

EDITORIAL

During the summer, a copy of the last-but-one issue of the Henry Sweet Society's BULLETIN was sighted on the shelves of the Oxfam bookshop in Oxford. Does the fact that it was priced at £1.75 — and this second-hand, of course — signify its arrival as a collectable for the specialist bibliophile? The editors would like to think so.

We are glad to report in this, the third issue of the relaunched BULLETIN, that the publication has been well received both in format and range of contents, and for the present further revision is not intended. The issue of web publication, raised in our last editorial, remains undecided. We shall continue to take advice on this, and provide opportunity for wider discussion if this step is recommended. A principal factor which currently argues against it is the need to maintain such web pages and ensure that access is not frustrated by lost links and technical failure. Such a commitment will require careful consideration. We shall however keep this matter, and the more general question of the BULLETIN's conventional publication, under review and would invite members to send us their comments, either of endorsement or criticism.

The bulk of this issue is devoted to the Amsterdam Colloquium in September 1998, an event remarkable not only as the first meeting of the Henry Sweet Society outside the U.K. but also for its excellent content and smooth organisation. For members who were unable to join us in Amsterdam, the abstracts indicate the range of topics discussed. Those attending enjoyed both a rich academic programme and some well chosen extracurricular entertainment, including a memorable evening boat trip on the Amsterdam canals. The flavour of the meeting is captured in the report accompanying the abstracts, written by Nicola McLelland, a new contributor to these pages, who has recently moved from Cambridge to a post at Trinity College Dublin

Other items in this issue include an article by John Considine on "John Milton and the Uses of Etymology". We would take this opportunity to congratulate John on his move from Oxford to the University of Alberta, and express the hope that he will be able to maintain his participation in the Society. The proportion of international members of the Society has always been strong, and we are aware that the majority of these can only hope to attend meetings rarely, if at all. For such members the BULLETIN's section of reviews is perhaps particularly relevant, and our reviews editors, Herman Bell and Michael Isermann, are glad to be able to offer in the present issue a goodly set of book reviews and a listing of publications for the Society's Library at Keble College.

The next meeting of the Colloquium will be held at Regent's Park College, Oxford, on 22nd March 1999. As this is a year in which an ICHOLS meeting is to be held, the Society's Colloquium will be a single day event. It has been arranged for a Monday, so as to enable visitors from abroad to take advantage of cheaper weekend rates. Accommodation is available both at Keble and at Regent's Park. Details of the event are printed in this BULLETIN and a separate booking form is enclosing with this mailing. Enquiries and requests for further booking forms should be addressed to Dr Mark Atherton, Regent's Park College, Pusey Street, Oxford OX1 2LB

For the next and subsequent issues of the BULLETIN, Andrew Linn will be wielding his bat for an innings as principal editor. Contributions can continue to be sent to either of the editors, or to one of the reviews editors, as appropriate. Members are warmly encouraged to submit material; addresses and submission deadlines are listed inside the back cover.

David Cram, *Oxford*

Andrew Linn, *Sheffield*

JOHN MILTON AND THE USES OF ETYMOLOGY¹

John Milton the poet (1608-1674) was a man of some learning, but the course of his life led him away from the philological work which his abilities qualified him to undertake. In his writings, he can be seen as a consumer rather than a producer of philology, discussing and arguing with the etymological work of others. Examining the story of these discussions and arguments brings several disciplines together: the history of linguistics, the history of reading, and, in Milton's case, the history of theological and political thought. D. F. McKenzie's description of bibliography as "the sociology of texts" in his famous Panizzi Lectures suggests a label for the field of inquiry to which this paper belongs: the social history of etymology.²

The story of John Milton's engagement with etymology begins in 1642, with a polemical exchange. A group of godly men had written a short book in 1641, under a pseudonym formed from their initials, *Smectymnuus*. There, they argued that the Reformation, profoundly as it had already affected English men and women, was not yet complete, because the English church was still governed by bishops. They proposed that this governance had not originated in Scripture, but in the corrupt traditions which had made the Papist church what it was. As well as attacking episcopacy in general, they attacked Joseph Hall, bishop of Norwich, in particular. Hall counterattacked, and Milton responded to Hall in the *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence, against Smectymnuus*, still in 1641.

Milton's style in the *Animadversions* was exuberant. "No one Clergie in the whole Christian world yeelds so many eminent schollers, learned preachers, grave, holy and accomplish'd Divines as this Church of *England* doth at this day" wrote Hall, and Milton reprinted the passage with the annotation "Ha, ha, ha."³ He was not concerned to be fair. Eleven years before Milton was born, Hall had produced a book of "Tooth-lesse Satyrs" in his undergraduate collection of satires, *Virgidemiarum sex libri*, and Milton used this title as a rod for the old bishop's back in the *Animadversions*: "You love toothlesse Satyrs;

¹ An earlier version of this paper was read to the Henry Sweet Society Colloquium, Oxford, on September 16, 1995. I should like to thank all the participants in that colloquium who commented on it, particularly Sylvia Brown, David Cram, and Vivien Law.

² D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London: The British Library, 1985).

³ John Milton, *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence, against Smectymnuus* (London: Printed [by Richard Oulton and Gregory Dexter] for Thomas Underhill, 1641), 61.

let me informe you, a toothlesse Satyr is as improper as a toothed sleekstone, and as bullissh."⁴

An anonymous *Modest Confutation* answered Milton, and rose to this bait, asking, "why, in the name of Philology, is a toothless Satyr improper?"⁵ Its author explained that poetic satires are not hairy satyrs, as Isaac Casaubon had done in the *De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi, & Romanorum Satira* (1605).⁶ He then made a digression into metaphors of teeth and horns in the Bible, satyrs being toothed and horned creatures, with a note on the etymology of the relevant Hebrew words. Next, he turned to Milton's defence in the *Animadversions* of a silly mistake by the Smectymnuans: they had confused *Areopagi* with *Areopagittici*. Milton had replied that greater alterations take place in the process of diachronic lexical change, and his opponent now stated reasonably that this was beside the point, after agreeing that lexical change does indeed take place, and giving some etymological examples. The intention was evidently to establish that Milton's philology was less sophisticated than that of his opponents, and to appeal in particular to the careful use of etymology as an authoritative means of establishing the present senses of words. This was a misjudgement.

In Milton's next, and final, contribution to the exchange, *An Apology against a Pamphlet call'd a Modest Confutation of the Animadversions upon the Remonstrant against Smectymnus*, he wrote:

that such a Poem should be toothlesse I still affirme it to be a bull, taking away the essence of that which it calls it selfe. For if it bite neither the persons nor the vices, how is it a Satyr, and if it bite either, how is it toothlesse ... What we should do therefore with this learned Comment upon teeth and horns which hath brought this confutant into his Pedantick kingdome of Cornucopia, to reward him for glossing upon hornes even to the Hebrew root, I know not ... now the worme of Criticisme works in him, he will tell us the derivation of German rutters, of meat, and of ink, which doubtlesse rightly apply'd with some gall in it may prove good to heale this tetter of Pedagoguisme that bespreads him, with such a tenasmus of originating, that if he be an Arminian and deny originall sinne, all the etymologies of his book shall witness that his brain is not meanly tainted with that infection.⁷

Milton here denounces the etymological method used by the *Modest Confutation* at this point as "Pedantick" and as "Pedagoguisme," making etymology a technique for schoolmasters, and not for the most inspired

⁴ John Milton, *Animadversions* (1641), 9.

⁵ *A Modest Confutation of a Slandrous and Scurrilous Libell, Entitled, Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defense against Smectymnus* (London: [np], 1642), 9.

⁶ See J. W. Joliffe, "Satyre: Satura: ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ. a Study in Confusion," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 18 (1956), 84-95.

⁷ John Milton, *An Apology against a Pamphlet call'd a Modest Confutation of the Animadversions upon the Remonstrant against Smectymnus* (London: Printed by E[dward] G[riffin] for John Rothwell, 1642), 33-34.

schoolmasters at that. Learned it may be, but it misses the point of the argument. Devising etymologies is a disease, a disfiguring tetter or a straining of the bowels or an infection of the brain or original sin itself: Milton heaps insulting invention upon it.

Three years after the *Apology*, he wrote more sombrely on an etymological argument, in *Tetrachordon*, the third of the works in which he advocated a readier availability of divorce. Arguing that Matthew 5.32, “who so shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication” permitted divorce on the grounds of fornication, Milton needed to interpret *fornication* as “the continual practise of disobedience and crossnes from the duties of love and peace.”⁸ He argued that the Greek of the New Testament is strongly influenced by Hebrew usage, and that in reading this particular text,

wee must of necessity have recours again to the Ebrew. For in the Greek and Latin sense by fornication is meant the common prostitution of body for sale. So that they who are so exact for the letter, shall be dealt with by the *Lexicon*, and the *Etymologicon* too if they please, and must be bound to forbidd divorce for adultery also, untill it come to open whoredom and trade.⁹

The “*Etymologicon*” to which he referred was presumably the Byzantine dictionary edited by Friedrich Sylburg as the *Etymologicon Magnum* in 1594.¹⁰ This certainly helps with the interpretation of the Greek word with which Milton was concerned, the abstract noun πορνεία, whose immediate etymon, the concrete πορνή it derives from the verb πέρνημι, to export for sale.¹¹ Πορνεία then, refers etymologically to a commercial transaction, and if the sense can be enlarged to include sexual misdemeanours in which money does not change hands, then it can in principle be enlarged to include other misdemeanours as well.

⁸ John Milton, *Tetrachordon: Expositiōns Upon the Foure Chief Places in Scripture, Which Treat of Mariage, or Nullities in Mariage* (London: Printed [by Thomas Payne and Matthew Simmons], 1645), 65.

⁹ John Milton, *Tetrachordon* (1645), 64.

¹⁰ This was a daunting book, even with the indexes which make it easier to navigate around Sylburg’s edition than those of his predecessors (1499; 1549), but appears to have been quite widely used by Milton’s contemporaries in early modern Cambridge: see H. F. Fletcher, *The Intellectual Development of John Milton* II (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961), 588 and E. S. Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), II 323. Milton himself cited it as an authority for one possible interpretation of the phrase γουνοῖς Ἀθηῶν in his marginalia on Pindar (*Works of John Milton* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931-1938), XVIII 303).

¹¹ Latin *fornicatio* is transparently a word for prostitution: there was never any doubt in or after antiquity that *fornix* means an arch, and that *fornices* were so notoriously frequented by prostitutes and their customers that in Horace, Juvenal, and Suetonius the word simply means “brothel.”

Here, Milton is not simply rejecting an inconsistent application of the etymological argument, but rejecting the whole argument outright. It is not that he regards “prostitution” as the appropriate gloss on πορνεία in this context: quite the reverse. He believes that the etymology of the word does not determine its sense. He did not quarrel with the etymology of *satire* in the *Modest Confutation*, and he accepts the etymology of πορνεία given here, but he denies their authority.

Later still, in a draft work of 1659, the *Proposalls of Certaine Expedients for the Preventing of a Civill War now Feard*, Milton wrote that

because the name of parliament is a Norman or French word, a monument of our Ancient Servitude ... Lords, & commons .. to be called by the King to parlie with him about the great affairs of his realme, it might be very agreeable with our freedome to chang the name of parliament .. into the name of a Grand or Supreme Counsell.¹²

This text admits that the etymological argument is at least powerfully suggestive. Milton does not suggest that a parliament must by definition be oppressive, or a royal council, but he believes that the word is dangerous because its etymology connects it with the Norman institutions which he regarded as oppressive, and specifically with royal councils. He believes, that is to say, that the name of a thing should be appropriate to it, and that etymology may suggest, although it can not dictate, the appropriateness of a name.

This is, I think, the argument of Socrates in the *Cratylus*. When Hermogenes proposes that “no name belongs to a particular thing by nature, but only because of the rules and usage of those who establish the usage and call it by that name,”¹³ Socrates argues towards two conclusions. The first of these is “that things have natural names, and that not everyone is a craftsman of names;” this is qualified by the slightly earlier statement that it is possible to give “each thing the form of name suited to it, no matter what syllables it is embodied in ... in Greece or abroad.”¹⁴ The second conclusion is reached by a long ironic play with false etymologies. It is that the truth of names cannot be reached by etymology. There is no way of analysing καλόν to show that it is the necessary and inevitable word to describe beautiful things, or that it is

¹² John Milton, *Proposalls of Certaine Expedients in Complete Prose Works* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953-80), VII. 337. Cf. *Readie and Easie Way* (1660), *ibid.* VII. 373: “I suppose therefor that the people well weighing these things, would have no cause to fear or murmure, though the Parliament, abolishing that name, as originally signifying but the *parlie* of our Commons with thir *Norman* king when he pleasd to call them, should perpetuate themselves .. under the name of a Grand or Generall Council.”

¹³ Plato, *Cratylus* 384d, tr. C. D. C. Reeve in Plato, *Complete Works* ed. John M. Cooper (Indianapolis & Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1977); for a recent discussion see Timothy M. S. Baxter, *The Cratylus: Plato's Critique of Naming* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), esp. 56ff.

¹⁴ *Cratylus* 390d-e, 390a.

derived from such a word; but it is the right word all the same.¹⁵ So, in the end, Socrates asserts his firm belief in the existence of stable truths, and of the beautiful and the good as things which last, and concludes that “no one with any understanding will commit himself or the cultivation of his soul to names.”¹⁶

The *Cratylus* appears to be the first refutation of the etymological fallacy in European writings on language. The history of the fallacy is somewhat complex.¹⁷ Given names, to be sure, are readily etymologized, and have been from Homer and the Old Testament onwards; the process works both ways, and names can be, and are, given for their etymology. The antique and late antique interpretations of words other than proper nouns, as gathered in the *Etymologiae* or *Origines* of St Isidore of Seville in the West, and the great Byzantine etymologica in the East, are very much more problematic.¹⁸

Isidore argues that “when you see whence a name has arisen, you will understand its force the sooner.”¹⁹ He qualifies his statement with the observation that not all names were assigned by the ancients on the basis of the nature of the thing named; but when he does get down to the significance of names, it is not clear that he is doing what we think of as etymology at all. His derivation of *homo* from *humus* may simply be wrong, influenced perhaps by the analogous etymology of the proper name *Adam*. On the other hand, his category of etymologies *ex contrariis* such as that of *lucus*, which Isidore explains “quia umbra opacus parum luceat” and we remember in the neater form “lucus a non lucendo,” were surely never meant to be right.²⁰ These relationships between words were rather reflective or mnemonic or poetic than, in any familiar sense of the word, linguistic. Isidore’s Eastern counterparts derived ἀγάπη, “love” or “charity,” from ἀγειν τὸ πᾶν, “to lead everything,” and his successor Papias the Grammarian derived *cadaver* from *caro data*

¹⁵ In the dialogue, Socrates derives it from κολοῦν, the present participle of κολῶ “I call,” arguing that “to name things (κoloῦν) is to perform beautiful (καλόν) works” (*Cratylus* 416d).

¹⁶ *Cratylus* 440c.

¹⁷ See esp. Excursus xiv, “Etymology as a Category of Thought,” in E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* tr. W. R. Trask (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953) 495-500.

¹⁸ Isidore was not, of course, the originator of many of the etymologies which he offers; for their histories see R. Maltby, *Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1991). Likewise, the Byzantine compilers of etymologies surely inherited material from the Alexandrian tradition.

¹⁹ Isidore, *Origines* I. 29: “dum videris unde ortum est nomen, citius vim eius intellegis.”

²⁰ Isidore’s source was Quintilian, *Institutiones* I. 6. 34 (where the accuracy of the etymology is in fact doubted); for the post-Isidorean history of the idea, see H. Walther, *Proverbia Sententiaeque Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964) §14015.

vermibus.²¹ Papias may certainly have known the earlier etymology of *cadaver*, from *cadere*, but chose not to use it.²² These apparently fanciful etymologies are evidently the rudiments of meditations on love and the grave, not serious attempts to explain the forms of words: they are, that is to say, like a number of Socrates' derivations of Greek words in the *Cratylus*. Likewise, the double derivations in Isidore and the Byzantine etymologists such as *reges a regendo et recte agendo* are neither statements of doubt as to which of two possibilities is to be preferred, nor suggestions that a word originates from a blend, or from a reinforcement of one word by another. They open up a punning meditation on the meaning of kingship. With the contrast between the apparent philological specificity of these statements and their meditative function, we might compare the late antique and mediaeval genre of hagiography, which reflected on aspects of the Christian life by means of narratives which appeared to be historically specific, but which were not what is now thought of as history.

When, at the end of the fourteenth century, Coluccio Salutati proposed first that law was so named because it was binding, *lex a ligando*, and then that it was so named because it was chosen, it bound those who chose it, and it was written and therefore to be read, he was thinking about law in an Isidorean way.²³ One of the silly games played by the silly courtiers in Ben Jonson's *Cynthia's Reuells* is the invention of etymologies. So, "Breeches, *quasi* beare-riches; when a gallant beares all his riches in his breeches."²⁴ Even there, the method is Isidorean: an etymology is being invented as a means of talking briefly about profligacy, not as a means of telling the history of a word or explaining what it means.

The category of meditative etymology as practiced by St Isidore and others co-existed with what might be called pedagogical etymology, the attempt to determine the sense of a given word by tracing its ancestry with some degree of historical rigour. This was the etymology practised by the author of the *Modest Confutation*. It was widely practised in early modern Europe, as Gilles Ménage noted in the introduction to his *Origines de la Langue Française* of

²¹ For *δύω* and other examples, see Robert Browning, "Etymologika" in Alexander Kazhdan et al., eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 735, and Alexander Kazhdan, "Etymology," *ibid.* 735-6. For *cadaver* see Papias Grammaticus, *Elementarium*, s.v.: I owe this reference to Dr Leofranc Holford-Strevens of Oxford University Press.

²² For citations of this etymology from Servius, St Isidore, et al., see C. Goetz, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1888 ff) VI 160.

²³ Coluccio Salutati, *De nobilitate legum et medicine* (1399), "ab eligendo igitur, et se ligando, tandemque legendo, lex dicta est," quoted in Victoria Kahn, *Rhetoric, Prudence, and Skepticism in the Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), 63-4. I owe this reference to Dr. Sylvia Brown of the University of Alberta.

²⁴ Benjamin Jonson, *Cynthia's Reuells* (1601), IV. iii. 157-8 in *Works* IV, ed. C. H. Herford, P. Simpson, and E. M. Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932).

