EDITORIAL

It was not until Andrew Linn took over from David Cram as principal editor of the HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN with the present issue, that he realised just how much work is involved. This editorial begins, then, on a personal note, by thanking David for doing the bulk of the editorial work over the past two years, and by thanking Masataka Miyawaki for the invaluable assistance he provided. A glance at the second issue of what was then the HSS NEWSLETTER, which appeared in November 1984, reveals the editor even then to have been D. Cram. A. Linn was unable to help at that time, since he was still at school!

All members for whom the Society has an e-mail address were contacted some months ago with a plea for contributions to the BULLETIN. This is a journal by and for the members, and without active participation by the membership, there would be no journal. Either this correspondence was very effective, or it was wholly unnecessary, since we have received a substantial amount of high-quality material for this issue. Nonetheless, there is no harm in reiterating the fact that the nature of the HSS BULLETIN allows for a much more rapid dissemination of information than is the case with many journals. Thus information about events and research in the history of linguistics quickly reaches the relevant people, and reviews can appear quite soon after a book is published. Given these advantages, it is to be hoped that contributors will continue to consider the HSS BULLETIN a natural organ for the development of the subject.

There are two 'Short Articles' in this issue, both of which started life in the context of an HSS Colloquium. An earlier version of Ernst Håkon Jahr's piece on the Norwegian historical linguist, Clara Holst, was delivered at the 1998 colloquium in Amsterdam. The historiography of linguistics in Scandinavia has for some time lagged behind that for the rest of Europe, and Ernst Håkon Jahr's article is an example of the recent advances being made in this area. Bernard Jones's piece on the fate of William Barnes at the hands of the British linguistic institutions of the nineteenth century was originally intended for delivery at the 1999 colloquium in Oxford, and it is good that it has reached members in a written form instead. A work which many members of the Society will certainly have used is R. C. Alston's *Bibliography of the English Language*, and its continuation is dealt with in the 'News and Announcements' section. To accompany the appearance of the most recent volume, Robin Alston agreed to write a piece documenting his experience in undertaking this monumental work, and considering the state of bibliographical studies today, in the past and into the future. This is a particularly welcome feature of the current issue.

The reviews are one of the most valuable parts of the BULLETIN, and frequently demonstrate how it is possible to deal with important matters of general applicability to the subject in the course of a fairly brief discussion. Reviews may be sent at any time to either of the editors or review editors, and members are welcome to review any of the book-length publications received by the Society's library and listed in the BULLETIN. During his time as a reviews editor, Herman Bell has done a marvellous job, keeping track of the publications received and soliciting reviews with an effortless combination of firmness and charm. New commitments mean that he has signalled his wish to pass the job on to somebody else, and the editors will greatly miss all the work he does.

Andrew Linn, *Sheffield*   David Cram, *Oxford*

CLARA HOLST (1868-1935):
NORWEGIAN HISTORICAL LINGUIST AND WOMAN PIONEER

Introduction

In all areas of our discipline, linguistics, we can identify many pioneers. Someone always has to be the first, be it to make an important discovery – like, say, Verner's Law – or to suggest new theoretical bases or a new methodology – like Noam Chomsky did with his *Syntactic Structures* in 1957 – or to be the first in one's group to discuss a particular issue – and so on.

The topic of this paper is the biography and contributions of the first woman ever to defend a doctoral dissertation in Norway. This occurred in 1903, and it so happened that this woman was a linguist. Her name was Clara Holst, and she was born on 4 June 1868 in Oslo. Her grandfather (Fredrik Holst) was a professor of medicine and was the very first candidate in modern Norway – after the end of the Dano-Norwegian union in 1814 – to defend his doctoral dissertation. His defense in 1817, when the University of Oslo had been in operation for only 6 years, lasted one entire day, and all in all a total of 13 opponents took part in the discussion. Clara Holst's mother was German (Anna Mathilde Charlotte Flemming), daughter of a physician in Mecklenburg. She married Clara's father, a Norwegian physician (Axel Holst) in 1856. They had nine children altogether, seven of whom lived beyond infancy. Of the nine children, Clara was number seven. One brother (Axel Holst) became, like his grandfather, a professor of medicine, and between 1919 and 1921, he was the elected rector of the University of Oslo. Another brother (Victor Holst) studied classical philology and became the headmaster of a well-known private school in Oslo (Oslo Borger- og Realskole). Of the three daughters in the family, only Clara received a university education.

Studies in Norway and Abroad

In the spring of 1889, Clara Holst graduated from a girls-only high school (Gymnasium, or Sixth Form) with the best possible grades. In the fall semester the same year, she was enrolled as a student at the University of Oslo, then the only university in Norway, seven years after the very first female student had been accepted. She chose Professor Johan Storm as her university advisor and mentor. Johan Storm (1836-1920) was at that time among the best known linguists in Europe, his role in the development of phonetics being especially important. He worked closely with and had a long-standing scholarly

relationship with Henry Sweet. When Sweet visited Norway to do fieldwork on Norwegian dialects, Johan Storm was his host. Storm's most influential and famous book is *Englische Philologie* (1881, 2nd enlarged edition (2 vols.) 1892-96). It probably proved very decisive for the young student Clara Holst that she came into contact with one of the leading linguists in Europe so early on in her studies. Not many of the Norwegian professors at the time had such an international standing as Johan Storm, and it is interesting to speculate whether her contact with him contributed to the fact that she acquired a lot of international academic experience during her studies, far beyond that of most of her fellow students.

In 1892, only two years after she began her studies in philology – as the first woman ever to do so in Norway – Clara Holst travelled to Cambridge and studied there for two semesters staying at a women's college. Unfortunately, no details are known of her studies in Cambridge. The year after her stay in England, she studied at the Sorbonne in Paris. While there, she joined the International Phonetic Association (IPA), having been recruited by Paul Passy, the founder of the IPA himself (*Le Maître Phonétique* 1893: 129). In 1894, she published a specimen of Norwegian in *Le Maître Phonétique* (81-82). She remained a member of the IPA until 1897.

In 1894, she returned to Oslo, where she graduated in 1895 and 1896 having taken exams in English and French, Norwegian and German. Her marks were excellent. The usual step for a person with such a (Cand. Mag.) degree in Norway would be to apply for a teaching position at a high school (or Gymnasium) somewhere around the country. However Clara Holst obviously had other plans. Not only had she been the first woman ever to graduate in philology in Norway, she now started her work towards a PhD.

Toward her Doctorate

In 1897, she studied for the entire year in Leipzig, and from 1898, she spent three semesters (one and a half years) at the University of Copenhagen. There she studied Old Danish and took an active part in discussion groups and philological associations. For two and a half years from the fall of 1899, she carried out research and worked on her dissertation in Oslo, after which she travelled to Berlin in 1902. While still in Oslo, she finished a paper on Low German loan words in Danish, which was published in the journal *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* in 1902 (Holst 1902). This paper, together with a second one published in the same journal the following year (Holst 1903a), formed the basis of her dissertation, which she finished during her stay in Berlin.

As a female in academia, Clara Holst encountered certain problems at German universities. It seems that, as a rule, women were not given access to lecture halls and seminars. Only when Professor Sophus Bugge, the well-

known Norwegian philologist, intervened and asked colleagues in Germany to make an exception for Clara Holst, could she attend lectures and sit in on seminars. One of the German professors who gave her access to his lectures after Professor Bugge had intervened was Professor Edvard Sievers in Leipzig. However, she was not given permission to take active part in discussions, but had to sit silently and listen while the professor and male students exchanged views on the various topics of interest. When she was in Berlin in 1903, she was also refused entrance to lectures and seminars. Bugge was once again called upon to help. This time, however, his intervention did not succeed as well as in Leipzig, and she was only given access to the departmental library, not to lectures and seminars. For a person like Clara Holst, this must have been rather frustrating, but we do not know anything about her reaction to this kind of discrimination. It could be that Clara Holst should also be considered a woman pioneer in the history of German universities since, after all, she was allowed access to lectures and seminars in Leipzig and to the departmental library in Berlin at a time when this was obviously not the case for female students in general.

    While studying and conducting research in Berlin, Clara Holst submitted her dissertation to the University of Oslo and applied to have it evaluated for a possible PhD defense. In November 1902, the Faculty of Arts at the university appointed a committee consisting of Storm, Hjalmar Falk and Alf Torp. At the same time, she received a modest scholarship ('Det grevelige Hjelmstjerne-Rosencronske legat') – the first and only support she ever received from her home university – to carry out research on the modern Low German dialects of northern Germany. Subsequently, she spent the year 1903 in Magdeburg and Westphalia doing fieldwork on Low German dialects.

The Doctoral Defense

She arrived home just in time for her PhD defense, on December 10th, 1903. The first opponent was Storm, who understandably was very proud of his old student. He agreed with the candidate on all main issues, but had a few objections concerning minor topics. One of these objections had to do with the fact that Clara Holst had used the term 'Icelandic' to refer to the language of the old Icelandic sagas. The commonly used term in Norway at the time was 'Oldnorsk' (Old Norwegian). The candidate showed her international experience and proved to be a scholar with independent opinions when in her rebuttal she stated that she found the term 'Old Icelandic' better for two reasons; first because the literature written in the language in question was undoubtedly authored in Iceland, and second, the term Old Icelandic was the term most commonly used in German and English. The second opponent (Professor Hjalmar Falk) and a third *ex auditorio* opponent from the floor

(Sophus Bugge) both praised the dissertation and agreed with its main findings, although Professor Falk did also have objections to minor points. All three opponents made comments pertaining to the fact that Clara Holst was the first woman ever to defend a doctoral dissertation at a Norwegian university.

Two days after her defense, the university board granted her the title of *Doctor Philosophiæ*. She was then 35 years old. Nobody could anticipate that in five years time this extremely active woman scholar would suddenly retire and disappear completely from academia, which was a tremendous loss for Norwegian historical linguistics. But let us return briefly to her dissertation.

The Study of Low German - Scandinavian Contact then and now

In her dissertation, written in the Dano-Norwegian standard of the period, Clara Holst investigated the vowel quality of Middle Low German by analysing the many loan words from Low German in the Scandinavian languages. The title of her dissertation was (in English transation) *Studies on Middle Low German Loan Words in Danish in the 14th and 15th Centuries* (Holst 1903b). Scholars prior to Holst had tried to ascertain the Middle Low German vowels by studying the vowel variation exhibited in the modern Low German dialects. By taking into consideration the vowels found in Low German loan words in Danish, Clara Holst was able to increase the amount of relevant linguistic data and was thus able to reach more reliable conclusions.

When today, we read about the intensive and massive language contact between Low German and the Scandinavian languages in the Late Middle Ages, a striking paradox immediately becomes apparent. All historical linguistic accounts stress that no language has ever influenced the Scandinavian languages to such a degree as Low German did at the height of the Hanseatic period. If this is the case – and there are no historical linguists who would dispute this – we should expect that a comprehensive account of the nature of this influence, and its ensuing (socio)linguistic results, would follow. But the paradox is that, once the uniqueness, in terms of Scandinavian language history, of this intense language contact has been established, authors often spend little time discussing the consequences for the Scandinavian languages, frequently devoting only a couple of pages to the entire topic.

This paradox is, however, relatively easy to explain. It is primarily due to the long-standing domination in Scandinavian philological research of the theoretical paradigm of the Neogrammarians. According to the Neogrammarian doctrine, language contact can in general only result in various types of loan. If an element X from language A is transferred to language B, this can easily be integrated into a Neogrammarian description. There is, therefore, a long tradition in Scandinavian historical linguistics of studying and classifying Low German loan words in the Scandinavian languages. In Norway, Clara Holst

8

initiated this tradition with her dissertation in 1903. Since then, a substantial amount of sound philological work has been carried out in this field over the past almost one hundred years, and a good deal of empirical evidence has been presented. Thousands of loan words have been identified, explained and classified.

Before we follow Clara Holst in her post-doctoral period, a few words are called for about the state of affairs today in the field of study that Clara Holst opened up in 1903, i.e. the study of the contact between Low German and Scandinavian. Today it is possible to extend the limits of research and our understanding of the contact between Low German and the Scandinavian languages in the Late Middle Ages far beyond the possibilities defined for Clara Holst by the Neogrammarian paradigm of her time. Due to the results of sociolinguistic research and modern, post-war language contact research, we are now able to pose entirely new questions and to focus on new areas. Novel and productive concepts have been developed and, as a result, we now can apply totally new perspectives when we investigate this language contact situation. Post-war research has established that language contact results in a multitude of different linguistic and sociolinguistic phenomena and mechanisms which may bring about important language change, and that direct loans, previously the sole focus of interest, are only one of the many consequences of language contact.

For Clara Holst, however, the Neogrammarian framework provided a fruitful method in her pre-Structuralist investigation of the vowel qualities of Middle Low German. The results she presented in her dissertation did indeed bring our knowledge of Middle Low German a step forward.

Teaching in Oslo

From 1904 until the summer of 1906, Clara Holst resided in Oslo. She had two short teaching assignments at the university in the spring semesters of 1904 and 1906, when she taught courses in German pronunciation. In the fall semester of 1904 she worked as a teacher of German at one of Oslo's high schools (Aars og Foss' Skole). However, according to a family tradition, she left this school immediately and for good after a serious dispute with the headmaster.

To America

With bleak prospects of getting a position at the University of Oslo, Clara Holst turned to America, and in the academic year 1906/1907 she secured a teaching post at Wellesley College for women, outside Boston. Wellesley College had

around 1200 students and a clear majority of female teachers. There Dr Holst gave courses in German and Old Icelandic.

For the following academic year, 1907/1908, after having spent the summer of 1907 back in Norway, she was appointed to an assistant professorship in Germanic languages at the University of Kansas, in Lawrence, a university with 2000 to 3000 mainly male students. The list of courses she gave both at Wellesley College and at the University of Kansas is impressive. In the Annual Catalogue for the University of Kansas, she is listed as teaching courses in German grammar, German composition, History of the German language, Gothic, Old Norse, and Modern Norwegian. Quite a teaching load, it has to be said. During her year in Lawrence, she published a paper on the Low German dialect of the author Fritz Reuter, as it could be established on the basis of the orthography of his earlier production (Holst 1907a).

At the same time as Clara Holst gained the appointment at the University of Kansas, her biography was briefly summarized in a publication in Norway to mark the occasion 25 years earlier, in 1882, when the first female student had been accepted and enrolled at the University of Oslo. The description of Clara Holst ended with the following wish on the part of the author:

> Hopefully, she will not stay long in Kansas. We do not have a surplus of competent, young philologists here at home, so there should soon be use for Miss Holst in her fatherland. (Tiberg 1907: 30. My translation)

Back in Norway, Clara Holst withdraws from Academia

Indeed, she did not stay long in Kansas. After only one year, she returned to Oslo in the summer of 1908, at the age of 40. After that we know very little of her. She disappeared completely as a scholar. In Oslo, she was certainly not offered a position at the university, and she lived the rest of her life with her two sisters in Oslo, until she died 1935 at the age of 67. Small obituaries in a few major newpapers remembered her as the first woman to have defended her doctoral dissertation in Norway.

The fact that Clara Holst retired so early from academia really is a mystery. She was not ill, and in 1914 it was even said that she travelled a lot for her own pleasure. However, as a scholar, her career ends in 1908 with the assistant professorship in Kansas. The paper on Fritz Reuter, which she finished while still in America, was to be her last scholarly contribution. This is probably the reason why so little has been written about Clara Holst until now – only one other small paper exists (Nesset & Valgard 1983).

For the future development of historical linguistics in Norway, it was extremely unfortunate that Clara Holst withdrew from scholarly activity at such a young age. With her international experience and perspective, taking into

account that she had studied in Cambridge, Paris, Leipzig, Copenhagen, Berlin and Oslo, and had even worked for two years in the States, Clara Holst was probably the most up-to-date linguistic scholar in Norway during the first decade of the 20th century. It is a pity that she was not offered a position at the University of Oslo so that students and colleagues alike there could benefit from her international experience and overview. Linguistic science in Norway was for a long time dominated by scholars whose international experience was quite limited. Apart from towering figures like Johan Storm, Sophus Bugge, and, later, Alf Sommerfelt, very few were able to establish links to the discussions that went on outside Scandinavia. Had Clara Holst been given a position at the University of Oslo, Alf Sommerfelt would probably not have felt so alone in his efforts in the early 1920s to bring new theoretical ideas, especially from France, to Norway.

During the year she taught at Wellesley, a college which, as mentioned, was only open to female students, Clara Holst published a short paper on the first woman in Norway to be appointed as an 'embetsmann' (civil servant), i.e. comparable to a German 'Beamte'. In this paper, Clara Holst, who herself was such an important pioneer for women in academia in Norway, gave her opinion on what she considered most important for women's advancement towards equality in Norwegian society. She wrote that this other woman:

> is not among those who work for feminism in speech and writing. However, in her quiet activity and planned progress and in her solid belief in the future she has contributed more to the equality of women than many others have with their speeches and lectures. (Holst 1907b: 33. My translation)

These words could indeed also be used to describe Clara Holst's contribution.

