of idiolexis, an importance out of proportion to its length and specific content.

John Honey, *Cambridge*

G.R.W. Dibbets, *De woordsoorten in de Nederlandse triviumgrammatika.*
Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU & Münster: Nodus, 1995. [Stichting
Neerlandistiek VU, 18]. iv + 349 pp. ISBN 90-72365-43-7 (Amsterdam) & 3-
89323-420-9 (Münster). f. 70.00 (excluding postage).

Grammatical writings on Dutch language which came into existence in the period of circa
1500 till circa 1650 are usually named trivium grammars. As is well-known, there are
seven subjects in the Middle Ages based on the Classics: quadrivium (arithmetica,
geomateria, astronomia, musica) and trivium (grammatica, dialectica, rhetorica). The
trivium part consisted of the subjects directed to language. The *septem artes liberales*
were considered to be indispensable for a well-educated man and a condition for scientific
training. Towards the end of the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance and the age of
Humanism education in grammar schools was organised in the trivium tradition.

This education was concentrated on Latin, but in the sixteenth century scholars and
writers became convinced of the value of the mother language. Therefore in those days
not only grammars on Latin were published, but on vernacular, too. These grammars were
also written according to the trivium model. These writings on language were composed
in connection with the 'artes', thus as a grammatica, dialectica and rhetorica. At about the
middle of the seventeenth century the trivium in Latin education disintegrated. And the
study of Dutch language was gradually separated from the study of dialectics and rhetoric.
In the eighteenth century there was no trivial coherence anymore.

For a long time the so called trivium period in the history of Dutch linguistics has
received a great deal of attention from researchers. The systematic analysis of earlier
grammars has grown in the last few decades. Since the fifties new editions of many
grammaticals texts have already been published. Meanwhile in dissertations and in many
articles attention has shifted from the interpretation of the old texts concerning phonetics
and orthography, to linguistic tradition and the position of these grammars in the
European context.

In *De woordsoorten in de Nederlandse triviumgrammatica* [The parts of speech in
Dutch trivium grammars] the author G.R.W.Dibbets, professor in the history of Dutch
linguistics at Nijmegen University, has compiled the results of a lengthy research. With
this impressive publication he wants to describe in particular the history of the *partes
orationis* in vernacular grammars. Nowadays we know these parts of speech as the basic
terms in traditional (school) grammar.

After an introduction on the trivium and the theory of the parts of speech all the distinctions, terms and interpretation problems are explained and illustrated with well chosen examples from many texts. The author uses not only real grammars, but also essays and introductions which have been published as part of other works, for example the linguistic preface of Anthony de Hubert's rhymed version of the Psalms. Besides, he uses orthography books and grammars written for foreigners and for comparison he consults grammars in other languages.

Dibbets' work on the parts of speech in Dutch trivium grammars is a copious study. The book represents with great precision present-day knowledge of this matter. Owing to the fact that the author is an eminent expert in the Low Countries it will become a standard book. The linguistic facts are well arranged and the text is accessible. Sometimes, if there is a motive, the author comments on historiographers like Michael (1970) en Vorlat (1975).

This excellent study on the parts of speech in Dutch grammatical works is an indispensable instrument for the history of linguistics of the Early New Dutch and the first stage of traditional grammar.

Bibliography

Hubert, A. de, "Noodige waarschouwinge aan alle liefhebbers der Nederduijtze tale". In: *De psalmen des propheeten Davids.* Leiden 1624. [Also in: F.L. Zwaan, *Uit de geschiedenis der Nederlandse spraakkunst.* Groningen/ Batavia 1939.]

Michael, I., *English grammatical categories and the tradition to 1800.* Cambridge 1970.

Vorlat, E., *The development of English grammatical theory 1586-1737, with special reference to the theory of parts of speech.* Leuven 1975.

L. F. van Driel, *Middelburg*

Helmut Gneuss. *English Language Scholarship: A Survey and Bibliography from the Beginnings to the End of the Nineteenth Century.* Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies. Binghamton, New York 1996. [Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, vol. 125]. 152 pp. ISBN 0-86698-130-6.

This book is the English translation and revision of a report delivered to the *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften* and published there in 1990. The revision pertains predominantly to the bibliography. The first part, an essay on 'The study of English', is followed by a second one, a bibliography broken down into 78 sections with some 950 titles. The historiographical essay refers to the sections of the bibliography. This is why we have in front of us a particular form of an annotated bibliography. But this particular form creates the particular value of the book.

The bibliography introduces readers to the basic literature. The essay, which may be read before or after consulting the bibliography, gives the historiographic context, thus explaining not only the historicity of the topic, the English language, but also the historicity of its linguistic treatment. It goes without saying that the two aspects cannot be kept separate in all cases. 'The study of language in early Anglo-Saxon England' (section nine of the bibliography), for example, cannot treat anything else but Anglo-Saxon and contemporary Latin. But as the topic 'grammar' appears in many subsequent sections, the attentive reader becomes aware that in section nine the object as well as the method of its treatment is historic'.

In characterising his essay, the author writes: 'My emphasis will be on the tasks, methods and aims of linguistic scholarship in the past, rather than on ideas and theories [...]'. This statement has a philologically traditional ring. A historiographical overview of the description of English emerges from the selection of books and papers which Helmut Gneuss comments upon, breaks down into temporal phases and connects with external historical facts. It is not a historiographical treatment of such arguments as can be found *post festum* in the sequence of linguistic ideas. This is to be praised highly as the author's intention is to bring together the mass of historical analyses pertaining to the English language *before* we start comparing arguments, defining paradigms, looking for philosophical underpinnings, etc.

That a single author tries to tackle this task is a good reason not to criticise details. Everybody will miss something, but wise restraint is the law for

regarding a book like this. Naturally, the bibliography is overtaken by new publications almost every day.

Gneuss's is an extremely practical and lucid book which introduces the historiography of linguistics (with reference to English) to a book genre where we do not usually find it. 'This book is made to last' is printed on the reverse side of page one. The statement refers to the chemical quality of the paper. It could also mean the character and the quality of the book itself.

Werner Hüllen, *Essen*

Kees Versteegh. *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes. Az-Zaǧǧāǧī's Theory of Grammar. Introduction, Translation, Commentary.* [Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 75], ix, 310 pp. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. ISBN 9 272 4562 2. [Price not known].

This work is one of the most significant contributions to the history both of Arab and of general linguistics to emerge for many years. While it will always remain impossible to extract the complete technical meaning of a term or argument from Arabic and reproduce it exhaustively in English in such a way that the non-Arabist gains a full and correct insight into the topic, there can be few more reliable interpreters of this particular seminal and influential text than Versteegh.

The potential importance of the book within its own tradition can be gauged by merely listing its principal themes — a practice normally to be avoided in reviews which pretend to any critical stance, but here a genuinely informative procedure. Al-Zajjājī attacks every important issue of grammatical theory that was being discussed in his circle in the middle of the tenth century A.D., in a series of frequently rather short and always dense and allusive chapters whose very titles will whet the appetite of any historian of linguistics: what is the exact number of parts of speech, what is inflection and why does it occur at the end of words, why is inflection needed at all, what are the origins of the case names, is there an absolute need for grammar, what is the relationship between speaker and speech act, between word and thing, between nouns and verbs, between inflection and meaning, how is time encoded in verbs, what is the logical priority of parts of speech, what is the nature of long vowel inflections, why is the distribution of case/mood inflections asymmetric between nouns and verbs, and so on, not forgetting the big question, what is the nature of grammatical causality!? One name that comes to mind here is Thomas of Erfurt: there is a tantalizing and still unresearched parallelism between the concept underlying the standard Arabic term for grammar, *naḥw*, which literally means "way" and the etymological equivalence implicit in the word "modistae". However, al-Zajjājī preceded Thomas of Erfurt by some four centuries, and any consideration of intellectual or historical relationships between the two can be set aside. What is certainly of the highest interest in al-Zajjājī's speculations is that he consciously and insistently separates himself from the philosophers of the period, who were themselves just beginning to challenge the ideological hegemony exercised by the traditional grammarians to which al-Zajjājī proudly

belonged. Since he was an exact contemporary of one of Islam's greatest philosophers, al-Fārābī (d. 950, who was moreover a good friend of one of al-Zajjājī's teachers, Abū Bakr ibn al-Sarrāj; al-Zajjājī himself died between 948-50), this assertion of grammar's independence from philosophy carries a special weight.