1650, written in the middle of Milton's career. Ménage dismissed the linguistic thinkers of antiquity, of whose meditations (I think that he had meditative etymologies particularly in mind) he wrote that "La pluspart de leurs Etymologies ne sont pas seulement mauuaises, elles sont pitoyables."²⁵ He also dismissed many of those of his own day, condemning the theorists who reflected on the relationship between their own vernacular and the language of Adam, and the theorists who believed their vernacular to be intimately related to a learned language such as Greek: for the men in both these categories, etymology proved their preferred histories of their own nation and the world.²⁶ In the thought of these pedagogical etymologists, as in that of the meditative etymologists, and as in that of the opponents of John Milton, arguments from etymology could be used to justify political or philosophical or doctrinal assertions.

Ménage was not alone, of course, in his impatience with this approach to etymology: the names of Covarrubias and Kilian come to mind. The developing philological rigour of the modern period even affects early modern authors for whom etymology was still associated with the wisdom of the past. There is, for instance, a natural progression from Joannes Fungerus' production of an Erasmian collection of disquisitions on proverbs in 1585 to his production of a disquisitive etymological dictionary of Latin in 1605.²⁷ But he is selective in what he reproduces from earlier etymologists: for instance, he specifically denies Papias' derivation of *cadaver* from *caro data vermibus* in favour of the earlier, more reasonable *cadaver a cadendo*. Etymology was becoming part of a serious attempt to understand antiquity. The work of the meditative and pedagogical etymologists was about to be superseded by that of the philological etymologists.

We have seen the derision with which Milton rejected arguments from etymology in the course of a controversy over the nature of the English Reformation. This was a controversy about how the world related to God; but it was also a controversy about how the English related to antiquity. The defenders of episcopacy believed in traditions by which truth had been transmitted, both textual and, in the case of the apostolic succession, sacramental. For them, the origins of a word were part of a continuum with its present sense, as the theology of the Fathers was continuous with their own. Milton disagreed radically with their thoughts on the apostolic succession, and with their thoughts on textual traditions of wisdom. His statement that "the

²⁵ Gilles Ménage, *Origines* (Paris: Chez Augustin Courbé, 1650), sigs. ã3^v-4^v.

²⁶ For the Adamic language, see Umberto Eco, *The Search for the Perfect Language* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 96 ff.

²⁷ Joannes Fungerus, *Nova Proverbiorum Farrago, Tam ex Graecis Quam Latinis auctoribus collecta* (Leiden: Plantin, 1585); *Etymologicum Latinum* (Frankfurt: E Collegio Paltheniano, 1605), revised and enlarged as *Originationum, seu Etymologici Τριγλωττου Florilegium* (Lyons: Sumptibus Petri Ravard, 1628).

laying on of hands .. creates nothing, it confers nothing; it is the inward calling of God that makes a Minister"²⁸ is of a piece with his refusal to be bound by the Fathers and the Councils: "I shall not intend this hot season to bid you the base through the wide, and dusty champaine of the Councils, but shall take counsel of that which counsel'd them, reason."²⁹ Both are of a piece with his refusal to be bound by etymology.

Milton did of course use the Fathers, for instance to support his interpretation of *fornication*. He was not an ignorant fundamentalist, reading the Bible out of all context; far from it. His reservations about the use of authoritative writings arose from experience in handling such sources, just as his reservations about arguments from etymology arose from sensitivity to etymology. In the *Animadversions*, he wrote that

hee that shall bind himselfe to make Antiquity his rule, if hee read but part, besides the difficulty of choyce, his rule is deficient, and utterly unsatisfying; for there may bee other Writers of another mind which hee hath not seene, and if hee undertake all, the length of mans life cannot extend to give him a full and requisite knowledge of what was done in Antiquity. ... Goe therefore, and use all your Art, apply your sledges, your levers, and your iron crows to heave and hale your mighty *Polyphem* of Antiquity to the delusion of Nouices, and unexperienc't Christians. Wee shall adhere close to the Scriptures of God.³⁰

Even earlier, in *Of Prelaticall Episcopacy*, he had repudiated the Fathers of the Church *en masse*, denouncing those theologians who, "as if the divine Scripture wanted a supplement, and were to be eek't out, .. cannot think any doubt resolv'd, and any doctrine confirm'd, unlessse they run to that indigested heap, and frie of Authors, which they call Antiquity," and then taking up the image of "frie" magnificently: "Whatsoever time, or the heedlesse hand of blind chance, hath drawne down from of old to this present, in her huge dragnet, whether Fish, or Sea-weed, Shells, or Shrubbs, unpickt, unchosen, those are the Fathers."³¹

Milton's theology, that is to say, disposed him to be highly unsympathetic to all philological inquiry, and particularly to the submission to authority implicit in the etymological fallacy. A double project of his does appear at first sight to have been deeply, and therefore puzzlingly, concerned with etymology. He was said to have worked on "a Latin *Thesaurus*, to the emendation of that done by *Stephanus*" and to have "begun a *Greek Thesaurus*;

²⁸ John Milton, *Animadversions* (1641), 50.

²⁹ John Milton, *Animadversions* (1641), 19.

³⁰ John Milton, *Animadversions* (1641), 31-2.

³¹ John Milton, *Of Prelatical Episcopacy, and Whether it May Be Deduc'd From the Apostolical Times by Vertue of those Testimonies Which Are Alleg'd to that Purpose in Some Late Treatises* (London: Printed by R[ichard] O[ulton] & G[regory] D[exter] for Thomas Underhill, 1641), sigs. A1^v-A2^r.

having scarcely left any part of learning unimprov'd by him."³² Now, the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* of Robert Estienne and the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* of his son Henri are both arranged on an etymological principle: that is to say, they are alphabetised by roots, under which derivatives are gathered, so that for instance BAINΩ is followed by βῆμα, βάσις, βάσιμος and so on. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* also provides quite a few etymologies, from Greek, or as attributed quotations from authors such as Varro, or of the order "Æquus (level) appears to be derived from aqua (water), because still water is entirely level."

I think that the answer to this puzzle is to be found in Milton's reading programme for the Latin thesaurus. The editors of a *Linguae Romanae Dictionarium Luculentum Novum* published in London in 1693 claimed that

we had by us, and made use of, a Manuscript Collection in three *Large Folio's* digested into an Alphabetical order, which the Learned Mr. *John Milton* had made, out of *Tully, Livy, Cæsar, Sallust, Quintus Curtius, Justin, Plautus, Terence, Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Manilius, Celsus, Columella, Varro, Cato, Palladius*; in short out of all the best and purest *Roman* authors.³³

This programme, founded on the study of the most familiar canonical authors, would hardly have added many new words or senses to Estienne's thesaurus. It looks like an attempt to collect suitable material for pedagogical, not philological, purposes: Milton was thinking of compiling a dictionary for schoolboys, to accompany his grammar, and was looking for suitable exemplary passages for it. The Latin dictionaries produced for English schoolboys in the previous century had also been based on Estienne.³⁴

Language, for Milton, was functional. It served the needs of the present. At a stage in the history of scholarship when etymology was still being used to appeal to the authority of the past, to antiquity rather than reason, Milton rejected it. Seeing the newer, philological use of etymology to understand the past, he rejected that too. He came closest to working with etymology, to finding a use for etymology, when there appeared to be a possibility of making a good dictionary of a learned language and making money from it. But the making of dictionaries is a slow thing, and it is not always lucrative; and Milton died with that project unfinished.

John Considine, *University of Alberta*

³² The basic early material on these projects is assembled in J. Milton French, *The Life Records of John Milton IV* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1956), 3-5.

³³ Quoted in French, *Life Records IV*, 5.

³⁴ See D. T. Starnes, *Robert Estienne's Influence on Lexicography* (Austin, University of Texas Press, 1963), 101-112.

OF LUNARIANS AND LINGUISTS**Fifteenth Annual Colloquium of the Henry Sweet Society****Amsterdam, 16-19 September 1998***Conference Report*

This year's Henry Sweet Society Colloquium was my first. It also marked a rather more important first, however: the first time the Society met outside the British Isles. To judge from the comments of the old-timers, this first foray onto the Continent was an unqualified success. Without forgetting the Society's British roots, the precedent is set for future continental gatherings, perhaps jointly with the *Studienkreis* at some point, as mooted at the AGM.

The Amsterdam Colloquium will be memorable for any number of details which, I am told, eclipsed all British Isles affairs to date — from fundamentals like the quality of the conference handbook, to extras such as the sumptuous hospitality aboard the city's finest cruise-boat and then at the British Council (apparently the fruits of supremely successful sponsorship-gathering). Arrangements for both work and play went very smoothly, and organizers Els Elffers, Jaap Maat, Jan Noordegraaf, Els Ruijsendaal and Robin Smith must be congratulated on all counts.

The best conference organization and hospitality in the world would have been nothing without the quality of the papers themselves (see the abstracts in this edition of the *Bulletin*). The geographical sweep was wide, from South America to Russia, and from Senegal to Norway. Contributions revisited such well-known works and personalities in the history of linguistic ideas as Lily, Comenius, John Wilkins, Lowth, Daniel Jones and Bertrand Russell. Thomas Becker's paper, arguing that Hermann Paul's ideas on morphology have much to teach modern morphologists, was a particular favourite for this *Germanistin* with a secret loathing for constituent analysis morphology. *Analogia, grammatica speculativa*, and the interplay between rhetoric and grammar in many grammarians' *oeuvres* also featured, as did the linguistic ideas of two figures more famous for their contributions to fields outside linguistics, Galileo and Nietzsche. It was also instructive to become acquainted with a few lesser known players, such as the English "polymath and poseur" John Minshew, and the gifted Norwegian linguist Clara Holst, whose chief mistake in life seems to have been being born female a hundred years too early.

Another unfortunate female was the Dutch “feral child” Anna Maria Jennaert, whose rescue from the wilds, Marijke van der Waal’s research revealed, not only turned her into a keen spinner, but also caused considerable scientific interest at the time. Continuing the Dutch line, Pieter Loonen brought to light the underrated yet important contribution of Huguenot refugees to French grammar writing, in a tradition largely distinct from the better-known Strasbourg one. And it was fitting, in Amsterdam, that the keynote lecture on the first evening also had a Dutch theme. Reinier Salverda reviewed the state of Dutch linguistics around 1900, concluding that the seeds of modern linguistics were already sown among the diverse research projects of that time, with a growing interest in non-Indoeuropean languages and in synchronic linguistics, for example.

Reinier Salverda’s keynote lecture was followed by the presentation of the first English translation of Pieter Verburg’s *Taal en Functionaliteit* (*Language and its Functions*, transl. Paul Salmon). The occasion was an emotional one for all who had been involved in the project, since neither author nor translator lived to see its completion, the result of some fifteen years’ labour. Pieter Verburg’s son spoke movingly of his father’s life and work, as did both his first and last doctoral students; a third speaker also praised Verburg’s involvement in the Resistance. The first copy of the book, presented on this occasion to Pieter Verburg’s son, will be handed over by him to the translator’s widow, Vivian Salmon.

A number of papers raised methodological issues in the history of linguistics. Rüdiger Schreyer not only introduced us to the musical speech of the moon-dwelling Lunarians, but also reminded us of the potential of hypertext technology for overcoming the linearity of the traditional text. Sergej Romaschko argued for greater precision in the notion of “influence,” while Andrew Linn’s paper on two 19thC Faroese grammars proposed a stylistics of standardising grammars, which I felt offered a useful starting-point for comparison with standardisation in other languages and periods.

Nor was it only the papers themselves that made the conference so valuable. Werner Hüllen’s comment that the HSS has something of a “family” feeling sums up the welcoming atmosphere well, with opportunity even for those not presenting to exchange ideas in the breaks or over dinner. In short, I have nothing but praise for the Amsterdam colloquium. Only one reservation is worth voicing, and that concerns the timing of the conference. Firstly, the programme was a very full one — and the first day, with lectures continuing into the evening, was especially strenuous for anyone who had spent the early part of the day travelling. Would it be worth considering extending the conference to three full days? Secondly, and perhaps more crucially, though the conference ended on Friday, many participants found themselves paying for an extra night’s hotel accommodation because flights are punitively expensive

unless the stay includes a Saturday night. Perhaps future organizers might bear the “Saturday night factor” in mind, and schedule the conference to include a Saturday.

Friday night’s Conference dinner, held in the delightful surroundings of an orphans’ “hofje” turned restaurant, was a fitting end to a most enjoyable few days, and even managed to continue the Henry Sweet Society tradition of a musical offering, this time in the shape of a baritone with harpsichord accompaniment. This more than compensated for Rüdiger Schreyer’s failure to sing us his sample of Lunarian — a grievous oversight in such a musical community as the HSS. The claim of one informant that the opening bars of “Close Encounters of the Third Kind” are in fact “Glory be to God on high” in Lunarian thus remained sadly unverified.

Nicola McLelland, *Trinity College Dublin*

THE FIFTEENTH HSS COLLOQUIUM 1998

Abstracts of papers

'Rules' and 'Use' in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Grammars of South American Languages

Cristina Altman (São Paulo, altman@netcomp.com.br)

Although it is known that the Dominicans and Franciscans had been pioneers in matters of education, the Jesuits developed their own pedagogy and became the most important educators in what concerns linguistic practices, especially in Portuguese America, i.e. what is Brazil today, where they were practically the only ones to deal with educational matters until the 18th century, namely catechisation of the natives, elementary education for the sons of colonists and 'superior' training for the new missionaries, to whom their grammars of native languages were addressed. Jesuit linguistic pedagogy was predominantly 'formal', in the sense that it prescribed that languages had to be learnt by strict method, not by informal means of oral communication.

Learning a language means understanding, reading, writing and speaking in accordance with grammatical rules, i.e. according to a Latin grammar model. The underlying assumption here is that any language, including the unwritten languages of the savages, has rules, and can, as a consequence, be formally described in such terms. As Latin grammar as well as the inventory of the Latin alphabet did not 'fit' perfectly the linguistic facts observed, the missionary grammarian not infrequently attributed his difficulty in finding the correct 'rule' for a given linguistic detail to the singularities of 'use'. This paper examines this tension between 'rule' and 'use' with regard to the Jesuitical descriptive practice of the 16th and 17th centuries, with special attention to the Brazilian context.

Hermann Paul, the post-Generative Morphologist

Thomas Becker (Munich, thomas.becker@lrz.uni-muenchen.de)

One of the major reasons to study the history of linguistic ideas is to dig up forgotten views which had fallen out of acceptance in subsequent contexts of research, but which may again prove fruitful in the present context. This is

precisely what has happened to Hermann Paul's morphological ideas as presented in his *Principien der Sprachgeschichte* of 1880 (English translation: *Principles of the History of Language*, College Park, Md.: McGrath, 1970). The following are some of his most interesting views:

- The structure of a language system is to be explained by its history (rather than by its underlying representations)
- Paradigm structures change through language use (rather than by being simplified)
- Morphology is paradigmatic (rather than simply the "syntax of words")
- Productivity is gradual: the degree of acceptability of a possible morphological word depends on its models in the lexicon (rather than being all or nothing, i.e., acceptable if generated, unacceptable if not)

In my paper I will argue that H. Paul's views as outlined above are closer to the facts than those commonly held in modern morphology.

Daniel Jones's Role in the Development of a Prestige Variety of British English Pronunciation

Beverley Collins (Leiden, collins@rullet.Leiden.nl) &
Inger Mees (Copenhagen, im.eng@cbs.dk)

The evolution in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries of a prestige pronunciation variety of British English (Received Pronunciation) has been placed under scrutiny by, amongst others, Crowley (1989: 164-74). One of the individuals generally regarded as having played a decisive part in the emergence of a standard is the British phonetician Daniel Jones (1881-1967). Crowley has claimed that in this role Jones revealed himself to hold prescriptivist and gender-biased views, and to be unduly influenced by considerations of social class.

This paper will argue that such accusations portray Jones in an unfair light. There is considerable testimony to show that Jones held liberal opinions on gender issues and social class. Furthermore, after a brief flirtation with elocution-influenced attitudes at the beginning of his career, Jones subsequently set himself firmly against prescriptivism and pleaded for objective investigation of speech in all its aspects; this was a stance which he maintained unremittingly up till his death. The authors will examine published and unpublished evidence which provides clues to the reasons behind Jones's change of heart, and the parts played in his conversion by contemporary figures such as Bernard Shaw, the literary critic Lascelles Abercrombie, and the Poet Laureate Robert Bridges.

References

- Collins, Beverley and Inger M. Mees (in press). *The Real Professor Higgins: The Life and Career of Daniel Jones*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Crowley, Tony (1989). *Standard English and the Politics of Language*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

The English Grammars for St Paul's School, London
Hedwig Gwosdek (Heidelberg, hgwosdek@t-online.de)

When John Colet, who had been Dean of St Paul's, London since 1505, refounded St Paul's Grammar School between 1508 and 1512, he placed his new institution under the governance of the Mercers' Company, appointed William Lily as the first headmaster and participated actively in the provision of textbooks for his school. In about 1510 he himself compiled a Latin *accidence* in English because he was not satisfied with any of the Latin grammars known to him. He entitled it *Æditio*, and it was a treatise on the parts of speech for those who had already mastered the rudiments of Latin Grammar. In the preface to his *Æditio*, called "A lytell proheme to the boke", he informs us of his intentions and his way of compiling this text: "In whiche lytel warke yf ony newe thynges be of me, it is alonely that I haue put these partes in a more clere ordre, and haue made them a lytel more easy to yonge wyttes than (me thynketh) they were before". The dean probably commissioned from Lily the *Angli rudimenta grammatices*, a short tract for the teaching of elementary Latin syntax in English. It can be found as a separate volume bearing the title *Guilelmi Lili Angli Rudimenta Paruulorum Lili nuper Impressa et correcta*, but was also published as a composite production in one volume with Colet's *Æditio*, as the title-page of the first extant edition of Colet's grammar of 1527 indicated: *Ioannis Coleti Theologi^a Olim decani diui Pauli æditio una cum quibusdam G Lili Grammatices Rudimentis*.

This paper first examines the two treatises by looking at their subject-matter and it brings together published data and several otherwise unexplored sources. Secondly, it tries to delineate the evolution of the treatises with reference to preceding English grammatical manuscripts and early printed grammars which circulated at the same time, an aspect which has not yet been taken into consideration. Evidence will be provided that the treatises are not the first of their kind but follow a broad tradition of manuscripts, and compete with other grammars printed at the same time. It is also suggested that the compilers followed the example set by generations of schoolmasters before them in compiling their teaching material under the influence of the new learning. Finally, an attempt will be made to outline the role of these treatises which became the basis of the English part of the so-called "Lily Grammar".

*Nietzsche's Tone*Niels Helsloot (Amsterdam, helsloot@niels.hobby.nl)

At the end of his student days, Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) wrote in one of his philological notebooks:

I am not afraid of the dreadful appearance behind my chair, but of its voice (*Stimme*): not even of its words, but of the terrifying unarticulated and inhuman tone of that appearance. Yet if it would still speak like humans speak!