REFERENCES

Holst, Clara. 1902. Middelnedertyske omlydsforhold belyst ved danske
      laaneord. Arkiv för nordisk filologi 18, 210-25.
---- 1903a. Lydovergangen a > o (å) i middelnedertyske laaneord i dansk. Arkiv
      för nordisk filologi 19, 141-61.
---- 1903b. Studier over middelnedertyske laaneord i dansk i det 14. og 15.
      aarhundrede. Kristiania [Oslo]: Grøndahl & Søns Bogtrykkeri.
---- 1907a. Zur Aussprache in Fritz Reuters Heimat. Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch
      33. Norden und Leipzig: Diedr. Soltau's Verlag, 143-158.
---- 1907b. Vor første kvindelige embedsmand. In: Clara Thue Ebbel (ed.),
      Kvindelige studenters jubilæumsskrift 1882-1907. Kristiania [Oslo]: S.
      M. Brydes Bogtrykkeri, 32-33.

Nesset, Olaug Margrethe and Jorun Valgard. 1983. Clara Holst (1868-1935).
    In: J. Valgard and E. Wessel (eds.), *Frauen und Frauenbilder.*
    Dokumentiert durch 2000 Jahre. (Osloer Beiträge zur Germanistik **8**).
    University of Oslo: Department of German, 8-17.
Tiberg, Antonie 1907. Kvindelige filologer. In: Clara Thue Ebbel (ed.),
    Kvindelige studenters jubilæumsskrift 1882-1907. Kristiania [Oslo]: S.
    M. Brydes Bogtrykkeri, 28-31.

Ernst Håkon Jahr, *Agder University College, Kristiansand, Norway*

WILLIAM BARNES (1801-86), THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY, THE ENGLISH DIALECT SOCIETY, AND THE DICTIONARIES

The 1860s was a time of mixed fortunes for William Barnes. After the death of his wife in 1852, his Dorchester school began to fail and ten years later was almost at a standstill. He was glad to sell it when he had the offer of the nearby country parish of Winterborne Came with Whitcombe. Moreover, his friends had obtained for him a civil list pension, and for the first time in his life he was free from money worries. On the other hand, English linguistics, which Barnes had studied for some thirty years, was only just beginning to catch up with work on the continent. Barnes's formative years were lived in the dark ages of English linguistics chronicled by Hans Aarsleff in *The Study of Language in England, 1780-1860*. In the 1840s Barnes reckoned that there were some thirty-six universities in the German states, and they had institutionalised comparative linguistics during the period indicated by Aarsleff. Barnes had gone to unusual lengths to school himself in the new Germanic linguistics and for twenty years he had been an outspoken follower of Bopp, but he had had to make his way outside the walls of any institution. By the time that he retired to his rectory, therefore, he was already in the opinion of the younger men of the Philological Society something left over from a past era. In this opinion they were unkind and unreasonable. A near-coincidence makes the point. There is a widespread belief that Max Müller coined the phrase 'the science of language' in his lectures on '*The Science of Language...*' in 1861. The first item in Barnes's *The Elements of English Grammar* (1842) reads:

GRAMMAR is the science of language. ([1])

Interestingly, he refined this twelve years later in his *Philological Grammar* (1854) to:

GRAMMAR is the science of speech. (1)

Barnes anticipates Max Müller by some twenty years. There can be little doubt that Barnes's phrase grew out of his early devotion to Bopp's scientific approach to linguistics, and this fact is far more important than simply deciding who used the phrase first. As it happens, Barnes and Max Müller were correspondents, and it may be that Barnes was more in step with such men as Max Müller and Rhys than with some of the more tetchy characters of the Philological Society.

But in 1863, Barnes was at least a respected elder. He was more or less the chief source for the Dorset section of Halliwell's *Dictionary of Archaic Words* (1847), had corresponded with Pitman, and was to become a friend of, amongst others, A. J. Ellis, Thomas Wright and L. L. Bonaparte. For placing Barnes in his time, it may be noted in passing that Joseph Wright, the editor of *The English Dialect Dictionary*, was born in 1855. Bonaparte had enough confidence in Barnes to entrust him with finding 'translators' of *The Song of Solomon* into 'Wessex' dialects in 1859. Barnes used the word 'Wessex' in a note about them at this time, and this seems to be the first use of it in a modern context.[1] The friendship of Bonaparte was to have a significance for the *English Dialect Dictionary* at the end of the century and beyond (see below).

With such contacts among members of the Philological Society, it is not surprising that, on behalf of the Society, Furnivall, its Secretary and Editor, should write to Barnes:

> For the Society's Dictionary I am very anxious to secure a series of papers on dialects [...] and should be very glad to see the first paper by one whose name is so widely known and so honoured as yours, and shall be greatly obliged if you will write it. (20 Jan 1863, *DCL*)

The respectful tone shows the esteem in which Barnes's work was then held. Being so much identified with a rural dialect, however, may in the long run have worked against Barnes's interests with the London-based Society. And it is also likely that this was an awkward time for Barnes to fall into the hands of Furnivall anyway. The wording of the invitation makes it clear that the Society's *Dictionary*, as then foreseen, was to be, as Barnes put it in the 1840s, 'a *Dictionarium totium Anglicitatis*' (*GM*, August 1846: 178) or 'a dictionary of all the English tongue' (*GM*, November 1846: 511). Barnes accepted the invitation eagerly before the end of the month, making the point that he would compile a paper 'on the Dorset or Southwestern English with its Teutonic bearings'. At the close of his letter Barnes added: 'PS. I might have joined your Society had I not had too many children to have your journal' (*HL*).

This deals with the sympathetic aside that 'the Philological Society [...] never made [Barnes] a member' (Taylor 1993: 105). 'Election' was a matter of subscription. Had there been a list of Members that indicated their linguistic

---

[1] Hardy wrote that until he used the word 'Wessex' in 1874 in *Far From the Madding Crowd*, 'it had never been heard of in fiction and current speech [...] to refer to anything later than the Norman Conquest' ('Preface', 1895). Barnes used the word in his 'Preface' to *Poems of Rural Life in Common English* (1868), and for the first time, it seems, in this private note made after a visit from Bonaparte. It was used in fiction by Thomas Hughes in *Tom Brown's Schooldays* as early as 1857 (Bernard Jones: unpublished paper read to the William Barnes Society, 15 November 1984). Hughes was an ardent Teutonist and admirer of Barnes. He was also one of those who endorsed Furnivall's application for the post of Secretary to the Royal Academy.

'qualifications', it would make amusing reading indeed. Barnes sent his manuscript to Furnivall on the 21 February 1863, and again stressed that he had dealt with 'Dorset and West English' (*HL*) and not the speech of Dorset alone. He assured Furnivall that his speedy response did not mean that he had sent in hasty work. What in fact Barnes submitted was a second revision of the materials published in 1844 with his first collection of dialect poems. He avowed his dedication 'to the science (speechlore)' *(HL)*. On 23 February Furnivall acknowledged receipt of the papers, and remarked: 'You use Frisian comparisons a good deal' (*DCL*). This Barnes took as a hint of Furnivall's interest to be followed up later. Furnivall then invited Barnes to read the paper to the Society - 'you would be able to pick up the plums better than I' (*DCL*). Barnes as usual did not go up to London, and on 9 April Furnivall reported after the reading of the paper:

> A good deal of amusement was excited by your phrases and Queen's
> Speech, and much interest by your account of the pronouns and
> pronunciation. (*DCL*)

Barnes had closed the introductory matter of his paper with a 'translation' of the 'Queen's Speech to the Houses on the opening the Parliament, 1863' from 'the language of hard words, as the poor call them', into 'plain English' (*Grammar and Glossary of the Dorset Dialect*, 2nd revision, 1863: 10). By 'plain English' Barnes meant colloquial 'Dorset' English presented in the Wessex notation used in the body of the book. The next day (10 April 1863) Barnes answered, insisting that he:

> put in the Queen's speech to show that whatever can be said in Latinized
> English, which the poor do not understand, could be said in plain
> English which they do understand. (*HL*)

Perhaps the concern for 'the poor' indicates some division of aims on Barnes's part because he hints at sociology as well as linguistics. 'The poor', he believed, have as much right to be considered 'a tribe' as other people, and he had made his point about tribes and their speech in his 'Preface' to *Notes on the Ancient Britons* (1859):

> To study tribes without their speech,
> Is to grope for what our sight should teach. ([v])

In the same letter of 10 April 1863 Barnes went on to report that he had recently heard of the existence of an English dialect in Ireland, and asked for 'a report of the meeting'.

The conditions on which the Society accepted the paper for publication suggest that at this stage Barnes had substituted Germanic names for the usual traditional technical, linguistic and grammatical ones derived from the classical languages (Baxter 1887: 221). Barnes agreed to the conditions, and the second revision of Barnes's 'Introduction and Glossary' to the 1844 collection of dialect poems was published for the Society by A. Asher & Co. in Berlin as *A Grammar and Glossary of the Dorset Dialect* before the end of the year.

Barnes made further contributions for the meetings of the Society during 1863 and 1864. Of these, two were read at the same meeting. The first, 'Our elder brethren the Frisians, their language and literature as illustrations of those of England' (4 December, *TPS* 1863), takes up the point made in Furnivall's letter of 23 February 1863, and its substance presumably became the closing chapter, 'The Frisians, the Fatherstock of the Saxon-English People', of Barnes's *Early England and the Saxon-English* (1869: [141]); the words of the chapter heading appear in a different order on the title page). The second paper, 'Traces ·of a Primary root *f*ng* of *fi** in ˌthe Indo-Teutonic languages' (4 December, *TPS* 1863), seems to derive from Barnes's work on *Tiw*. On 9 May 1864 Barnes noted: 'Sent to the Philological Society a list which I had gathered of old English words' (*DCM*). This apparently included material that constituted the first of two papers read before the Society later in the year: 'Some old English words wholly or almost left out of use' (3 June, *TPS* 1864). The second paper on that occasion was 'Notes on the Language of the Stone Age' (*TPS* 1864). Another paper was read at the end of the same year: 'On our Names of Colours', (6 December, *TPS* 1864), and this so far seems to be the end of Barnes's contributions of this kind to the work of the Philological Society.

Furnivall reported to Barnes on the papers read on 3 June 1864 the next day. Of the first he wrote:

> I am sorry to say that our members did not show much sympathy with them. Where the two words are both in use, as 'desert' and 'wilderness', they thought that a distinction of meaning had grown up, and if not, they would sooner have two words than one for the same thing, as it prevents repetition. A few of the shorter old words they liked, but all the old ones that have become strange to them, they did not want revived. The classical feeling was stronger than I had expected. (Baxter 1887: 222)

Of the second paper, Furnivall reported: 'The Stone Age they rebelled at' and, as a parting shot: 'Your *Tiw* is not accepted' (ibid.).

Furnivall has long had a reputation for rudeness. In these exchanges with Barnes he seems to be rough and ready, but hardly antagonistic. When Furnivall remarks on the 'classical feeling' at the meeting, it must be remembered that he believed that he himself had been born to Teutonize the

English language. What he said could be seen as an expression of sympathy with Barnes. The mood for Teutonizing stemmed from a widespread belief that English ought to develop on its own Germanic lines rather than resort to taking in more words from Classical and Romance languages. For English writers as a whole, this was a matter of degree rather than a choice of either one or the other of two extremes. There is, for instance, a playful allusion to the effects of Romance and Saxon words in English in the twelfth chapter of Dickens's *Bleak House* (1852-3). As for 'the Stone Age' - the performance (Barnes was not the speaker) must have been altogether remarkable, although it is most unlikely that the establishment even knew what the paper was about. The reference here to *Tiw*, a published book, is puzzling. It might be that Barnes hoped that the Society would 'adopt' it to help friends who at this time were petitioning for his civil list pension. The book represents the furthest, if partial, reach of Barnes's attempt at an understanding of the origins of language.

Barnes may not on the whole have been heartened by the Philological Society's reception of his work, although the drift of the correspondence with Furnivall at this early stage seems to show that Furnivall was doing the soliciting, and not Barnes. It may also be that Barnes, as already remarked, came to Furnivall at an awkward time for, just a year afterwards, in 1864, he set up the Early English Texts Society. This was followed by the Chaucer Society in 1868 and a string of other such societies. Their aim was to provide the *Dictionary's* word collectors with reliable texts from which to work. For Furnivall, however, the thrill of supervising and editing texts overrode his commitment to the *Dictionary* itself, and undermined his position as Secretary and Editor to the Philological Society. When Barnes, for instance, requested the return of 'papers' in 1867, Furnivall seems to have believed that he had already returned them. In this year Barnes's edition of Jacob Poole's *A Glossary* [...] *of the Old Dialect of* [...] *the Baronies of Forth and Bargy* [...] *in Ireland* (1867) was published. This is what Barnes had made of the dialect he referred to in the letter to Furnivall on 10 April 1863. The glossary had been compiled by Poole in the 1820s, and Barnes prepared the manuscript for publication. Bonaparte was a generous patron, and Barnes discussed with him the possibility of publishing Poole's *Glossary* privately. However, Bonaparte was concentrating on Basque publications at the time and publication was left to Barnes's regular publisher. It was later used by Wright. However, Barnes's letter to Furnivall dated 10 April 1863 (see above) shows that he had a hope that Furnivall would take this dialect glossary for the Philological Society. Furnivall's control over papers is questioned implicitly by his return of some of Barnes's manuscripts on 21 June 1869 with the admission that they had been lost (*DCL*). This would seem to end Barnes's active dealings with Furnivall and with the Society.

So things stood for some years. Then two events - not perhaps wholly unlinked - happened in the year 1873. Furnivall applied for the post of Secretary to the Royal Academy. The Society wakened up to the possibility that

Furnivall might one day depart, and that there were no arrangements for replacing him. In turn this alerted some members to a general unawareness of the state of the papers of which Furnivall had long been sole custodian. Then, at a Cambridge meeting of the Philological Society, there was a move to form an English Dialect Society. This done, Skeat was made Honorary Secretary. Later Skeat wrote simply that: 'In 1873, I founded the English Dialect Society' (Skeat 1911: 103). The intention was to relieve Murray of responsibility for one part of the Society's *Dictionary*, and thereby save time and bring forward the date of publication.

The names of Barnes and Skeat had been seen together in the pages of *The Hawk*, a monthly periodical, published at Ringwood for the twelve months of 1867. From Skeat's contributions it is clear that he was then aware of Barnes as a distinctive poet to be ranked with Tennyson (*The Hawk*, September: 279) and as a scholar in Old English, (*The Hawk*, July: 205). In 1873 Barnes became a member of the new Society.

The American limb of the Philological Society's *Dictionary* had been allowed to fall by default, although many American readers worked on with the Society. The separation of the dialect materials lopped off another limb from the main trunk. Furnivall's first letter to Barnes assumed that the dialect materials were to be incorporated in the one undertaking, and Barnes's *Grammar and Glossary* was seen as the first of many steps. From Barnes's point of view it would have been better to have the dialect words included in their alphabetical places in the main *Dictionary*. However, he did not make such a remark in 1873. Perhaps he felt that, as he could make no headway with the Philological Society, he had no other course than to work with the Dialect Society.

A new turn of events complicates the issues in 1876 when the Lancashire members, building on the successful publication of the *Lancashire Glossary*, edited by George Milner and John H. Nodal in 1875, volunteered to take on the business of the Dialect Society and moved its headquarters to Manchester. The officers in Manchester, working under Skeat as Director and Secretary, were very business-like. But local enthusiasm, it seems, led them not only to continue within the Society work that had already been started in Manchester on the Lancashire dialect, but also to seek to promote the local poet, Edwin Waugh. Nodal was a powerful Quaker journalist who was a newspaper editor in Manchester and on the staff of *The Saturday Review* from 1875 to 1885, and Milner was to become editor of the collected works of Waugh. Waugh and Nodal were fellow members of the Shandean Club, a highly esteemed Manchester gentlemen's club, and Milner simply thought 'Barnes is inferior to Waugh' (Waugh n.d. [c. 1890]: xviii). Barnes is 'philologically correct' whereas Waugh's 'dialect is not the result of philological study [...] it comes unsought because it is his native speech' (ibid.: xiv). Barnes was inferior, in Milner's view, because he was a scholar. Here

distinctions have become hopelessly blurred. Poetry is the highest form of word usage, but for the Dialect Society that should not have entered into the reckoning. Waugh was genuinely unlearned; not therefore encumbered with philology; therefore the more authentic dialect writer. So the argument ran. The thicket is impenetrable. The speech of Blackmore Vale was as 'native' to Barnes as that of Rochdale was to Waugh. One should not, by the way, assume that the Society's officials in Manchester expressed the views of Waugh himself. He had his own copy of Barnes's *Poems of Rural Life in the Dorset Dialect Third Collection* (1862).