The reader is well served not only by the translation but by the extensive and detailed annotations, a wide ranging bibliography and several specialized indices. The author tells us that this book has been gestating for some time, and now that parturition has finally occurred it can be recorded with much satisfaction that the progeny will have a major influence on scholarship in the field for many years to come.

M. G. Carter, *Oslo*

T. J. Reed & David Cram (translators and eds.). *Heinrich Heine. Selected Poems*. London: Everyman, J. M. Dent, 1997. xxiv + 99 pp. ISBN 0-460-87865-4. £ 2.00.

' One may say of verse translations of Heine what Dr. Johnson said of second marriages, that they are the triumph of hope over experience. '

Norman Macleod (1930)

What a gloomy observation! Nevertheless, there are many triumphs in a recent selection of Heine's poems translated into English verse. The poems in Reed and Cram (1997) are fresh in at least three senses of the word: (1) new, (2) vigorous and (3) saucy as in the German — *frech*. A pleasing balance is maintained between originality and fidelity to Heine's prototypes.

The concise format of the Everyman's Poetry series has resulted in a bargain price (£2), but a minimum of commentary. It is to be hoped that the authors will be invited elsewhere to comment on the controversial process of creating verse translations of Heine.

Each translation was identified with a particular person. Ann Reed contributed a song of May. Otherwise the translations were done either by T. J. Reed or by David Cram.

T. J. Reed produced a brief, but fascinating introduction to Heine's life and poetry from the sublime to the paradoxical. Heine, like Tannhäuser, was enthralled by Venus, yet thirsted for involvement in human causes, hence his commitment to revolutionary liberalism.

Tastes have been shifting over the past century and a half. Yet Heine still has a remarkable power to attract modern audiences. This applies not only to the following translation by David Cram, but also to the German original of 1821-22. The poem, Love's Declensions, has been singled out for attention here because of its linguistic overtones.

Love's Declensions

For aeon after aeon	Es stehen unbeweglich
Up in the skies above	Die Sterne in der Höh,
The stars gaze at each other	Viel Tausend Jahr, und schauen
With unrequited love.	Sich an mit Liebesweh.

The language they converse in	Sie sprechen eine Sprache
Is exquisitely grand,	Die ist so reich, so schön;
And one no linguistician	Doch keiner der Philologen
Could ever understand.	Kann diese Sprache verstehen.
I alone have learnt it,	Ich aber hab sie gelernet,
Of all the human race,	Und ich vergesse sie nicht;
By using as a textbook	Mir diente als Grammatik
The grammar of your face.	Der Herzallerliebsten Gesicht.

The word 'unrequited' fits skilfully into the first stanza and appeals to anyone who knows the meaning of unrequited love, *ergo* everybody? When the concept of unrequited is extended to the third stanza, it suggests a one-way flow of love between 'me' (the lover) and 'you' (the inaccessible beloved). However, the German original is ambiguous, allowing also for a two-way flow of love between 'me' (the lover) and 'you' (the other lover). Similarly the stars seem to be experiencing a mutual communication of love's pain —'*Liebesweh*'.

Instead of 'unrequited love', the point can be demonstrated by substituting 'eyes of aching love' [*Pace* poets!] as follows:

1. For aeon after aeon	This would maintain the
2. Up in the skies above	possibility of a two-way
3. The stars gaze at each other	flow of '*Liebesweh*'.
4. With eyes of aching love.	

Liebesweh, like the Beatific Vision of the mystics, may have been its own reward. It was a component of the *cosmic* language as envisioned by Heine, — an elusive language of infinite longing which he shared with the stars. Did *cosmic* grammar have a reciprocal declension?

References

Holtzhauer, Helmut and Klingenberg, Karl-Heinz (eds.), 1968. *Heine's Werke.* Berlin & Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, [Bibliothek Deutscher Klassiker] 5:36-37.
Macleod, Norman. 1930. *German Lyric Poetry.* London: Leonard & Virginia Woolf at the Hogarth Press, 91.

Herman Bell, *Oxford*

Brigitte Bartschat. *Methoden der Sprachwissenschaft. Von Hermann Paul bis Noam Chomsky.* Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1996, 188 pp. ISBN 3-503-03740-3.

This book has grown out of an informal photocopied anthology which the author used for many years at the university of Leipzig when no authentic texts could be provided for students there. The explanatory deliberations that went together with these texts now forms the main body of the book. B. Bartschat keeps the anthology character by extracting her ideas from short significant text samples of her authors rather than from their works in general. Students who use the book as an introduction to 19th and 20th century linguistics will particularly like this method. The chapters are devoted to the 'Neo-grammarians, Baudouin de Courtenay, Ferdinand de Saussure, the Prague Circle of Linguists, glossematics (Hjelmslev and Uldall), descriptive linguistics (Bloomfield and Harris) and Noam Chomsky (Standard version). This selection is dominated by the evolution of linguistic structuralism and leaves aside all semantically and pragmatically oriented authors. For introductory purposes the restriction to the 'structural mainstream' is certainly justified, although it does not mirror the actual development of linguistics in Europe. The treatment of authors is lucid and comprehensive, guided by the two concepts of 'continuity' and 'discontinuity'. It is worthwhile mentioning that compared with other introductions to linguistics Russian contributions, which are notoriously neglected in such books, are given the attention they deserve.

Werner Hüllen, *Essen*

Selahi Diker, *And the Whole Earth Was of One Language*. Izmir: Selahi Diker, 1996. ISBN 975-96037-0-5.

Quite where the full title of this book begins and ends is hard to tell, and such a beginning provides a good introduction to both the length and the unorthodox approach of this study. In varying type sizes and on varying pages the reader is given the following title(s): Discovery of ancient Turkish civilizations which set the foundations of Greece and Rome. Ten Thousand Years of the Turks. And the Whole Earth Was of One Language. Decipherment of Lost Languages Including Etruscan, Scythian, Phrygian, Lycian, Hittite, Hurrian, Urartian, Sumerian, Achaemenid Aramaic and Elamite, Parthian. And The Unfolding of the Language of the Pelasgians and The decipherment of the Issyk Inscription also A New Interpretation of Presently-known Turkish Languages including Kök-Türk, Chuvash, Hungarian-Finnish And Marco Polo's Mongol. While it is pleasant to know that the art of the long title did not die with the seventeenth century, one is hard put to it to know what to do with such a title, let alone such a book. Being, anyway, ill qualified to pronounce upon the details of such research, what follows is not so much a review as an informal introduction to this extraordinary piece of work.

Reference to 'ten thousand years of the Turks' in the title alerts the reader to the Great Sun Theory of early Republican years in Turkey, during which students of Turkish sought to show that all languages descended from Turkish. The writer's use of the word 'Turkish' to describe so many languages and dialects reinforces this connection, as does his ultimate aim: the book sets out to prove that the ancient civilizations of Anatolia, civilizations which gave rise to the earliest cities in the world, were Turkish, and that the present-day Turkish people need no longer feel dispossessed of culturally significant roots. It is therefore not entirely unexpected to find the text ending with the following quotation from Atatürk: 'I have no doubt at all the Turks' forgotten great quality and the great capability of creating civilization will rise like a new sun at the dawn of a higher civilization of the future' (p797). There have been other publications along similar lines, but I know of none on this scale in English. The quest as presented here may not be particularly attractive to non-Turks, but the information-gathering along the way certainly is, and the synthesis of information from disparate sources, while providing a different or anachronistic interpretation, fits in well with the current re-thinking of previously-accepted theories of proto-languages and their diffusion.

The thesis of the book is that the lost people and lost languages listed in the title should not have and can not have been truly lost, but rather that all these languages 'which were generally non-Semitic, non-Indo-European, and also agglutinative ... had to be related to the Ural-Altaic group of which Turkish is the only major language spoken today in Eurasia' (p3). The confident tone of this assertion is carried through the whole book, and is perhaps not always justified. This is a matter of presentation and methodology, to which we will turn a little later.

The book opens with discussions of the following 'Turkish' languages: Kök-Türk, Chuvash, Hungarian and Finnish, and 13th century Mongol. The writer then goes into a reconsideration of traditional decipherments, showing a large number of new meanings. These come from the lost languages mentioned in the title, and of the languages of the Southern Black Sea, Trojan, Cretan and Carian peoples, Sumero-Babylonian, Sakas, Yueh-Chih, Hephtalite, Sogdian, and Ancient Egyptian. The effect of Turkish on ancient (Indo-European and Semitic) languages and on Kurdish form the third part of the book, and the final part contains explanations of selected geographical names, followed by an appendix which provides discussion of the phonetic values of some letters from ancient alphabets and a table of alphabets.