In my eyes, this occasional note illustrates a motive behind Nietzsche's passionate search for a linguistic, and rigidly scientific, shelter from his changeable "musical" emotions. His resignation from those "*Stimmungen*" resulted in great scientific success; at the age of twenty four he got a professorship in philology. In this capacity, he kept trying to understand an unarticulated tone from the past, and to get it to speak. Gradually he took his distance from intellectual one-sidedness as it was promoted by his teacher Friedrich Ritschl in order to prevent confusion. It was exactly the reality of such confusion which science should face. Although Nietzsche found it more and more difficult to defend this point of view as a professional philologist, and retired after ten years, he never gave up his plea for a two-sided scientificity. After all, only by taking a multiplicity of stances at once, will it be possible to laugh at oneself, and only this ability may make science "gay" (*fröhlich*).

I think it unfair to dispose of this plea by categorizing it as a complementary one-sidedness, e.g. as philosophy, art or even mental disturbance, instead of considering its scientific relevance.

Sounds and their Signs in John Wilkins's Essay

Michael Isermann (Ruprecht-Karls-Universität, Heidelberg)

One of the parts of John Wilkins's (1614-1672) universal project *An Essay Towards a Real Character And a Philosophical Language* (1699) that has received comparatively little reception in the ever-growing literature devoted to an understanding of this work is the *doctrine of letters*, which is treated by Wilkins — quite in line with grammatical tradition — in "The Third Part Containing Philosophical Grammar" (Chapter X: Of Orthography). So far as it has been commented upon at all, the "doctrine of letters" has been studied

almost exclusively in the context of the history of phonetics. Although my own perspective will be a different one, it is not altogether unrelated to the historical study of the knowledge of phonetics in the late 17th century in that it focuses on the notion of the sound and the technical (terminological, classificatory) apparatus that Wilkins employs in his description of sounds. I will suggest that the description of sounds in the grammatical part of the *Essay* bears such a resemblance to the description of things in the scientific part (= the tables that constitute Part II: Universal Philosophy) that one cannot escape the conclusion that any real distinction between grammar and science, or between orthography and philosophy, is ignored or, if that is preferred, smoothed out. There is no essential distinction between sounds and things. I will also argue that Wilkins's phonetic character is just another real, philosophical character.

Clara Holst (1868-1935): Historical Linguist and Woman Pioneer
Ernst Håkon Jahr (Tromsø, Ernst-Haakon.Jahr@hum.uit.no)

This paper gives an account of the contribution to historical linguistics by the Norwegian academic woman pioneer Clara Holst (1868-1935). Holst was the first woman to defend her Ph.D. in Norway (1903). In her dissertation, she investigated one major result of the intense language contact between Low German and Scandinavian in the 15th and 16th centuries, namely loan-words. By studying the phonetics of Low German loan-words in Scandinavian, Holst was able to shed new light on several then unresolved questions concerning Low German language history.

My paper will also include a short biographical sketch of her life. For several years Dr Holst studied and conducted research outside Norway: in England (Cambridge), France (Sorbonne), Germany (Leipzig, Berlin, Magdeburg) and Denmark (Copenhagen), and she taught for two years (1906-1908) at universities in the US, but she never held a university position in her native country. Clara Holst's biography contains several still unsolved questions.

James Hutton's Synthesis of 'Epistemolinguistic Issues' at the End of the Scottish Enlightenment

Lieve Jooke (Leuven, lieve.jooke@arts.kuleuven.ac.be)

This paper focuses on the work of a Scottish author who is rarely taken into consideration in studies of eighteenth-century language theory. In 1794 the geologist James Hutton published his three-volume "An Investigation of the

Principles of Knowledge”, a work that takes up the Lockean theme of tracing the progress of the human intellect from sense to scientific reasoning. Volume two devotes almost two hundred pages to a discussion of language, which is fundamentally grafted upon the sign theory of Étienne Bonnot de Condillac. Like Condillac, Hutton equates the beginning of ‘artificial’ or instituted communication with the moment when an occasional expression is given the status of ‘sign’ by the addressee. Hutton hence sees no difficulty in solving the speculative question of how language must have begun, because any kind of significant expression could be called the basis of a communicative system. My paper analyses whether Hutton understands the development of speech from these broad communicative beginnings as a gradual process relying on experience and motivated by communicative needs, or as a reflected institution of grammar and rules. In so doing, I will take into account the main themes of Scottish Enlightenment language theory, synthesised in Hutton’s references to contemporaries like Adam Smith and Lord Monboddo. In addition, this paper intends to give a provisional conclusion on the findings of my postdoctoral research project concerning the impact of Condillac’s language theory in Scotland between 1760 and 1800.

Michel Foucault, Richard McKeon and Grammatica Speculativa
Louis Kelly (Cambridge, ljk1@hermes.cam.ac.uk)

During the last third of the thirteenth century *grammatica speculativa* reached its mature form through extensive reinterpretation of the way in which Aristotelian physical models applied to language processes. This cannot be said to be a “breakthrough” in Kuhn’s sense because process models had been current in grammar for some time and *grammatica speculativa* was never a majority theory of general grammar. According to Foucault, *la grammaire générale* sought the universals underlying the linguistic representation of thought: thought itself is a representation of something else. General grammar rose because, during the seventeenth century, scholarship moved from commentary to criticism. Like all sciences, grammar is embedded in the *épistème*, the “set of relationships that unites the discursive practices that give rise to formalised systems” and allows for reciprocal communication between sciences. The *épistème* depends on the “archive” which is the knowledge and attitudes of mind largely derived from canonical texts. Sciences develop through the questions the archive prompts one to ask data. The general grammarian asks how language functions. Where Foucault has *épistème*, McKeon speaks of “Encyclopedias”.

The intellectual development of the Middle Ages begins in the Greek and Roman Encyclopedias which were organised according to heuristic

principles derived from the classical rhetorical tradition of the Topics. Twelfth- and thirteenth-century developments are due to the Arab Encyclopedia developed from the tradition of the *Analytiks*. Where the goal of the Roman encyclopedia was sciences of structures, the Arab dealt with the structure of science. It taught the Middle Ages how to seek analytical systems from one science to organise another. Thus *grammatica speculativa* formalised the Roman grammatical tradition centred around Boethius and Priscian according to universal analytical principles drawn from Arab and Latin commentators on Aristotelian physics and metaphysics. This rethinking begins with the redefinition of grammar itself: it becomes a science proposing a formal model of how language comes to be and of the processes by which it attains its goal. The models postulated for the generation and behaviour of words are simple and recursive.

Because they assume that a science develops in a particular way in a particular intellectual milieu, I would suggest that Foucault and McKeon provide a suitable model to account for the rise and development of *grammatica speculativa*.

References

- Foucault, Michel (1966). *Les Mots et les Choses*. Paris: Gallimard.
 McKeon, R. (1975). "The Organisation of Sciences and the Relations of Cultures in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries". In: *The Cultural Context of Medieval Learning*. ed. S. E. Murdoch & E. D. Sylla. Dordrecht & Boston: Reidel, 151-192.

Vossius, Spinoza and Schultens: The Application of Analogia in Hebrew Grammar

Anthony J. Klijnsmit (Amsterdam)

The concept of *analogia* has its origin in Antiquity. In Renaissance grammar the application of *analogia* is revived by Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577-1649). It is defined by Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 B.C.) as 'similar words are inflected similarly'. This definition was taken over by Vossius. In the eighteenth century, the concept of *analogia* — notably within the circles of the Dutch scholars of Latin and Greek, the so-called *Schola Hemsterhusiana* — has undergone a certain change: scholars tend to consider it as 'the creative principle of language'.

The grammatical concepts of Dutch Hebrew grammarians of the eighteenth century are related to those of the grammarians of the classical languages and they could be considered as belonging to the *Schola Hemsterhusiana*, although this is not done by historiographers of linguistics.

The foremost Hebraist of the eighteenth century was Albert Schultens (1686-1750) and he is known for his 'wild analogies'. Schultens had read the

Hebrew grammar of Benedictus de Spinoza (1632-1677): he refers to the works of the philosopher several times.

Spinoza's grammar is a 'Vossius-grammar' and the philosopher, too, applies the *analogia*, and often his analogies are as wild as Schultens's.

In this paper I will try to establish the relationship between Spinoza's and Schultens's grammatical options.

Towards a Stylistics of Standardisation: the Case of Faroese and Norwegian
Andrew R. Linn (Sheffield, A.R.Linn@Sheffield.ac.uk)

Both Faroese and Norwegian were given a standard written form in the course of the nineteenth century. Central to these standardisation processes are the grammar books which codify a single variety of the languages, both of which exhibit marked variation in their spoken forms. Norwegian was standardised by Ivar Andreas Aasen (1813-1896) in his grammars of 1848 and 1864, and Faroese by Venzel Ulrik Hammershaimb (1819-1909) in his grammars of 1854 and 1891. The earlier grammar in each case was descriptive, presenting the forms found in the contemporary dialects, and illuminating them with earlier varieties of the Scandinavian languages in the spirit of the dominant historical-comparative approach to language study. There is a degree of standardisation inherent in writing even a descriptive grammar, in describing the language system in one way rather than another, but the later grammar in each case was one of an explicitly standard variety hewn from the surface variation.

In my paper, while concentrating on the Faroese case, I compare the various stylistic strategies adopted by both grammarians in passing from description to standardisation, and I do so by considering the grammars under the headings 'Variation and Uniformity', 'Authority', 'Structure and Naming' and 'The Wider Standard'. The historiography of linguistics has sometimes suffered from a lack of methodological and theoretical rigour and this paper is also, in part, an attempt to present and test a theory of standardisation.

The Production of French Grammars by Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic

Pieter Loonen (Groningen, loonen@let.rug.nl)

The seventeenth-century Republic of the United Provinces witnesses a tremendous increase in the production of teaching materials for French. These materials were often written by refugees from French-speaking areas, but a separate assessment of their achievements has never been made. The Huguenots

in particular were large in number and they came over a long period of time. However, in the fairly extensive literature on their contribution to life in the Republic, references to 'school', 'teaching', 'grammar' etc. are consistently absent. Do we have to assume that the Huguenots were never involved in the teaching business, or that teaching was seen as an activity not worth spending ink on, or is this neglect simply due to lack of information? I shall argue that these three points are pertinent to this issue in varying degrees, and subsequently show that Huguenot teachers and grammarians were markedly present in the Dutch Republic and that they left their stamp on the teaching of French, there and abroad, with a large measure of success.

John Minshew, Polymath and Poseur: Old English in an Early Seventeenth-Century Dictionary

Peter J. Lucas (Dublin, peter.lucas@ucd.ie)

This paper considers:

- (1) Minshew's contribution to lexicography, taking into account previous work on him;
- (2) The printing of the work and the use of special Old English types in particular;
- (3) Some examples of Minshew's treatment of Old English, good, bad, and indifferent;
- (4) His place in the development of Old English and Germanic Language Studies.

Bibliography:

- Joan, Sr Mary, RSM. (1962). *Minshew's Guide into the Tongues and Somner's Dictionarium*. In: *Mediaeval Studies* 24, 375-7.
- Minshieu, John. (1617). *Ductor in Linguas, The Guide into Tongues*. London: [Eliot's court Press, sig. A-2Z printed by Melchisidec Bradwood subsidiary sig.²A-N printed by another (unidentified), and all finished by William Stansby, who added the preliminaries]. STC 17944.
- Rosier, James L. (1961). The Sources and Methods of Minshew's *Guide into the Tongues*. In: *Philological Quarterly* 40, 68-76.
- Schäfer, Jürgen (1973). John Minshew: Scholar or Charlatan?. In: *Renaissance Quarterly* 28, 23-35.
- Wiener Leo (1899). Spanish Studies in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. In: *Modern Quarterly of Language and Literature* 5, 3-11.
- Williams, Franklin B. (1948). Scholarly Publication in Shakespeare's Day: A Leading Case. In *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies*, eds. James G. McManaway, Giles E. Dawson, and Edwin E. Willoughby (Washington, Folger Shakespeare Library), 755-73.

The Beginnings of Phonetics in the British University System

Michael K. C. MacMahon (Glasgow, m.macmahon@englang.arts.gla.ac.uk)

Occasional lectures on general phonetics had been given in a few British universities during the course of the 19th century, especially in Oxford by Sweet. In Liverpool, at the end of the 19th century, phonetics was already accepted as an academic discipline, thanks mainly to the efforts of Lloyd.

Holiday courses in phonetics had been successfully run since 1896, in Edinburgh, Oxford and Dublin, with British and European phoneticians doing most of the teaching.

Various evening classes and holiday courses in phonetics were organised for teachers in London from 1903 onwards; the lectures were given by Edwards and Roppmann. Yet the first department of phonetics in Britain was not established until 1907, by Daniel Jones, at University College, London.

Was there more to phonetics in Britain during the early years of the 20th century than its being merely an adjunct to language-teaching? This paper will explore the background to work in articulatory phonetics, as well as in acoustic and experimental phonetics. Comparisons will be drawn with work in other countries.

Revisiting the Concept of Logical Form

William McMahon (Akron, Ohio, mcmahon@uakron.edu)

The notion of logical form continues to be used in linguistics by such as Chomsky and Frawley. This notion was originally formulated by philosophers about 100 years ago, so it is to them that we turn, not only for the historical source of the concept, but for arguably the clearest articulation of the meaning of logical form.

The best source on this subject is Bertrand Russell, in a series of writings during his "logical atomist" period, from about 1905 to 1920. This paper will explain Russell's view of logical form and the assumptions underlying it. For Russell, logical form is the syntactic structure of a perspicuous artificial language, into which we must translate an ordinary language sentence in order to clarify the meaning. This point of view led Russell to formulate his theory of descriptions, considered by some to be the greatest piece of analysis of the 20th century.

Consideration of logical form is especially significant for understanding the relation of logic to ordinary language, which then allows us to assess the role of logic in linguistics.

Twentieth-Century Cornish Lexicography and Language Revival

Jon Mills (Luton, jon.mills@luton.ac.uk)

In this century the Cornish language had been revived so that, today, Cornish is spoken by many Cornish people as a second language. Moreover a few people currently living in Cornwall have been raised as bilingual from birth. Texts from the Middle Cornish (1200 to 1575 AD) and Modern Cornish (1575 to 1800 AD) periods form the basis upon which Cornish has been revived in the twentieth century. Dictionaries have made an important contribution to the pedagogical basis of this revival. The Williams (1865) dictionary and Lewis (1923) form the basis of later twentieth-century pedagogical dictionaries. Both Williams and Lewis are Welsh and have been led astray by analogy with the Welsh language on a number of issues. As a result, some subsequent dictionaries are not faithful to native Cornish practices. Analogy with Welsh and Breton has also led some revivalists to adopt Middle rather than Modern Cornish as the basis for standardising Cornish spelling and grammar. Furthermore Welsh and Breton have been used as sources for borrowing new words into twentieth-century Cornish. Other writers, notably Jenner (1904) and Gendall (1997), have shown a preference for Modern Cornish as a pedagogical basis for the revival of Cornish. Jenner chose to take up the language where it had left off and disapproved of the inclusion of Welsh and Breton borrowings for which no authority exists in Cornish (Jenner 1904: xv). Jenner also adapted Modern Cornish orthography along loosely phonetic lines in order to create a consistent spelling system. Gendall (1997) on the other hand, has selected a single preferred spelling for each lexeme from those spellings that are attested in the historical literatures. The result is that today there are three different standardised spelling systems in common usage amongst revivalists.

References

- Gendall, R.R.M. (1997). *A Students' Grammar of Modern Cornish - Part 1, English Cornish*, Menheniot: The Cornish Language Council.
- Jenner, Henry (1904). *Handbook of the Cornish Language*. London: David Nutt.
- Lewis, Henry (1923). *Llawlyfr Cernyweg Canol*. Wrecsam: Hughes.
- Williams, R. (1865). *Lexicon Cornu-Britannicum - Gerlyvr Cernewec*. London: Trubner.

Linguistic Ideas for Literacy In English

Joyce Morris (Queen's English Society, London,
jmm@buscentre.demon.co.uk)

Alphabets are a great linguistic idea and the bedrock of Western civilisation. However, due to language change over time, the Roman alphabet for English is

more problematic for literacy learners than for other languages in that relationships between phonemes and graphemes are not so consistent.

This paper focuses on some of the linguistic ideas which have been proposed as solutions to the problem of spelling irregularity especially since the British Government introduced compulsory education in 1870. They include ideas which retain traditional orthography, make temporary changes for initial literacy learning, or radically and permanently alter it as in the recently publicised 'Cut Spelling'.

As indicated, the 1960's were the most eventful decade in the history of British reading instruction and research partly because linguistics entered the field of educational provision. It could have been the period when systematic phonic teaching was re-established as the most effective method of developing initial literacy. Unfortunately, the findings of reputable research were no match for ideology as the 'progressive' education movement reached a new peak of influence with the publication of the 'Plowden Report', *Children and their Primary Schools* (DES, 1967).

Systematic phonic teaching is now a statutory requirement in the National Curriculum for English as the current Labour Government gives priority through political initiatives to raising literacy standards. Nevertheless it continues to be a subject of heated debate as indicated in *Controversial Issues in English*, a 1998 publication of the Queen's English Society. Moreover there is still a need for reform to ensure that phonic instruction and published phonic resources for classroom use are 'research-based' and 'linguistics-informed'.

The history of linguistic ideas for literacy in English suggests that there is little hope of such a long advocated reform being accepted without much further, informed debate. This paper is therefore a contribution from a historical perspective to that debate.

Early Modern Grammarians who Write about Rhetoric
James J. Murphy (Davis, California, jermurphy@ucdavis.edu)

While there have been several abstract studies of the relation between grammar and rhetoric in Renaissance Europe, one promising research area has been neglected: that is, the investigation of those writers who treat both subjects. In Arthur Padley's *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500-1700: The Latin Tradition* (Cambridge University Press, 1976), there is notice of some 32 grammarians who also wrote Latin treatises on rhetoric. This number was ascertained by matching Padley's authors with those listed in James J. Murphy (ed.) *Renaissance Rhetoric: A Short-title Catalogue* (New York: Garland, 1981).

A study of these Latin authors' works can provide insights into their motivations for writing in both fields, and shed some light on their understanding of relations between the two subjects.

There are also some authors who write about vernacular grammar, but who use Latin for their rhetorical work. One example is the Spanish humanist Antonio Nebrija, who published the first Castilian grammar, *La lengua Castellana*, in 1492, but then in 1515 published *Artis rhetoricorum compendiosa coaptatio ex Aristotele, Cicerone, et Quintiliano*. Interestingly, when he comes to a discussion of tropes and figures, he refers his readers back to the vernacular *la Lengua Castellana*.

In any case a study of these two-field authors may open up a new avenue of exploration.