If that was the stance of senior officers in the Dialect Society, Barnes fared no better at the hands of the more academic. The first of the three parts of Elworthy's work on Somerset dialect began to appear with *The Dialect of West Somerset*, read before the Philological Society on 15 January 1875. In the introduction Elworthy writes:

> [...] one learned gentleman quotes as proof [that the river Parrett is a dialect boundary] a record in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle of AD 658, how in a certain battle, the Britons were driven back as far as the river Parret. (Elworthy 1875: 6)

Barnes, presumably the 'one learned gentleman', had adopted the traditional dialect boundary, the river Parrett; Elworthy chose Taunton and the Quantocks. Martyn Wakelin, working from the *English Dialect Survey* materials, puts it at the 'Quantock Hills together with the river Parrett' (Wakelin 1986: 3). The projected mean distance between the Parrett and the Otter works out at about five miles, a difference so slight that it is hard to see what there is to argue about. To make bad worse, Elworthy went on in the third part of his work, *The West Somerset Word-book*, to prefer the poetry of one of the contributors to Barnes's *Glossary* to that of Barnes himself. Ignoring Pulman's connection with Barnes - he had prepared the Somerset version of the *The Song of Solomon* for Barnes and Bonaparte in 1859 - he writes:

> I have quoted freely from [Pulman's] verses, and so far as dialect goes, he is by a long way the most accurate, and less given to eke out his versification with literaryisms [...] he does but as all other writers of the same class, not excepting Barnes, have done - humour and quaintness first, dialect and correct construction of the spoken language second. Moreover, Pulman's district is closely allied to this [West Somerset], as also is that of Nathan Hogg and Peter Pindar [...] A peculiarity of all Western Dialect poets except Pulman [...] is that all common English words in *f* are spelt with *v*, and all words in *s* are spelt with *z*. (Elworthy 1888: viii-ix)

This is strikingly at odds with Milner's assessment of Barnes in his work on Waugh and shows that there are more ways of being wrongheaded than one. The fancy names 'Nathan Hogg' and 'Peter Pindar' are themselves enough to indicate the level at which they aimed. For Elworthy to say that Barnes put 'humour and quaintness first, dialect and correct construction of the spoken language second' shows a questionable knowledge of Barnes's work. Barnes was very careful about the phonetics of f and s.[2] It is hard to believe that any scholar should be so wayward in his judgments, just as it is hard to understand why one member of the Dialect Society should show such bad manners to a fellow member. All this happened under the eyes of Skeat. By 1893 Dartnell and Goddard's highly regarded *A Glossary of Words Used in the County of Wiltshire* listed, among works consulted, Barnes's *Grammar and Glossary* of 1863, his *Glossary and Grammar* of 1886, and 'Also additional words published by him in the *Dorset County Chronicle*' (Dartnell and Goddard 1893: 222). These words had been contributed by Barnes to that paper in answer to a request he had published in it in a letter dated 12 January 1882. The tone is altogether more kindly and civilised. As a member of the Society, Barnes is named in its Second Annual Report: 'Dorsetshire. Some words have been contributed by the Rev. W. Barnes which are not to be found in his [1863] Glossary' (*EDS, Transactions*, 1874: 9). Words to this effect were, indeed, published several time in the *Transactions* (e.g. The Sixth Annual Report, (1878: 6) and so on). In 1877 the Society published *A Bibliographical List* of dialect writings compiled by Skeat and Nodal, who in their introduction make acknowledgments for 'Miscellaneous articles [...] contributed by the Rev. William Barnes' (*EDS, Transactions*, 1877: 2), and in the '*List*' itself is the note: 'The following list has been kindly revised by the Rev. W. BARNES' (ibid.: 48). However, neither Barnes's 'words' nor his 'Miscellaneous articles' were printed in the Society's publications.

Also listed for publication in 1879 was a new edition of Akerman's *Wiltshire Glossary*. Akerman had been Secretary to the Society of Antiquaries and a member of the Alfred millennial committee in 1849. Barnes had reviewed the original edition of this *Glossary* in 1842 (*GM*, December 1842: 629), and in 1859 proposed Akerman to Bonaparte as the Wiltshire translator for *The Song of Solomon*. The latter, however, thought Akerman's version too near to that of Dorset for use on this occasion. Was Barnes, then, unrealistic in thinking that the Dialect Society might issue a revised edition of his own *Grammar and Glossary*?

---

[2] Milner and Elworthy seem to confuse poetic and dialect features in their assessments. Barnes's work, it should be remembered, was done before the International Phonetic Alphabet became generally accepted. Unlike most writers who tried to convey dialect speech by phonetic notation, he worked over many years on an increasingly simplified phonetic system of his own. It confronts the reader with fewer difficulties than those presented by other users of dialect notations.

The Annual Report for 1881 (published in 1882) at last tabled the proposal that 'a complete English Dialect Dictionary should be undertaken'. The idea of such a dictionary had, of course, been implicit from the time of the separation of the materials. The weakness of the plan lies in the fact that a dialect dictionary would inevitably be relegated to provincial status. The wisdom or unwisdom of such a separation has already been touched upon.

In the 1880s Barnes, almost simultaneously with a general request from the Society, himself appealed for more words in the local weekly paper, *The Dorset County Chronicle* (12 January 1882). Surprisingly, his letter was quizzed rather churlishly in the same paper (*DCC*, 9 February 1882). The acknowledgment from Dartnell and Goddard shows that his continued collecting was carefully followed. Barnes, however, cannot have known of this in the 1880s. How far he got in the revision he meant to give the *Grammar and Glossary* is not known because his health began to fail. An edition of *A Glossary of the Dorset Dialect with a Grammar* was run off locally in 1885 (dated 1886) to please him, and this led Nodal to order 500 copies for the Dialect Society. The Society soon had cause to shed any embarrassment - the copy had not been prepared for the press and there is no sign that proofs had been read. Nodal quickly cancelled the order. Then in 1886 Barnes died. The next that is heard from Skeat is an aside two years later:

> [...] We know that Mr Barnes used to write a whole book free from
> foreign words, but some of his compounds were very comic'. (*Notes &
> Queries*, XII, 24 November 1888: 405)

Of course, Skeat had used the Philological Society's collections, without Murray's knowledge, to publish his *English Etymological Dictionary* in 1881. Scrupulousness was not always a first consideration among some members of the establishment. Even so, such persistent rejection of Barnes is rather odd.

Seven years later, the Dialect Society's papers were sent to Oxford for Wright to begin the task of editing the *English Dialect Dictionary*, Volume I of which was published in 1898. It comes as a shock to learn that in the 1890s Dorset was relatively a 'dialect blank' (Wright 1932 II: 384). The quality of what was available was found to be good because most of it came from Barnes (ibid.). However, Wright had access to Barnes's papers only in the Bonaparte collection and not from the materials of the Dialect Society. As Barnes had clearly sent materials to the Society, as he had done earlier to the Philological Society, it is hard to find an explanation for this fact. The editors consulted Hardy who, being nervous about dialect matters, shrewdly put them in touch with his friend - and Barnes's friend - H. J. Moule. By the time the *Dialect Dictionary* was finished with Volume VI in 1905, Wright had found further sources for Dorset materials. Whereas Barnes's contribution was still used from

Bonaparte's collection, those of the other contributors went directly to the Society and the editors. The Dorset contributors acknowledged by Wright were almost wholly people who knew Barnes, had helped him, people whom he had helped, or whose interest had been inspired by him. Barnes is the most substantial source of Dorset words in the *Dialect Dictionary* - he also appears as a source for the dialects of Forth and Bargy, County Wexford - but in the *Dictionary* as a whole the Dorset materials are surprisingly few. Dorset stretches to one column of sources by listing almost all Hardy's Wessex Novels on separate lines, whereas there are eight columns for Lancashire sources. However, beyond a certain point, quantity bears little relevance to usefulness - a lot of bumpkinese passes as 'dialect' in most regions, and often finds its way into lists of 'sources', particularly when it is set out as 'verse'. Even poetry worthy of the name may have rules of its own to obey, and should therefore be handled with more care than has been customary by dialectologists.

What then is to be made of Barnes's fate at the hands of the English Dialect Society? Barnes after all compiled the first of the regional grammars and glossaries to be commissioned by the Philological Society, and later by the Dialect Society. Moreover, the published records of both Societies show that Barnes sent in to them words and miscellaneous articles. Unless Bonaparte had some so far unknown arrangement whereby he was able to remove Barnes's contributions to the two societies into his own personal collection, these contributions were not passed on to Wright. Some shroud seems to have draped itself over the whole business. And as the editors of the *Dialect Dictionary* found Dorset to be a dialect blank, there must be some suspicion that materials were done away with, or somehow 'lost'. As things stand, the two Societies appear to have behaved as if they had some reason or cause to ensure that Barnes's lively philology should be cast into the shade. What that cause or reason was may well be forever unknown.

c. Bernard Jones 1999

ABBREVIATIONS

DCL	Dorset County Library - miscellaneous papers
DCM	Dorset County Museum - miscellaneous papers
EDS	English Dialect Society
GM	*Gentleman's Magazine*
H	Huntington Library - miscellaneous letters
TPS	*Transactions of the Philological Society*

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

[Relevant works by Barnes are given in the main text.]

Aarsleff, Hans. 1983 (1967). *The Study of Language in England 1780-1860*
　　London and Minneapolis: Athlone Press and University of Minnesota
　　Press.

Akerman, John Yonge. 1842. *A Glossary of Provincial Words and Phrases in
　　use in Wiltshire*. London: J. R. Smith.

Baxter, Lucy ['Leader Scott']. 1887. *The Life of William Barnes Poet and
　　Philologist*. London: Macmillan.

Benzie, William. 1983. *Dr F. J. Furnivall*. Norman, Oklahoma: Pilgrim Books.

Dartnell, George Edward and Edward Hungerford Goddard. 1893. *A Glossary
　　of Words used in the County of Wiltshire*. English Dialect Society.

Elworthy, Frederick T. 1875. *The Dialect of West Somerset*. English Dialect
　　Society.

---- 1877. *An Outline of the Grammar of the Dialect of West Somerset*. English
　　Dialect Society.

---- 1888. *The West Somerset Word-book*. English Dialect Society.

Halliwell [-Phillipps], James Orchard. 1847. *Dictionary of Archaic Words*.
　　London: John Russell Smith.

Jacobs, Willis D. 1952. *William Barnes Linguist*. Albuquerque: University of
　　New Mexico Press.

Jones, Bernard. 1990. A Glossary Restored [Abstract]. *The Henry Sweet
　　Society Newsletter* 14, 15-28.

---- 1992. William Barnes and the South West Dialect of English. In: Rissanen,
　　Matti, Ossi Ihalainen et al (eds) *History of Englishes*. Berlin, New York:
　　Mouton de Gruyter, 556-565.

---- 1992. William Barnes and the Philological Society [Abstract]. *The Henry
　　Sweet Society Newsletter* 19, 7-9.

---- 1996. William Barnes, the Philological Society up to 1873 and the *New
　　English Dictionary*. In Juhani Klemola, Merja Kytö et al (eds) *Speech
　　Past and Present*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 80-100.

Müller, F Max. 1861. *Lectures on the Science of Language* [...]. London:
　　Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts.

Murray, K. M. Elisabeth. 1977. *Caught in the Web of Words*. Newhaven and
　　London: Yale University Press.

Nodal, John H. and George Milner. 1875. *A Glossary of the Lancashire
　　Dialect*, Part I. Manchester: Manchester Literary Club.

---- 1882. *A Glossary of the Lancashire Dialect*, Part II. London: Trübner, for
　　the English Dialect Society.

Skeat, Walter W. 1911. *English Dialects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
　　Press.

Taylor, Dennis. 1993. *Hardy's Literary Language and Victorian Philology*.
        Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Upton, Clive, and J. D. A. Widdowson. 1996. *An Atlas of English Dialects*.
        Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wakelin, Martyn F. 1986. *The Southwest of England*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:
        John Benjamins.
Waugh, Edwin. n.d. [c. 1890]. *Lancashire Sketches* [Vol I (of II); in the 8 vol.
        Collected Works], ed. by George Milner. Manchester and London: John
        Heywood.
Wright, Elizabeth Mary. 1932. *The Life of Joseph Wright*. (2 vols.). Oxford:
        Oxford University Press.

Bernard Jones, *East Stour, Dorset*

WHAT MAD PURSUIT?

B ibliographers are, I am convinced, touched with madness. How else can one explain the persistent attempts throughout history since the invention of printing to subordinate knowledge to some sort of accessible order? Gesner (1545); Du Verdier (1585); Lipen (1679); Teissier (1686+); Georgi (1742+); De Bure (1763+); Panzer (1793+); Ebert (1821+); Sabin (1868+); Evans (1903+); Palau y Dulcet (1923+); Besterman (1939+): all laboured to achieve the impossible, but knowledge has gradually become more tractable because of their efforts. Stevenson was right when he said: "To travel hopefully is a better thing than to arrive, and the true success is to labour." Because the bibliographer never arrives: there is always another corner in some library or archive in which an unknown piece of the jigsaw awaits discovery. Sometimes the labour seems comic: as when Johannes Moller produced in 1697 his extraordinary *Homonymoscopia*, which lists writers whose first and last names were the same!

I suppose a precondition for becoming a bibliographer is an interest in books; and that I can definitely trace to my sixth birthday when my father gave me an edition of the works of Dickens: it began a life-long habit of acquiring books and trying to understand them. It took me many years to learn the awful truth that books are deceivers, and surrender unwillingly the secrets of how they came to be what they are. In a sense, every book, like every human being, has a history, and the bibliographer's task is to tease out that history. Like people, books are related to other books, some closely some distantly, but no book stands alone. This is why bibliography concerns itself with bringing together the members of a dispersed family (a diaspora of sorts), be they books on medicine, playing cards, or books by authors who lived in Chalon-sur-Saône (Louis Jacob de Saint Charles published such a bibliography in 1652: *De claris scriptoribus Cabilonensibus* printed at Hamburg).

. . . .

1958 found me at the new University of New Brunswick, recruited to teach Old English, the history of the English language, and several other courses in English Literature. Fredericton, in those days, was about as boring and uninspiring a place as I had ever had the misfortune to live in, so it was not long after my arrival there that I began busying myself with projects. The first was to compile (for my students) a compendium of texts on the history of the language; the second was a manual for teaching students how to compose Old English prose. The latter I sent to Elliot Van Kirk Dobbie (then the *doyen* of

Old English studies at Columbia), and we subsequently exchanged letters
written in OE! 1958 was also the year when I was asked to consider updating
Kennedy's renowned *Bibliography* published at Harvard in 1927. After a
winter's research – such as was possible in Fredericton – I came to the
conclusion that what was needed was not a revision but a completely new
work, compiled according to bibliographical principles and based on a wide-
ranging search of the research libraries of the world. The summer of 1959 was
spent in London and Oxford, and the list of additions to Kennedy had begun to
grow to the point where I was certain that my conviction was right.

        In 1960 I moved to London – ostensibly to acquire a PhD, but in reality
to get at all those libraries in Europe that few British or American
bibliographers had ever taken account of. I began by writing to some 600
libraries in Scandinavia, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, France, Italy and
Spain. The response was beyond dreams, and plans were laid for my first foray
among the rare book collections of Europe. The first tour, undertaken in 1961,
lasted six weeks with a cruel timetable which barely left time for eating and
sleeping. But I managed, with the generous help of hundreds of librarians, to
cover the major (and many minor) libraries in Denmark, Sweden, Holland,
Germany and Switzerland. Thomas F. Dibdin (whose bibliographical travels in
Europe were documented in his *Bibliographical, Antiquarian, and Picturesque
Tour* published in 1821) travelled through Europe in what one might call *style*:
I often had to sleep in my VW Beetle, and meals consisted in market produce
cooked on a Camping-Gaz burner, a couple of non-stick pans, and a plentiful
supply of Kleenex to clean up! Occasional stays in small hotels (9/- a night)
were necessary in order to have a bath and wash dirty clothing. With very few
exceptions I was accorded quite extraordinary privileges and was allowed to
work after closing time in numerous small libraries. One such was the old
Staatsbibliothek in Bamberg, where at about midnight I stumbled on Thomas
Basson's 1586 printing of Gabriel Meurier's *Coniugations* - still the only copy
ever discovered. Even for those libraries that could not allow after-hours work I
was always permitted access to the stacks, which is where discoveries are
made. That, alas, is no longer possible since librarians are understandably
worried about security. But the loss to scholarship which dependence on a
library's catalogue has effected is incalculable. Books *do speak* to those who
understand them, and for every discovery I have made over the years by
consulting a catalogue there are ten which only revealed themselves when I
could handle them straight from the shelf. Of all the libraries I worked in on the
Continent during this period none could equal the riches I found at Göttingen,
and the systematic manner in which the books were shelf-marked meant that
everything I needed was in one location. At that time few English or American
bibliographers took the trouble to go there, believing that the only rare English
book in the collections was the Treveris printing of *A, C, mery talys* (1526 –
STC2 23664). Later that year I first met Bernhard Fabian, whose prodigious

labours on behalf of English Studies in Germany is now legendary, and urged him to do something about Göttingen's wonderful English collections. When *the Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue* (*ESTC*) started in 1976 he was one of the first to collaborate and the fruits of that are to be seen in the splendid catalogue he produced in 1987-88.

1962 was taken up with my second foray, which concentrated on British libraries, and included numerous country houses. Longleat was probably my most fruitful source, and the Marquis did everything possible to make my days there pleasant. I remember how baffled he was at my excitement when I discovered the only known copy of Pierre Valence's *Introductions* (1528) – the book of which Lambeth Palace has a fragment (frequently referred to in Dobson's great work on pronunciation). Some years later I reproduced this in the Scolar Press *English Linguistics* series. The Newberry Library in Chicago awarded me a Fellowship that summer and, once I had catalogued the Bonaparte Collection, gave me the freedom to travel around America. Of the many librarians I met that year I particularly remember Edwin Wolf II – one of the great librarians of this century – who presided over the Library Company of Philadelphia, founded by Franklin. Edwin's unrivalled knowledge of his own library's collections and others throughout America made that summer a memorable one, and wherever I went his support proved invaluable. We became firm friends, and when I started the *ESTC* at the British Library in 1976 he was one of the first to cooperate. I tried to teach him MARC cataloguing, but without much success: Edwin always preferred pen and paper!

1963 was taken up with completing the task of reading the *General Catalogue* of the British Museum, scanning hundreds of periodicals for evidence of the publishing history of the texts with which I was involved, and describing in detail the Museum's vast collection of grammars and dictionaries. That year I persuaded the Museum to acquire microfilms of rarities I had discovered in other libraries, and users of my *Bibliography* will be familiar with this. It was also the year in which I managed to complete most of my dissertation on spelling reform before 1700.