Glossaries of selected words from all the languages mentioned above are presented, but the extent to which the selections are reductive is not always evident. Most of the glossaries are clearly and explicitly selections of words apparently showing Turkish influence on those languages (this includes the (6 page) Hungarian and Finnish, (3 page) Southern Black Sea, (6 page) Trojan, Cretan and Carian, (3 page) Lycian, (4 page) Pelasgian-Oghur, (29 page) Sumerian, (6 page) Aramaic, (9 page) Achaemenid Aramaic, (6 page) Elamite, (12 page) Persian and Median, (4 page) Pontus and Cappadocian, (9 page) Parthian, (3 page) Chinese travellers, (3 page) ancient Egyptian, (6 page) Sanskrit, (8 page) Ancient Greek, (2 page) Latin, (2 page) Anglo-German, (5 page) Armenian, (2 page) Semitic, and (3 page) Kurdish glossaries). In the case of some other glossaries, however, the inexpert reader cannot tell whether or not they are complete. Here my general impression is that almost all of them present only those words which the writer finds relevant to his discussion. This latter category comprises glossaries of Kök-Türk (5 pages), Chuvash (5 pages), Phrygian (7 pages), the 13th century Mongol language (15 pages), Scythian (Saka) (9 pages), Etruscan (7 pages), Hittite-Hattian (8 pages), Hurrian (4 pages), Sumero-Babylonian (7 pages), Royal Achaemenid Elamite (14 pages), Saka,

Yueh-Chih, Hephtalite (4 pages), and Sogdian (1 page - clearly not enough to cover the many Sogdian inscriptions that the writer says have been found (p 696)). In the case of the Issyk glossary (2 pages), taken from the only known text in this language, we are assured that we have the complete word list.

The bibliographic entries and references in the text use a system of abbreviation which is at times cumbersome, and the bibliography itself contains some surprising omissions, notably Colin Renfrew's Archaeology and Language[1]; there are a number of scholars in this country working on ancient Turkic and Anatolian languages, but no references to their work is found here[2].

The writer vituperatively rejects the approaches and findings of professional historians, and replaces them with his own 'logic and reason' (p2) and with his 'training in positive sciences in which only logic and proof count' (p1) (Mr. Diker is a geophysicist). The question is, has he thrown the baby out with the bathwater? A little more of the traditional apparatus of academic writing would go a long way to make this book more palatable; when a writer is presenting new material and interpretations in explicit conflict with accepted theories, they must be presented in a comparable fashion. To be more specific, absence of precise corroborating evidence and of academic contextual material (some sort of 'review of the literature'), and of any clear statement concerning the methodology of the study, have removed from most readers the ability to assess the strengths or weaknesses of the arguments presented here. The absence of reference to Renfrew's work is particularly noticeable here, as almost all of the methodological criticisms of paleo-linguistics made in that earlier book are relevant to this one, whether in points of agreement or of clear disagreement. Some of the assumption underlying the arguments, notably that a simple link can always be made between race and language, are very off-putting. In my opinion the methodological shortcomings of this book are so great as severely to restrict its usefulness. In spite of many footnotes and references, and after 801 pages of mostly expository material, concentration on only those details which the writer deems important to his arguments at the expense of any useful overview of the whole subject, combined with a confidence of presentation that we are not used to reading in this controversial and exploratory field, is deeply disturbing. The effect on the reader is best

---

[1] London: Jonathan Cape, 1987.

[2] I am grateful to Dr. Şukriye Ruhi for her advice on this point.

described as not being able to see the wood for the trees, and at the same time wondering whether the trees are as solid as they look.

One consequence of the scale of the task attempted here is the necessity to include much information in little space, and this may account for some of the apparently unsubstantiated or unconvincing statements. Shortcomings of presentation include lack of any explanation of the principles of transcription - or indeed of the phonological reconstructions - used, incomplete and an inconsistently presented bibliography, and many language mistakes and inelegancies for which we should not blame a non-native writer of English; but after so much time and effort, it is surely a pity that the script was not sent to a reliable proof-reader.

It was the very scope of this work, and the scale of Mr. Diker's undertaking, which first drew my attention to it, and these factors remain perhaps the most impressive side of the whole study. Certainly it contains many shortcomings, but one cannot pull oneself away from the feeling that many gems must be found in so great a quarry. Time and again the reader is violently put off by grave faults of presentation, which invite strong distrust of the information provided; but just as one is about to push the book away once and for all, the fact that it is rare and precious to find all this information between the same covers, and that it is, after all, interesting, force one to continue. The fact that this material has been presented in English is especially important - here for the first time findings and comments of Turkish scholars made in their own language are available to the non-Turkish speaking community.

If the findings reported in this work are complete and accurate, then this must be considered an important if unacademic book. If (as I suspect) not, then it remains an anachronism, a book of such curiosity value that still it should not be ignored. The glossaries alone are of some value. I can only regret that the style of its presentation remains off-putting and unconvincing, and hope that one better versed than I in these ancient languages may provide us with an expert assessment of its true value.

Margaret J-M Sönmez, *METU, Ankara**

---

* *Ten thousand Years of the Turks* costs $100 and may be obtained from the author at the following telephone/fax numbers: (232) 285 87 58 (Turkey), (303) 988 5824 (USA).

NOTES AND ARTICLES

Edwina Burness

Members of the Society will have been saddened to hear of the death of Edwina Burness. I first met her at a Society meeting, and was immediately struck by her vividness. The startling red hair was matched by a colourful personality, and her spirited and generous conversation made her a person I always looked forward to meeting. We were both interested in dictionaries, and I have not forgotten her paper on 17th-century lexicography given at a Textbook Colloquium meeting at UCL. Our shared involvement in this group as well as in HSS gave us plenty of opportunities for meeting and talking, especially when she became assistant editor of the Colloquium's journal PARADIGM. John Wilkes, its editor, has testified to the contribution Edwina's sense of style made to the preparation and sub-editing of articles.

Edwina had for some time taught at the Boston University campus in London. More recently she was teaching at Anglia Polytechnic University in Cambridge. A memorial reading was held at APU after her death, at which colleagues, students and friends testified to Edwina's scholarship, her warmth and her generosity of spirit. (One of the contributions came from Vivian Salmon, who had known Edwina far longer than I and had collaborated with her. I hope Vivian's text might be printed in a future Newsletter.)

Recently Edwina had learned that she had a terminal cancer. She and her husband, the art-historian Nigel Gauk-Roger, were found dead in their house, and the circumstances make it clear that they had decided to end their lives together. I must record my admiration for their courage and my respect for the mutual love and commitment which led them to their decision, while deploring the loss many of us still feel. The sense of shock and disbelief persists: it is difficult to accept that Edwina is no longer with us.

Chris Stray, *Swansea*

The Textbook Colloquium

The Textbook Colloquium, or to give its full title, the Colloquium on Textbooks, Schools and Society, was started in 1986 by a small group drawn from the Henry Sweet Society, the History of Education Society and the British Society for the History of Mathematics. Its central idea is that textbooks illustrate and exemplify a number of interrelated processes which are important in the study of society. It seemed to us that these processes, and especially their interrelation, had been neglected by historians, and that there was an extremely interesting interdisciplinary field to be explored.

We are interested in how ideas, as they emerge from society, are adapted for presentation in school: in their simplification and distortion; in the extent to which textbooks are influenced by religious, social and political prejudice; in the time-lapse between the availability of an idea in society as a whole and its adoption in school: whether the time-lapse varies amongst subjects, and if so. why. Textbooks transmit ideas and attitudes, but we do not know how long it may take for an idea which has been vividly met in school to influence adult behaviour, nor how far the time varies according to cultural conditions and the nature of the subject.

In considering such questions we need to take account of the publishing history of influential textbooks. Textbooks are conservative, often reprinted for fifty years or more in hundreds of editions: but they also reflect, through these various editions, changes in political and moral outlook. Developments in the subject matter of textbooks, although more familiar to us, are less frequent than are changes in attitude. Changes in attitude are reflected in changes in teaching methods, and these are often expressed through variations in typography and layout which represent the importance given to various aspects of the subject matter. Many lines of interest join in a consideration of the textbook as a material and commercial object.