The Reflections of Comenius's Language Endeavours in the Encyclopaedia Comeniana

Jana Privratská (Prague, privratv@dec59.ruk.cuni.cz)

Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius, 1592-1670) has been known to the historiographers of linguistics mostly as a thinker in the field of language, one of the proponents of a universal language, the author of language textbooks, and a language pedagogue. However, being quite extensive, his linguistic endeavours in fact represent only one of his many fields of interest: theory and practice of education, philosophy, theology, social reform, language sciences, literature, etc. Hence the idea of researchers into the works of Comenius to have an encyclopaedia which will arrange knowledge of Comenius and of his work, in a complex way, and by means of this knowledge of Comenius to study various trends and personalities in Czech and European culture. On the basis of the preceding development most attention has been paid to the seventeenth century; the reception of Comenius's work has been traced through the following epochs up to the present day, embracing various countries of the world.

So, an encyclopaedia "sui generis" is being conceived, addressing a broad educated public. At the moment, the *Encyclopaedia Comeniana* consists of more than 2000 entries from several dozen scholars contributing to it.

In my paper the characteristics of the linguistically oriented entries within the whole of the encyclopaedia will be presented and I shall give some details of the research project which is being elaborated at Charles University in Prague with participation from many foreign experts in the field.

***Transferring Grammars: How German Grammar by Jacob Grimm was
Converted into Russian Historical Grammar by Fedor Buslaev***
Sergej A. Romaschko (Moscow/Paris, romaschko@msh-paris.fr)

Adaptation of foreign linguistic texts was for a long time one of the main paths of development for Russian language science. One of the first Russian grammars, the *Russian Donat* of the 16th century, was a conversion of a famous Latin grammar into a native one. In the 17th-18th centuries a series of Western linguistic works (grammars and dictionaries) were transformed in this way (e.g. a Latin-German dictionary became a Latin-German-Russian one).

The 19th century was a time for transition from adaptation of texts to adaptations of ideas and structures of knowledge. Nevertheless, even new trends in linguistics were borrowed still — at least partly — in the old way. Fedor I. Buslaev (1818-1897), one of the first proponents of historical and comparative studies in Russia, declared that his *Historical Grammar of Russian* (1958) was modelled after J. Grimm's *German Grammar*. However, Buslaev's grammar was not a mere replica of Grimm's work, and that wasn't only caused by the change in the object language.

To estimate the transformational process, at least two interrelational levels must be distinguished: 1) the level of general ideological framework and 2) the level of empirical grammatical analysis. On the first level, like many Russian scholars of the time, Buslaev followed the ideas and programme of German Romantic philology (folkloristic, historical and comparative studies with the aim of recovering the 'Volksgeist'). In this sense Buslaev's grammar was a "transfer grammar", but, on the second level, some original features depended on a) national grammatical tradition, b) new trends in linguistics and c) the object language (Russian) itself.

The phenomenon of transferring linguistic texts from one language community to another one is quite usual practice in the earlier periods of the history of linguistics. A typology of transfer could be a useful tool for historiographic work.

Dutch Linguistics around 1900: A Critical Reappraisal
Reinier Salverda (London, r.salverda@ucl.ac.uk)

The accepted view holds that in the Netherlands modern Structural linguistics began to take off in the 1920s, especially after the First International Conference of Linguists in The Hague in 1928. Thus, the Dutch situation is no exception to the development of European linguistics in general, where the Saussurean revolution began to have an impact really only from the 1920s onwards.

But this picture invites the question: what were Dutch linguists doing before then? For example, should the work they were engaged in perhaps be considered as having been unscientific? Or did it perhaps subscribe to different standards of scientificity? Were Dutch linguists at the time completely locked into the rival paradigm of the Neogrammarians? Or was there actually a crisis in linguistics around 1900?

I will try to answer these questions by looking into the state of linguistics and its contributory disciplines in the Netherlands around 1900. Specifically, I will consider the actual research practice of a number of leading Dutch linguists, and explore what issues and debates they were engaged in, what results they achieved, and how these contributed to progress in linguistics as a new and emerging discipline.

My overall aim is to contribute (i) to a critical reappraisal of this period in the history of linguistics and the contribution of these Dutch linguists, and (ii) to a better understanding of a number of intellectual themes and concerns that have continued to play a central role in the subsequent dynamics of the discipline in the course of the 20th century.

*John Wilkins, the Man in the Moone and Everything: On Links and
Hyperlinks in the History of Ideas*

Rüdiger Schreyer (Aachen, schreyer@anglistik2.rwth-aachen.de)

The history of linguistics is often viewed as part of the history of ideas. Of the many difficulties both concepts are fraught with, I will discuss, in this paper, only the way a history of ideas represents its objects. The very concept of history presupposes that these objects are connected by, for instance, relations of temporality, contiguity, similarity or causality. Speech and writing are linear and therefore ill suited to represent the multiple links that may obtain within the network of our brain, between historical objects. This is particularly true if the objects of history themselves are ideas, mental entities (phenomena?) we tend to think of as repeatable and therefore panchronic. To illustrate this situation I will demonstrate that John Wilkins's universal language is related to Lunarian, the language spoken on the moon — and I am far from being facetious. I simply wish to show how linear representation aggravates the recognition and establishment of links between ideas. Writers have tried to break the mould of temporal linearity by adding to their texts abstract, tables of contents, footnotes, cross dictionaries, bibliographies and maps. Following up these links within a text can involve considerable cost of time. Following up links outside a text may also involve considerable cost of money if the reference is not readily accessible. Furthermore, a conventional text may also waste a reader's time by making him read or re-read things alien to his purpose.

When reading a text we must follow the rigid path predetermined by an author who cannot possibly imagine all the uses his text may serve. More freedom in textual arrangement for the writer and more freedom of choice for the reader would certainly be desirable. Exploiting the hypertext-, multimedia- and full-text-search capabilities of modern computers as well as using the Internet can and — I believe — will save time and money, and will allow more freedom to readers and writers (not only) in the history of ideas.

The Poetics of Formalism and Functionalism: Understanding Linguistic Science as Discourse

L. Shi-Xu (Singapore, ellshiz@nus.edu.sg)

Linguistic formalism and functionalism, the two competing ways of thinking and talking about language, have preoccupied much of twentieth-century Western linguistic research. Even efforts critical of these approaches have tended to treat them as more, or less, inaccurate, or wrong, approaches to language. Seldom are the ways of speaking about language themselves examined as focus of attention, i.e. the ways in which theories and notions of language are formulated and discussed. One of the consequences is that the role of discourse and rhetoric in the construction of linguistic knowledge is smoothed over. In the present study, the writing of the two linguistics paradigms will be scrutinised. Specifically, I shall look at the cases of the two leading exponents of formalism and functionalism, Chomsky and Halliday respectively, and try to show that their linguistic theorising is guided by and constituted in various discursive tropes, such as metaphor, cross-situational variation and ideological motivations. In a sense this study identifies recurring and regular ‘methods’ of writing through which knowledge of language is rendered available and the social (- other) orientations of theory formation and evaluation. By highlighting the textual and rhetorical ploys in linguistic theory and analysis, I hope to demonstrate that we can gain insights into the nature of linguistic science and of its object by studying its own discourse.

Face and Race in the Early Nineteenth Century: European Grammars of Wolof and Urdu

Richard Steadman-Jones (Sheffield, R.D.Steadman-Jones@Sheffield.ac.uk)

In this paper I draw comparisons between two sets of early nineteenth-century grammars. One group describes the South Asian language Urdu, and the other the West African language, Wolof. The two sets of texts are similar in that both

are implicated in larger political structures. The Urdu must be read in the context of British colonialism in Bengal. The Wolof grammars, moreover, were written by campaigners for the abolition of the slave trade and the provision of education for Africans. Previous discussions of these texts, however, have been simplistic in the way that they have analysed the relationship between description and political activity.

Commentators who have focused on linguistic dimensions of the texts have tended to ignore their political dimensions entirely. Conversely, cultural historians who have attempted to contextualise the grammars more fully have usually underestimated the political possibilities of grammatical discourse. They have often drawn an analogy between colonial or proto-colonial grammars and the prescriptive grammars of English which appeared in the 1760's, developing an analysis in which European grammarians are said to have established standards of 'correctness' through which control could be exercised over native speakers. This type of analysis is insufficiently sophisticated.

In both groups of texts, European grammarians attempt to persuade their readers that a non-European language, either Urdu or Wolof, is 'rational' and 'civilised' and not a 'barbarous jargon'. In doing so, they draw upon the rhetorical resources of contemporary linguistic theory, highlighting features of the languages which are 'admirable' and attempting to mitigate ones which might attract 'censure'.

In the case of Urdu, however, the reason for undertaking this defense of the language is the need to make Company Servants take the language seriously. The grammarians argue that, if they don't, they will produce 'jargonick' Urdu which will humiliate them in the eyes of Indians and so undermine their attempts to construct colonial authority. In the case of Wolof, the defence of the language constitutes an attack on contemporary racialist science which suggested that 'inferior races' would speak inferior languages or have no language at all. My aim in comparing the texts in this way is to point out the complex ways in which grammatical discourse can participate in larger political strategies and call for a more sophisticated approach to the study of colonial encounters.

Towards an Edition of Lowth's Correspondence

Ingrid Tiekens-Boon van Ostade (Leiden, tiekensboon@rullet.leidenuniv.nl)

In the history of English linguistics, Robert Lowth (1710-1787) is primarily known for his *Short Introduction to English Grammar* (1762). According to *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* (1992), Lowth's name has even "become synonymous with prescriptive grammar". The publication in

1995 of Robert Lowth's works (ed. Reibel), however, places the grammar in the context of Lowth's other writings, such as his *De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum* (1753) and his *Life of William of Wykeham* (1758). In his biography of Lowth, Hepworth (1978) describes Lowth as an orientalist, who was professor of poetry in Oxford from 1741 until 1750, and who became Bishop of London in 1777. The view of Lowth as a grammarian or even as *the* eighteenth-century prescriptivist is thus a highly limited one.

That this view is also basically incorrect can be demonstrated by means of an analysis of Lowth's letters to his publisher, Dodsley. As Lowth's own correspondence has so far been left unpublished, the letters demonstrating this must be sought in the edition of Dodsley's correspondence (ed. Tierney 1988), which includes the in-letters along with the out-letters.

In my paper, then, I will primarily present a case for publishing Lowth's correspondence by showing that there are many reasons for doing so apart from the usual historical value of such an undertaking. In particular, I will show that there are reasons to believe that Lowth, like Johnson in the case of his *Dictionary* (1755), was commissioned by his publisher to write an English grammar. Moreover, studying the language of Lowth's letters will enable us to study his private styles of writing and to set these off against his public styles. Furthermore, the letters will help us reconstruct Lowth's social network. Social network analysis is an important tool in analysing the process of language change in detail. In Lowth's case, it is important in view of the reputation he acquired as a prescriptivist to try and discover where he found the linguistic norm which he was instrumental in spreading.

Feral Children in the Netherlands: An Eighteenth-century Case within its European Context

Marijke van der Wal (Leiden, mjwal@rullet.leidenuniv.nl)

In 1769 the Berlin Academy invited scholars to submit their essays dealing with the question "en supposant les hommes abandonnés à leurs facultés naturelles, sont-ils en état d'inventer le langage?" Apart from Herder's prize winning essay, others were submitted, most of which remained unpublished. Eighteenth-century authors were particularly interested in so-called feral children, who could be evidence for both the original pre-linguistic state of man and the development of language. It is not surprising, therefore, that cases of such children were listed in the unpublished contest material of the Berlin Academy. Among well-known instances, such as the Hesse wolf child and the Irish sheep boy, a mysterious reference to a Dutch female equivalent occurs. In my paper, I want to reveal the previously unknown details of this case, which must have been familiar to the eighteenth-century contemporaries. The discovery of the

girl in 1717 appears to have been a remarkable news item, which did not pass unnoticed in international periodicals. Moreover, she figured, together with other 'wolf children', in several scientific publications. After having examined the details and background of this particular case, I would like to assess whether feral children played any major role in contemporary linguistic debate.

Galilean Linguistics

Nick Wilding (Florence, wilding@datacomm.iue.it)

Galileo Galilei's famous image in *Il Saggiatore* (1623) of the Book of Nature, written in the language of mathematical characters instantly became one of the leading slogans of the New Science in seventeenth-century Europe. While this empirical epistemology, designed to replace Aristotelean book-based natural philosophy, has received full investigation amongst historians of science, Galileo's linguistic ideas remain relatively underanalysed.

In this paper I wish to look not only at the terminological reforms which he introduced into the language of natural philosophy, and the rhetorical strategies deployed in constructing a propaganda for the New Science, but also at written language, within the format of the book, as in itself providing an epistemological model. Galileo's cultural production is above all *visual*, and the model he uses for perception is always that of *reading*. His first major discoveries, which earned him international fame and a highly paid post at the Medici court, were produced with the help of his swiftly perfected telescope, and disseminated in his famous book *Sidereus Nuncius* (1610). Already here, the universe is represented as a visual semiotic system, which the telescope renders legible. The book's unique strategy of discovering, identifying and naming the Medicean Planets (four of the moons of Saturn) provides a point of entry to the linguistic market, its economy and power structures. The designation and dedication of the 'stars', and contemporary reactions to this strategy, will be analysed within the context of reading practices and print culture. Galilean linguistics will be reconstructed as part of a larger linguistic movement, in the context of Florentine academies and inter-court politics.

Hebrew Studies at the Time of the Counter-Reformation: The Reception of Bellarmine's Institutiones

Irene Zwiep (Amsterdam, zwiep@let.uva.nl)

Hidden among the last folios of MS 993 of the Biblioteca Geral of the University of Coimbra are three short Hebrew poems, written by a student of

the local *Collegio das Artes* in 1597. These simple compositions in pure, but not quite flawless, Biblical Hebrew have but little literary merit, yet, on the other hand, they invite us to reconstruct the history of the study and education — at times two closely related issues — of the holy tongue by Jesuit scholars in the decades after the Council of Trent, a study that was pursued both at various *trilingue* colleges and at the most prestigious centre of Jesuit learning, the Collegio Romano in Rome.

This inevitably brings us to Roberto Bellarmino's short grammar of Hebrew, the *Institutiones linguae hebraicae*, first printed in 1578 by the Roman printer Francesco Zanetti. First we will briefly outline the origin and theoretical presuppositions of the *Institutiones*, with special reference to the impact of the Jewish Hebrew tradition (personified by the famous Eliah Levita's grandson Eliano Romano) played in the transmission of this tradition to Christian scholars. Thereupon its use within the Jesuit school system will be examined, as well as its — at times critical — reception among more or less contemporary scholars with an interest in Hebrew scholarship.

Hans-Dieter Dräxler***Die Idéologie in Deutschland. Versuch der Rekonstruktion der Rezeption einer französischen wissenschaftlichen Theorie im Deutschland des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts.***

Münster: Nodus Publikationen. 1996. 268 pp.

Die im folgenden untersuchte Arbeit entstand als Dissertation im Rahmen des an der Universität Frankfurt (Main) organisierten DFG-Projekts *Ideologenrezeption* unter der Leitung von Brigitte Schlieben-Lange. Sie stellt die Ergebnisse dieses Projekts für Deutschland dar.¹

Die Einleitung bietet eine ausführliche Einführung in die Sprach- und Zeichentheorie der französischen *Idéologie*. Neben der Darstellung Destutt de Tracy's und seines Werkes werden weitere sprachphilosophische und wissenschafts-geschichtliche Fragestellungen, wie etwa die nach der Einheitlichkeit des ideologischen Forschungsprogramms oder die nach dessen Verortung in der französischen Tradition des Sensualismus, verhandelt. Die interessanten Beziehungen zwischen den Ideologen und Wilhelm von Humboldt, auf die in der Einleitung, unter anderem durch die ausführliche Behandlung der sogenannten Aarsleff-Debatte,² hingewiesen wird, werden vom Autor leider nicht weiterverfolgt, obwohl deren systematische Darstellung meines Erachtens von vordringlichem Interesse gewesen wäre.

Die weitere Vorgehensweise der Arbeit ist seriell. Dräxler überzeugt hier sowohl in der Definition des Verfahrens als dem "[...] der seriellen Interpretation. [...] Ihm liegt die Auffassung zugrunde, daß Geschichte nicht aus diskontinuierlichen Ereignissen besteht, deren Sinn von vornherein bestimmt ist, sondern aus langfristigen Entwicklungen, in denen sich die Bedeutung der einzelnen historischen Tatsache aus dem Nebeneinander aller ergibt" (S. 17), als auch (sieht man von der Ausklammerung Humboldts einmal ab) den Gesamtplan der Arbeit (cf. S. 19) betreffend. Innerhalb dieses Planes sind vor allem die ausführliche Darstellung sowohl der deutschen Sprachphilosophie als auch der Sprach- und Zeichentheorie des untersuchten Zeitraumes (1796-1836) hervorzuheben. Angesichts der geistigen Situation im Deutschland des ausgehenden 18. und beginnenden 19. Jahrhunderts, der Dominanz der

¹ Zur Rezeption in Italien erschienen zwei Studien von Roland Bernecker (*Die Rezeption der "idéologie" in Italien. Sprachtheorie und literarische Ästhetik in der europäischen Aufklärung*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1996.; *Die "idéologie" in Italien. Eine kommentierte Bibliographie zur Sprachtheorie der Spätaufklärung*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1997.), die Spanien betreffende Arbeit von Elisabeth Volck-Duffy befindet sich in Vorbereitung.

² Innerhalb dieser Debatte stieß die Behauptung Aarsleffs, Humboldt könne den Ideologen zugerechnet werden, auf vehemente Kritik durch Gipper / Schmitter, Oesterreicher und Trabant (cf. Dräxler: 14 f.).

Schriften Kants und ihrer Rezeption, wird die Schwierigkeit deutlich, der die deutsche Rezeption der französischen Ideologen als Fortsetzer der sensualistischen (Sprach-) Philosophen gegenüber stand. Besondere methodologische Akzentuierung verdienen die von Dräxler entwickelten Schemata zu Rezeptionsformen (S. 82) und Rezeptionsstufen (S. 85). Sie veranschaulichen pointiert die Bedingungen von Rezeption - letzteres vor allem bezüglich ihrer Anwendbarkeit auf die spezifische Situation um 1800. Ohnehin zeigt der Autor neben der methodischen auch die historische Bedeutung des Problems "Rezeption" auf. Um diesem Problem gerecht zu werden, wird sowohl die ausführliche Darstellung der historischen Voraussetzungen im allgemeinen als auch die deutsche Ideologenrezeption betreffend geleistet. Die politische, institutionelle, konfessionelle, bildungstheoretische Situation, die publizistische Aktivität, die spezifisch deutsche Begegnung mit der Französischen Revolution, etc. sind wichtige Parameter, die von Dräxler berücksichtigt werden.