The 1960s witnessed the last days of traditional bibliography, before the onslaught of the electronic revolution. The North Library was a hot-house of bibliographical endeavour: Bill Jackson revising Pollard & Redgrave's *STC*; Ted Besterman working on the revision of his monumental *World Bibliography of Bibliographies*; Ted Hodnett working on woodcut books printed before 1535; Blanche Henrey compiling her definitive work on English botany and horticulture; Kathleen Coburn, George Whalley and Bart Viner editing Coleridge; Jack Robson editing Mill; Carl Stratman compiling his *Bibliography of English printed Tragedy 1565-1900*; Walter Ong working on his Ramus *Inventory*; Eric Partridge ransacking the collections for his dictionaries. We must have seemed a lunatic lot to the patient staff who delivered and collected books by the thousand every day! Those days seem to belong to another time

which we shall never see again, for libraries everywhere have introduced systems and practices which make such endeavours impossible. Of course, the French have always suffered constraints, as anyone who has worked in the libraries of Paris knows only too well. When I was working in Paris I always stayed with my aunt, Louise Depréaux, librarian of the Fondation Thiers. She knew all the Paris librarians, but no amount of personal influence could move the Bibliothèque Nationale to allow me more than twelve books a day! So a typical day for me was to start at Rue Richelieu, then migrate to the Arsenal, the Géneviève, the Mazarine, the Sorbonne, Saint Denis, Versailles, and back to the wonderful collection in my aunt's apartment.

By the time I got the coveted PhD in 1964 it was time to move on, and I was fortunate in persuading the University of Leeds to appoint me as Lecturer in English Language. Harold Orton was very supportive of my work and I was able to visit the Museum at least once a week at minimal cost. By 1965 I felt ready to publish Volume I, devoted to English grammars, and *le grand projet* was at last underway. It recorded significantly more texts than were listed in Kennedy, and copies were located in some 400 libraries throughout the world. The files of data had now become a domestic embarrassment and my wife banished me to a small garden house: with over 30,000 cards; six filing cabinets of correspondence and photocopies; and one cabinet which housed the transcriptions I had made since 1959.

By 1975, the year in which the British Library asked me to organize *ESTC*, the files had almost doubled, filling two rooms in a building in Ilkley. While progress had been satisfactory up to that point I knew that accepting the challenge of *ESTC* would seriously affect my ability to keep up with my intended publishing schedule. In fact, between 1975 and 1997 I was only able to publish the two parts of Volume XII devoted to the Romance languages. On the other hand directing the world-wide *ESTC* gave me splendid opportunities to visit libraries and hundreds of important items came to light as records were sent in to the project from participating institutions. It also provided the opportunity to engage in a foray of exceptional importance: the examination of every manuscript volume in the British Library (60,000+) in order to discover uncatalogued printed items – until recently archivists seldom noted printed items bound up in manuscripts. Thus it was that I found in Additional MS 26604 the only known (and probably the earliest) printed example of Gujarati characters. It is a single sheet (watermarked 1797) with the title: *A Table shewing, in the six lines from left to right at the top, the form of the characters, pronunciation, and power, of the Guzzerat alphabet* – ESTC t149645. This item will be included in Volume XIV.

From 1990 I was Director of the School of Library, Archive & Information Studies at University College London, from which I retired in September 1998. Then, and only then, could I return to the work which had been an important part of my life for so many years, even the years when I

seemed to have neglected it. But the gathering of information, if not its inclusion in a printed volume, has gone on continuously. My interleaved volumes contain many hundreds of additions and corrections, and it is my intention to include all these in a supplementary volume when the series is complete.

One of the most rewarding outcomes of the *Bibliography* has been the renewed interest in historical studies of English which it has done something to stimulate, and I have received letters over the years from many young researchers who have found it useful, and who have been able to add information I did not know about; and it seems to have spurred others to attempt to bring under bibliographical control texts printed after 1800 – witness the listing of nineteenth century English grammars compiled by Manfred Görlach at Cologne, soon to be published. And one has only to look at the contents of *Historiographia Linguistica* since 1974, not to mention other more recent journals in this field, to see that historical studies of language are alive and well.

I have nearly completed my further researches on Volume XIV, which covers all the languages not so far dealt with: Irish, Gaelic, Hebrew, Arabic, Persian, the languages of the Indian sub-continent, Chinese, Amerindian, and a further hundred-odd languages for which I have found glossaries in travel books. It will, I think, come as a surprise to some that so much of this fugitive material remains unexamined. It will be one of the largest volumes in the series and will be illustrated with over 200 facsimiles. It should be ready for the printer by late summer this year. The Volumes I dread are XV and XVI which cover Greek and Latin: the number of items for Latin is so large that I have had to divide the two volumes at 1650. Will we ever, I sometimes wonder, know how many times Lily's grammar was *really* reprinted? If the evidence for English spelling books is any guide, I suspect that 50% of all the Lilys have vanished without trace!

While there are good reasons for being optimistic about the future of bibliography in the electronic age, there will be losses as well as gains. *ESTC* could never have been undertaken other than with the use of computers, and large-scale bibliographical projects benefit users because there is no waiting for the publisher, or the bibliographer who clings to his offspring until it is mature and near-perfect. On the other hand, when I consult library catalogues available via Telnet or the Web, I am often appalled at the wretched quality of the records I find. *ESTC* started *de novo*, and every item was described from the originals according to a clearly established set of rules and guidelines. The subsidiary project at the American Antiquarian Society to re-catalogue early American books was based on even stricter rules. But that, alas, is not the case for much of what *ESTC* now includes, and this has resulted in thousands of errors, faulty locations and inconsistencies which I doubt will ever be corrected. More seriously, perhaps, is the prevailing policy amongst librarians

to depend entirely on their automated catalogues, most of which are simply the result of hasty conversions from card to computer. In other words, bibliographical shopping is increasingly like supermarket shopping: if you can find it you can buy it! Coupled with the growing tendency to severely restrict access to the stacks – even by staff! – the bibliographer's task in the next millennium is going to be an unenviable one!

Research libraries have always been nurseries for scholarship, and their traditional hospitality to the researcher needing large quantities of books has made it possible for substantial bibliographical projects to be both conceived and carried out: that hospitality is daily diminishing as financial pressures inexorably call for reduced services. Some kinds of research *can* be satisfied by a daily quota of ten books, but others can *not*. I, for one, count myself extremely fortunate to have embarked on this *mad pursuit* when I did...

> And though it be vnperfect, as I know not what first Booke either of Dictionarie, or Herball, or such like was perfect at the first or second edition, yet he that helpeth me to put in one Booke that I haue not seene, I hope that I shall shew him ten that he neuer heard of. (Andrew Maunsell, *The First Part of the Catalogue*, 1595)

Robin Alston, *Brockford, Suffolk*

Sixteenth Annual Colloquium of the Henry Sweet Society

Regent's Park College, Oxford, 22 March 1999

Conference Report

Since 1999 is the year of ICHOLS VIII the Henry Sweet Society will not be holding its annual conference in September but instead met in March for a one-day colloquium at Regent's Park College, Oxford. Despite the short duration of the event, a wide range of topics was explored and it was exciting to be reminded of the richness which is such a hallmark of our discipline.

The first two papers dealt with the work of John Wilkins but from rather different angles. Joe Subbiondo explored the idea of the philosophical language with reference to seventeenth-century theories of knowledge and education. Michael Isermann then discussed the very design of the universal character itself, using mathematical texts to uncover possible layers of symbolism. Both interesting in their own right, the two papers together provided a compelling illustration of the multifaceted nature of linguistic texts and the diverse forms of inquiry to which they are susceptible.

After lunch Inge Kabell discussed the work of John Hasfeld, the nineteenth-century teacher of English who was born in Denmark but spent much of his life in Russia. Her paper focused attention on another aspect of the discipline — the practical issues associated with teaching and learning languages. Werner Hüllen explored the semantic aspects of John Locke's philosophy. Then Éva Jeremiás moved beyond Europe to discuss the grammatical thought developed by Persian scholars of literature. Finally Hermann Bell raised some interesting questions about the political uses of linguistic ideas among speakers struggling to preserve an endangered language, Nubian.

The day's programme implicitly invited us to consider the breadth and vitality of our discipline. It was appropriate therefore that, halfway through the conference, John Walmsley should have spoken on "The Future of Linguistic Historiography" and explicitly discussed the nature of the field and the ways in which we would like to see it develop. Short though it was, then, the colloquium provided much food for thought and thanks are due to Mark Atherton for organising such a successful and stimulating event.

Richard Steadman-Jones, *Sheffield*

Abstracts of papers

Perceptions of Language History: Three Models and a Threatened Tongue

Herman Bell (Oxford, herman@nubia.u-net.com)

Nubian concepts on the revival of their mediaeval language are examined here in terms of models from three other languages: (1) Classical Arabic or Fuṣḥā, where it is a question of maintenance rather than revival, (2) the *Landsmål* of Ivar Aasen in Norway and (3) the *Katharevousa* of Adamantios Koraïs in Greece. Only Classical Arabic has direct influence on Nubian thinking; yet, each of these three situations provides distinctive insights for interpreting the phenomenon of language revival.

The present study examines perceptions of the history of the Nile Nubian language known as Nobíin in terms of three factors: the sense of a glorious past, the threat of extinction and the potential for language engineering.

Amid growing fears that the Nobíin language may be headed for extinction, some of its speakers have become haunted by the sense of a glorious past. The perception of glory and the threat of extinction are examined here with reference to some remarkable psychological parallels drawn from the experience of Ivar Aasen in the development of *Landsmål* in 19th century Norway.

It should come as no surprise that Nobíin is regarded as having a glorious past. The original Nubian homeland along the Nile in southern Egypt and the northern Sudan possesses some of the grandest of ancient Egyptian monuments such as the 13th century BC temples of Abu Simbel. In the same region a number of Christian churches were excavated with brilliant wall-paintings of the 8th to the 12th centuries AD. Occasionally excavations revealed inscriptions and texts written in Old Nubian, a language ancestral to Nobíin.

In the early 1960s only a few educated Nubians realized that their language had been written in the mediaeval period. In recent centuries literacy has been principally in Arabic, and no longer in Nubian. In fact, only for the past century has the international scholarly community known of the existence of written Nubian in the mediaeval period. From the early 16th century to the late 19th century awareness of a writing system for mediaeval Nubian seems to have suffered a total eclipse. A poetic description of the Norwegian situation from Henrik Ibsen is particularly apt for Nobíin: it has experienced a '400-year night'.

In 1962-64 many Nubians suffered the trauma of resettlement in order to escape the flood waters from the High Dam that was constructed just south of

Aswan. They soon observed that children born after the resettlement in urban areas such as Khartoum were generally no longer able to speak Nobíin. Word is also getting around that the Ḥarāza Nubian language of northern Kordofan became extinct in the mid-20th century and that the Birgid Nubian language of Darfur is also by now probably extinct. The perception of the history of Nobíin is therefore infused with a fear of extinction.

The response has been dramatic. It reveals a faith in language engineering involving the construction of a *via media*, or partial rapprochement of Nobíin towards the Old Nubian of the mediaeval period. This concept is similar to the *via media*, or *Katharevousa* developed by Koraïs. Recent Nubian scholars have taken significant steps towards creating and publishing an archaizing High Nubian language with Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic as conscious models. This has involved not only the revival of Old Nubian vocabulary, but also the use of the Old Nubian script based on Greek and Coptic letters with three additional Old Nubian characters, probably derived via Meroitic from ancient Egyptian.

Remarkable among the Nubian scholars has been an expression of solidarity with all peripheral languages viewed as threatened by the expanding use of global languages. In that sense, their work is a contribution to the general phenomenon of languages caught between globalization and parochialism in search of an appropriate response.

****

John Locke, Semanticist
Werner Hüllen (Düsseldorf, werner.huellen@uni-essen.de)

The history of semantics is a more difficult field of research than, for example, the history of grammar, because there is no strict system of concepts and terms and because the relevant passages are to be found in what could be called diverse unspecific places, among them the writings of philosophers. But problems of semantics have always been discussed in the history of linguistic ideas - theoretically, e.g. in the definitions of word-classes, practically, e.g. in glossaries and onomasiological dictionaries. The most prominent semantic problem is what is nowadays called the 'referential function'. John Locke's works have an obvious linguistic substance. He considers word-meanings not as names tagged to things, as was generally done before him, but as names tagged to simple and complex ideas which depend on experience, but which, once triggered by sensations or reflections, are the result of the workmanship of the human mind. A linguistic analysis of Locke's work is permitted to show that he marks the dividing line between referential (speculative) and mental lexicography, although it does not do justice to him philosophically. For Locke, words are the knots that tie together simple and complex ideas which, by the

creative mind of speakers, fall into such patterns as serve the communicative needs of people in a society. Communication is achieved whenever these needs are fulfilled. These and many other features of Locke's epistemology foreshadow *avant la lettre* structuralist semantics with its techniques of feature analysis as well as pragmatic semantics with its axiom of meaning as usage. Moreover, as the work of the human mind is culture dependent, there are also relativist concepts in the Whorfian sense to be found. Whereas onomasiological dictionaries up to 1700 were guided by the purposes of referential function, i.e. giving names to things even if these were seen in a categorial order (e.g. Aristotelian), they are guided after 1700 by a system of simple and complex ideas in which the things (as genera) sit like knots in a net. Locke's thinking marks the dividing line between these two lexicographical concepts. P. M. Roget's *Thesaurus* is an outstanding example. Its preface is full of Lockean ideas and terminology, as can easily be shown.

****

A Possible Source of Wilkins's Character
Michael M. Isermann (Heidelberg)

The present paper has two interrelated aims. The first is to furnish evidence that the system of symbolic notation used by John Wilkins in *An Essay towards a Real Character, and a Philosophical Language* (1668) is based on the numeral character presented in Book II, ch. XIX of Henry Cornelius Agrippa's *De Occulta Philosophia Libri Tres* (Cologne, 1533) rather than on any of the possible sources previously proposed by research on Wilkins. The second aim is to decipher Wilkins's character. The relation between these two objectives is as follows: despite the obvious correspondences both in the sign material used and the way it is arranged, the strongest evidence for Wilkins's debt to Agrippa does not derive from directly accessible features. Rather, it derives from the fact that both real characters are ciphered in such a strikingly similar way that it is hard to imagine how Wilkins could have 'invented' his own character without relying on Agrippa's numeral character as a model. Consequently, I will first present what I believe to be the solution to Agrippa's riddle and then use it as a key for detecting the constructional principles underlying both Wilkins's character and the philosophical tables.

****

Landmarks in the Persian Linguistic Tradition: A Reconstruction of the Native Grammatical Literature of Persian

É. M. Jeremiás (Budapest / Cambridge, jeremias@ludens.elte.hu)

New Persian as a relatively unified form of the written literary language appeared in the 10th cent. Despite the dominance of the Classical Persian language and literature, especially poetry, in the larger Persian-speaking areas from Anatolia to India in the Islamic period, the grammar of Persian in its own right was not studied until the 16th century. The superiority of Arabic as the language of science or the lack of a firmly established literary / language norm like the Qur'an are among the possible reasons.

There are sources however (e.g. prosody, rhetoric, lexicography, translations and commentaries on the famous grammatical descriptions of Arabic) from which one can infer the grammatical thinking of the early mediaeval period. The aim of the present paper is to give a survey of the direct and indirect sources on the basis of which the different stages of this grammatical tradition and, as a consequence, a conscious knowledge of the Persian grammar can be reconstructed.

Furthermore, it deals with some terminological problems of this 'reconstructed' linguistic tradition, including the translation, adaptation and restructuring of the Arabic model. The changes in the meaning and usage of Arabic terms reveal some basic characteristics of Persian, its linguistic heterogeneity and history.

The analyses to be presented are based mainly on manuscript sources preserved in Western and Oriental collections.

****

A discussion of John Hasfeld and his works on the English language

Inge Kabell (Copenhagen, kabell@engelsk.ku.dk)

Over the years - alone or together with Hanne Lauridsen, my colleague at the Department of English, Copenhagen University - I have been doing research on the English teaching material, i.e. textbooks, grammars and dictionaries, composed *by* Danes, *in* Denmark and *for* a Danish public in the period 1680-1880.

As English was not taught regularly in Danish schools or at any higher level during most of this period, the above-mentioned teaching material must primarily have been used by teachers giving private lessons and consequently the number of copies was undoubtedly small. These facts have naturally complicated our studies; our best source so far has been an unpublished manuscript, a list (now found at the Royal Library, Copenhagen) of all licensed interpreters who were registered in Denmark over the last 300 years, because most of these interpreters

were also active as textbook writers and foreign language teachers. In this list we
have found much inspiration for our work in general and here we also happened to
find the name of John Hasfeld together with a description of his life and works. His
fate immediately caught our attention and we decided to include him in our studies
although his pupils and the target group for his grammars etc. were Russians and
not Danes.

John Hasfeld (1800-1894) was a Dane born and bred, but due to financial
difficulties he had to emigrate to Russia in his early youth. In St Petersburg he first
worked at the Danish legation, but later he took up the profession of a language
teacher. His pupils were primarily young Russian naval cadets, but he also gave
private lessons. He taught several languages but above all English. The English
teaching material which was available then in Russia for teachers of that language
must in Hasfeld's opinion have been inadequate, since, after he had been in St
Petersburg for approximately 10 years, he decided to compose a textbook/grammar
of his own. By then he had undoubtedly become so familiar with Russian that he
could write his book - and another smaller one, a collection of tables, only meant
for the pupils/students - half in Russian and half in English. Both works are
interesting and reveal Hasfeld's good understanding of pedagogical strategies side
by side with his excellent linguistic skills. The examples that he uses are often
entertaining and politically relevant, but never polemic or provocative - that would
have been too dangerous!