The bibliographical study of textbooks can be sustained only by scholars of a serene temperament. Popular textbooks, from the end of the eighteenth century, were produced in large numbers, often anonymous and undated; they were tinkered with, reprinted, imitated and pirated. They were worn out and thrown away. Those which survived in an attic amongst "granny's schoolbooks" were grubby and incomplete. The survivors in libraries are frequently uncatalogued, because no one asks for them; and no one asks for

them because no one knows they are there. Yet they are significant historical documents.

The Colloquium is trying to bring textbooks, both individual works and types of book, into fuller academic light. Like all who introduce interdisciplinary studies we are having to establish our own identity: there are no research or teaching posts in textbook studies, and it will take time for our diverse interests to cohere into a consistent discipline. We are greatly helped in establishing our identity by the current interest in book and publishing history. Those working in this field share many of our interests and help to strengthen the validity of such interdisciplinary work. Textbooks themselves provide evidence of linguistic change. Many of them discuss it in a pedagogic context which, because it is often banal and unscholarly, has been little studied, in spite of its importance. The Colloquium's work has yet to touch substantially on twentieth century textbooks or on textbooks in modern languages other than English, but we are in touch with French, Scandinavian, Dutch and German bodies whose concern is mainly with contemporary publications. Our hundred or so members are drawn from a dozen different countries.

The Colloquium meets about three times a year, where possible round a table rather than in rows. Meetings are open to all and are held in different parts of the country to connect with local groups and individuals and to explore collections of material. Papers given at the colloquia are printed or summarised in *Paradigm* the Colloquium's journal, thrice-yearly. We have published two short monographs and have others in preparation. The published list of members records also their research interests and relevant publications, covering as wide a range as might be expected: literary acquisition in colonial and post-revolutionary America; Victorian science books for young children: quantitative history of nineteenth century book production; semiotics of textbooks; textbooks of English as a foreign language: dictionaries and grammars; design of textbooks.

Enquiries about the Colloquium should be addressed to Jean Russell-Gebbett, 16 The Cloisters, Beeston, Nottingham, NG9 2FR.

Ian Michael, *Swansea*

James Legge: The Heritage of China and the West
Aberdeen University, 8-12 April 1997

This international conference was held in the centenary year of the death of
James Legge (1815-1897), translator of the Chinese classics and pioneering
figure in the relations between China and the West. The conference brought
together scholars in a number of disciplines from Hong Kong, the People's
Republic of China, the United States and Europe. Papers presented covered a
wide range of topics concerning the history of international relations and the
history of ideas, and what emerged, among other things, was the importance of
Legge as a figure in the history of linguistic thought in the late Victorian period.

Legge was born in the town of Huntley, Aberdeenshire, received his
M.A. from King's College, Aberdeen, and after many years on the Chinese
mission field, was appointed in 1875 as first holder of the chair of Chinese at the
University of Oxford. His name is linked to that of Max Müller, who had been
appointed as first holder of the Oxford chair in Comparative Philology in 1868,
and who was instrumental in preparing the ground for the chair of Chinese. It is
indicative that Legge starts out his inaugural lecture with a reference to Max
Müller's inaugural lecture eight years earlier. Like Max Müller, Legge was
concerned not just with philological matters, but also with the newly
established science of comparative religion, and Legge's later translation of
Confucian and Taoist works were to appear in the monumental series *Sacred
Books of the East* which Max Müller had initiated. As a philologist, Legge was
perhaps not of the same stature as Max Müller, but nevertheless an eminent and
influential thinker. His range of linguistic interests are indicated in brief in his
inaugural lecture, which constitutes a plea for the more extensive study of the
Chinese language as well as of Chinese literature and thought. Much of what
he says seems to point forward to the twentieth century, e.g. the study of
dialects, the study of Chinese characters, a passing mention of 'pidgin' English.
Other remarks however link back to the concerns of previous centuries. Thus
observing the peculiarity of the Chinese language in being largely
monosyllabic, and after contrasting it with other languages in a manner
informed by current typological thinking, he goes on to comment: "While I do
not say that Chinese is a relic of the earliest human speech, it would seem to be
more akin than any other existing language to what that speech was" (Legge
1876:20). One wonders how he knew.

Legge's translations are (the experts assure us) both scholarly and sophisticated. He was highly respected by the Chinese for his command of the language and for his interpretations of difficult texts. On the other side of the linguistic coin, he attempted match the stylist register of the original with a 'dynamic equivalent' in English, using up to five different stylistic levels ranging from the English of the Authorised Version to the dialect of his native North East Scotland. His translation work also drew him into a heated controversy, which came to be known as "the term question', concerning the Chinese term(s) to be used to translate the Christian words for God (*elohim* and *theos*). This debate still makes an interesting case study of a translation dilemma, the problem being that, where a closely matching Confucian term is available, ideological criteria may preclude its use precisely to avoid cultural identification. On these matters, Legge took a 'comparativist' view (Legge 1850) which was in line with current academic thinking but not always held in favour by his co-religionists.

James Legge deserves greater scholarly attention than he has so far received in the historiography of linguistics, and it is to be hoped that the proceedings of this conference, together with the biography by Lauren Pfister and Norman Girardot which is in preparation, will stimulate further research on his linguistic activities. It is of mild but inconsequential interest to note that Legge's biographical trajectory, from Aberdeen to Oxford, matched that of George Dalgarno two centuries earlier. But Aberdeen did not enter the picture when he wrote to a friend later in life that: "Next to Hong Kong, Oxford is the most delightful place in the world".

Legge, James (1850) *Letters on the Rendering of the Name God in the Chinese Language*. Hong Kong: "Hongkong Register" Office.

Legge, James (1876) *Inaugural Lecture of the Constituting of a Chinese Chair in the University of Oxford, delivered in the Sheldonian Theatre Oct 27, 1876*. Oxford & London: James Parker.

David Cram, *Oxford*

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED
(to 15 April 1997)

Members of the Society have been kind enough to donate the following publications to the HSS Library at Keble College. Further contributions, which are very welcome, should be sent to:

> Mrs. Marjory Szurko
> The Librarian
> Keble College
> Oxford OX1 3PG

Monographs by individual authors will be reviewed wherever possible; articles in collected volumes will be listed separately below, but, like offprints and articles in journals, will not normally be reviewed. It would be appreciated if the source of articles could be noted where not already stated on the offprints.

The Society is also very grateful to those publishers who have been good enough to send books for review.

Members who wish to consult the Library are welcome to stay at Keble College, and should write in advance to the Steward.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

ADAMSKA-SAŁACIAK, Arleta
Language Change in the Works of Kruszewski, Baudouin de Courtenay and Rozwadowski. Poznań: Motivex, 1996. 175 pp. ISBN 83-902692-4-4

BARTSCHAT, Brigitte. *Methoden der Sprachwissenschaft. Von Hermann Paul bis Noam Chomsky.* Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1996, 188 pp. ISBN 3-503-03740-3

van BEKKUM, Wout, HOUBEN, Jan, SLUITER, Ineke and VESTEEGH, Kees
The Emergence of Semantics in Four Linguistic Traditions: Hebrew, Sanskrit, Greek, Arabic. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997. [Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 82]. ix + 322 pp. ISBN 90 272 4568 1 (Eur.,Hb.)

BERNECKER, Roland
Die "Idéologie" in Italien: Eine kommentierte Bibliographie zur Sprachtheorie der Spätaufklärung. Münster: Nodus, 1997. [Studium Sprachwissenschaft 13]. 245 pp. ISBN 3-89323-013-0, ISSN 0721-7129

DIKER, Selahi, *And the Whole Earth Was of One Language.* Izmir: Selahi Diker, 1996. ISBN 975-96037-0-5

DUTZ, Klaus D. & GENSINI, Stefano (eds.)
Im Spiegel des Verstandes: Studien zu Leibniz. Münster: Nodus, 1996. 220 pp. ISBN 3-89323-268-0

FOOLEN, Ad & NOORDEGRAAF, Jan (eds.)
De taal is kennis van de ziel. Opstellen over Jac. van Ginneken (1877-1945). Münster: Nodus, 1996. 223 pp. ISBN 3-89323-267-2

GAMBARARA, Daniele, GENSINI, Stefano & PENNISI, Antonino (eds.)
Language Philosophies and the Language Sciences: A Historical Perspective in Honour of Lia Formigari. Münster: Nodus, 1996. [Materialen zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und der Semiotik, 8]. 395 pp. ISBN 3-89323-308-3

GNEUSS, Helmut. *English Language Scholarship: A Survey and Bibliography from the Beginnings to the End of the Nineteenth Century*. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies. Binghamton, New York 1996. [Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, vol. 125]. 152 pp. ISBN 0-86698-130-6

HUIZINGA, J.
Inleiding en Opzet voor Studie over Licht en Geluid. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU & Münster: Nodus, 1996. [Stichting Neerlandistiek VU, Cahiers voor Taalkunde, 11]. 96 pp. ISBN 90-72365-30-5 (Amsterdam) & 3-89323-515-9 (Münster)

LEE, Penny
The Whorf Theory Complex: A Critical Reconstruction. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996. [Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 81]. xix + 323 pp. ISBN 90 272 4569 X (Eur.,Hb.).ISBN 90 272 4570 3 (Eur., Pb.)