Die Hauptleistung der Arbeit besteht in der Rekonstruktion des Rezeptionsprozesses, ihrer Anwendung auf die seriellen Verfahren, die vom Autor mit geradezu akribischer Genauigkeit vorgenommen werden. Das von Dräxler untersuchte Korpus wird nach Textsorten wie Monographien, Übersetzungen, Rezensionen, Verweise, etc. gegliedert (Kap. 3.1.), was sich insofern als nützlich erweist, als diese Unterteilung sowohl quantitative als auch qualitative Aussagen zuläßt. Darüber hinaus wird das Material zeitlich (Kap. 3.2.) und nach rezipierten Autoren (Kap. 3.3.) gegliedert.

Neben der Ideologen-Rezeption durch deutsche Autoren geht der Verfasser auch auf die Rolle der *Ecoles Centrales*, der 1795 ff. in ganz Frankreich sowie in den linksrheinischen Gebieten zur Zeit der französischen Besatzung etablierten Zentralschulen, ein. Besondere Bedeutung kommt hierbei dem Fach *Grammaire Générale*, einer ideologischen Musterdisziplin, zu (Kap. 4.2.). Die spezifische Ausprägung dieses Unterrichts divergiert in den linksrheinischen Gebieten von der rein ideologischen Ausrichtung in Frankreich dadurch, daß verstärkt die Rezeption Kants mit in dieses zentrale Fach einfließt, ja interessante Mischformen entstehen.

Schließlich werden "Berührungspunkte und Relationen" der Ideologenrezeption in den Preisfragen der Berliner Akademie (1799-1810) (Kap. 4.3.), sowie der deutschen "periodischen und monographischen Literatur" (Kap. 4.4.) behandelt. Eine Hochphase wäre in diesem Bereich zwischen 1800 und 1810 anzusetzen (vgl. Schema S. 94).

Das abschließende Kapitel (Kap. 5.) rekonstruiert eine Begriffsgeschichte von *Idéologie* in Deutschland. Hierin wird zwischen der Geschichte des Begriffs (Kap. 5.1.) und der deutschen *Idéologie*-Rezeption im Zuge der Rezeption französischer Wissenschaft allgemein (Kap. 5.2.) unterschieden. Auch in diesem Teil der Arbeit wird eine chronologische und personelle

(Degérando, Destutt de Tracy, Cabanis, Laromiguière) Strukturierung und Untersuchung vorgenommen.

Insgesamt betrachtet liegt die Stärke der vorliegenden besprochenen Arbeit sicherlich in der minutiös durchgeführten seriellen Analyse der Ideologienrezeption in Deutschland. Beeindruckend ist die Qualität der statistischen Vorgehensweise, welche die genaue Rekonstruktion des untersuchten Korpus leistet. Jedoch leidet der stilistische Ausdruck oftmals angesichts der dokumentarischen Fülle des Materials. Auch die Fußnoten sind leider teilweise ungenau. Abgesehen von diesen kleinen formalen Mängeln stellen sich dem Leser jedoch auch zunehmend inhaltliche Fragen. Wenn der Autor in seiner sehr knappen Schlußbetrachtung zu der Folgerung kommt, "[...] daß man in Deutschland über den Stand der französischen Philosophie, damit auch über die *Idéologie*, informiert ist und daß es Berührungspunkte gibt" (S. 224), daß jedoch diese Berührungspunkte, sprachwissenschaftlich interpretiert, "[...] mit dem eigentlichen Anliegen der *Idéologie*, der sensualistisch fundierten Begründung von Erkenntnis und Wissenschaften, nichts mehr gemein" haben (ibd.), bliebe zu hinterfragen, ob diese so genaue serielle Interpretation und Rekonstruktion nicht zu einem lediglich kargen, durchweg negativen Ergebnis führte. Dieses wird von Dräxler selbst folgendermaßen formuliert: "Das Quellenstudium konnte weder eine deutsche ideologische Tradition noch eine einzelne deutsche ideologische Schrift erschließen" (ibd.). Dem widerspricht, zumindest in Teilen, ein weiterer Vorzug des vorliegenden Buches. Demjenigen, dem Leser ein breites Spektrum von sehr lesenswerten Texten der Zeit um 1800 zugänglich zu machen, die deutlich zeigen, in welchem Maße Rezeptionsverfahren von äußeren Gegebenheiten der Zeit abhängen, wie dies Dräxler bereits in der oben zitierten Definition des seriellen Verfahrens feststellen konnte.

Jochen Hafner, *Universität Tübingen*

Kenzo Kihara (ed.), with the assistance of Keiko Takeuchi and with an introduction by Ko Miyake

Henry Sweet: A Handbook of Phonetics.

Tokyo: Sanseido, 1998, xi + 234 pp. ISBN 4-385-35494-4.

It was during the Henry Sweet Society Colloquium at St Peter's College Oxford a few years ago that I first heard confirmation of what up to then had been merely a rumour in Sweet scholarship. This was the (intriguing) fact that in or around 1912-13 many items of the late Henry Sweet's own personal library (along with books from the library of W.W. Skeat) had found their way to Japan. In fact, it turns out that they had been bought by the Japanese scholar, Professor Sanki Ichikawa, the first professor of English Philology at the Imperial University of Tokyo. As Kenzo Kihara tells us in his Editor's Preface to this reprint, it was on his retirement in 1946 that Ichikawa donated many of these books to his university, including Sweet's own annotated copy of the *Handbook of Phonetics* (1877). This is the book which is reprinted here. Naturally the reappearance of Sweet's *Handbook* is in itself to be welcomed, since it has long been out of print. Of equal interest, however, is that this is a facsimile reprint which reveals all the personal annotations made by Sweet in the margins of his copy, along with some additional notes by one J.S., almost certainly to be identified as the Norwegian scholar Johan Storm, author of the influential *Englische Philologie* (1881), who was a personal friend of Sweet, and who met and corresponded with him over a period of many years, particularly after the publication of the *Handbook* in 1877.

At this time, Sweet was at one of the highpoints of his career, being President of the London Philological Society, author of learned articles on the phonology of many European languages, a respected editor of Old English texts such as King Alfred's *Pastoral Care* (1871-2), and the well-known compiler of a historical English textbook, *An Anglo-Saxon Reader* (1876) -- which was to be used at many universities in revised versions for at least another hundred years thereafter. At the same time also, Sweet was hard at work on the draft versions of his *Grammar* and his *Practical Study of Languages*, both of which did not appear until much later. For all these reasons, the decision to reprint the *Handbook of Phonetics*, a work from a seminal point in Sweet's career, is to be welcomed warmly.

Storm, who was Sweet's senior by nine years (as Kihara reminds us), was a keen supporter of the younger scholar's academic work in the areas of phonetics, history of English, language teaching reform and spelling reform. From the evidence of this facsimile, it would seem that Sweet allowed Storm to borrow and annotate his own copy of the *Handbook* in pencil, all other marginal comments, in ink, being those of Sweet himself. Kihara, in his Preface, displays admirable scholarly caution in stating that the suggested

identity of 'J.S.' is pure conjecture, but this reviewer, for one, is convinced. Particularly useful for the historian of linguistics is the Appendix of the book in which transcriptions have been prepared for all the marginal notes. Some of the annotations are in phonetic script, such as Visible Speech, and the aid to decipherment thus afforded by the editor and his assistant is considerable.

Lack of space in this review prevents any detailed examination of Sweet's marginalia as they appear in the volume. But to take one just example, the following annotation illustrates very well one aspect of his thinking. In the original Preface of 1877 (*Handbook*, p. xii), Sweet had discussed his own study of Icelandic pronunciation, and a glance at his 'Specimens' reveals that he had given some extracts of Old Icelandic texts in both his 'narrow' (phonetic) and 'broad' (roughly phonemic) transcriptions. As he reviewed his own work, however, Sweet wrote in the margin (p. xii):

I rather regret not having written these specimens throughout in Broad Romic. Narrow Romic is more suited for symbolizing accurately isolated sounds than for connected passages.

Reflected here is Sweet's interest in 'broad' notation, that is, in a kind of phonetic transcription that indicates only significant, meaningful distinctions (in this respect, as Wrenn pointed out fifty years ago, Sweet almost formulated the concept of the phoneme). Another point to note in the above text is the significance of the term 'connected passages'. The term presupposes one of Sweet's major structuring principles in the *Handbook*, which distinguishes between the analysis and synthesis of speech sounds and treats them in separate sections of the book; it also reflects the focus, found not only in Sweet but also in other philologists and language teaching reformers of the 1870's and 1880's, on passages of 'connected' language, in which natural, authentic, contextualized texts were used for the acquisition of the forms of a foreign language rather than artificial, rule-bound, context-free sentences chosen merely to illustrate grammatical paradigms, as in the 'grammar method' so prevalent in most secondary schools and universities in this period. These texts were transcribed by Sweet in a notation system that separated stress-groups rather than individual words; the approach thus helped the language student to observe and assimilate the units of connected speech rather than automatically assuming that they corresponded exactly to the separated words of the written language.

There are many interesting possibilities for research suggested by the annotations in this copy of the *Handbook* published by Kihara and Takeuchi. A closer study of Sweet's comments in the facsimile may complement (or even add to) our knowledge of the development of his thought in the 1880's. In addition, new light may be thrown on this chapter in the history of linguistic ideas by a comparison of Sweet's and Storm's marginal comments with their discussions in the extant correspondence. Since there are alterations in later editions of the *Handbook of Phonetics* and in the later *Primer of Phonetics*

(1890), some of these may turn out to have originated in the comments recorded in this facsimile.

If other annotated books exist in the holdings of the library at Tokyo, for instance a personal copy of Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader* or his *History of English Sounds*, perhaps we can look forward to further facsimile reprints of works of this kind?

Mark Atherton, *Oxford*

Joyce M. Morris (ed.)

Controversial Issues in English. Proceedings of the Queen's English Society's Silver Jubilee Conference 18th October, 1997.

London: The Queen's English Society, 1998. xxxiv + 89. ISBN 0 9520037 3 2.

The purpose and substance of this volume are clearly indicated by its subtitle. The Queen's English Society (QES) is "a non-political organization whose members, from all walks of life, are united in their grave concern about 'Standards in English' and associated controversial issues which have long needed to be resolved" (iv). Its Silver Jubilee Conference, held at the Institute of Education, University of London, was intended to mark the beginning of "an era of concerted action [by the QES] to achieve a stronger voice in public debate and in the corridors of power for the cause of Standard English particularly with regard to its use in the media and in educational provision for the development of oracy and literacy in the schools" (v).

The main sessions at the conference were devoted to presentations by seven invited speakers on key issues of continuing interest to the members of the QES. Their papers are included in the present volume unedited. This has the virtue of allowing us a clearer impression of conference day, but it highlights the unevenness of the presentations—an appealing melange of hobbyhorses, book puffs, and after-dinner remarks. In addition to the papers, the contents include several introductory sections, a transcription of the discussion period, and some appended material.

The introductory sections will be useful to those not already familiar with the society. The volume begins with acknowledgements by the editor (iv-vi), including a description of some of the "[m]essages for the success of the conference received from public figures" (iv). This is followed by "A Brief History of the Queen's English Society," by Harold Steward (vii-viii). In "Why a Continuing Need for the Society?" (ix-xxv), the lengthiest section of the volume, the editor details the history of the Reading Wars in the United Kingdom, including the circumstances leading to the coinage of 'phonicsphobia.'

The helpful "Introduction to the Conference Proceedings" (xxvi-xxxiv), by the editor, provides clarification, amplification, and background on the principal speakers and their papers. This was in part necessitated by the decision not to impose 'editorial conformity.' For example, Susan Elkin, an invited speaker and a member of the Society of Women Writers and Journalists (SWWJ), neglected in her presentation to mention the results of the SWWJ centenary opinion survey of its members, an omission the editor remedies (xxx).

The invited speakers were each assigned a controversial issue. Perhaps as a consequence, the titles of the papers are generally very descriptive. The

first of the invited papers is "Standards in English" (1-4), by Chris Woodhead. As Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools, Woodhead is able to draw on a number of sources, including National Curriculum tests, to assess the state of Standard English standards in the schools.

"Teachers' Views on English Standards, Grammar Teaching, the Correction of Errors, and on Each Other" (5-20), by Bernard C. Lamb, is an abbreviated report of a survey conducted for the QES in 1995. We learn, for instance, that although most teachers of English approve of teaching grammar, "only 28% want grammar taught explicitly" (10). The paper includes tables, graphs, and a selection of anonymous written comments by teachers, which "contained far too many errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation" (13).

In 1976, Keith Davidson was the first invited speaker to appear at a QES conference. Today he is an executive member of the National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE), an organization whose positions one gathers differ provocatively from those of the QES. In "Grammar: NATE Position Paper, KS3 Tests" (21-32), Davidson presents a pleasant introduction to basic linguistic concepts, making playful use of the ambiguity of the term 'grammar' to provoke what the editor describes as a 'vociferous response' (xxix) from the delegates. The NATE Position Paper on Grammar is included in the volume as an appendix (83-86).

In "Initial Literacy and the Phonics Controversy" (33-47), Jennifer Chew presents a documented support for systematic phonics teaching early in the curriculum. She surveys the range of initial reading strategies and counters misconceptions about phonics. The notion that phonological awareness must precede phonics instruction is apparently widespread in the United Kingdom.

"A Journalist's Contribution to the Debate" (48-54), by Susan Elkin, is adequately described by its title.

In "The Enemies of Standard English" (55-59), John Honey highlights the role of "academic linguists and...inspectors / advisers" in the elimination of systematic English grammar instruction from the schools. Among the consequences, he notes several tragic plane crashes and a prime minister who pronounces postvocalic /l/ as [w].

Hamish Norbrook draws on many years' experience with the BBC to raise several issues related to world English in "British English – what else?" (60-68). "English is not our language now," he notes, and predicts the rise of "valid local and regional varieties of English" (66, 67). He recommends to British speakers of English the role of supportive grandparents, rather than strict parents, of the language. Strangely, Norbrook seems to place Malabo in Guinea Bissau and India in South East Asia.

The presentations by the invited speakers were followed by an open forum, chaired by Michael Plumbe, Chairman of the QES, during which delegates presented questions and comments to the speakers. A transcription of

this session is included on pp. 69-81. Among the topics are poetry, the Internet, and the proportion of linguists who are “fraudsters and swindlers.”

The volume closes with closing remarks by the Chairman, the NATE position paper, and biographical notes on the speakers (87-89), contributed by themselves.

The value of this volume is as a primary source on language attitudes, understandably so since it is a detailed account of a conference for and by a constituency drawn “from all walks of life.” While many controversial issues are represented, others are missing. The editor notes that “‘Spoken English’ and ‘The Literary Canon’ had to be omitted” because of time constraints (xxvi). More surprisingly, perhaps, specific questions of divided usage are all but ignored. Davidson suggests that concern with Standard English stems from “posh people” upset by “a handful of non-standard forms” (27), but that view is not supported by the present volume. Only Elkin gives specific examples of the loss of distinctions. This reviewer was disappointed to find no mention at all of the Queen’s usage preferences.

Bruce C. Johnson, *Boulder, Colorado*

Jan Noordegraaf

The Dutch Pendulum. Linguistics in the Netherlands 1740-1900.

Nodus Publikationen, Münster, 1996. xvi + 189 pp. ISBN 3-89323-264-8

This book contains a selection of eight essays written by the author between 1987 and 1994, and republished here in English, some of them slightly enlarged and adapted. The papers are ordered chronologically, according to the temporal order of the periods discussed, starting with the early 18th century and ending with the early 20th century. Their titles are (in that order): 'Women and Grammar. The Case of Johanna Corleva (1698-1752)', 'The Schola Hemsterhusiana revisited', 'Trends in Nineteenth-Century Linguistics and the Debate in the Royal Netherlands Academy (1855-1858)', 'Dutch Linguistics and the Origin of Language. Some Nineteenth-Century Views', 'The *Volksgeist* Concept in Dutch Linguistics. Issues and Controversies, Old and New', 'Hoogvliet versus Van Ginneken. Dutch Linguistics around the Turn of the Century', "'On Light and Sound". Johan Huizinga and Nineteenth-Century Linguistics', and 'Hendrik J. Pos (1898-1955) and the History of Linguistics'.

Jan Noordegraaf is a well-known figure among historians of linguistics, who combines meticulous scholarly method with a vast knowledge and great erudition. The fact that he is Dutch has induced him to develop a special interest in the history of linguistic studies in the Netherlands. This is how the present book came into being.

Noordegraaf (henceforth irreverently just N.) tells a number of interesting stories about various figures, issues and debates that occurred in Dutch cultural life during the period discussed. The first essay, on the early 18th century Amsterdam lady Johanna Corleva, is more anecdotal than historically relevant. Corleva translated some well-known foreign publications (e.g. the Port Royal *Grammaire générale et raisonnée* of 1660) into Dutch and she wrote a bilingual Dutch-French and French-Dutch dictionary, based on morphological principles, as well as a learner's grammar of Dutch and of French. Neither at home nor abroad was she recognized as an author of weight, and, one must say, she hardly left a mark on linguistics in the Netherlands or anywhere else.

The second essay describes the 'Schola Hemsterhusiana', a group of classical scholars in the late 18th and early 19th century, followers of Tiberius Hemsterhuis (1685-1766), a polymath and professor of Greek. This school specialized in (sometimes fanciful) etymologizing, but was also carried by serious scholarship. According to N., the Hemsterhusians were inclined to follow Lockean empiricism rather than Cartesian rationalism. But it does not become clear in what way this philosophical and methodological opposition became manifest in their actual work. The reception among classical scholars abroad was, on the whole, one of appreciation.

Then comes an essay on the first large-scale spelling debate in the Netherlands which took place during the 1850s. Other than in most other European countries, spelling reforms have been a perennial issue in the Netherlands over the past 150 years, always provoking strong emotions and hardly ever the object of sober debate and balanced decisions. The debate at issue was no exception. N. shows, however, that, despite the emotions, various strands of contemporary linguistic thinking influenced the positions taken by the protagonists in the debate. The strands of linguistic thinking that played a role came mainly from Germany, as N. points out (p. 66): the opposing Dutch views reflected the opposition that existed in Germany between 'the Grimm-Schleicher connection', on the one hand, and 'the Humboldt-Steinthal-Heysse line' on the other.