He says somewhere that the system he uses in his textbook is of his own
invention and that he wants it to be known as 'Hasfeld's method'; and true enough,
there are ideas in it that I have found nowhere else, especially the fact that he
makes the teacher put questions in Russian but expects them to be answered in
English by the pupils. Apart from this, his method, however, seems not wholly
unlike methods used by some of his European contemporaries, such as Ahn and
Ollendorff. In his last work, *An Essay on Teaching*, he outlines the theoretical
background for his textbook/grammar.

John Hasfeld made quite a name for himself in St Petersburg society
during the many years he lived there and at the beginning also through his
friendship with George Borrow, the English writer, who spent a couple of years in
the Russian capital; all in all, it has been a great pleasure for me, as a Dane, to
study the life and works of a fellow Dane of the past whose fate was out of the
ordinary and who always seems to have been a good representative of his native
country, which he never forgot and often visited.

****

John Wilkins's Philosophical Language as a Pedagogic Strategy
Joseph L. Subbiondo (Saint Mary's College of California,
jsubbion@stmarys-ca.edu)

One of the first initiatives of the Royal Society was commissioning John Wilkins (1618-1672) in 1662 to develop a philosophical language - he completed the project in 1668 with the publication of his *Essay Towards a Real Character, and a Philosophical Language*. Wilkins maintained that the natural tables in his *Essay* provided the "most useful repository [of knowledge] in the world" and that his language, based on these tables, served to "promote and facilitate the knowledge of nature". While scholars have recognized that Wilkins's *Essay* represents the crest of the philosophical language movement, they have not considered the possibility that Wilkins may have created his philosophical language to serve as a pedagogic strategy for improving scientific education. Moreover, historians writing on the new science and the universities in 17th-Century Europe in general and England in particular have overlooked the philosophical language movement.

Wilkins's theory of education shaped his philosophical language. In the opening pages of his *Essay*, Wilkins asserted that his philosophical language was designed for the "spreading of knowledge". Wilkins's educational method was based on two assumptions: first, the words of his language were arranged to reflect the relationships of their referents; and second, the elements of each word, like the terms of an algebraic expression, revealed the components of the referent. He developed his language on the premise that "knowledge of [language and nature] [...] ought to be conjoined"; and the "conjoining" of language and nature was the defining as well as the unique aspect of his philosophical language. As one learned the words of his language, one learned the nature of the referents of the words.

Wilkins explicitly maintained that the tables would "prove the shortest and the plainest way for attainment of real knowledge". He emphatically expressed his confidence in his project as he insisted that he would not have proposed it to the Royal Society unless it "were [...] a thing I had well considered and were convinced of". In order to appreciate the radical nature of Wilkins's use of philosophical language as a pedagogic strategy, it is important to contrast it to conventional educational practice of his day. The 17th Century educational approach was straightforward: a professor lectured on a text from his prepared notes, presented an exegesis of the text, and then defended his exegesis against diverse opinions. With his philosophical language Wilkins created a data base in the tables, and his language enabled students to access his data base. Thus, he intended to convert the student from a passive to an active learner; and he planned that his philosophical language be the basis of this conversion.

****

The Future of Linguistic Historiography
John Walmsley (Bielefeld, walmsley@nov1.lili.uni-bielefeld.de)

The vantage-point adopted in this presentation is a point in time five, ten or perhaps twenty years hence. What will the historiography of linguistics look like then? What kind of goals should we be working towards? There are currently signs of uncertainty as to our aims and purpose, and our professional identity (cf. the symposia at Essen in 1989 and Regensburg in 1994), so this is an opportune time to reflect on these questions and to try to draw together the various concerns.

For those who believe that the Society should be debating these matters, the following are major areas which repeatedly turn up as the focus of attention in the papers presented at the symposia mentioned above: our corporate understanding as a discipline; representation and funding; qualification and training; institutionalisation; publications; and our role in society. I believe that the Society should concern itself with the following questions:

- **Corporate understanding**
  Should the Society be trying to establish itself as an independent discipline in the scientific community?
  Ought it to be one of our concerns, to try to train a new generation of scholars in this field?
  Would we like to see the discipline institutionalised, and if so, to what degree and in what way or ways?
  We need to develop clearer ideas of what our discipline is about, how it contributes to wider knowledge, and how it ought to be practised.

- **Representation and funding**
  In what directions, research-wise, is the discipline likely to develop in the next few years?
  How should our discipline be represented with respect to major fund-dispensing bodies?

- **Qualification and training**
  How should or can good practice be disseminated?
  - Possibilities at first and second degree level
  - Masters and doctoral qualifications, *Promotion, Habilitation*
  - Society meetings
  - Conferences
  - Symposia
  - Special seminars / workshops
  - Summer Schools

- **Institutionalisation**
  The possibilities include:
  - Separate institutes, research centres for the history of the discipline
  - Courses, course components
  - University teaching posts

- **Publications**
  A number of publishers in different countries do have a section for the history of linguistics. Some periodicals are specifically devoted to the history of linguistics (the *Henry Sweet Society Bulletin*; *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*; *Histoire, Epistémologie, Langage*; *Historiographia Linguistica*). However, a case can be made for publishing papers on the history of linguistics in both specialist and non-specialist periodicals.

- **Our role in society**
  In terms of society at large, the history of linguistics should be able to make useful contributions to a number of matters of public concern. With respect to other disciplines, we might ask: Whom do we expect to learn most from? Whom have we most to offer? With which other disciplines could we best cooperate?

  Taken together, our conferences and symposia consistently show that we share many themes and concerns at a European level, but at just this level we have no common forum in which to discuss them. ICHoLs is not the appropriate framework, for obvious reasons. There is a gap at the European level. Below this, we have societies meeting at a national level.
  The consequence is a diffuse picture, especially from the outside: which European society ought one to join? Why do we not have a common European information base?
  The movements in Europe currently being what they are, both politically and financially, I think we should be looking towards:

- a society for the history of the language sciences at the European level
- regular meetings at the European level, which would not of course preclude national meetings
- a European data-base
- unified European representation for the historiography of linguistics
- increased access to research funds on the European level.

Maria Filomena Gonçalves
Madureira Feijó, Ortografista do século XVIII: para uma história da ortografia portuguesa. Lisboa: Ministério da Educação. Instituto de Cultura e Língua Portuguesa, 1992. 142 pp. ISBN 972-566-154-0

A t least a short notice to draw attention to the present study by Maria Filomena Gonçalves, from the University of Évora, in Southern Portugal, about one important chapter in the history of Portuguese orthography, is called for. As it happens, on the other side of Atlantic, the Brazilian Academy of Letters has just published a *Vocabulário ortográfico da Língua Portuguesa* (Rio de Janeiro: Academia Brasileira de Letras, 1998) reviving long-standing polemics. Among the various issues related to the codification of the European national varieties since the 16th century, few seem to have aroused such passionate dispute within Portuguese-speaking countries as orthography has. European, African and American varieties of Portuguese have remained faithful to their own norms until today, and discussions about their unification are far from at an end, as long as different interests are involved. As a matter of fact, if Europeans retain in their favour the historical role of the birthplace of the language, Brazilians seem to win the economic argument. No publisher would want to upset 200 million potential consumers.

Filomena's book does not aim to take a position in this debate, but to reconsider it in scientific and historical perspectives, tasks that she accomplishes with competence but with variable results. The theoretical review, in chapter one, 'Oral versus Escrito' (pp. 23-34), about the nature of the written modality of language in relationship to speech is mercifully short. The proposal of the 'scientific' discipline of Graphemics to study the "internal relationship of the graphemes" and their (random?, cf. p. 30) correspondence to phonemes resists a good justification. The claimed urgency in rescuing writing from the secondary level to which modern linguistics relegated it seems to minimize, after all, the twenty five hundred years of alphabetical dictatorship which preceded it.

From chapter two on, Maria Filomena explores aspects of Portuguese orthography in a much more interesting way. 'Antecedentes da Ortografia Portuguesa' (pp. 35-49) quickly reviews the main phases in the establishment of Portuguese orthography. One follows the various solutions, from the most ancient text in Portuguese, the *Testamento de Afonso II* (dated 1214), up to the 18th century, via the first Portuguese grammars of Fernão de Oliveira (1536) and João de Barros (1540), the first orthographic manual of 1574, by Pêro de Magalhães de Gândavo, and the 17th-century dictionaries and vocabularies.

The retrospective allows us to observe the gradual predominance of etymological criteria in the development of Portuguese orthography through the 18th century, which will find its great expression in the work of Madureira Feijó, the central figure of chapter 3 (pp. 51-105). One understands, for example, why the digraphs <nh> and <lh>, although functional, have not been represented, and why others, superfluous from this point-of-view, like <ct>, <gm>, <pt>, <cç>, eg., auctores, augmento, sculptura, acção, have been introduced. The chapter goes on to discuss the impact of the work of Feijó in the description of Portuguese language and his relationship with his contemporaries and predecessors. The conclusion (pp. 106-112) correlates efficiently the solutions prescribed by Feijó and the ideals of purity, tradition and prestige which underlie his proposal.

Taking into consideration the larger social and intellectual European context - the establishment of the printing press in Portugal; the political strength of the codification of the vernaculars; the growing prestige of the classical languages; the awareness of the social value of linguistic varieties - Maria Filomena succeeds in showing the historical and social reasons for the hesitations and superpositions in the creation of a graphic system of representation for a language. If her work cannot find a definitive solution to the discrepancies among the national varieties of Portuguese, it can, hopefully, shed more light on the debates.

Cristina Altman, *São Paulo*

R.R.K. Hartmann and Gregory James
Dictionary of Lexicography
London and New York: Routledge, 1998. 192 pp. ISBN 0-415-14143-5 (Hb.)

R einhard Hartmann, Director of the Dictionary Research centre at the University of Exeter and founder of EURALEX (the European Association of Lexicography) is well known for his postgraduate training in the field of lexicography. Gregory James, Director of the Language Centre at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, has undertaken research into what separates and unites European and Asian lexicography. There are several dictionaries of language and linguistics currently on the market. However, as far as I am aware, this is the only dictionary dealing specifically with lexicography. Whilst this work is not restricted to covering specifically English lexicography, that is where its main emphasis lies. This dictionary aims to examine both the theoretical and the practical aspects of lexicography and the relationship between these as well as provide a comprehensive overview of the current state of lexicography. The authors achieve all of these aims.

A dictionary of lexicography is by its very nature introspective. The many genres or types of dictionary can be structurally classified. Categories such as monolingual, bilingual, bilingualised, for example, thus form the basis of a linguistic typology. Appropriateness of the component structures of dictionaries is analysed from the points of view of macrostructure and microstructure. The user perspective considers lexicography from the point of view of the dictionary user. Translation is one very common reason for recourse to a dictionary. For example the needs of a speaker of English and a speaker of French translating a nonspecialist English text into French are not equally served by the same simple English French dictionary. The profiles of dictionary users, the various contexts of dictionary use, the functions of the dictionary and its many situations of use, and the skills necessary for, and brought to bear on dictionary use, are all taken into account in user oriented research. The increasing use of full-sentence definitions in learners' dictionaries serves as an example of the attention now being paid to users' needs. Explicit instruction in dictionary use, such as the inclusion of dictionary skills in school syllabuses and the teaching of dictionary skills in teacher training syllabuses are becoming increasingly more common. Preparation for examinations is amongst the oldest dictionary traditions in China, where dictionaries have been known for 3000 years. On the other hand in India it was within an oral tradition that dictionaries first developed; their memorisation being facilitated by metrical structure and oral recitation. In both India and

China the dictionary was considered to represent the 'best' or 'correct' language. Indeed the notion that 'the dictionary' represents some form of final authority in matters of lexical meaning and use is a very deep-seated attitude shared among many language communities around the world. However since Samuel Johnson published his *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755), lexicographers have felt the need for firm linguistic evidence on which to base their dictionaries. There are a number of operations involved in the production and compilation of dictionaries. Preliminary activities include surveying the potential market, planning the dictionary, training and recruitment of staff, etc. However there are three principal stages in the dictionary making process itself; these are data gathering, editing and publishing. The writing and editing of the entries in the entry database is central stage in the dictionary making process and in recent years dictionary compilation has been assisted by the creation of computerised dictionary databases. The production, distribution, marketing and sale of the dictionary conclude the dictionary making process. Dictionary advertising matter commonly makes claims to comprehensiveness of coverage. However cross-dictionary comparisons of coverage are frequently unmanageable. There is a proliferation of specialised dictionaries. Indeed there seems to be a dictionary for almost every conceivable lexical requirement. Nevertheless it may well be impossible to compile a truly accurate and comprehensive descriptive dictionary of an entire language. Increasing demand for training in lexicography has led to courses in Africa, China, Europe and India.

Following the Acknowledgements the front matter of this dictionary includes an Introduction followed by a section on the working methods used in the dictionary. The Introduction includes sections on theory and practice, dictionary typology, the user perspective, linguistic evidence and dictionaries, dictionary compilation, and dictionary coverage and quality. The main body of the dictionary includes over 2000 alphabetically arranged entries. Following the headword, a typical entry includes the definition, elaboration, examples, cross-references to other headwords in the dictionary or cross-references to related notions, and references. Definitions on the whole are in the formulaic style. Diagrams are occasionally used to portray certain concepts. An extremely useful feature of this book is the large number of the bibliographical references which supplement many of the entries. Icons are an interesting feature of the microstructure; these are used to distinguish cross-references, references to publications, sample of reference works and references to electronic data such as internet sites; so, for example, a small icon depicting a computer is used to indicate references to electronic data. These icons are a great help if, for example, one is scanning the dictionary rapidly in search of references on a given topic. The main body of the dictionary is followed by a 15-page bibliography which includes all the books and articles referred to in the entries.

This dictionary is both well written and accurate. It is accessible and user-friendly. Researchers in lexicography will especially find the many references found in the entries and the extensive bibliography extremely helpful. There has long been a need for such a dictionary to serve those who are researching into lexicography or lexicology. I have always found dictionaries that deal with the broader areas of language and linguistics somewhat frustrating when I consult them about specifically lexicographical terms and usages. Hartmann and James's dictionary goes a long way towards satisfying the need for a dictionary of this particular field. This would appear to be the only work of its kind, bringing this information together in an alphabetical and semasiological format in a single volume.

Jon Mills, *Luton*

A. A.Kibrik, I. M.Koboseva & I. A.Sekerina (eds)
Fundamental Trends of Modern American Linguistics.
Moscow: MSU Press, 1997. 455 pp. [Published in Russian]

The present book is a collection of surveys of contemporary American linguistics. The surveys deal with the most fundamental trends of American linguistics, such as Generative Grammar, generative approaches to the evidence from various languages (in particular, Russian), phonology, formal semantics, psycholinguistics, language acquisition, Functionalism and cognitive linguistics, and each survey also gives an introduction to the history of the subject, because the authors claim that it's almost impossible to understand any burning issue of modern linguistics without a careful look at the ideas which formed the basis for modern developments in theories of language and thought. Russian historical linguistics has always been open to dialogue with all the main schools of linguistic thought - the fundamentals of Sapir and Bloomfield, Structuralism in its full flourish and the early stages of Generative Grammar were all familiar to Russian readers. But recent years have seen a somewhat alarming tendency of Russian linguistics becoming isolated from western scientific studies, linguistics included. That is why this new collection of surveys attracted our attention - it tries to fill the information gap.

The first two chapters of the book present two different approaches to the history of Generative Grammar. One of them is written by J. Bailyn (New York State University) and is called 'A Short History of Generative Grammar'. Looking through the history of Chomsky's writings from *Syntactic Structures* to the newly published *The Minimalist Program*, the author tries to understand the main paradox in the development of Generative Grammar - how it could happen so that the first variant of it left us nothing but the basic concept of innate human language competence, governed by some independent internal laws. In his attempt to explain this phenomenon, J. Bailyn deals with the most important stages in the history of Generative Grammar beginning with the Standard Theory of the 1960s and proceeding to a profound analysis of its modifications produced in the 1970s and 1980s.

The second chapter of the collection is also devoted to a brief historical sketch of Chomsky's works, but the authors outline the subject from a different point of view - they pay special attention to some definite language phenomena that formed the empirical foundation for discussing Generative Grammar and outline how interpretation of its main ideas changed in the course of time. The authors - K. Kasenin (Moscow State University) and Y. Testeletz (Russian Academy of Science) - succeeded in proving the fact that changes in Generative Grammar which first appeared to be nothing but play with terminology and

ways of formal analysis were dictated by the internal logic of this theory and new data that attracted Chomsky's attention. In brief, these two surveys suggest a short but brilliant reconstruction of Chomsky's work in its historical context.

One of the next surveys in the collection is written by E. Zubritzkaya (The University of New York City) and is devoted to the development of classical ideas of mid-20th century phonology, including Chomsky and Halle's *The Sound Pattern of English* (1968) and Jakobson's *Observations on the Phonological Classification of Consonants* (1962). The author considers the changes which took place in the principles of organization of linguistic theory. And the last part of the book (but not the least in importance and interest) is written by I. Sekerina (Pennsylvania University) and among other important issues it presents a historical outline of American psycholinguistics. The author states that this powerful and rapidly developing linguistic discipline originated in 1951 when linguists and psychologists together announced the foundation of the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology, and briefly follows the changes in psycholinguistics which can be seen from Chomsky's 1957 and 1965 works up to the recent works by J. A. Fodor and A. Inoue (1995).