NICHOLS, John D. & Ogg, Arden C.
nikotwâsik iskwâhtêm pâskihtêpayih!: Studies in Honour of H. C. Wolfart Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, 1996. [Memoir 13]. x + 490 pp. ISBN 0-921064-13-6

NERLICH, Brigitte & CLARKE, David D.
Language, Action and Context: The Early History of Pragmatics in Europe and America, 1780-1930. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996. [Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 80]. xii + 497 pp. ISBN 90 272 4567 3 (Eur.)

NOORDEGRAAF, Jan
The Dutch Pendulum. Linguistics in the Netherlands 1740-1900. Münster: Nodus, 1996. xvi + 189 pp. ISBN 3-89323-264-8

O'MEARA, John (ed. and translator)
ᐅᓇᐊᑕᓐ / *Ninoontaan/ I Can Hear It: Ojibwe Stories from Lansdowne House Written by Cecelia Sugarhead*. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, 1996. [Memoir 14]. xxxiii + 224 pp. ISBN 0-921064-14-4

REED, T. J. & CRAM, David (translators and eds.)
Heinrich Heine. Selected Poems. London: Everyman, J. M. Dent, 1997. xxiv + 99 pp. ISBN 0-460-87865-4

STAMMERJOHANN, Harro (ed.)
Lexicon Grammaticorum. Who's Who in the History of World Linguistics. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996, xxvii + 1047 pp. ISBN 3-484-73018-8

STRAY, Christopher (ed.)
The Mushri-English Pronouncing Dictionary. Available from the author, c/o Department of Classics, University of Wales Swansea SA2 8PP. 1996. vii +82 pp. ISBN 07049 0 774 7.

TAYLOR, Daniel J.
Varro — De Lingua Latina X: A New Critical Text and English Translation with Prolegomena and Commentary. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996. [Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 85]. ix + 205 pp. ISBN 90 272 4573 8 (Eur.)

THIBAULT, Paul J.
Re-reading Saussure. The Dynamics of Signs in Social Life. London & New York: Routledge, 1997. xxii + 360. ISBN 0-415-10410-6 (Hb.), ISBN 0-415-10411-4 (Pb.)

VERWER, Adriaen
Schets van de Nederlandse taal: Grammatica, poëtica en retorica. Latin edition of E. van Driel translated into Dutch by J. Knol. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU & Münster: Nodus, 1996. [Stichting Neerlandistiek VU, 21]. 22 + 25 + xiv (bis) + 140 (bis) + 5 pp. ISBN 90-72365-47-X (Amsterdam) & 3-89323-424-1 (Münster)

JOURNALS

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft. 6:2 (1996). ISSN 0939-2815

Biblionews and Australian Notes & Queries. 21:1 (March 1996). ISSN 0157 3276

Biblionews and Australian Notes & Queries. 21:3 (September 1996). ISSN 0157 3276

Zeitschrift für Semiotik. 18:4 (1996): *Historische Wurzeln der Pragmatik*, ed. by Brigitte Nerlich.ISSN 0170-6241

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

AARSLEFF, Hans
"Herder's Cartesian *Ursprung* vs. Condillac's Expressivist *Essai*". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 165-179

ADAMSKA-SAŁACIAK, Arleta
"Language change as a phenomenon of the third kind". Review of Rudi Keller, *Sprachwandel. Von der unsichtbaren Hand in der Spache.* (Tübingen: Francke, 1990). *Folia Linguistica Historica, Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae,* 12:1-2 (1991), 159-180

ADAMSKA-SAŁACIAK, Arleta
"On explaining language change teleologically". *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia,* 22 (1989), 53-74

ADAMSKA-SAŁACIAK, Arleta
"Paradigms and linguistic historiography". In Edmund Gussmann (ed.), *Licensing in Syntax and Phonology.* (Lublin: Folium, 1995), 239-248

ADAMSKA-SAŁACIAK, Arleta
"Rozwadowski's laws of language development". *Folia Linguistica Historica, Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae,* 14:1-2 (1993), 15-28

ADAMSKA-SAŁACIAK, Arleta
"The *Teleologen* on language change". *Folia Linguistica Historica, Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae*, 8:1-2 (1988), 457-480

AQUECI, Franco
"Un'apertura dialogica della linguistica enunciativa di A. Culioli". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 329-336

AULETTA, Gennaro
"Alcuni appunti sulla semiotica leibniziana". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 129-132

AUROUX, Sylvain
"Science et temporalité". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 27-32

BAKKER, Peter
"Hudson Bay trader's Cree: A Cree pidgin?" Nichols & Ogg 1996, 1-34

van BEKKUM, Wout
"Part One: The Hebrew tradition". van Bekkum, Houben, Sluiter & Vesteegh (1997), 3-47

van BEKKUM, Wout, HOUBEN, Jan, SLUITER, Ineke and VESTEEGH, Kees
"Meaning in four linguistic traditions". van Bekkum, Houben, Sluiter & Vesteegh (1997), 285-300

BLAIN, Eleanor M.
"A moraic analysis of syllables in Minnesota Ojibwe". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 35-59

BLONSKY, Marshall & SCHULZ-KEIL, Wieland (voice-over eds.)
"'Was macht der Mensch mit Worten?' Roman Jakobson und die Entwicklung der modernen Sprachwissenschaft: Ein Gespräch aufgenommen von Marshall Blonsky und Wieland Schulz-Keil". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6:2 (1996), 173-186

BOLOGNA, Maria Patrizia
"Riflessioni sul rapporto fra ricerca etimologica e teoria semantica nella linguistica tedesca dell'Ottocento". In Roberto Ajello & S. Sani (eds.), *Scritti Linguistici e Filologici in Onore di Tristano Bolelli*. (Pacini, 1995), 239-248

BURKHARDT, Armin
"Geballte Zeichen: Das Symbol und seine Deutungen". *Zeitschrift für Semiotik*. 18:4 (1996), 461-482

CARLETON, Frank
"Rare books: some boundaries of definition". *Biblionews and Australian Notes & Queries* 21:1 (March 1996), 7-10

CAVALIERI, Rosalia
"Mente, linguaggio e patologia in Henri Bergson". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 289-301

CHEVALIER, Jean-Claude
"Quelques lectures sur «Les synonymes et la grammaire dans la tradition française»". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 133-142

CHIRICÒ, Donata
"Maine de Biran: la parole au *moi*". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 143-153

COOK, Eung-Do
"Stability and variability in Chipewyan phonology". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 61-76

COUDERT, Allison P.
"Leibniz, Knorr von Rosenroth, and the *Kabbalah Denudata*". Dutz & Gensini 1996, 9-28

CYR, Danielle E.
"Between grammar and cognition: The expression of definiteness in Plains Cree". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 77-111

D'AGOSTINO, Mari
"Forza, consenso, suggestione. Forme del potere e modelli
di cambiamento linguistico tra Ottocento e Novecento". Gambarara, Gensini &
Pennisi 1996, 269-288

DAHLSTROM, Amy
"Narrative structure of a Fox text". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 113-162

DARNELL, Regna
"What are texts for these days?" Nichols & Ogg 1996, 163-170

De MAURO, Tullio
"Qualche contraddizione della filosofia del linguaggio". Gambarara, Gensini &
Pennisi 1996, 17-26

Di CESARE, Donatella
"Hat Kant über die Sprache geschwiegen?" Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi
1996, 181-200