The fourth chapter looks at three different mid-19th century views on the origin of language question, represented by the protestant theologian-linguist Willem G. Brill (1811-1896), the Roman Catholic priest Wilhelmus Wessels (1833-1900), and Henri Moltzer (1836-1895), an agnostic linguist and professor of Dutch at Groningen University. Brill represented the non-Darwinian view that man is made of two distinct essences, matter and mind, unlike animals, whom he took to be just matter. Language is a product of man's mental constitution, and cannot, therefore, have originated from animal cries or anything else in the animal kingdom. Language is also a social product, and as such, according to Brill, originated in the love between man and woman. Wessels defended the orthodox Catholic view that language is of divine origin, a gift from God to the first man (a view that found very few followers in the Netherlands). Moltzer, finally, held that the origin of language was an empirical issue, to be studied scientifically. First he proposed that man differs from animals in that he speaks and thinks, whereas animals do neither. Language, then, is there as an expression of human thought. Later on, however, he embraced a more Darwinian point of view, proposing that, indeed, whatever is human about man, including language, developed out of the brute nature of animals. This chapter thus gives the reader a kaleidoscopic view of the origin of language debate as it was conducted in a small country of minor cultural importance.

In chapter 5, two turn-of-the-century debates are discussed, one about the status of Afrikaans, the semi-creole Dutch-derived Boer language of South Africa, the other about the question of proper spelling in Dutch. The link between the two is the fact that in both cases negative value judgments were made with regard to Afrikaans and simplified spelling, respectively, on the grounds that a language, including its spelling, was thought to reflect the 'spirit of its people', its 'Volksgeist'. Again, it is interesting to see how prominent a role this idea played in discussions of less than a hundred years ago.

The sixth chapter opposes and compares two prominent Dutch linguists, Jan Marius Hoogvliet (1860-1924), teacher of classical languages, and Jac J. A.

van Ginneken (1877-1945), Jesuit priest and professor of Dutch, comparative linguistics and Sanskrit at Nijmegen University. Both objected to the exclusively historical view of language that dominated the linguistic scene of the day, and both may thus be regarded as exponents of the new synchronic or structuralist trend that was beginning to make itself felt in Europe, and, for that matter, also in America. In 1903 Hoogvliet published a book called *Lingua*, in which he claimed to present a general grammar that would reduce the specific grammars of individual languages to no more than twenty or thirty pages. This general grammar treats every utterance in a language as an expression of an underlying thought, and is based on ideas of cognitive psychology in combination with what is clearly an early structuralist analysis of linguistic constructions in terms of minimal units or building blocks (called 'morphomeres' in later publications). I must admit that here, more than anywhere else in the book under review, I felt the wish to know more about the precise analyses proposed by the author discussed, and about his sources of inspiration (which Hoogvliet himself, apparently, mentioned only sparingly). This book *Lingua* was reviewed, in a moderately positive way, yet not without a certain amount of irony and condescension, by Van Ginneken, who had no trouble pointing out the inevitable lack of empirical support for Hoogvliet's theory, and his dependence on foreign authors. Van Ginneken himself, however, preferred much more exuberant views. Like Hoogvliet, he argued, in this review and in a number of later publications, that human language expresses psychological states and processes, but his ideas are more romantic: for him, the psychological basis of language is to be found in feeling and emotion, not in cognition (a view that Sapir 1921:40-1 confessed to being 'utterly unable to follow').

Chapter 7 describes the linguistic activities of Johan Huizinga (1872-1945), the great historian, who graduated in Dutch language and literature at Groningen University, but decided to switch over to history when his plan for a doctoral dissertation met with strong opposition. Huizinga was very critical of the Young Grammarians, who, in his (mistaken) view, completely neglected the psychological basis of language. This earned him some stern criticism, especially from Karl Brugmann, the leading Young Grammarian around 1900, who told him to study more before voicing criticisms of this nature. Huizinga felt that linguistic theory should pay more attention to word meaning, and especially to the cross-modal metaphors used for light and sound ('heavy', 'sharp', 'thin', etc.). In addition, Huizinga, who also had strong literary leanings and connections, felt that the origin of language lay in poetry, a romantic view that probably originated with Giambattista Vico in the early 18th century (*Scienza Nuova*, 1725), and became popular through Herder and Humboldt, to the point of being shared even by Otto Jespersen.¹

¹ See my *Western Linguistics*, p. 77.

The final essay deals with the Dutch philosopher-linguist Hendrik J. Pos (1898-1955), who started his academic life as a classicist but soon specialized in general linguistics, and later became mainly a philosopher. He was brought up a protestant, and was, at first, a professor at the Calvinist Free University in Amsterdam. Soon, however, he became disaffected with the kind of Calvinism that was required of him at the Free University. He broke with Calvinism and indeed with religion altogether, and in 1932 he accepted a chair of philosophy at the (then) Municipal University of Amsterdam, where the intellectual climate was one of free thinking, with a tendency towards left-wing views. He published little, but was an influential figure in Dutch academic and intellectual life between 1935 and 1955. His views on language were of a general, programmatic and philosophical nature, with a special emphasis on the history of linguistics. He never did any actual analytic or descriptive work.²

The book is full of interest and colour, especially for those who are already acquainted with Dutch intellectual history. In practice, however, the readership of the book will be largely restricted to Dutch linguists and historians, besides the odd non-Dutch specialist who wants to be informed about details of Dutch linguistic work during the past few centuries. The reason for this is clear. Although N. carefully refrains from value judgments, his readers will hardly fail to notice that Dutch linguistics, during the period at issue, was 'a sideshow of a sideshow' (to borrow a phrase used for Lawrence of Arabia's exploits in the Middle East during the First World War), yet without Lawrence's brilliance and panache. The views espoused or developed by the personae in the various little dramas described by N. were, if not lacking in substance, derived from other, much more prominent, authors outside the confines of the Low Countries. N. does mention this fact from time to time. Yet he does not indulge in a precise search for the sources, or an analysis of why the Dutch authors he discusses took over and selected the ideas the way they did. He might have mentioned, for example, that practically all 19th century Dutch linguists were either classicists or students of Dutch. It is not unthinkable that the prominent position of classical scholarship in 18th and 19th century Dutch cultural life may have had something to do with the views that were held on linguistic matters.

One critical note is in order. Unfortunately, the quality of N.'s English leaves too much to be desired, grammatically, lexically, idiomatically, stylistically, and even orthographically. This is a pity, as it might give rise to a no doubt false suspicion of disrespect for readers with a native command of English. N. should have realized that, conversely, a published text written by a

² Pos was one of my professors when I studied at the Municipal University of Amsterdam in the early 50s. I admired him for his dignity and his knowledge, but found his linguistic views disappointing. I was, in fact, the last student he examined: he died a few days after I took my oral exam in Ancient Philosophy with him — a feat that I have been unable to repeat with any other professor since

non-native author in clumsy and faulty Dutch would leave Dutch readers embarrassed. Writing in a foreign language that one does not have full mastery of is a delicate exercise that needs much coaching and monitoring.

Apart from this negative point, however, the book is a valuable contribution. It adds a few figures to the gallery of minor gods in the linguistic pantheon.

References

Sapir, Edward 1921: *Language*. Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York.
Seuren, Pieter A.M. 1998: *Western Linguistics. An Historical Introduction*.
Blackwell, Oxford.

Pieter A.M. Seuren, *Nijmegen*

Raffaella Petrilli***Temps et détermination dans la grammaire et la philosophie ancienne.***

Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1997, 223pp. Pr. DM. 69,-. ISBN 3-89323-273-7

In his *Peri hermeneias* Aristotle explains the fundamental notions of his logic, such as *onoma*, *rhema* and *logos*. When discussing *onoma* and *rhema* he introduces two very novel notions, *onoma aoriston* and *rhema aoriston* (16a30-2). He feels constrained to do so because according to him one can use in Greek the negation *ou* closely together with an *onoma*, e.g. in the expression *ouk anthrōpos* and then link it with a verb. Thus *ouk anthrōpos peripatei* does not necessarily have the sense of “man is not walking” but can also mean “not-man is walking”. On the analogy of *ouk anthrōpos* he also assumes the existence of expressions such as *ou peripatei* (“is not-walking”). Because of these expressions not yet having been denominated he introduces the terms *onom,a aoriston* and *rhēma aoriston*. Now, what does Aristotle mean by “not-man”? Ancient commentators, such as Ammonius (5th cent., *Comm. in Arist. Graeca* 4.5, pp. 40.16-42.24) and most modern scholars, in as far they deal with this question, explain the expression as looking at all species except man which come under the genus of “animal” (*zōion*). Petrilli, however, starts from the other side, the term *aoriston*. Because of a text in Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* she identifies *aoriston* as “being (not in actuality but) in potentiality”. In other words, *ouk anthrōpos* looks at something which is not yet a man, has the potentiality of being a man. Potentiality is indeterminate but the same can be said of phrases containing a future tense or an optative mood + *an*.

Aristotle, of course, is doing logic (dialectics), not speaking about language in general. In this context one can understand why he pays attention to the kind of expressions I mentioned, for it makes some difference in respect of truthness/falseness when one says: “No man is walking”, “man is not walking, does not walk”, “not-man is walking” or “man is not-walking”.

According to Petrilli Aristotle has laid here the foundation of a theory of indeterminacy which in the following centuries definitely shaped the views of Theophrastus and Chrysippus on *aoristia*, and also influenced the explanations of grammarians in respect of this phenomenon. It is well-known that ancient grammarians use denominations like *chronos aoristos* (the Greek aorist tense), *onoma aoriston* (nomen indefinitum, such as “someone”), speak about the indeterminacy of the infinitive, and even distinguish on the Latin side between *ego* as a *pronomem finitum* and *tu* and *ille* as *pronomina minus quam finita* because when saying *ego* a speaker is talking someone who is being determined to a greater extent than when says *tu*. Scholars usually refer for these distinction to Stoic logic. Petrilli does not think them wrong but they should have gone further back, to Aristotle.

Her book consists of four chapters, dealing with Aristotle, Theophrastus, the Stoics (= Chrysippus), and the grammarians (specifically Apollonius Dyscolus). At

the end we have a bibliography and an index of names, but not an *index locorum*. In general it may be said that scholarly discussion published after 1990/1 has not been consulted by P., whose book is based on her “thèse de doctorat” defended in Paris in 1993.

As I shall publish a much longer review in the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* I wish to focus on a few aspects on Petrilli’s book. The first point I wish to make is that in my mind she has convincingly shown the right way to interpret Aristotle’s novel notion, and links of the Aristotelian views with those of Stoics. However, her insistence on *aoristia* as being always the upper term whenever distinctions and subdistinctions are made looks like an inevitable consequence of an author’s research of a specific object. I also have objections (both of a chronological and a methodological type) to the way she handles the Latin theory of pronouns, for which I must refer to my longer review. A more serious objection concerns the author’s tendency to seem to suggest that Aristotle’s views influenced the grammarians in a direct way, not through the Stoics. Notwithstanding these objections I expect this book to have a definite place in future discussions.

Dirk M. Schenkeveld, *Heemstede NL*

Rob Pope***Textual Intervention. Critical and Creative Strategies for Literary Studies.***

London and New York: Routledge, 1995, xvi + 213 pp. ISBN 0-415-05437-0 (pbk)

Rob Pope's *Textual Intervention* belongs to the INTERFACE series of University textbooks published by Routledge and edited by Ronald Carter, the aim of which is to 'examine topics at the "interface" of language studies and literary criticism and in so doing to build bridges between these traditionally divided disciplines'. In achieving this laudable aim, the series includes such titles as Michael J. Toolan, *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*, David Birch, *Language, Literature and Critical Practice*, Ruth Waterhouse and John Stephens, *Literature, Language and Change*, Richard Bradford, *A Linguistic History of English Poetry* and Valerie Shepherd, *Literature about Language*. As yet there is no title directly concerned with the history of ideas about language, though one could imagine such a work fitting into the series, especially if its content were geared towards cultural historical issues, along with a practical and analytical 'workbook' approach. The latter approach is clearly the main rationale of *Textual Intervention*. As the title indicates, its main focus is written language of all kinds (mainly but not only from the literary canon), and its basic method is a mixture of criticism, creative rewriting and playful manipulation of the set texts in order to highlight their style, rhetoric, genre, cultural content and ideological background. Obviously an experienced teacher and tutor, Pope presents a clear repertoire of usable techniques for encouraging students to systematically explore, deconstruct and reconstruct a variety of texts from Shakespeare to the present day.

One such text is the poem by Robert Browning 'My Last Duchess' (1842). The series of steps Pope suggests for approaching this text, involve what he calls 'de-centring and re-centring the literary classic' in order to 'intervene', recreate and re-evaluate the poem. The moves he suggests are (1) to try to deliberately alter the style, context or emphasis of the text (2) to consider how these changes throw light on the meanings and values of the text, and (3) to discuss with others and come to some consensus or preference. Other activities might involve 'translating' the text into a different idiom, listing the characters directly or indirectly involved and imagining how the text would differ if composed from their point of view, considering other texts or actual historical events from the same period which are not mentioned or alluded to in the passage to be studied. By these means Pope gives practical and usable techniques for enlivening the literary or linguistic/stylistic seminar.

This book could be regarded as a lecturer's resource and reference book. Some of the activities suggested would be feasible only with groups sufficiently motivated by the material itself, or by the conviction that such cultural-

historical approaches can be combined with linguistic analysis. From a pedagogical point of view, I imagine some groups of students would need to be wooed carefully before they would warm to such activities as actually daring to rewrite literary texts in the seminar room rather than taking part in the more traditional approach of seminar paper + questions and discussion. Arguably, the creative writing method is perhaps also unsuited to the needs of a linguistic historian; again the theoretical deconstructionist basis (outlined in a final chapter) may also conflict with the particular theoretical assumptions on which a linguistic historian usually bases their teaching. Nevertheless, there may be ways of taking both the theory and practice presented here and adapting it to other disciplines, if only for the interesting and provocative questions which some of the proposed techniques raise, particularly when they are applied to the study of texts from the past. If students can be provoked into interrogating, discussing and debating their set texts, then methods such as these are well worth considering.

Mark Atherton, *Oxford*

Wout van Bekkum, Jan Houben, Ineke Sluiter, Kees Versteegh
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, v. 82). ix + 322 pp. ISBN 90 272 4568 1 (Eur., Hb.)

This work contains a brief preface followed by four major parts, each of which is a history of the inquiry focused on questions of meaning in a particular linguistic tradition, and concludes with a short comparison of the scope and achievements of the respective traditions. It is a rare and welcome work in many respects, two of which are its focus on semantics in the broadest sense, and its bringing together in one volume studies of traditions which are considered to be disparate. The key word one must bear in mind in approaching this work is one that appears in its title, and that is “emergence”. The only definition of semantics to appear in this work that is coined by the authors themselves is “the theory of meaning” (p. 287). The authors have traced the histories, not of formal theories of semantics, but rather of practices and discussions which include meta-linguistic discussions of meaning, ranging from the meaning of names, phrases, and grammatical categories, to classification of sentence and discourse types. They have also included the history of philosophical inquiry as to the epistemological status of human and divine language.

The question which was the impetus for this joint production had to do with the fact that each tradition had a “corpus of revealed or revered texts, which gave rise to the development of linguistic and hermeneutic studies” (p. v). The authors wished to investigate the ways in which and the extent to which these sacred texts were involved in the development of semantics in each of the respective traditions. In each instance, the methods for transmission and interpretation of the texts are shown to have influenced the particular approaches to meaning which arose:

Wout van Bekkum’s history of semantics in the Hebrew tradition traces the ways in which “meaning” has been studied and debated in the context of the Hebrew Bible, primarily the first five books termed the *Tôrâh*. His discussion begins with a compendium of terms which have been used to refer to “meaning” within the tradition. An interpretive approach to teaching of the bible developed in the context of a widening gap between Classical Hebrew and the contemporary vernacular, which varied from place to place under the influence of migration and multilingualism. Two of the techniques adopted early on, the explanation of word-meaning through etymological association, and the explication of textual meaning through allegorical interpretation, are also found in the bible itself. Interpretive studies of the bible were termed

midrāś and relied upon established exegetical techniques, such as the seven attributed to Hillel. Two principles in particular appear to have predominated, those of explication of *pešāṭ* or “plain meaning”, and *dērāś* or “meaning as a result of hermeneutic deduction”. Medieval scholars such as Saadiah Gaon adopted principles of exegesis from Arabic, termed *tawīl*, and also discussed meaning in terms of the Arabic *ma'nā*. The approach to meaning as *pešāṭ* “literal” or *dērāś* “derived” also applies to two opposing camps to translation of the bible into Arabic, those of the Karaites and Rabbanites, respectively. Also addressed are dictionary making and the evolution of the concept of the triliteral root. The work of Moses Maimonides contains discussions of word meaning which include the concepts of synonyms and homonyms. He also distinguished between “inner” and “outer” meaning, between “meaning” and “name,” and between “message” and “word,” the former in each pair being characteristic of the divine, and the latter characteristic of the human and conventional.

This author’s citation system adopts the confusing practice of citing two authors as if they were one author possessed of a hyphenated surname (e.g. “Weiss-Butterworth,” p. 29); other authors make use of the ampersand when citing two authors. Several authors are cited in the body of the text whose full reference is missing from the Bibliography (e.g. “Harris 1995,” p. 37).

Although Jan Houben’s contribution on “The Sanskrit Tradition” takes a chronological approach to the study of meaning in eight major religious, grammatical, logical and philosophical schools, his discussion is unified throughout by his attention to the ways in which the various schools viewed the relation between the two basic concepts of *śabda* (‘speech sound’, ‘word’, ‘language’) and *artha* (‘meaning’), and to the reasons why the questions of whether or not sacred and human language are able to convey meaning, how both are able (or not able) to do so, and what was the meaning thereby conveyed were of central importance to those various schools. Among the issues addressed in the Sanskrit tradition were the questions of whether the relation between a word and its meaning is eternal, whether meaning is to be constructed from the word or from the sentence level, whether the meaning of words in the Vedas is to be considered the same as the meanings of words used in everyday life, whether what is expressed by a word represents the universal concept or the specific instance of a thing, whether grammatical gender and other affixes contribute to alter the meaning of word, and the mental concept of words as held by both speaker and hearer. Of the eight schools discussed by Houben, the first three, namely the Brāhmaṇas, the Nirukta, and the Mimāṃsā, are primarily concerned with the language of the Vedas, while the later schools of the grammarians Pāṇini and Bhartṛhari, the Buddhist logicians Dīnāga and Dharmakīrti, the dhvani theory of poetics, and the Navya-Nyāya school of logic were also concerned with questions of Sanskrit language in general. Houben restricts his discussion to works written only on and in Sanskrit, thus Dravidian

works on semantics, and much of the Buddhist and Jaina works are excluded from consideration.

The problem of authors cited in the body of the text whose full reference is missing from the Bibliography is considerably worsened in Houben's contribution. The numerous omissions include "Raja 1969," which he mentions as being the first book one should consult as a general introduction to semantics in this tradition (p. 134).