In general, this fascinating and useful set of surveys written in clear (although not primitive!) language extends our view of both historical background and of the modern situation in different trends of linguistic science, and therefore the readership of this book is not only restricted to historians and philosophers of linguistics. It could also be of great interest to students and scholars of related disciplines and to all those who are interested in the problems of human language and thought.

N. Guryanova, *Ulyanovsk State University*

Andreas Kilcher
*Die Sprachtheorie der Kabbala als ästhetisches Paradigma. Die Konstruktion
einer ästhetischen Kabbala seit der frühen Neuzeit.*
Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzeler, 1998. vii + 403 pp. ISBN 3-476-01560-2.
DM 98.00.

Cabbala is the name of a tradition of Jewish mysticism which originated in
Provence and Spain during the High Middle Ages and, after the expulsion
of the Jews from Spain in 1492, spread to other parts of Europe and Palestine.
In the course of European religious and intellectual history, it assumed many
versions. Its historically latest one is the popular Chassidism of the nineteenth
century. In his book *De Arte Cabalistica* (1517), Johannes Reuchlin was the
first to treat the relevant corpus of Hebrew texts according to the philological
methods of Humanism. In doing so, he also introduced it to the theological and
linguistic traditions of Christianity. The list of Hebrew texts he gave in his book
(including the Sefer ha-Sohar, the Sefer Jezirah, the alphabet of Rabbi Akiva
[fl. between 50 and 135], the narrative Pirkei de Rabbi Elieser [Eliezer ben
Hyrcanus, end of first cent. - to beginning of second cent.], and others) came to
be canonical for later centuries. Their path through history is marked by
reception, interpretation, translation and secularization. Whoever wants to
understand the Cabbalistic tradition must find their way through these various
phases.

The book under review follows this path through eight centuries - an
impressively massive undertaking of historiography. I find that, somewhat
contrary to the rather modest title and subtitle, the main corpus of arguments
and reports does not concern the periods after the New Modern Era but
pertains, with a remarkably homogeneous degree of attention and knowledge,
likewise to all the centuries and periods concerned. It is in the nature of the
topic that many areas of intellectual European life are covered: Jewish and
Christian theology, philology, linguistic theory, philosophy, aesthetics, literary
criticism, semiotics, interdisciplinary topics like Romanticism or Structuralism,
etc. In this review, I will be mainly concerned with the importance of the
Cabbalistic tradition for the history of linguistic ideas. The book is so rich in
argumentatively displayed historical material that it can tolerate a reviewer's
interest which is not on the focus of the author's interest.

All Cabbalistic writings are meant to be comments on older writings,
notably on the Pentateuch. The author distinguishes between a hermeneutic and
an aesthetic tradition. Besides securing and editing the texts with philological
accuracy, the hermeneutic tradition looked for the ideas behind the linguistic

surface, found meanings as expressed by language. It focussed on the semantic substance as distinguished from the semiotic means of linguistic expression, eventually establishing a history of Cabbalistic ideas. The aesthetic tradition, however, used Cabbalistic writings as a reservoir of images, tropes and figures which, in the course of intellectual history, were transposed stylistically, metaphorically, and rhetorically into other contexts. It focussed on the semiotic means of linguistic expression rather than on semantic substance.

The hermeneutic tradition is divided further into a theosophical and an ecstatic approach. In its exegetical work, the theosophical Cabbala, as founded by Rabbi Akiva, progressed from the literal meaning of texts to the allegorical one, from there to Talmudic interpretation and, finally, to the hidden, ungraspable sense. In this process, every text is open to an indefinite number of possible readings. The language under consideration, archetypically existent in the Torah, is understood to be a symbolically encoded representation of the ten divine predicates (sephirot), which together constitute the divine name. Language - or more precisely: the Hebrew letters - are thought of as the means by which God created the world. It is the ultimate aim of Cabbalistic exegesis to become aware of the hidden linguistic formulae of the Divine Being and of the world.

In contrast to this, the ecstatic Cabbala, as represented by Abraham Abulafia (1240-?1291) and Joseph Gikatilla (1248-1325), concentrated on more formal techniques devoted to the explanation of the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. They are the Gematria (i. e. the identification of letters with numbers and the construction of mathematical relations between words), the Notarikon (i.e. the manipulation of acronyms), and the Temurah (i.e. the permutation of letters according to certain rules, eventually arriving at an uncountable number of alphabets). These three techniques constitute a system of decomposition and reorganization of texts. It is the sixth way (of seven) of reading, following (i) literal reading, (ii) commenting, (iii) homiletic explanation, (iv) explaining similes and riddles, and (v) explaining irregularly written letters. It creates by semiotic manipulation (vii) the ultimate understanding of divine language.

Not the historical appearance of the Cabbalistic tradition but Hebrew as a virtual language hidden in the totality of possible letter-combinations is regarded as the pre-Babylonian perfect language out of which all languages of this world emanated. It is the (virtual) ideal semiotic system in which a mystic signification of each letter contains the name(s) of God. In studying its possibilities, for example by way of a Torah exegesis and recitation, the divine power of language transfers from God to the human being. By way of analysis, the human mind becomes aware of the great context of divine predicates and the creation. By way of synthesis, the human mind can repeat the divine speech acts within its own limits. Cabbalistic techniques then turn into a tool of magic as is shown by the story of the creation of the Golem.

The Early Modern Period - notably the translations into Latin by Paulus Ricius (d. 1541) and Guillaume Postel (1510-1581), and the works of Johannes Reuchlin and Pico della Mirandola - saw the origin of Christianizing adaptations of Cabbalistic texts, in which allegorical and topological explanations served to give them a meaning which conformed to the ideas of the Christian Heilsgeschichte. The old letter-bound techniques of decomposition and reorganization of texts were used to achieve this new aim, which gave Cabbalism a much larger platform than it had had within the Jewish tradition. One of its topical centres is again the idea of a perfect language, now generally thought of as Adamitic. The assumed singularity of Hebrew, as explained, for example, by Claude Duret and Agrippa von Nettsheim, stimulated the idea that in general, i.e. outside the Hebrew tradition, a system of linguistic signs was possible which totally depended on the meanings and the combinations of its elementary units. There are many demonstrable relations between authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Andreae, Bacon, Comenius, Boehme, the Rosicrucians, etc.) and Cabbalistic ideas. But, more important than these, the concept per se of an *ars combinatoria* as an ideal means of communication and of storing all the knowledge of the world reveals the historical importance of Cabbalism. It comes to the surface in secret languages as described in John Wilkins's *Mercury* (1641), in Franciscus Mercurius van Helmont's concept of the Hebrew letters as natural sounds which fall into the patterns of natural words and sentences, and of course in the combinatorial systems planned by Athanasius Kircher - who identified the Hebrew letters with hieroglyphs - and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. The author emphasizes that, in spite of later references, Raimundus Lullus and Giordano Bruno do not belong to this type of *ars combinatoria* with a Cabbalistic background, because their ideas of the letter as a linguistic unit and the human memory were quite alien to its assumptions.

The application of Cabbalistic mysticism to nature and its objects in Paracelsian and Rosicrucian works is a new element in Cabbala reception. It exploits the possibility that letters (names) as symbols of the essence of items of reality (their Signaturen) can be made the tools of magic operations. Here the talismanic side of the Cabbala amalgamates with Neo-Platonic ideas. Its peak is Agrippa von Nettesheim's *De Occulta Philosophia* (1533). It may very well be that the influence of this book on the various universal language schemes in the following century, for example on John Wilkins's *Essay* (1668), is much larger than assumed so far (Michael Isermann, private communication) and exceeds the general background effect on these projects which Cabbalism undoubtedly had.

So far the Cabbalistic tradition had irrational (mystic) as well as rational (formal) features. Both gave it an important role in the history of linguistic ideas. In the age of Enlightenment, however, it lost its position. The Cabbala was now an anti-rational phenomenon par excellence, either acknowledged in a

historical perspective as a natural but outdated pre-rational religion or criticized and even ridiculed as esoteric magic. Its basis was regarded as neither empirical nor rational - the only two sources of knowledge which were acknowledged - but a fantastic and purely aesthetic playing with words. First signs of obvious antisemitism are obvious in this context. More agreeable is the interpretation of Freemasonry as a late form of Cabbalistic societies exercising an esoteric humanism of tolerance and intercultural understanding. Even the enlightened Jewish tradition in the narrow sense looked for a rationalization of Cabbalistic ideas. The author judges this phase as a path towards the aesthetic paradigm of the German Romantic era to come. The historiographer of linguistic ideas cannot help but state that the Cabbala was no longer the general background nor a topic under linguistic discussion. It became an object of philosophical controversial reasoning.

One direct effect of the critical assessment of Cabbalistic writings during the Enlightenment was to intensify and broaden the knowledge of the old texts. Otherwise, the reception of the Cabbala in the era of Romanticism in Germany went back to the ideas of a universal model of language and language-bound knowledge as developed in the seventeenth century. The awareness of Cabbalistic ideas now became truly aesthetic in that it concentrated on the rhetorical and figurative character of the relevant texts, but moved away from the Jewish origins of this tradition. It is in the deliberations of Novalis (Friedrich von Hardenberg) and Friedrich Schlegel that the identification of 'Cabbalistic' with aesthetic qualities of language as the centre of a Romantic awareness of the unity of nature, i.e. God and the world, is most prominent. The reception of Cabbalism shifted almost entirely to philosophy and literature. Its magical topics became a popular motif of narrative writing (e.g. the Golem story). Closer to the area of linguistic ideas are Johann Georg Hamann's and Johann Gottfried Herder's conceptions of the Ursprache of mankind. For both, this first language was determined by aesthetic and not by theological arguments, although their controversy was about its non-divine origin. And these aesthetic arguments were taken from the context of Cabbalism. They are the musical features, visual concreteness, rich synonyms and metaphors which the original language (speech) of mankind was assumed to abound in. Hamann identified it with the language of the Cabbala and made it the prototype on which to model the style of his own writings. Herder had a more critical view and regarded the Cabbala as a degenerated form of this earliest language of mankind which he found most clearly represented in folk poetry. He outdid, as it were, the concept of historical Cabbalistic language with its own idealized qualities.

The twentieth century is marked by a historiographical and philological treatment of the Cabbalistic tradition according to present-day historiographical standards. Leading among the many experts is Gershom Scholem, who in his contact with Walter Benjamin developed his own concept of language as a tool

of reason and revelation in which mysticism and mathematics are united. Among many others, Umberto Eco stands out with his idea of indefinite semiosis, i.e. the endless reference of one text to other and ever more texts in which meaning is grasped as what it really is - ungraspable. Finally, there is Jacques Derrida. For him, truth, this pivotal point of a logocentric language theory, is nothing but the endless play of deconstruction. Texts do not have any signifié any more, they are complex signifiants in an endless chain of references. Derrida calls this exile, i.e. the ever unfulfilled promise of a homeland (i.e. meaning). As there are no longer fixed authors nor fixed meanings, the letters as the substantial units of language assume a life of their own. This is 'grammatology'. Except for its perfectly secular character, no linguistic theory was ever closer to the Cabbalistic tradition than this one.

Reading Andreas Kilcher's book is an intellectual enterprise which is worthwhile and rewarding even for such historiographers (like the present reviewer) whose main concern is not Jewish intellectual history. There are several reasons for this.

First, semantically and, even more so, formally the Cabbala tradition is uncovered as yet another stable complex of ideas and language-focussed techniques extant over eight centuries of European intellectual life and in the background of many phenomena which we do not normally associate with Hebrew mysticism. This enhances our historiographical knowledge. Particularly noteworthy in this respect are for me the idea of a perfect (universal) language in the seventeenth century and present-day text-semiotics.

Second, the special Cabbalistic methodology of commenting on the Bible appears in a number of features as the prototype of reading historical texts, which is also a main concern, for example, of linguistics and the historiography of linguistic ideas. Once again in European intellectual life, it is a theological position which exercises its influence through many centuries, even if eventually in secularized ways. For the Cabbalistic mystic, the Urtext is pure virtuality, it is the potential of all possible readings which are being produced in history. It is a written text with the indefinite possibilities of letter configurations to be realized by oral actualizations (which may then be written down). To use a Cabbalistic image: it is a white fire in front of white paper which becomes readable only when turned into black flames (the Hebrew letters). It is the perfect world to be turned into imperfect reality. In this way, the Cabbalistic position becomes an allegory of our work with historical material. Beyond all theological considerations which are attached to the Bible, any historical text is alive only as a sequence of readings, sometimes quite divergent in their semantics. Every era produces its own conditions of understanding. Consequently, every era produces its own versions of history. 'Tradition' is the change in the ways of understanding to which one and the same text is subjected.

Third, as a corollary of this, the Cabbala also appears as the prototype of historiographical work. In the same way in which it cannot be separated into 'original' and 'derived' versions, we cannot separate 'history' from 'historiography'. It is not the task of historiographical treatments of linguistic literature to find out what 'linguistics was all about' in the past, but such treatments are the only ways in which to speak of history, in spite of the fact that historiography is always subject to the conditions of its own present. To use a Kantian term: at any time, the historiography of the present provides us with the conditions of the possibility of recognizing the past (Hüllen 1996, 1998).

REFERENCES

Hüllen, Werner 1996. Schemata der Historiographie. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6.1, 113-125.
---- (1998). Die Historiographie als Aufforderung zum kritischen Anachronismus. In: Peter Schmitter and Marijke van der Wal (eds.), *Metahistoriography. Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of the Historiography of Linguistics*. Münster: Nodus, 171-181.

Some topics of the book are also treated in:
Eco, Umberto 1993. *La ricerca della lingua perfetta nella cultura europea*. Rome: Laterza. (English translation: *Search for the Perfect Language*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.)
See:
Hüllen, Werner 1994. Umberto Eco's journey through European linguistics. *The Henry Sweet Society Newsletter* 23,5-10.

Werner Hüllen, *Düsseldorf*

Friedrich Kluge
Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache
Bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. 23. erweiterte Auflage. Berlin/New York:
Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
lxiv, 921 pp. ISBN 3-11-012922-1.

No expert in Germanic studies or historical linguistics in general would deny that, since Friedrich Kluge (1856-1926), one of the core members of the Neogrammarian movement specializing in historical study of Germanic languages (cf. Jankowsky 1972: 144ff), published the first edition in 1883, his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* ('Etymological Dictionary of the German Language') has always been counted as one of the most reliable reference tools for etymological research not simply of New High German, but also in the sphere of Germanic languages such as English, Dutch, Norwegian, Icelandic, Swedish, Danish. Even after the passing of Kluge, this etymological dictionary was revised repeatedly by distinguished historical linguists such as Alfred Götze (1876-1946), Wolfgang Krause (1895-1970), Hans Krahe (1898-1965), Alfred Schirmer (b. 1887), and Walther Mitzka (1888-1976), all of whom, without exception, represent Germanic or Indo-European linguistics at the time of each revision (cf. Neumann 1971: 110-111). With the ceaselessly elaborate contributions of these scholars throughout the span of more than one hundred years, *Kluge* has solved a number of problems which the etymological dictionary faces by nature (cf. Objartel 1983) and, therefore, has obtained so high a reputation that the name of "Kluge" today is regarded as a word synonymous with the "authentic" etymological dictionary for German linguistic scholarship.

The 22nd edition (1989), the first revised version since 1967, incorporates significant revisions in the long history of *Kluge*. As several reviewers have commented (e.g. Knight 1990, Jeep 1991, Grimm 1991, Polomé 1993), this edition is a completely new work with an entirely innovative format. The chief reviser Elmar Seebold (b. 1934), one of today's most esteemed historical linguists, also declares in the preface that this new edition is "insofern ein völlig neues Buch, als der Lemma-Bestand grundlegend systematisiert worden ist, und alle Artikel nach einem festen Schema aufgebaut und neu geschrieben sind (a completely new book in that the entries have been fundamentally systematized and all the articles are designed and newly written according to a definite scheme)" (Kluge 1989: vii).

Some reviewers regard the significantly increased number of foreign-term entries (Knight 1990: 70, Jeep 1991: 185, Grimm 1991: 186) and the considerable variety of references to other articles (Jeep 1991: 185) as the

major differences made by the new systematizing in the 22nd edition. In addition, some fifty four pages of introductory remarks outlining "the making-up of the dictionary (xi-xiii), terminology (xiv-xxxvi), representation of foreign (i.e. non-German) alphabets and sounds (xxxvii-xl), and abbreviations, including citations of relevant literature and reference works (xli-lxv)" (Jeep 1991: 185) are acknowledged as a remarkable supplement of invaluable information to this etymological dictionary as well as to the basic knowledge of historical linguistics.