DIONISOTTI, A. C.
"Beatus Rhenanus and barbaric Latin". In *Annuaire 1985. Spécial 500ᵉ
Anniversaire de la Naissance de Beatus Rhenanus.* (Sélestat: Les Amis de la
Bibliothèque Humaniste, 1985), 183-192

DIONISOTTI, A. C.
"From Ausonius' schooldays? A schoolbook and its relatives". *The Jounal of
Roman Studies* 72 (1982), 83-125, pls. 1-3

DIONISOTTI, A. C.
"From Sephanus to du Cange: Glossary stories". *Revue d'Histoire des Textes*
14-15 (1994-5), 303-336

DIONISOTTI, A. C.
"Greek grammars and dictionaries in Carolingian Europe". In Michael W.
Herren (ed.) in collaboration with Shirley Ann Brown. *The Sacred Nectar of
the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages.*
[King's College London Medieval Series, II]. (London: King's College,
University of London, 1988), 19-39, with *Introduction*, 1-2, and *Index
codicum*, 247-248

DIONISOTTI, A. C.
"Latin grammar for Greeks and Goths". Review article of Mario De Nonno (ed.), *La Grammatica dell'Anonymus Bobiensis* and Marina Passalacqua (ed.), *Tre Testi Grammaticali Bobbiesi* (Rome: Edizione di Storia e Letteratura, 1982, 1984). *The Jounal of Roman Studies* 74 (1984), 202-208

DIONISOTTI, A. C.
"On Bede, grammars and Greek". *Revue Bénédictine* 92:1-2 (1982), 111-141

DIONISOTTI, A. C.
"On the Greek studies of Robert Grosseteste". In A. C. Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton & Jill Kraye (eds.). *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays.* (London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1988), 19-39, with *Introduction*, 1-2, and *Index codicum*, 247-248

DIONISOTTI, A. C.
"On the nature and transmission of Latin glossaries". In Jacqueline Hamesse (ed.). *Les Manuscrits des Lexiques et Glossaires de l'Antiquité Tardive à la Fin du Moyen Âge.* [Textes et Études du Moyen Âge, 4]. (Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 1996), 205-250, pls. 1 & 2, and *Index*, 2-4

DIONISOTTI, A. C.
"Robert Grosseteste and the Greek encyclopaedia". In *Rencontres de Cultures dans la Philosophie Médiévale. Traductions et Traducteurs de l'Antiquité Tardive au XIVe Siècle. [Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales, Rencontres de Philosophie Médiévale].* (Louvain-la-Neuve & Cassino: Université Catholique de Louvin & Università degli Studi di Cassino, 1990), 337-353

DRAPEAU, Lynn
"Conjurors: The use of evidentials in Montagnais secondhand narratives". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 171-194

DROIXHE, Daniel
"Adam ou Babel? Théorie du signe et linguistique biblique de Descartes à Leibniz". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 115-128

DUTZ, Klaus D. (compiler)
"Collectanea — Collectabilia ". New Publications. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6:2 (1996), 287-331

DUTZ, Klaus D.
"Leibniz und die Linguisten. Der 'Fall Feinhals' und einige andere methodologische Befangenheiten". Dutz & Gensini 1996, 29-67

DUTZ, Klaus D. & GENSINI, Stefano
"Im Spiegel des Verstandes". Vorwort. Dutz & Gensini 1996, 7-8

EGAN, Rory
"*ex Occidente Lux*: Catastrophic volcanism in Greek and Dene oral tradition". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 195-209

EGIDI, Rosaria
"Wittgensteins Philosophie des Geistes". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 303-315

EHLERS, Klaas-Hinrich
"Deutsch und Französisch als tschechische Wissenschaftssprachen in der Ersten Republik: Die Sprachen des Prager Linguistik-Zirkels". M. Berger, K. Krolop & M. Papsonová (eds.) *Brücken*, Germanistisches Jahrbuch, DAAD, new series 4, (1996), 105-133

ELFFERS, Els
"Van Ginneken als psycho-syntheticus". Foolen & Noordegraaf 1996, 51-80

ELIA, Annibale
"Elogio dell'imperfezione. Spunti di discussione su macchine intelligenti e lingue perfette". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 351-365

FERRETTI, Francesco
"Neuro-Molyneux". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 317-327

FOOLEN, Ad & NOORDEGRAAF, Jan
"Woord vooraf". Foolen & Noordegraaf 1996, 7-10

"Lia Formigari's writings. Monographs, editions, articles". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 367-373

FORTIER, Paul A.
"Theory, literary texts and empiricism". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 211-226

GAMBARARA, Daniele, GENSINI, Stefano & PENNISI, Antonino
"Introduction". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 9-16

GENSINI, Stefano
"The Leibnitian concept of 'significatio'". Dutz & Gensini 1996, 69-98

GENSINI, Stefano
"Leibniz filosofo del linguaggio fra: Platone, Aristotele ed Epicuro: Note sulla *Epistolica de historia etymologica Dissertatio* (1712?)". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6:2 (1996), 219-244

HAGEN, A. M.
"Van Ginnekens taalsociologie". Foolen & Noordegraaf 1996, 81-91

HAFNER, Heinz
"Die Dramatik der Moderne unter neuem Blickwinkel". Project. *Zeitschrift für Semiotik.* 18:4 (1996), 483-484

HACK, Martin
"Semiotisch relevante Lehre an den Hochschulen Deutschlands, Österreichs und der Schweiz". *Zeitschrift für Semiotik.* 18:4 (1996), 485-520

HAIMAN, John
"Two Hua texts". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 227-256

HAßLER, Gerda
"Kants Herausforderung an die Sprachtheorie". Review of Lia Formigari, *La sémiotique empiriste face au kantisme.* (Liège: Mardaga, 1994). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6:2 (1996), 271-280

HOCKETT, Charles F.
"Voice in Algonquian verbs: A suggestion". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 257-261

HOUBEN, Jan
"Part Two : The Sanskrit tradition". van Bekkum, Houben, Sluiter & Vesteegh
(1997), 49-145

HULSHOF, Hans
"Genetisch taalonderwijs in theorie en praktijk. Van Ginnekens ideeën
over de relatie tussen taalkunde en taalonderwijs". Foolen & Noordegraaf 1996,
145-172

HYMES, Dell
"Arikara rhetoric: Ethnopoetic suggestions". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 263-280

JAKOBSON, Roman
"Prinzipien der strukturalen Analyse". Translated from Czech by Klaas-Hinrich
Ehlers and Marek Nekula. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*
6:2 (1996), 201-218

KACZMAREK, Ludger
"Organisation, Kommunikation, Formentstehung. Resonanzen eines
begrifflichen Feldes bei Leibniz und in der Gegenwart". Dutz & Gensini 1996,
99-122

KEMPEN, Gerard
"'De zwoele groei van den zinsbouw' De wonderlijke levende grammatica van
Jac. van Ginneken uit *De Roman van een Kleuter* (1917)". Foolen &
Noordegraaf 1996, 173-216

LEMAN, Wayne
"A Cheyenne version of 'The Rolling Head'". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 281-307

van der LUBBE, Fredericka
"*The High Dutch Minerva* of 1680 and its author". Part I: "The Author".
Biblionews and Australian Notes & Queries 21:1 (March 1996), 17-32

van der LUBBE, Fredericka
"*The High Dutch Minerva* of 1680 and its author". Part II: "The Book". With
Addenda et Corrigenda. *Biblionews and Australian Notes & Queries* 21:3
(September 1996), 83-110

MAIONE, Maurizio
"Azione motoria e linguaggio in Thomas Reid". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi
1996, 155-164

MARAZZINI, Claudio
"Le osservazioni linguistiche nel primo censimento del Regno d'Italia".
Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 257-268

MARCISZEWSKI, Witold
"Hätte Leibniz von Neumanns logischen Physikalismus geteilt?". *Beiträge zur
Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6:2 (1996), 245-259

MARRONE, Caterina
"Il *Prodromus Coptus*. La doppia via egittologica di Athanasius Kircher".
Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 105-113

MATTEUZZI, Maurizio
"Leibniz e i sincategoremi". Dutz & Gensini 1996, 123-135

NEIJT, Anneke
"Van Ginnekens geruchtmakende bekering. Spellingstrijd in de eerste
helft van deze eeuw". Foolen & Noordegraaf 1996, 119-144

NEKULA, Marek & EHLERS, Klaas-Hinrich
"Jakobsons Bilanz des Strukturalismus: Ein Vortrag, der jahrzehntelang nicht
gedruckt werden konnte". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6:2
(1996), 187-199