Ineke Sluiter views meaning as the guiding principle underpinning all Greek linguistic investigations. In the Greek tradition, there is no dominant religious text, and interest in language stems primarily from epistemological considerations. Divine will was, however, thought to be manifest in such texts as oracles, dreams, and myth, and under the desire to interpret this will the exegetical techniques of glosses, paraphrase, and allegory arose. In the Greek tradition, etymology was the starting point of linguistic investigation, and Sluiter's analysis is particularly enlightening; its purpose was not "historical," but rather motivated by the desire to understand the reasons for names. The focus was on possible semantic connections, rather than formal correspondence. Early debates on the reliability of names held that they reflected not truth but opinion, and as such were conventional. Proponents of this view such as Democritus pointed to the existence of synonyms as evidence for their arguments. Sluiter analyzes two theories of meaning addressed in Plato's *Cratylus*, and his theory in the *Sophist* that "propositional meaning" lies only at the sentence level. In the work of Aristotle (*On Interpretation, Categories*), language is found to be symbolic of thought, rather than mimetic of things. Sluiter explains that meaning is part of Aristotle's definitions of the formal categories of "name" (*ónoma*), "predicate" (*rhēma*), and "sentence" (*lógos*). She traces the ways in which the concept of "focal meaning" was applying to his definitions of homonyms and synonyms. The discussion of the Stoics' views on meaning focuses on their notion of the "sayable" (*lektón*). Semantic factors are part of the concept of "regularity" (*katallelótēs*) which appears in the work of the syntactician Apollonius Dyscolus. In the work of Augustine, the "word" receives attention as the locus of meaning, and there is metalinguistic differentiation between "use" and "mention" of a word.

Kees Versteegh refers to the persistent opposition of the concepts of *lafz* (interpreted variously as "expression," "actual utterance," "form") and *ma'nā* (most broadly, "meaning") as the most interesting aspect of the history of the Arabic tradition. Versteegh in fact organizes his study around the various ways in which different disciplines interpreted the concept of *ma'nā*. The tradition originates in exegesis of the Qur'ān, in the form of rephrasing passages of the text in an attempt to clarify the intention of the speaker. The mainstream of Arabic linguistic analysis, initiated by Siibawayhi, focused on syntax and morphology, and in this school, the term *ma'nā* is used primarily to indicate "the syntactic function of a word or category" (p. 243). The analysis of

word meaning, centered on sets of radicals, was the domain of lexicographers, a discipline peripheral to the grammatical tradition. For literary critics, the *ma`nā* of a text was the thought of the poet, apart from the form of his words; for logicians, the *ma`nāni* were abstract, universal concepts, expressed through sound but not necessarily so. Under the development of linguistic thought by the rhetoricians following the introduction of Greek logic, the level of the sentence became the focus of semantic investigation. Al-Ġurġānī studied meaning differences in different sentence types, word order, and use of particles. The final discipline to make a substantial contribution to semantics, that of the legal sciences, grew from the thought of the Mu'tazilites, who debated on the locus and nature of *ma`nā*. The legal system dealt with written precepts, which were to be applied to new cases by analogy, and scholars in this context sought to clarify various aspects of speech and of meaning. Versteegh's survey and analysis is rich and deep, and delves into many more aspects of the Arabic tradition's study of meaning than can be touched upon here.

This work will be of interest to specialists in each of the respective traditions. Each part concludes with a section on "suggestions for further reading" and extensive bibliographies. Though highly specialized, the work would also serve well as a text in a graduate course on the history of linguistics.

Ann Wehmeyer, *Gainesville, Florida*

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(to 15 October 1998)

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.

Herman Bell

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

BONDEVIK, Jarle & NES, Oddvar (eds.)
Ivar Aasen-studiar I. Bergen: Norsk Bokreidingslag L/L, 1998. [Skrifter frå Ivar Aasen-Selskapet, Serie B, Kommenterar og Studiar Nr. 1] 118 pp. ISBN 82-7834-010-2

de BONTH, Rolandus Johannes Godefridus
"De Aristarch van 't Y": De 'grammatica' uit Balthazar Huydecopers Proeve van Taal- en Dichtkunde (1730). [Doctoral dissertation for the Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen]. Maastricht: Shaker Publishing B. V., 1998. xiv + 419 pp. ISBN 90-423-0036-1

BREKLE, Herbert E., DOBNIG-JÜLCH, Edeltraud, HÖLLER, Hans Jürgen & WEIB, Helmut (eds.)

Bio-bibliographisches Handbuch zur Sprachwissenschaft des 18. Jahrhunderts. Die Grammatiker, Lexikographen und Sprachtheoretiker des deutschsprachigen Raums mit Beschreibungen ihrer Werke. Band 4, H-I.
Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1996. xvii + 404 pp. ISBN 3-484-73024-2

BREKLE, Herbert E., DOBNIG-JÜLCH, Edeltraud, HÖLLER, Hans Jürgen & WEIB, Helmut (eds.)

Bio-bibliographisches Handbuch zur Sprachwissenschaft des 18. Jahrhunderts. Die Grammatiker, Lexikographen und Sprachtheoretiker des deutschsprachigen Raums mit Beschreibungen ihrer Werke. Band 5, J-L.
Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1996. xviii + 412 pp. ISBN 3-484-73025-0

DOVETTO, Francesca M.

Luigi Ceci (1859-1927) e la linguistica del suo tempo. Münster: Nodus, 1998. 179 pp. ISBN 3-89323-275-3

ELFFERS, Els, MAAT, Jaap, NOORDEGRAAF, Jan, RUIJSEDAAL, Els & SMITH, Robin

Colloquium Handbook. Amsterdam, 1998. [The Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas, Fifteenth Annual Colloquium, Amsterdam, 16-19 September 1998] 64 pp.

HARTMANN, R. R. K. & JAMES, Gregory

Dictionary of Lexicography. London & New York: Routledge, 1998. xv + 176 pp. ISBN 0-415-14143-5

KOPPELBERG, Stephan

Untersuchungen zum lateinischen Erbwortschatz des Katalanischen. Münster: Nodus, 1998. [Münstersche Beiträge zur Romanischen Philologie, 17]. 496 pp. ISBN 3-89323-567-1

MONAGHAN, Charles

The Murrays of Murray Hill. New York: Urban History Press, 1998. x + 166 pp. ISBN 0-9662430-0-5

MORRIS, Joyce M. (ed.)

Controversial Issues in English: Proceedings of The Queen's English Society's Silver Jubilee Conference 18th October, 1997. London: The Queen's English Society, 1998. xxxiv + 89 pp. ISBN 0-9520037-3-2

ROBINS, Robert H.

Texts and Contexts: Selected Papers on the History of Linguistics. (Edited by Vivien Law). Münster: Nodus, 1997. [The Henry Sweet Society Studies in the History of Linguistics, 5]. 341 pp. ISBN 3-89323-455-1

STEVENS, Charles

Winchester Notions: The English Dialect of Winchester College. (Edited by Christopher Stray). London & New Brunswick, NJ: The Athlone Press, 1998. xxii + 321 pp. ISBN 0-485-11525-5 (hb) & 0-485-12138-7 (pb)

WAKELY, Richard & BENNETT, Philip E. (eds.)

France and Germany in Scotland: Studies in Language and Culture.

Edinburgh: The Department of French, the University of Edinburgh, 1996.

[Papter from the Centenary Celebrations of the Departments of French and German at the University of Edinburgh, 1994-1995]. xiv + 101 pp. ISBN 0-9529293-0-9

JOURNALS

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft. 8:1 (1998). ISSN 0939-2815

Il Cannocchiale. Rivista di Studi Filosofici. 1 (Jan. – April 1998).

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

BONDEVIK, Jarle

“Den fyrste grammatikken Aasen åtte”. Bondevik, Jarle & Nes, Oddvar 1998, 8-54

FORSGRÉN, Kjell-Åke

“On ‘Valency Theory’ in 19th-Century German Grammar”. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 55-68

HEINZ, Sabine

“Die Keltologie an der Humboldt- vormals Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität.

Eine Ideengeschichte und ihre Umsetzung". Discussion. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 105-124

HAFNER, Jochen & SCHLIEBEN-LANGE, Brigitte

"Diskursformation: Die Grammaire Générale an den Ecoles Centrales (1795-1803). Report on Project. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 133-146

HOFMAN, Rijcklof

"Manuscripts and Tradition of Grammatical Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance. 11th Course of the International School for the Study of Written Records 16. – 23. 10. 1997, Ettore Majorana Centre, Erice (Sicily)". Report on Meeting. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 128-131

HÜLLEN, Werner

"Die Historiographie als Aufforderung zum kritischen Anachronismus". In P. Schmitter & M. v. d. Wal (eds.). *Metahistoriography. Theoretical and Methodological Aspects*. (Münster: Nodus, 1998), 171-181

JOOKEN, Lieve & SWIGGERS, Pierre

"Lord Monboddo's Views on the Corruption and Preservation of Language. With the Edition of an Unpublished Manuscript (1766)". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 11-26

LINDA, Markus

"Fragen an ein Buch zu Saussures Arbitraritätsbegriff". Review of Silvia B. Garcia, *Zum Arbitraritätsbegriff bei F. de Saussure. Eine exegetisch-philologische Untersuchung*. (Münster: Nodus, 1997). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 153-164

LINN, Andrew Robert

"Ivar Aasen and V. U. Hammershaimb: Towards a Stylistics of Standardization". Bondevik, Jarle & Nes, Oddvar 1998, 91-118

LINN, Andrew Robert

"Rasmus Rask and English". In Vivien Law & Werner Hüllen (eds.), *Linguists and Their Diversions*. (Münster: Nodus, 1996), 307-331

LINN, Andrew Robert

Review of E. F. K. Koerner and R. E. Asher (eds.), *Concise History of the Language Sciences: From the Sumerians to the Cognitivists*. (Oxford & New York: Pergamon Press, 1995). *Historiographia Linguistica* 23:1/2 (1996), 194-200

NERLICH, Brigitte

"The Function of Polysemous Jokes and Riddles in Semantic Development".
Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive/ Current Psychology of Cognition 17:2
(1998), 343-365

NERLICH, Brigitte

"Linguistic 'Representation' as *Darstellung*: From Bernhardt to Bühler".
Il Cannocchiale. Rivista di Studi Filosofici. 1 (1998), 193-223

NERLICH, Brigitte

"Saussure and Wittgenstein: The Arbitrariness and Autonomy of Grammar". In
Edeltraud Werner, Ricarda Liver, Yvonne Stork and Martina Nicklaus (eds.). *et
multum et multa*. [Festschrift für Peter Wunderli zum 60. Geburtstag].
(Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1998), 143-156

NERLICH, Brigitte & Clarke, David D.

"The Linguistic Repudiation of Wundt". *History of Psychology* 1:3 (1998),
179-204

NOWAK, Elke

"X. Internationales Kolloquium des SGdS". Report on Meeting. *Beiträge zur
Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 125-127

POPPE, Erich

"Ireland und Europa im frühen Mittelalter. Texte und Überlieferung. 5.
Internationales Kolloquium Universität Konstanz, 16. – 20. März 1998".
Report on Meeting. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1
(1998), 131-132

SAINT-GÉRAND, Jacques-Philippe

"Aporie ou Prototype? Certes! Exemple de «DÉTAIL» chez Antoine Meillet".
Discussion. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 69-
104

SAINT-GÉRAND, Jacques-Philippe

Obituary. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 147-152

SALMON, Paul B.

"Herder versus the Rest: The 'Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache' as
Polemic". Wakely & Bennett 1996, 49-63

SAUER, Hans

“*Principiae Grammaticae Illyricae und Compendium Grammaticae Illyricae. Zwei bairische Englischgrammatiken aus dem späten 18. Jahrhundert*”.
Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 8:1 (1998), 27-54

SCHMITT, Rüdiger

“Die Geschichte der Keltologie – einmal anders”. Review of Joachim Lerchenmueller, >*Keltische Sprengstoff*<. *Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studie über die deutsche Keltologie von 1900 bis 1945*. (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1997). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 165-169

SCHMITT, Rüdiger

Short review of Joachim Lerchenmueller & Gerd Simon, *Im Vorfeld des Massenmords. Germanistik und Nachbarfächer im 2. Weltkrieg. Eine Übersicht*. (Tübingen: Verlag der Gesellschaft für interdisziplinäre Forschung, 1997). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 171-174

SCHMITT, Rüdiger

Short review of Katherine Forsyth, *Language in Pictland. The Case against 'Non-Indo-European Pictish'*. (Münster: Nodus, 1997). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 174-176

SUBBIONDO, Joseph L.

“17th-Century Universal Grammar and Contemporary Linguistics. John Wilkins and Noam Chomsky”. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:1 (1998), 1-9

ULVESTAD, Bjarne

“Ivar Aasen og granskinga av sunnmørsmålet”. Bondevik, Jarle & Nes, Oddvar 1998, 55-89

**THE FORMATION OF DISCOURSE:
THE GRAMMAIRE GÉNÉRALE AT THE ECOLES CENTRALES
(1795-1803)¹**

Since October 1997 the project *Diskursformation: Die Grammaire Générale an den Ecoles Centrales (1795-1803)*, financed by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, has been organized by Brigitte Schlieben-Lange, Ilona Pabst and Jochen Hafner at the Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics, University of Tübingen (Germany).

The essential aim of this linguistic and historical project is the investigation and reconstruction of scientific discourses in their historical context. In order to illustrate such a reconstruction based on a critical study of Michel Foucault's conception of discourse² we will take as an example the subject of General Grammar (*Grammaire Générale*) in the *Ecoles Centrales*, French Central Schools, established in and after 1795 in all French³ *Départements*. The initial step of our research project is the serial analysis of the source material as described by B. Schlieben-Lange⁴ in order to document the specific educational and linguistic situation in France after *Thermidor*. The creation of the Central Schools introduced some new subjects (and also a new type of education, based on the principle of *analyse*) into the reformed educational system, within the framework of *Grammaire Générale*. It is evident that the discussion about the contents, aims and definition of this new subject was vigorous about 1800 and is therefore one of our main interests. The educational system of the *Convention* and *Directoire* periods was deeply influenced by the ideals of the French Revolution and by the sensualistic language and grammar theory embraced by the scientific group known as the *Idéologues* (main representatives: Destutt de Tracy, Cabanis, Ginguené).

¹ This report is a shortened English version of: Jochen Hafner, Brigitte Schlieben-Lange (1998): "Diskursformation: Die Grammaire Générale an den Ecoles Centrales (1795-1803)." In: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8: 133-146.

² Michel Foucault (1966): *Les mots et les choses*. Paris: Gallimard. See also: Brigitte Schlieben-Lange (1996): "Über die Notwendigkeit des Diskurs-Begriffs in der Sprachwissenschaftsgeschichte." In: Herbert E. Brekle, Edeltraud Dobnig-Jülch, Helmut Weiß (Eds.): *A Science in the Making. The Regensburg Symposia on European Linguistic Historiography*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen. 233-241.

³ Also in formerly French regions of the states of Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, etc.

⁴ Brigitte Schlieben-Lange (1992): "La Grammaire Générale dans les Ecoles Centrales." In: id. et al (eds.): *Europäische Sprachwissenschaft um 1800. Methodologische und historiographische Beiträge zum Umkreis der "idéologie"*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen. Vol. 3: 213-262.

The corpus contains, among other documents, the extensive correspondence between the *Grammaire Générale* teachers in the Central Schools all over France and the minister of the interior, the members of the *Conseil d'Instruction Publique* (the institution responsible for the scientific — which during the *post-thermidor* period means sensualistic — quality of instruction, composed by Daunou, Domergue, Ginguené, Destutt de Tracy, etc.), the *cahiers*, treatises, exercises and descriptions of the courses, timetables and further information about the *Grammaire Générale* teaching. These documents reveal the complex structure of this specific educational and scientific situation: on the one hand a direct theoretic influence of the *Conseil d'Instruction Publique (CIP)* can be traced, on the other hand the teachers had the possibility to develop new educational and scientific concepts and to enforce their realisation. This relatively open structure is due to the dialogic ideal of the late enlightenment; in this case of the dialogue between the representatives of theory (the *grammairiens-philosophes* like Destutt de Tracy) and those of educational practice (the teachers in the French province). By studying the rich material of the corpus the constitution of a “strong” discourse, the formation of its argumentative core, the organisation of the pre-existent scientific and intellectual material (by exclusion, integration or transformation) can be documented.⁵ Therefore documents like ministerial questionnaires concerning the age, education and teaching structures of the individual teachers, comments of the *CIP* judging the scientific structure and contents of the treatises, *cahiers* and exercises, are helpful for reconstructing this unique historical and educational, linguistic and scientific discourse. After a relatively liberal period, the minister with his letter addressed to all *Grammaire Générale* teachers of the Central Schools (dated 5^o jour complémentaire an VII)⁶ and a

⁵ Authors like Condillac, Locke, Harris (and his French translator Thurot) will be considered.

⁶ “En effet, Citoyen, dans l’ensemble de l’éducation, votre cours doit être le complément et le couronnement des cours de langues anciennes, et l’introduction aux cours de belles-lettres, d’histoire et de législation. Or, vous n’ignorez pas que dans le nouveau système d’instruction, auquel préside exclusivement la méthode qui consiste à aller toujours du connu à l’inconnu, les Professeurs de langues anciennes doivent, avant d’entrer en matière, faire observer aux enfants, comment, depuis leur naissance, ils ont appris le peu qu’ils savent; leur faire remarquer ce qu’ils font quand ils pensent et quand ils parlent; c’est-à-dire, leur donner les faibles notions d’idéologie et de la grammaire générale qui sont à la portée de cet âge, et qui sont nécessaires pour bien comprendre les règles d’une langue quelconque, et pour en abrégier l’étude. Par la même raison, votre cours venant après celui de langues anciennes, vous devez d’abord profiter des connaissances acquises par les élèves dans cet intervalle, pour leur donner des leçons plus approfondies sur l’idéologie et la grammaire générale; car c’est là l’époque où ils doivent apprendre réellement ces deux sciences. Ensuite, il faut appliquer ces connaissances à la grammaire française, puisqu’elle est le premier pas dans l’étude des belles-lettres; et enfin, il faut en tirer les règles de l’art de raisonner, puisque c’est là le fil conducteur qui doit aider les jeunes gens à apprécier les hommes et les choses, les faits et les institutions, dans les cours d’histoire et de législation,

report of the *CIP* concerning the contents and structure of this subject (16 pluviôse an VIII) give clearly defined orders to the teachers.⁷

Within the research of a *Grammaire Générale* manual for the Central Schools, these defining documents can be interpreted as a further definition of the subject, seen in relation to the new educational project of the Central Schools. In this concept, the *Grammaire Générale* is the continuation of the *Langues Anciennes* course (Latin studies) and the preparation for the social sciences *Législation* and *Histoire*. Its aim is a logical formation of language under genetic aspects. In this context, the *Grammaire Générale* is judged as the method of methods, as the science of sciences, as a general theory of language⁸ corresponding to its natural genetic process⁹, it is expressed in nearly all general grammar treatises of the Central School teachers in terms of the following canonical structure:¹⁰

- (1) *Idéologie* ou théorie de l'entendement (sens, facultés, opérations)
- (2) *Des signes* (les différents systèmes sémiotiques, leur progrès du langage d'action à l'écriture, problème de la langue universelle)
- (3) *Grammaire Générale*
- (4) *Grammaire française*
- (5) *Logique*

et les guider pendant le reste de leur vie." (Archives Nationales de France, F¹⁷ 1338, Dossier 4): 2.