Compared with the 22nd edition, the latest 23rd version is enlarged by as many as one hundred pages, but does not change so remarkably in the fundamental principle of organizing the dictionary as observed in the previous revision. In the preface (vii), Seebold mentions three reasons for publishing this most recently revised edition, which can be summarized in a word as the result of "scientific rigor". In other words, Seebold intends to supplement newly established theory and more reliable information and discards as many descriptions as possible which are "für den Benutzer unwichtig (unimportant for the user)", so that *Kluge* may keep the consistency of a unified scheme in format and contents. As an example, I take the article on "Seele (soul)" to compare these two editions:

> 23rd edition (1995):
> Seele *f.* (< 8. Jh.). Mhd. *sēle*, ahd. *sē(u)la*, as. *sē(o)la* aus g. **saiwalō f.*
> "Seele", auch in gt. *saiwala*, ae. *sāwol*. Herkunft unklar. Adjektiv:
> *seelisch*; Präfixableitung: *beseelen*, entsprechend *entseelt*.
> Nndl. *ziel*, ne. *soul*. - H. Adolf: *Wortgeschichtliche Studien zum*
> *Leib/Seele-Problem* (Wien 1937); J. Weisweiler *IF* 57 (1940), 25-55; G.
> Becker: *Geist und Seele* (Heidelberg 1964); B. La Farge: *'Leben' und*
> *'Seele' in den altgermanischen Sprachen* (Heidelberg 1991); Röhrich 3
> (1992), 1455-1457.

> 22nd edition (1989):
> Seele *f.* Mhd. *sēle*, ahd. *sē(u)la*, as. *sē(o)la* aus g. **saiwalō f.* "Seele",
> auch in gt. *saiwala*, ae. *sāwol*. Herkunft unklar.
> Nndl. *ziel*, ne. *soul*. - J. Weisweiler *IF* 57 (1940), 25-55; G. Becker:
> *Geist und Seele* (Heidelberg 1964).

At first glance, both editions are virtually identical in the style and the manner of describing etymological explanation of "Seele". The difference, however minor it may be, is that in the 23rd edition some derived words are juxtaposed and some new references are added, which is, as we see the reviewers indicating above, one of the important revised items in the 23rd edition. The 23rd edition is thus, as Seebold says, an "erweiterte Auflage (enlarged

edition)", but, unlike the previous one, not a "völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage (completely newly revised edition)".

What I would like to indicate as the common feature between the 22nd and the 23rd editions of *Kluge* is the increased number of the final judgment: "Herkunft unklar (etymology unknown)". It might be sheerly my impression, but let us take a look at the following etymological explanations of "Seele" in the 15th and 11th editions. (The reason I have chosen these two editions is as follows: The 15th edition, published in 1951 in the name of Friedrich Kluge and Alfred Götze with the help of Hans Krahe and Alfred Schirmer, experiences no fundamental change in description until the 21st edition of Mitzka. The 11th edition, revised by Alfred Götze with the support of Wolfgang Krause, is retained unchanged throughout the 14th edition. In short, the 11th and the 15th versions of *Kluge* are the two "mile-stone" editions between Kluge's decease in 1926 and Seebold's first thorough-going revision in 1989.)

> 15th edition (1951) [not changed until the 21st edition (1975):
> Seele *f.* mhd. afries. *sēle*, ahd. *sē(u)la*, asächs. *seola, siala,* anfr. *sēla,*
> mnl. *siele,* nnl. *ziel,* ags. *sāwol,* engl. *soul,* got. *saiwala.* Awestnord.
> *sāl(a),* isl. *sāl,* norw. *saal,* aschwed. *siāl,* schwed. *sjāl,* dän. *sjæl* beruhen
> auf Entlehung teils aus dem Ags., teils aus dem Asächs. Urgerm.
> **saiwalō* 'die vom See stammende, zum See gehörige' ist *l*-Ableitung
> von **saiwa-z* (s. See). Bestimmte Seen galten den Germanen als
> Aufenthaltsort der Seelen vor der Geburt und nach dem Tode: J.
> Weisweiler 1940 Idg. Forsch. 57, 25ff.

> 11th edition (1934) [not changed until the14th edition (1948)]:
> Seele F. mhd. *sēle,* ahd. *sēla.* Die ahd. Form steht für **se-wla* mit
> Verstummen des *w* im Silbenanlaut (vgl. ahd. *lērahha* aus **lē-wrahha*
> unter Lerche, ahd. *hīrāt* für **hī-wrāt* unter Heirat) wie im Wortanlaut (s.
> lispeln). Daneben selten ahd. *sēula,* asächs. *seola, siala* (daraus entlehnt
> schwed. *sjāl*), anl. *sēla,* afries. *sēle,* ags.*sāwol* (daraus entlehnt anord.
> *sāl, sāla*), got. *saiwala.* Dem germ. **saiwalō* entspricht lautlich fast
> genau gr. αἰόλος (aus **saiuolos* oder **saiuelos*) 'beweglich'. Auch der
> Bed. nach ist diese Verbindung möglich, da die Seele im Volksglauben
> als ein (im Gegensatz zu dem erdgebundenen Körper) bewegliches
> Wesen (Schmetterling, Maus, Schlange, Vogel) gedacht wird.
> Bemerkenswert ist, daß auch gr. αἰόλος sonst etymologisch vereinzelt
> ist.

Both editions show different explanations concerning the original meaning of "Seele". I do not intend to judge here which interpretation is more reliable or

more persuasive, but merely wish to indicate that these older editions present quite interesting interpretations of the etymology of "Seele".

As a matter of fact, in the older editions we often come across insightful, imaginative, inspiring as well as instructive explanations of the original meaning in a number of entries, even if they seem to be merely trivial hypotheses. Needless to say, not a few "Herkunft-unklar" words in German must exist despite long-standing tremendous efforts of etymologists. However, in the 22nd and 23rd editions, I should acknowledge, the final judgment of "Herkunft unklar" appears too frequently, making me, as well as many "etymology-enthusiasts", somewhat disappointed.

What makes a difference in the etymological explanation of "Seele" in the 11th edition compared with the 15th edition is Weisweiler's detailed survey of the semantic relationship between "Seele (soul)" and "See (sea)" (1940). From this viewpoint, he attempts one possible interpretation of the *Herkunft* of "Seele". The revisers of the 15th edition (i.e. Hans Krahe and Alfred Schirmer) may appreciate Weisweiler's investigation and, as a result, adopt the implied hypothesis as *Kluge*'s "official" etymological explanation of "Seele". Mitzka makes no new attempts, nor does he add any new findings to this article in his revised editions. The revisers of the 11th edition (i.e. Wolfgang Krause and Alfred Götze), six years before the publication of Weisweiler's assertion, present their own etymological interpretation of "Seele". It follows then that Krahe and Schirmer as well as Mitzka accepted Weisweiler's interpretation as the most plausible explanation of the etymology of "Seele" and discarded the older description provided by Krahe and Schirmer because it was no longer valid. In any case, the revisers of the 11th and 15th editions present their own etymological views concerning the word "Seele". Consequently, I find myself wondering why the revisers of the 22nd and 23rd editions have not followed this tradition, but feel inclined, instead, to take refuge in "Herkunft unklar". From the referential notes attached to almost all the entries in these new editions, it is possible to trace some interpretations on the origin of "Seele" including Weisweiler's. But from the details of the contents of the article itself, the readers of the newest *Kluge* cannot glean any inspiring revelations.

There may be various reasons why Seebold and his assistants discard Weisweiler's hypothesis and go no further than "Herkunft unklar". The most probable reason may be related, as mentioned before, to the scientific rigor and the intellectual honesty of these revisers. Some reviewers of the 22nd edition of *Kluge* have noted this attitude as follows:

> It [the 22nd edition] incorporates new research and recently accepted theories. What no longer corresponds to current thinking in research has been cut out. Attention has been given to what can actually be substantiated (Knight 1990: 70).

       Numerous items from the old edition have been eliminated, because of infrequent usage or regional restrictions, or because they were deemed not in need of etymological explanation. Of course many of these decisions are subjective in nature, but on the whole good judgement was used (Jeep 1991: 185).

       Die Neubearbeitung zeichnet sich insgesamt durch ein hohes Maß an Wissenschaftlichkeit aus. Die Bearbeiter beschränken sich zumeist auf das tatsächlich Belegbare. Manche (wenn auch durchaus informative) Weitschweifigkeit früherer Auflagen wurde auf das Relevante verkürzt [...]. Mit bewundernswerter Konsequenz wurden neuere Forschungsergebnisse eingearbeitet. Das zeigen schon die zahlreichen Literaturverweise, die oft bis in die 70er und 80er Jahre unseres Jahrhunderts reichen [...]. Begründeten Hypothesen wird selbstverständlich auch weiterhin Raum gewährt (Grimm 1991: 186). [The new edition excels by a high degree of scholarly standard. The revisers confine themselves mostly in what is actually provable. Many a long-winded description of earlier editions (even if they are certainly informative) was shortened to what is relevant [...]. With admirable consistency, newer results of research were incorporated. This becomes apparent from numerous references which often reach to the 70s and 80s of this century [...]. As a matter of course, this edition continues providing space for well-founded hypotheses.]

As we see from the quotations above, the revisers' consistency and rigor as researchers require them to replace many scientifically untenable etymological "stories" with the simple phrase "Herkunft unklar" or some other similar expressions.

       I am eager to praise this earnest endeavor to achieve exactness in scientific research, that is, this commitment to consistent scientific "Gründlichkeit" (cf. Polomé 1993: 377ff) and, moreover, I am by no means reluctant to appraise the 23rd edition of *Kluge* as the most up-to-date among the contemporary dictionaries of the etymology of the German language. I know it is the consequence of accurate and comprehensive investigation to assert that the etymology of particular words is unknown. Nevertheless, I would have to insist that an etymological dictionary indicate any type of information of the original meaning of as many entries as possible, even if they seem to be hypotheses or mere "anecdotes", instead of dismissing them just comfortably as "Herkunft unklar". *Kluge* is, also in my opinion, "nicht nur für Fachleute, sondern auch für etymologisch und sprachhistorisch interessierte Laien ein wertvolles und weithin geschätztes Nachschlagewerk (a valuable and highly admirable reference not only for specialists, but also for laymen who are interested in etymology and the history of language)" (Schröter 1996: 511).

Therefore, even a plausible hypothesis is welcome, as long as it *can satisfy* our intellectual curiosity and inspire our etymological imagination, which may be the most effective device for the etymological inquiry and is bound to yield results in an area which so-called scientific research cannot cover. If standard philological evidence in an etymological investigation is of no avail, imagination may be the only possible way to reach the most persuasive etymological interpretation of a word.

While we concede that scientific strictness in the 22nd and 23rd editions excels in comparison with the previous editions, we can still expect to derive valuable insights in the older versions of *Kluge*. As a consequence, we are well advised to keep older editions of *Kluge* on hand. Indeed, this caution might well apply to a great number of reference works after a new edition has arrived, as new editions of reference books are not necessarily the better versions in every aspect.

REFERENCES

Grimm, Hans-Jürgen. 1991. Besprechung von Friedrich Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. (22. Auflage. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989). *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 28:3, 186-187.

Jankowsky, Kurt R. 1972. *The Neogrammarians. A Re-Evaluation of Their Place in the Development of Linguistic Science*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Jeep, John M. 1991. Review of Friedrich Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. (22nd edition. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989). *Language* 67:1, 184-185.

Kluge, Friedrich. 1995. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. 23., erweiterte Auflage. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

---- 1989. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 22. Auflage unter Mithilfe von Max Bürgisser und Bernd Gregor völlig neu bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

---- / Götze Alfred. 1953. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 16. Auflage bearbeitet von Walther Mitzka. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

---- 1934. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Elfte Auflage mit Unterstützung durch Wolfgang Krause bearbeitet von Alfred Götze. Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.

Knight, G. A. 1990. Review of Friedrich Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. (22nd edition. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989). *The Linguist. Journal of the Institute of Linguists* 29:2, 70.

Neumann, Friedrich. 1971. *Studien zur Geschichte der deutschen Philologie. Aus der Sicht eines alten Germanisten*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Objartel, Georg. 1983. Zur Geschichte des 'Kluge': Probleme eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der deutschen Sprache. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* **11:3**, 268-289.

Polomé, Edgar C. 1993. Review of Recent Etymological Dictionaries. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* **21:3-4**, 376-380.

Schröter, Ulrich. 1996. Besprechung von Friedrich Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. (23. Auflage. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995). *Leuvense Bijdragen* **85:3-4**, 511-513.

Weisweiler, Josef. 1940. Seele und See. Ein etymologischer Versuch. *Indogermanische Forschungen* **57:1**, 25-55.

Hiroyuki Eto, *Georgetown University, Washington, DC*

Charles Monaghan
The Murrays of Murray Hill
Brooklyn (New York): Urban History Press, 1998.
166pp. ISBN 0-9662430-0-5.

In 1996, the Henry Sweet Society published Two Hundred Years of Lindley
Murray, a collection of essays edited by Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade that
commemorated the 200th anniversary of the publication of Lindley Murray's
English Grammar (1795). The writers who contributed to this volume focused
their attention on a variety of topics related to Murray's landmark textbook on
English grammar such as the book's reception, its sources, its influence on
teaching English in Germany, its effect on pronunciation, and its influence on
spelling. While disparate in their themes, the writers addressed the place of the
textbook in the history of English linguistics.

To the Murray collection, Charles Monaghan contributed the
introductory biographical essay, "Lindley Murray, American". In *The Murrays
of Murray Hill*, Monaghan offers us a fuller biography of Lindley Murray: he
begins his study with the arrival of the Murrays in America, with particular
attention to their business success in New York, and concludes with Murray's
self-imposed exile to Holdgate, England. There, Murray launched his prolific
and successful career as a writer, especially of textbooks on English grammar.
Monaghan's history is an engaging study of Murray and his family in particular
and of mid to late eighteenth century New York in general: it treats the
transitional years in American history leading up to, including, and immediately
followingthe Revolutionary War.

Following an inventory of his sources, Monaghan sketches a history of
the Murray and the Lindley families in Pennsylvania where Murray was born in
1745. Murray's father, Robert, immigrated to Pennsylvania from Ireland in
1732; and there he met and married Mary Lindley in 1744. Soon after, the
Murrays lived for intervals in Philadelphia and North Carolina before settling in
New York in 1753. In his third chapter, Monaghan describes "The Spectacular
Rise of RobertMurray in New York." Drawn to the shipping business,
Murray's father became prosperous and influential to the extent that Murray
"was a wealthy and privileged youth, the scion of a rich family, from a home
that welcomed international travelers" (22).

Chapter 4, "The Enlightenment Education of Lindley Murray," is
particularly relevant to our understanding of Murray as English grammarian. As
Monaghan aptly notes, Murray's education "provides a casebook for examining
the way children of the American mercantile gentry were brought up in the

1750s and 1760s" (23). As Murray stated in his memoirs, he began his formal education at Benjamin Franklin's Academy and Charitable School in Philadelphia where he was immersed in the Travels of Cyrus and "agreeably exercised in the business of parsing sentences" (24). He completed his school education in North Carolina and New York; and after briefly working as an accountant in his father's business, he studied business under the tutelage of Robert Waln in Philadelphia and law under Benjamin Kissam in New York. Kissam also tutored John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in the United States. Until his departure for England, Murray practised law.

In this chapter, Monaghan convincingly argues that Murray received a broad and traditional liberal education that cultivated in him a life-long respect of the integration of knowledge and a love of language. Murray was knowledgeable in many areas including Latin and French literature, science, literature, business, and law. Monaghan draws on Murray's published reading texts as the sources for his conclusions. While Monaghan drifts into unsupported conjecture at times, such as suggesting that he may have studied French to read Voltaire, for the most part, he keeps his conclusions grounded in the evidence of his sources. Also, the reader will sense in this chapter that Monaghan could have been more specific as to the relationship of Murray's education and his concept of language. Perhaps he would have concluded that Murray did not consider or read the theoretical linguistics of his time – a conclusion that would help us understand Murray's motivation for writing his grammar.

Chapters 5 and 6 treat the American Revolution and Murray's loyalist position prior to the war. These chapters, in many respects, are probably the most illuminating of the whole biography because they elucidate what has been uncertain about Murray – his opposition to the Revolution and his departure to England to avoid the consequences of his politically incorrect position. While Murray claimed that he moved to England in 1784 for his health, Monaghan helps us understand the difficult situation that Murray needed to leave behind him.

In Chapters 7, 8, and 9, Monaghan discusses Murray's life in England, where he continued to work on the social justice issues promoted by his fellow Quakers: for example, he advocated for the freedom and education of slaves. Soon, his main work was writing; and in 1787, he published his first book, *The Power of Religion on the Mind in Retirement*, which Monaghan asserts was "the most influential of Lindley's works outside his textbooks, becoming a staple of Quaker reading well into the nineteenth century" (93). As he became involved with education, he was inspired to write his textbooks on English: *English Grammar* (1795), *English Exercises, Adapted to the Grammar* (1797), *Key to the Exercises* (1797), *English Reader* (1799), *Sequel to the English Reader* (1800), *Introduction to the English Reader* (1801) *An Abridgment of L. Murray's English Grammar* (1801), *An English Spelling Book* (1804), *First*

Book for Children (1805), and a two volume *English Grammar* (1808). In addition, he wrote two French textbooks.

While the material in the final chapters should help readers keep track of the unprecedented number of editions of Murray's works that were printed during his life and well after his death in 1826, the appendix, "Lindley Murray's Publishing Numbers" was the most useful section of the book for appreciating Murray's success as a writer of English grammar textbooks. For example, Monaghan's tables reveal that *English Grammar* was published in 52 editions by 1832, *English Exercises* in 56 editions by 1854, *An Abridgment* in 133 editions by 1845, *English Reader* in 25 editions by 1842, and *Spelling-Book* in 44 editions by 1834. Monaghan calculates that the total production of Murray's textbooks reached 15.5 million copies by 1840 – "making him the largest-selling author in the world in the first four decades of the nineteenth century" (135). Monaghan also provides his reader with a summary of editions of the *English Reader* in America from 1799 through 1860.