NERI, Demetrio
"Ingegneria genetica, eugenetica e generazioni future". Gambarara, Gensini &
Pennisi 1996, 337-350

NERLICH, Brigitte
"Einführung in die Geschichte der Pragmatik". *Zeitschrift für Semiotik*. 18:4
(1996), 413-421

NERLICH, Brigitte
"Sprachliche Darstellung als Prozeß: Die Pragmatisierung eines Begriffs von
Kant bis Bühler". *Zeitschrift für Semiotik*. 18:4 (1996), 423-440

NICHOLS, John D.
"William W. Warren and Ojibwe traditional history". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 309-335

NIEDEREHE, Hans-J.
"Bericht über das 'Coloquio international sobre historia de la Lingüística en España e Hispanoamérica'". Report on meeting. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6:2 (1996), 187-199

NOORDEGRAAF, Jan & FOOLEN, Ad
"Bezieling en conflict. Jac. van Ginneken en de taalkunde". Foolen & Noordegraaf 1996, 11-34

PENTLAND, David H.
"Verbs of precipitation in Algonquian". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 337-353

PERCONTI, Pietro
"Grammatica universale pura e Intenzionalità del linguaggio.
Introduzione a Georg Michael Roth". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 211-223

PETRILLI, Raffaella
"Verbo, rivelazione, conoscenza. Modelli di linguaggio nella teologia cristiana". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 33-48

PIRO, Francesco
"Are the 'canals of tropes' navigable? Rhetoric concepts in Leibniz' philosophy of language". Dutz & Gensini 1996, 137-160

POMBO, Olga
"Leibnizian strategies for the semantical foundation of the universal language". Dutz & Gensini 1996, 161-171

POPPE, Erich
"'Dieser wohlausgedachte Abriß, dieses kernreiche Buch': Valentin Ernst Löschers 'Literator Celta'". *Sprachwissenschaft* 21:4 (1996), 421-445

PRAMPOLINI, Massimo
"L'attualità di Rask e i paradigmi di Hjelmslev". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 225-243

RHODES, Richard & BUSZARD-WELCHER, Laura
"An intruder in a sugar camp is beaten off". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 335-36

ROSIER-CATACH, Irène
"Quelques controverses médiévales sur le conventionnalisme, la signification et la force du langage". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 69-84

RUSSELL, Kevin
"Does obviation mark point of view?" Nichols & Ogg 1996, 367-382

SCHLIEBEN-LANGE, Brigitte
"*Abitut*. Zur Verwendung eines modistischen Terminus in den *Leys d'Amors*". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 49-68

SCHMITZ, H. Walter
"Ungeheuer über Leibniz und die *cognitio symbolica*-Tradition". Dutz & Gensini 1996, 173-185

SIMONE, Raffaele
"Unicità del linguaggio e varietà delle lingue in Port-Royal". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 85-103

SLUITER, Wout
"Part Three: The Greek tradition". van Bekkum, Houben, Sluiter & Vesteegh (1997), 147-224

van der STROOM, Gerrold
"De taalbiologie van Jac. van Ginneken". Foolen & Noordegraaf 1996, 93-118

TANI, Ilaria
"«Non è morta materia quello che i sensi ci offrono». La critica di Herder allo schematismo trascendentale". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 201-210

TAYLOR, Allan R
"'Mexican' in Arapahoan languages". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 383-386

VALENTINE, J. Randolph
"*Amik Anicinaabewigoban:* Rhetorical Structures in Albert Mowatt's telling of an Algonquin tale". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 387-428

VALENTINE, Lisa Philips
"Metanarration in Severn Ojibwe". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 429-459

VARANI, Giovanna
"Leibniz' Rezeption der Aristotelischen Dialektik". Dutz & Gensini 1996, 187-208

VECCHIO, Sebastiano
"Postille linguistiche manzoniane". Gambarara, Gensini & Pennisi 1996, 245-256

VERSTEEGH, Kees.
"Part Four: The Arabic tradition". van Bekkum, Houben, Sluiter & Vesteegh (1997), 225-284

VONK, Frank
"Ausdruck eines Mitteilung und Steuerung: Pragmatische Kritik an Wundts völkerpsychologischem Forschungsprogramm". *Zeitschrift für Semiotik.* 18:4 (1996), 441-460

VONK, Frank & SCHMITTER, Peter
"'Metahistoriography': Eine internationale Tagung zur Geschichtsschreibung der Linguistik in Noordwijkerhout". Report on meeting. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6:2 (1996), 261-266

VOORHIS, Paul
"Analysis of prephonemic texts: Frank Speck's Catawba, Mohegan, Penobscot and Wawenock". Nichols & Ogg 1996, 461-490

WADE, W.D
"Preface". Nichols & Ogg 1996, vii-x

WEIDEMANN, Hermann
"Aristoteles und Kripke". Review of Gianluca Sadun Bordoni, *Linguaggio e realtà in Aristotele*. (Rome & Bari: Laterza, 1994). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6:2 (1996), 280-285

WEIJNEN, A.
"Herinneringen aan Jacques". Foolen & Noordegraaf 1996, 35-50

Henry Sweet Society Colloquium

University of Luton
10 - 13 September 1997

The papers for this year's annual colloquium have now been accepted, and a provisional programme is included in this edition of the Newsletter. The response has been very good indeed and the Luton colloquium looks set to be an extremely interesting one. It is particularly pleasing for the society to be able to welcome colleagues from all corners of the world and to host speakers from 14 different countries. In addition to the usual 25 minute papers, there will also this year be an hour long symposium on the nature and history of figures and tropes, chaired by a panel of specialists in the field. Because of the high level of papers being offered, the academic programme looks set to be a full one, but a number of social events have been built into the programme as well.

Further information and booking forms are available from the conference organiser, Dr Andrew Linn, at:

Department of English Language and Linguistics,
University of Sheffield,
Sheffield S10 2TN,
England.

E-mail: A.R.Linn@Sheffield.ac.uk. Tel: 0114 222 0216. Fax: 0114 276 8251.

The deadline for booking and payment of the fee is Friday 25 July.

Provisional programme

Wednesday 10 September
1300 -	Arrival and registration
1730	Werner Hüllen (Essen, President of the Henry Sweet Society) - *On the Importance of a 'History of Books' for a 'History of Ideas'*
1830	Dinner

Thursday 11 September
0800	Breakfast
0930	Douglas A. Kibbee (Urbana, Illinois) - *Language and Dialect in the History of Linguistics: a Case Study of the Politics of Anglo-Norman*
1000	Jon Mills (Luton) - *Cornish Lexicography from the 9th Century AD to the Present Day*

1030	Lieve Jooken (Leuven) - *The Foundation of Grammatical Categories in 18th Century Scottish Treatises on Language*
1100	Coffee
1130	Fredericka van der Lubbe (Sydney) - *Martin Aedler: Germanist, Hebraist or Comparativist?*
1200	Masataka Miyawaki (Yokohama) - *James Harris's Revision of Hermes*
1230	Gerda Haßler (Potsdam) - *Hervás y Panduro's Position in the History of Anthropological Linguistics*
1300	Lunch
1400	David Cram (Oxford) / Jaap Maat (Amsterdam) - *Dalgerno [sic] in Paris*
1430	Discussants: James J. Murphy (Davis, California), Lynette Hunter (Leeds), Peter Mack (Warwick), Dirk M. Schenkeveld (Amsterdam), Brian Vickers (Zurich) - *Symposium on the history and nature of figures and tropes*
1530	Tea
1600	Hanne Lauridsen (Copenhagen) *English in Denmark in the Period 1678-1800*
1630	Inge Kabell (Copenhagen) - *English in Denmark in the 19th Century*
1800	Dinner
1930	*Concert of 'linguistic organ music'* - Andrew Linn

Friday 12 September

0800	Breakfast
0930	John E. Joseph (Edinburgh) - *A Matter of Consistency: Humboldt on Chinese*
1000	Ann Wehmeyer (Gainesville, Florida) - *Keichû and the Native Japanese Linguistic Tradition*
1030	Cristina Altman (São Paulo) - *South American Missionaries and the Description of the General Languages*
1100	Coffee
1130	Dirk M. Schenkeveld (Amsterdam) - *Reasons for the non-Development of Syntactical Theory in the Hellenistic Period*
1200	David A. Reibel (Tübingen / York) - *The Rt Rev Robert Lowth (1710-1787) D.D., Bishop of Oxford, Pioneer of English Syntax*
1230	Kjell-Åke Forsgren (Skövde) - *German Valency Grammar of the 19th Century*
1300	Lunch
1400	Els Elffers (Amsterdam) - *From Psychological Linguistics to Psycholinguistics*
1430	Béatrice Godart-Wendling (Paris) - *Le Traitement de la Quantification d'Ajdukiewicz à Montague*
1500	Geirr Wiggen (Oslo) - *The Work of the Norwegian Dialectologist, Amund B. Larsen (1849- 1928)*
1530	Tea
1600	Frits Stuurman (Utrecht) - *'Traditional Grammar' in the Early History of Chomskyan Generative Linguistics*
1630	Pius ten Hacken (Basle) - *The Unity of the Chomskyan Research Programme*
1715	Annual General Meeting
1900	Conference Dinner

LIBRARY COLLECTION

The Library of the Council School (*Ratsschulbibliothek*) in Zwickau, Saxony.