⁷ While Destutt de Tracy, in the year IX, emphasizes the dialogical structure of the here shown discourse: "Je crus donc que je ferais une chose utile de leur [les professeurs] offrir un texte à commenter, un canevas à remplir; et je ne doutais pas que bientôt, par l'effet même de leurs leçons, les cahiers de plusieurs d'entre eux ne devinssent d'excellents traités, aussi utiles à l'avancement de la science qu'à son enseignement." Antoine-Louis-Claude Destutt de Tracy (1801-1815): *Eléments d'Idéologie*. 5 tomes en 4 vol. Paris. [Reprint Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog 1977]: Vol. I: 9. Moreover, "Je crois même qu'en égard à l'état de la science et aux nombreuses imperfections que je n'ai pu faire disparaître de mon ouvrage, il a besoin, pour être vraiment utile, d'être présenté, commenté, peut-être même corrigé, par un habile professeur: car, quoi qu'on en dise, moins une science est avancée, moins elle a été bien traitée, et plus elle a besoin d'être enseignée. Ibid.: 12. Destutt describes as his own merit the fact of having given to the discourse of general grammar a language in common: "Tout ce que j'en espère, c'est que ceux qui écriront après moi se croiront obligés de me discuter; ce qui fera que bientôt ils auront une langue commune, au moyen de laquelle on pourra les entendre tous; tandis que jusqu'à présent chaque auteur a la sienne, qui n'est bien familière qu'à lui.", ibid.: 8.

⁸ See: Destutt de Tracy, Vol. II: "[...] la méthode des méthodes. [...] la science des sciences." IX. Ibid.: XII: "[...] la théorie générale du langage."

⁹ See Brigitte Schlieben-Lange (1992): 223. "C'est aussi vrai pour la partie sémiotique qui retrace le plus souvent la genèse des systèmes sémiotiques à partir du langage d'action à travers le langage articulé jusqu'à l'écriture, l'écriture alphabétique et l'imprimerie."

¹⁰ As mentioned in Brigitte Schlieben-Lange (1992): 222-223.

Over and above the methodical and grammatical pre-texts (Condillac, Locke, Harris, etc.) the work and publications of newly founded ideologically influenced institutions like the *Ecole Normale*, the *Institut National*, the *Société des Observateurs de l'Homme* and the *Décade* will be examined and will permit interesting results for the reconstruction of our *Ecole Centrale* discourse.

It is amazing that this work has never been done until now for the situation in France. There are only recent studies concerning the reception of the movement of *Idéologie* in Germany¹¹, Italy¹² and Spain¹³, results of the former research project "Ideologenzereption" (1986-91), of which our current project is a successor. While the 4 volumes *Europäische Sprachwissenschaft um 1800* (edited by B. Schlieben-Lange et al. 1989-1994) gave essential methodical aspects, only individual *Ecole Centrale Idéologues* have been studied recently: Thiébaud and important pedagogical grammar aspects by Chevalier¹⁴, Daube by Brekle¹⁵, Mongin by Schlieben-Lange.¹⁶ A survey of the actual situation of research has been given by Zollna.¹⁷

¹¹ Hans-Dieter Dräxler (1996): *Die Idéologie in Deutschland. Versuch der Rekonstruktion der Rezeption einer französischen wissenschaftlichen Theorie im Deutschland des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

¹² Roland Bernecker (1996): *Die Rezeption der "idéologie" in Italien. Sprachtheorie und literarische Ästhetik in der europäischen Aufklärung*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.; Id. (1997): *Die "idéologie" in Italien. Eine kommentierte Bibliographie zur Sprachtheorie der Spätaufklärung*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen. (Studium Sprachwissenschaft. 13.).

¹³ Elisabeth Volck-Duffy (1991): "Die Rezeption der "Idéologues" in Spanien zwischen 1800 und 1830. Bedeutende Vorläufer für die zentrale Rezeption der vierziger und fünfziger Jahre." In: Schlieben-Lange et al. (eds.): *Europäische Sprachwissenschaft um 1800*. Vol. 3: 241-256.

¹⁴ For example: Jean-Claude Chevalier (1986): "Grammaire philosophique et enseignement des Écoles centrales." In: Winfried Busse, Jürgen Trabant (Eds.): *Les Idéologues. Sémiotique, théories et politiques linguistiques pendant la Révolution française. Proceedings of the Conference, held at Berlin, October 1983*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins. (Foundations of Semiotics. 12): 207-218.; Id. (1987): "Grammaire philosophique ou décadence de la grammaire et de la philosophie: La grammaire en 1800." In: Dino Buzzetti, Maurizio Ferriani (Eds.): *Speculative Grammar, Universal Grammar and Philosophical Analysis of Language*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins: 85-95.

¹⁵ Herbert E. Brekle (1989): "Louis-Jacques-Joseph Daube: Révolutionnaire (1792) et Idéologue (1802)." In: Schlieben-Lange et al. (Eds.): *Europäische Sprachwissenschaft um 1800*. Vol. I: 109-127.

¹⁶ Brigitte Schlieben-Lange (1990): "Mongin, Idéologue de la Meurthe." In: Hans-Josef Niederehe, Konrad Koerner (Eds.): *History and Historiography of Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Vol. II: 541-557.

¹⁷ Sabel Zollna (1992): "Etat actuel des recherches du projet sur la réception des Idéologues en Europe: Espagne, Italie, Allemagne." In: Michel Balat, Janice Deledalle-Rhodes (Eds.): *Signs of Humanity. L'homme et ses signes*. Vol. III. *Semiotics in the World / La sémiotique dans le monde. Akten des IV. Kongresses der Association Internationale de*

The analysis of our rich primary source, material will enable us to illuminate the phenomenon of the “historical discourse formation”, its function as well as its theoretical foundations (the writings of Destutt de Tracy) and the practical work in the “provincial peripheries” (the General Grammar courses in the Central Schools). Important questions will be: which grammatical (pre-) texts are allowed in the courses, which ones are avoided? Which elements and categories are contained in the *Grammaire Générale* teachers’ manuals? How can the concept of universal grammar be educationally realized, was it taught independently from Latin and French grammar?

Apart from these primary sources, the secondary sources such as 19th and early 20th century studies on the *Idéologues* and the *Grammaire Générale* will be critically studied: while Picavet’s detailed study¹⁸ first drew attention to the post-thermidorian philosophers and scientists, Brunot, however, in his monumental *Histoire de la langue française*,¹⁹ cast doubt on the educational success of the Central Schools. His view is based on the single aspect of the standard of teaching the French language.

We chose a framework for categorisations of the individual *Grammaire Générale* teachers. Factors like their education (for example religious orders, *Ecole Normale*, etc.) and career before the revolution, the interaction between the teachers and the institutions concerned with education (at Paris and in the *Départements*), the adaptation of the sensualistic and semiotic prescriptions from Paris, the integration of the teacher’s own lectures into their manuals, are important segments of the formation of discourse interpreted as a process, less than Foucault’s discourse model which is more based on the results. In a relatively homogeneous discourse, the differences (of the younger teacher’s generation, etc.) are interesting and significant elements.

Our methodical approach can be divided into three steps: documentation, analysis and edition: *firstly*, the documentation of the interaction between the individual *Grammaire Générale* teachers and the members of the *CIP*; *secondly*, an analysis of the documents relevant to the process of discourse formation; and *thirdly*, an edition of the as yet unedited comments of the *CIP* (Archives Nationales de France). This approach can serve as a model for the reconstruction of other “strong discourses” and will hopefully be adapted in other research projects.

Jochen Hafner / Brigitte Schlieben-Lange, Tübingen

Sémiotique: L’Homme et ses signes. Barcelona / Perpignan 31.3.-6.4.1989. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 1421-1429.

¹⁸ François Picavet (1891): *Les Idéologues: Essai sur l’histoire des idées et des théories scientifiques, philosophiques, religieuses, etc. en France depuis 1789.* Paris: Alcan.

¹⁹ Ferdinand Brunot (1937): *Histoire de la langue française des origines à nos jours. Tome IX: La Révolution et l’Empire.* Paris: Armand Collin. [Reprint 1967].

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF ATHANASIUS KIRCHER

<http://galileo.imss.firenze.it/multi/kircher/index.html>

A project is underway, with the collaboration of the Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza (Florence), the European University Institute (Florence) and the Pontifical Gregorian University (Rome), to produce an internet and CD-ROM digitised edition (due Spring, 1999) of the correspondence of Athanasius Kircher, S.J. (1602 – 1680).

Kircher produced over 30 books, on subjects as diverse as universal languages, magnetism, plague, optics, music and egyptology. His correspondence, largely unedited, constitutes an important source for many aspects of baroque culture. The correspondence is of particular interest to historians of linguistics, science and philosophy.

High quality scanned images of the 2,291 letters to and from Kircher in the Archives of the Gregorian University will be linked to a searchable database containing information on the letters' senders, receivers, dates, places, names mentioned and subjects discussed. Transcriptions and translations of the letters will be added as the project progresses. The correspondence will be available for use free of charge on the WWW, and also in CD-ROM (or DVD-ROM) formats.

The new media's flexibility allows the edition to expand as more letters are traced. We encourage users of the correspondence to submit references to letters not yet included, plus any transcriptions, translations, bio-bibliographical references or suggestions, to:

Nick Wilding,
wilding@datacomm.iue.it

Michael John Gorman
gorman@imss.fi.it

H.E.C.,
Istituto Universitario Europeo,
Via dei Roccettini 9
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
ITALY

**THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY
FOR THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC IDEAS**

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
held on Friday, 18 September 1998 at the University of Amsterdam**

The meeting was called to order at 1745

1 **Matters arising from the minutes** – There were no matters arising. The President thanked Dr Atherton in his absence for taking those minutes.

2 **Treasurer's Report** – The report was circulated and then summarised verbally by Prof Flood. Subscription income was remarkably substantial this year thanks to the written reminders which had been circulated with the *Bulletin*. The surplus was four times that of the previous year. However, the Treasurer stressed the Society's ongoing obligation to plough funds back into the HSS Publications Series. The financial state of the Publications Fund was fully explained as a 'snap-shot' of the situation at the end of 1997. Given publication costs and given the need to maintain the Society's library at Keble College, Oxford, the Treasurer proposed raising the rate of subscription in 2000. The Treasurer pointed out the administrative advantages in maintaining a given level of subscription for a period of time rather than altering it slightly each year. The President thanked the Treasurer for his report and for his continued service to the Society. Prof Jahr enquired about credit card subscriptions. The Treasurer replied that such a facility usually required at least 2000 subscription payments per year which the HSS does not currently have. It was noted that consideration is being given to the establishment of a Dutch Giro account. Prof Jahr outlined the problem of exorbitant bank charges for overseas members and asked for the credit card option to be reconsidered. It was noted that the introduction of the Euro might alleviate the situation. The report was accepted by the Meeting.

3 **HSS Publications** – The President noted that the financial status of the series had been amply covered by the Treasurer's report. Prof Flood summarised the current situation: 5 volumes have appeared, and the 6th (by Dr Anneli Luhtala) is about to go to press. Mr Dutz was thanked for the professionalism and quality of his work. Members were reminded that they could avail themselves of the generous reductions available to them on any publication from Nodus.

4 **The HSS Bulletin** – Dr Cram noted that he was currently principal editor with Dr Linn taking over that role at Easter. Criticisms over the small font size had been dealt with, and further comments on the new format and contents were invited. The *Bulletin* website was explained and comments on that were also invited. Dr Cram mentioned the possibility of creating a cumulative index. Contributors to the colloquium were invited to correct their abstracts prior to publication in the *Bulletin*. There was no further discussion. The editors were thanked for their work.

5 **The HSS Library** – Members were reminded to send copies of their own publications to the library. No report was available at this stage. Dr Tiekens-Boon van Ostade asked about borrowing from the library. Some discussion followed and it was noted that the Executive Committee would discuss the matter further. Mr Mills asked whether there was a catalogue. The special catalogue prepared by Prof Paul Salmon was mentioned, as was the cumulative catalogue provided by the *Bulletin*. Discussion followed as to the inclusion of the holding in the Oxford University Libraries catalogue.

6 **Colloquia** – The President explained that proposals had been received from Oxford, Edinburgh and Munich and it was likely that Oxford would be the host in 1999 and Edinburgh in 2000. The need to get into the habit of planning colloquia further ahead was noted. Mr Dutz asked about co-operation between the Society and the *Studienkreis Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*. This suggestion was to be given serious consideration.

7 **Committee Membership** – The membership of Prof Noordegraaf was renewed.

8 **AOB** – Prof MacMahon asked whether a Nodus Publikationen order form could be made available to members. Mr Dutz responded that it will soon be much easier to place orders with the establishment of a Nodus website. Prof Salverda announced the 'Bookshop of the World' conference to be held in September 1999. The President announced the establishment of the new Society for the History of Hebrew Linguistics. Mr Dutz announced the next SGdS conference on Weisgerber, to be held in Münster. Dr Linn was thanked for acting as secretary in Dr Atherton's stead.

The meeting closed at 1825.

THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC IDEAS

<i>General Fund</i>	Accounts for the period 1 August 1997 to 31 July 1998			
Income	1998	1997	Expenditure	
			1998	1997
Subscriptions				
1997/1998 (1996/1997)	2,083.83	997.66	Administration	297.94
advance 1999+	237.00	54.00	Bulletin (two issues)	808.60
Donations	51.00	3.00	HSS Library	-
Bank interest	128.27	148.52	Maintenance of Sweet's grave	42.00
Advertising	50.00	25.00	Bank charges	-
Miscellaneous	201.00	156.00		3.50
Total	2,751.10	1,376.18	Surplus carried down	1,148.54
				1,601.56
			Total	2,751.10
				2,322.88
Balance in Gen. Fd. b/f 1.8.1997	4902.61	4407.05		
Surplus on year's working	1,601.56	415.56		
	6,505.17	4,822.61		
less 'pump-priming' of pubs	1,174.95			
Balance of 31.7.1998	£5,330.22			

BALANCE SHEET

<i>Current Assets</i>	
Current account	346.52
Deposit account	52.67
High Interest account	4931.03
Total at Bank	£5,330.22
Debtors (publications) (est.)	1,000.00
Gross Assets	6,330.22
less Liabilities	£237.00
Net Assets	£6,093.22

Current liabilities

Advance subscriptions	237.00
Creditors	-
Total liabilities	237.00

Represented by

General fund	£5,330.22
Debtors (publications)	1000
Gross assets	£6,330.22

<i>Publications Fund</i>	£	DM	<i>Expenditure</i>	£	DM
Income			Production costs vol. 1		0
Subscriptions (external and internal)			Production costs vol. 2		6027.05
vol. 2	250		Production costs vol. 3		0
vol. 4	1250		Production costs vol. 4		6439.78
vol. 5 (estimated)	1250		Production costs vol. 5	0	3533.93
Royalties (to 31.12.1997)			Total Expenditure	0	16,000.76
vol. 2	81.93	2213.08	£ equiv. @ £1=DM2.94	5442.44	
vol. 4		202.23			
vol. 5		0			
Total income	2831.93	2515.31			
less Expenditure	0	16,000.76			
Surplus/(deficit) £	2,831.93	-13,485.45			
Approx. £ equiv. of DM	-£4,586.89				
Approx. surplus/(deficit)	-£1,754.96				

John L. Flood
Honorary Treasurer

6 September 1998

**THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC IDEAS
COLLOQUIUM AND ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING**

Monday 22nd March 1999: Regent's Park College Oxford

VENUE Regent's Park College occupies one whole side of Pusey Street between St John's Street and St Giles, near the main centre of Oxford, within walking distance of the Bodleian Library. Oxford was the *alma mater* (at Balliol College) and later the home for many years of Henry Sweet himself, and this Colloquium, in the past, has been the occasion for many HSS members to visit the city. Also near Regent's is Keble College, where HSS members can rent short-stay rooms, and where there is of course access to the Henry Sweet Society Collection of books and articles on the history of linguistics. Accommodation is also available at Regent's Park College, both before and after the Colloquium. This may be particularly attractive for those travelling before the weekend and thus arriving early for the Colloquium.

AGM This will take place at 12 noon, after the first papers, and before lunch at 1 p.m.. The probable agenda will be (1) Matters arising (2) Financial Report (3) Publications (4) Colloquia (5) HSS Bulletin (6) Library. Any other items should be sent to the Secretary. This is a good opportunity for members to express their views and help shape the policies of the Society.

CALL FOR PAPERS Papers are invited on all aspects of the history of linguistic ideas. Please send your proposals to Dr Mark Atherton, Regent's Park College (address below) by the end of January.

COST (including coffee, lunch, tea) £24

BOOKING Please send a completed booking form (with a cheque payable to Regent's Park College Oxford) to the following address as soon as possible and preferably by the end of January: Dr Mark Atherton, General Secretary HSS, Regent's Park College, Pusey Street, Oxford, OX1 2LB

Booking Form: Henry Sweet Society, 1999 Colloquium, Monday, 22nd March, 1999, at Regent's Park College, Oxford (Pusey Street, Oxford, OX1 2LB).

Name:

Address:

Do you require accommodation at Regent's Park College?

(Guide to prices: full board £57, bed and breakfast £31.50; for Colloquium participants staying at Regent's the conference fee would be reduced accordingly)

— *A NEW SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTICS* —

SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY OF HEBREW LINGUISTICS

Members of the Henry Sweet Society will be interested to hear about the foundation of a new History of Linguistics Society. This is a Society for the History of Hebrew Linguistics which is being set up at the Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca. It is supported by the Dirección general de Enseñanza Superior del Ministerio Español de Educación y Cultura (project: PB 96-0006, plan I+D).

The periodical *Helmantica: Revista de Filología Clásica y Hebrea* offers good publication opportunities. Each year there will be an issue of approximately 160 pages devoted exclusively to the History of Hebrew Linguistics. The first issue has appeared this year.

For further details please contact:

Dr Santiago García-Jalón de la Lama
Departamento de Estudios Hebreos y Arameos
Facultad de Filología
Universidad Pontificia
Compañía 5
37002 SALAMANCA
Spain