John Walmsley, Bielefeld

One of the positive results of German reunification has been greater freedom to travel in former Eastern bloc countries (not just the former German Democratic Republic - GDR), and improved access to library collections. Zwickau was rumoured to have a large - if not the largest - collection of textbooks in the former GDR. Unfortunately, however, as in the case of the *Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek* (FLB) Gotha, the library did not have (and still does not have) an adequate published catalogue. It might be useful, therefore, for members of the Society to learn more about the nature of the collections in Zwickau, their history and state of repair.

Zwickau lies between Gera and Chemnitz on the route between Frankfurt and Dresden. The holdings of the *Ratsschulbibliothek* comprise about 90,000 titles, including approximately 1,200 incunables, about 26,000 16th. century and 52,000 17th. century works. The library also holds about 200 mss., which have been properly catalogued (Schipke, 1990).

The collection exhibits a number of interesting features. The Council School Library (*Ratsschulbibliothek*) grew from a Latin school which was not originally a grammar school (or *Gymnasium*), but which was established independently of the Church in 1291. The wealth of Zwickau (based on silver) enabled the town to engage teachers of ability, who attracted pupils from other parts of Saxony. The earliest dated book in the library contains an inscription by its donor, Bernhard Schauenpfennig, to the effect that it was presented to the library (hence already in existence) of the Zwickau "*Gymnasium*" on 17th. Feb. 1498. In 1537 the Rector Petrus Plateanus described the library as a "*bibliotheca publica*" - the first of its kind in Saxony.

The library benefited from three significant collections made by people born in or otherwise connected with Zwickau: Stephan Roth (1492-1546), Johann Zechendorf (1580-1662) and Christian Daum (1612-87). Both Roth and Daum were almost obsessive collectors of books and papers. Roth bequeathed 6,000 volumes and 4,000 letters to the library in his will. Zechendorf, an orientalist, was head of the school before Daum. He also left his collection of books to the school library, and Daum's private collection was bought by the Town Council in 1694. This comprised about 7,800 volumes (including some which had been in the personal possession of Martin Luther) and about 6,000 letters, together with about 34,000 occasional prints (*Gelegenheitsschriften*) such as Epithalamia, other congratulatory poems, and the *Leichenpredigten* which were traditionally preached at the funeral of prominent citizens, and published.

The significance of these sixteenth and seventeenth century collections is brought home when one considers that in some cases they exceed in magnitude those of illustrious nobles: August of Saxony's library numbered 2,354 volumes in 1580, and the Duke of Wolfenbüttel's somewhat over

5,000 in 1614, and these were much greater than those available in many universities. In 1596 the library of the Philosophical Faculty in Rostock numbered about 540 volumes (Kordes and Walmsley 1995: 146). Luckily, and unlike many other European libraries, that in Zwickau has come through all the wars in its long history virtually unscathed.

This brief historical outline gives some idea of the main emphases in the collection. The 1746 catalogue contains 54 headings, many with further subdivisions. They cover mainly Philology (22 sections), Philosophy (12 sections), Theology (9 sections) and Law (5 sections). There are also, however, sections on Mathematics, Geography, Chronology, History, [*Libri*] *"Antiquarii"*, and Medicine. The main emphases of the library are reflected not only in the structure of the catalogue, but also in the number of titles in each section.

From about 1890-1895/96 a card-index catalogue was set up, and new acquisitions are of course catalogued according to modern methods. Access to books up to the mid-18th. century, however, is via the Subject Catalogue (1746, 2 ms. vols.) or the card-index (alphabetical by author) - both on microfiche. Unfortunately, the quality of the 1746 catalogue is so uneven that it has not been considered advisable to enter it on an electronic database. Instead, the collection will have to be (re-)catalogued from scratch (which is why a number of the figures above can only be approximate). In pursuit of this goal, two projects are currently financed by the German Research Council (*Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*). One is to catalogue the Christian Daum bequest (cf. Nagel, 1996). The other is to catalogue the *Gelegenheitsschriften*. The latter task is expected to be completed in 1998. For the bulk of the printed works, however, it is not possible to make a prediction.

References

Kordes, U. and J. Walmsley (1995) Eine verschollene Gelehrtenbibliothek. Zum Buchbesitz Wolfgang Ratkes um 1620. *Wolfenbütteler Notizen zur Buchgeschichte* 20, 133-71.
Nagel, D. (1996) Der handschriftliche Nachlass von Christian Daum in der Ratsschulbibliothek Zwickau. *Wolfenbütteler Barock-Nachrichten* 23, 28-32.
Nagel, D., Leistner, K. and I. Zürner (1995) Catalogue to the exhibition "Historisch wertvolle Handschriften und Drucke aus dem Bestand der Ratsschulbibliothek Zwickau", 7.12.1995 - 28.1.1996 Dortmund, Dortmund: Stadt- und Landesbibliothek Dortmund.
Schipke, R. (1990) *Die mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Ratsschulbibliothek Zwickau*. Berlin. Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Handschrifteninventar. Ed. H.E. Teitge, No. 13.

Further information can be obtained from:
Herrn Dr. Dietrich Nagel, Direktor, Ratsschulbibliothek Zwickau,
        Lessingstrasse 1, D-08058 Zwickau, Germany.

        Tel.: (0375) 83 42 00
        Fax.: (0375) 83 41 41.

The library is open Mon. - Thurs. 8 am - 5 pm; Fr. 8 am - 3 pm.

An Onomasiological version of the OED

I am most grateful to Professor Hüllen for his proposed revisions to the *OED* entries for *onomaisiology, semantics,* and related words. In particular, it is helpful to have a proposed form of words for the revised definitions; so often scholars advise us in general that changes are necessary to an entry, but they shy away from suggesting how their improvements might be implemented to their satisfaction!

The question of an onomasiological work underpinning the *OED* has long been a matter of interest to the *OED*. It would certainly be a powerful tool, offering a further dimension of reference to students of language, culture, etc.

In fact, work towards such a goal was inaugurated by Professor Samuels in the English Language Department of Glasgow University in 1964, with funding from a variety of sources such as the British Academy, the Leverhulme Trust, and the University of Glasgow itself. The project, known as the Glasgow *Historical Thesaurus of English,* is now well advanced. Entries in the first edition of the *OED* were carded and reorganised according to a thematic framework (developed from Roget's original classificatory system). The *OED* made available to the Glasgow team (under the direction of Professor Christian Kay) material added to *OED2,* which they have incorporated in their files. The Thesaurus archive now contains some 650,000 slips, drawn from the *OED* and its *Supplements* and from dictionaries of Old English. Several subsets of material (religious vocabulary, Old English terminology) have already been published. The structure of the Thesaurus' entries is chronological, allowing the user to follow the emergence of words describing concepts over time.

For more information, see the web page at:

http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/EngLang/thes.html

where it is said that 'it is envisaged that the work will be published in book form by Oxford University Press, probably in two volumes of about the same size as the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*. At the same time a database is being created in Ingres for future research. Publication on CD-ROM is also likely... Publication of the Thesaurus is expected around 2000'.

It is my sincere hope that once the initial work has been accomplished, the thesaurus network can be applied to the *OED* database, facilitating a new mode of consulting the dictionary. The mechanics of this will not be straightforward, I am sure, but it is an objective well worth pursuing.

John Simpson
Chief Editor
Oxford English Dictionary

78