Monaghan's history is intended for many audiences, including those interested in the history of the Colonies, of Pennsylvania, of New York, of the Quakers, and of Lindley Murray's textbooks. As a result, it is difficult to characterize and criticize the book as a history of linguistics per se, but the work does provide a fascinating glimpse of the intellectual and political milieu of the person who is responsible for writing several of the most popular textbooks on grammar ever published. If Monaghan intended his book solely for historians of linguistics, he would have shown more relevance of the biography of Murray to his writing on grammar. Also, he would have analyzed Murray's textbooks in linguistic terms. However, if he had done so, he would have lost his other audiences.

For those interested in Lindley Murray's life and/or the American Revolutionary period, I recommend the book. I would not recommend it for those who are looking for a book that will analyze Murray's theory of grammar.

REFERENCES

Ramsay, Andrew Michael. 1752. *The Travels of Cyrus*. London.
Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid (ed). 1996. *Two Hundred Years of Lindley Murray*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen (The Henry Sweet Society Studies in the History of Linguistics, vol.2.).

Joseph L. Subbiondo, *Saint Mary's College of California, Moraga, California.*

Stephen O. Murray
American Sociolinguistics: Theorists and Theory Groups.
Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1998. x + 339pp. Pr. NLG 60.
ISBN 90 272 2178 2

This abridgement of Murray's 1994 book contains a condensed version of its first chapter followed by the bulk of chapters 8, 10-14 and 16-18 (with parts rearranged) and the 'Appendix on methods'. A new five-page chapter on 'Midwestern Semiotics and Georgetown Pragmatics' is almost entirely about Michael Silverstein, apart from a page on semiotics at Indiana University and a brief paragraph on sociolinguistics at Georgetown. Anyone who has the 1994 book is unlikely to want this one as well, except possibly Michael Silverstein. It should also be noted that much of the material dates back to Murray's 1979 doctoral thesis and has been repeatedly published by him in various guises, including a 1983 book (Murray 1983a).

My mostly glowing review of the 1994 book (within the review article Joseph 1995) included a few criticisms, some of which Murray has responded to here. Most of my attention was given to the chapters which have not been included here, but on the material relevant to this book I had the following to say:

> No one has told the story of how sociolinguistics developed in the U.S. with the wealth of detail and personal insight that Murray brings to it; in that area alone his book will endure as a primary source for as long as American linguistic history is studied [...] [F]or anyone with a keen and unbiased interest in the history of linguistics in the 20th century [...] Murray has produced a work of real importance. In some areas, [...] [including] the early history of sociolinguistics, it is unparalleled. (Joseph 1995: 381-382)

Perhaps it isn't fair to compare an abridgement with the original, since, unless the original was overly long (which Murray 1994 wasn't), one is bound to dwell on disappointments over what has been left out rather than consider the shorter work on its own merits. But then it isn't possible for me to read this latest incarnation as if I didn't know the previous one. Among the handful of things I can say in the new one's favour is that it is much more affordable, and that the space given to the sociological model which had formed the basis of Murray's 1979 doctoral thesis (and which, it will surprise no one to hear, was already outdated by 1994) is greatly reduced.

You get what you pay for, however, and by detaching the development of sociolinguistics from its roots in earlier anthropological and structural linguistics, and even from Chomskyan goings-on contemporary with it, the new book decontextualises and impoverishes Murray's account more than one might have anticipated. The material remains unique and invaluable to specialists, though again they will want to consult the fuller version. Non-specialists are likely to find the rearranged material as a detached history of American sociolinguistics confusing. Most of the principal sources of American sociolinguistics are discussed somewhere in the book, but scattered across chapters not originally drafted so as to tell this story as such. As a history of American sociolinguistics, Koerner (1995) is a clearer guide.

A book with the title *American Sociolinguistics* would do its readers a service by starting off with a general overview and a definition of what it takes sociolinguistics to include and exclude. As it is, the book opens with a description of itself as "This study of postwar *anthropological* linguistics in North America" (emphasis added). Eh? Sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics aren't interchangeable terms, are they? Adding to the confusion, the back cover says that "This is a revised version of *Theory Groups and the Study of Language in North America* (1994), the post-World-War-II history of the emergence of sociolinguistics in North America [...]" — but the 1994 book wasn't that. It opened by calling itself "This study of anthropological — and not-so anthropological — linguistics in North America". The first nine of its 18 chapters contain nothing relating directly to the emergence of sociolinguistics, but instead trace the emergence of Chomskyan linguistics via Sapir, Bloomfield and the Neo-Bloomfieldians. Moreover, it is hardly precise to call the new book a 'revised' version of the earlier one, when with few exceptions the revisions are cuts, and substantial cuts at that.

Despite these quirks, there is an abundance of rich material on early work on language by American sociologists like Stanley Lieberson and Paul Hanly Furfey, students of language contact like Einar Haugen and Uriel Weinreich, early sociolinguistic work by Wallace Lambert and Roger Brown, ethnographers of speaking, particularly John Gumperz and his students, including Deborah Tannen, ethnoscientists like Ward Goodenough and Floyd Lounsbury, as well as Erving Goffman, Harold Garfinkel, and dozens of other lesser known figures — all this in addition to the 'mainstream' sociolinguists like Charles Ferguson, William Bright, Susan Ervin-Tripp, Dell Hymes and William Labov. It is refreshing to have Labov decentralised as he is here, in view of the general tendency to see his work as defining American sociolinguistics. Again, however, this is liable to be disorienting to nonspecialist readers in the absence of an introductory overview.

My review article also noted that, in an advance from the 1983a version, "he does not strive for a fiction of objectivity, but inserts himself directly into the study. Thus he deals at some length with his own training in 'third-

generation Berkeley sociolinguistics'" (Joseph 1995: 389). I tried to present both the positive and negative aspects of this complex matter, while making clear that on balance I applauded Murray for doing it. In the new book, however, Murray has added a note (p. 262, n. 4) in which he says that "Joseph (1995: 389, n. 10) stomping on my first attempt since [Murray 1983b] at experience-near ethnography of linguistic anthropology is definitely discouraging [...]". This was in response to my saying that the section on Berkeley sociolinguistics was "one of the less interesting sections of the book. It is another case — and this is the other side of the postmodernist argument — of closeness distorting perspective". At this point came the note Murray refers to as my 'stomping on' him, where I actually argue in favour of proceeding as he has done, note that it is a difficult thing to bring off well, and then, apparently what so wounded him, I remark that "With no disrespect intended to either Hockett or Murray, Murray on Berkeley sociolinguistics in the early 1980s sounds more like Hockett on the neo-Bloomfieldians than like Murray on the neo-Bloomfieldians". This is 'stomping'? My point, which I had assumed would be clear from what preceded in the review, was that the mercilessly critical stance Murray takes when exposing the weaknesses of others is not maintained in the section on Berkeley sociolinguistics. There are criticisms, but nothing like the rough ride the Neo-Bloomfieldians get. Murray's new footnote goes on to say that my remark is "unfair, I think, in that I looked at documentary data, made clear that I did not think my own group was the sole (or even the primary) engine of progress, and did not take the "I was there, thus I know" stance [...]". This comment merely proves my point: the three things Murray lists are criticisms of Hockett — apt ones at that, but look at how Murray homes in on them with brutal and razor-sharp clarity. That is the kind of treatment he doesn't mete out to himself and his Berkeley contemporaries, which is why that part of Murray (1994) is less interesting than those which 'stomp' on Sapir, Chomsky and so many others. The former material has been retained in the new book, the latter has not (although Murray's *bêtes noires* receive plenty of sideswipes *en passant*). But this is by no means to say that the 'experience-near ethnography' is *un*interesting, on top of which the relative level of interest takes little if anything away from its documentary and ethnographic value.

On one criticism made by me and others, Murray has *nearly* given in: he remarks that "reviewers have been appalled by my drawing comparisons of Noam Chomsky to Mao Zhedong in unleashing new lines and new waves of zealots" (256). Actually, Murray (1994: 445) compares Chomsky with both Stalin and Mao in successive sentences, and writes not only of new waves of zealots but of "Constant purges, persistent rhetoric about a sacred 'revolution' accompanied by persistent misgovernment" and so on. But he fails to grasp that what matters isn't 'appalled' reviewers but the fact that, as I wrote in my earlier review, "for a historian to equate a scholar whose tactics he dislikes with the

great mass murderers of the century hardly inspires confidence in his detachment and objectivity" (Joseph 1995: 387).

That was an understatement. What is strange about Murray's books, or rather his evolving book in its various incarnations, has been the coexistence of, on the one hand, an obsession with seemingly rigorous and objective (but questionable and increasingly outdated) sociological method, and on the other, intense emotional reactions to some of the figures he is writing about, Chomsky above all, but Sapir as well and many others besides. One more advantage the new book has over its 1994 predecessor is the reduction of this cognitive dissonance, partly because the sociological model has had its role trimmed to the point that the term obsession no longer applies, and partly because the figures over whom it is most impossible for Murray to feign objectivity are only marginal characters in this abridgement. Nevertheless, my best hope for the present book is that its price will induce many to buy it who will then be led to the 1994 volume, which, warts and all, is still its author's *magnum opus* and the more compelling read.

REFERENCES

Joseph, John E. 1995. The Structure of Linguistic Revolutions. *Historiographia Linguistica* 22, 379-399.
Koerner, Konrad. 1995. Toward a History of Modern Sociolinguistics. Ch. 6 of *Professing Linguistic Historiography*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Murray, Stephen O. 1979. *Social Science Networks*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto.
----- 1983a. *Group Formation in Social Science*. Edmonton, Alberta: Linguistic Research.
----- 1983b. The Creation of Linguistic Structure. *American Anthropologist* 85, 356-362.
----- 1994. *Theory Groups and the Study of Language in North America: A Social History*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

John E. Joseph, *Edinburgh*

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(to 1 April 1999)

Members of the Society have been kind enough to donate the following publications to the HSS Library at Keble College, Oxford. 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, 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

ALTMAN, Cristina
A Pesquisa Lingüística no Brasil (1968-1988). São Paulo:
Humanitas/FFLCH/USP, 1998. 380 pp. ISBN 85-86087-27-0.

AVKSENT'JEV, L. H. et al. (eds.)
Spadščyna D. M. Ovsianyko-Kulykovs'koho ta sučasna filolohija. [The
Heritage of D. M. Ovsianyko-Kulykovs'kyj and the Philology of Today].
Xarkiv: Oko, 1998. 440 pp. ISSN 0453-8048, Visnyk Xarkivs'koho
universytetu, 411.

BREKLE, Herbert E., DOBNIG-JÜLCH, Edeltraud, HÖLLER, Hans Jürgen &
WEIß, Helmut (eds.)Bio-bibliographisches Handbuch zur Sprachwissenschaft
des 18. Jahrhunderts. Die Grammatiker, Lexikographen und Sprachtheoretiker

des deutschsprachigen Raums mit Beschreibungen ihrer Werke. Band 5, M-Pa.
Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1998. xvii + 404 pp. ISBN 3-484-73026-9.

van DRIEL, Lo & Noordegraaf, Jan
De Vries en Te Winkel. Een Duographie. The Hague: Sdu Uitgevers &
Antwerp: Standaard Uitgeverij, 1998. 269 pp. ISBN 90-75566-77-8.

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

IVČENKO, Anatolij & TARANENKO, Oleksandr (eds.)
Movoznavstvo: Tezy ta povidomlennia III Mižnarodnoho kongresu ukrajinistiv.
Xarkiv: Oko, 1996. 344 pp. ISBN 966-526-002-2.

JUCHEM, Johann G.
Kommunikationssemantik. [Signification. Beiträge zur
Kommunikationswissenschaft. Band 3]. Münster: Nodus, 1998. 224 pp. ISBN
3-89323-653-8.

KRALLMANN, Dieter & SCHMITZ, H. Walter (eds.)
*Perspektiven einer Kommunikationswissenschaft. Internationales Gerold
Ungeheuer-Symposium, Essen 6.-8.7.1995.* [Signification. Beiträge zur
Kommunikationswissenschaft. Band 1], 2 vols. Münster: Nodus, 1998. vol. 1:
vii + 326 pp., vol. 2: viii + pp. 327-557. ISBN 3-89323-651-1.

PRADOS, Rosálio Maria Netto, BRAZ, Vânia Maria Gorgulho, de OLIVIERA,
Sílvia Cristina & OLIVIERA, Suze Silva
I° Colóquio Cuba-Brasil de Terminologia: léxico, cultura e desenvolvimento.
I° Coloquio Cuba-Brasil de Terminología: léxico, cultura y desarolло.
(Havana, 20-21 November 1998). São Paulo: Humanitas/FFLCH/USP, 1998.
186 pp.

RADCHENKO, Oleg Anatol'evich
*Yaz'ik Kak Mirosozidanie. Lingvofilosofskaya Kontseptsiya
Neogumbol'dtianctva,* 2 vols. Moscow: Metatext, 1997. vol.1: 308 pp., vol. 2:
232 pp. ISBN 5-89672-003-3.

SCHMITTER, Peter & van der WAL, Marijke (eds.)
*Metahistoriography. Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of the
Historiography of Linguistics.* Münster: Nodus, 1998. 190 pp. ISBN 3-89323-
272-9.

SHISHA-HALEVY, Ariel
Structural Studies in Modern Welsh Syntax. Aspects of the Grammar of Kate Roberts. [Studien und Texte zur Keltologie. Band 2]. Münster: Nodus, 1998. 268 pp. ISBN 3-89323-612-0.

SUBAČIUS, Giedrius
Žemaičių bendrinė kalbos idėjos. Vilnius: Mokslo ir Enciklopedijų Leidybos Institutas, 1998. 489 pp. ISBN 5-420-01427-0

TIEKEN-BOON van OSTADE, Ingrid, van der WAL, Marijke & van LEUVENSTEIJN, Arjan (eds.)
DO in English, Dutch and German: History and Present-day Variation. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU & Münster: Nodus, 1998. [Stichting Neerlandistiek VU, 24]. ISBN 90-72365-56-9 (Amsterdam) & 3-89323-428-4 (Münster).

VERBURG, Pieter A.
Language and its Functions: A Historico-critical Study of Views Concerning the Function of Language from the Pre-humanistic Philology of Orleans to the Rationalistic Philology of Bopp, translated by Paul Salmon in consultation with Anthony J. Klijnsmit. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1998. [Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 84]. xxxiii + 577 pp. ISBN 90 272 4572 X (Eur.,Hb.), 1 55619 621 0 (US,Hb.).

JOURNALS

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft. 8:2 (1998). ISSN 0939-2815.

Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich. *Mitteilungen.* 1 (Frühjahr 1999).

Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek. 17 (1997 & 1998). ISSN 0922-7865.

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

BACHLEITNER, Norbert & MÜHLBERGER, Günter
"Die österreichischen Verbotslisten und ihre Bedeutung für die Zensurgeschichtsforschung. Eine qualitative und quantitative Untersuchung der in Österreich zwischen 1795 und 1848 verbotenen Literatur". Project

description. Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich. *Mitteilungen.* 1 (Frühjahr 1999), 12.

BARBÓN RODRÍGUEZ, José Antonio
"Gerold Ungeheuer: der Mann, den ich gekannt habe". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 17-21.

BEIJ-SUTMULLER, Petra
"G. C. Mulder, een schrijvende onderwijzer". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 17 (1997 & 1998), 17-35.

BLIESENER, Thomas
"'Sprache des Herzens'. Peri- und präverbale Modi von Kommunukation". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 187-199.

BORSA, Gedeon
"Ungarische Nationalbibliographie". Project description. Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich. *Mitteilungen.* 1 (Frühjahr 1999), 13.

BRITZ, Etienne
"Inskripsies in 'n 'gaapsing'. 'n Interpretasie van die pentekening op omslag van Breyten Breytenbach se digbundel *Soos die so* (1990)". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 17 (1997 & 1998), 7-16.

BÜNTING, Karl-Dieter
"Begrüßung". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 5-7.

CALDERÓN RIVERA, Alvaro
"Ungeheuers Einfluß in der modernen experimentellen Phonetik Kolumbiens". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 23-26.

CHRISTY, Craig T.
"From Perception to Reception: The Inner Language Form in the Theories of Humboldt, Steinthal, and Potebnja". IvÑcenko & Taranenko 1996, 276.

CORNIPS, Leonie
"Habitual *Doen* in Heerlen Dutch". Tieken-Boon van Ostade, van der Wal & van Leuvensteijn 1998, 83-101.

DESMET, Piet
"'Historiometry' or the Use of Statistics in Linguistic Historiography" *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 245-274.

DIBBETS, G. R. W.
"Het Redelijk Gezelschap van Joannes Vollenhove". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 17 (1997 & 1998), 37-64.

DUTZ, Klaus D.
"British Historiography Visits the 'Continent'". [Fifteenth Annual Colloquium of the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas, 16.-19. 9. 1998, Amsterdam]. Report on meeting. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 301-309.

DUTZ, Klaus D. (compiler)
"Collectanea — Collectabilia". New Publications. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 317-355.

DUTZ, Klaus D.
"Verwandtschaften, Fauna und Psychologie. Metahistoriographische Überlegungen". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 107-117.

ELFFERS, Els
"Linguistics and Psychology: How Should We Reconstruct Their Relationship". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 87-106.

ELFFERS, Els
"A Reply to Dutz and Law". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 127-131.

EROMS, Hans-Werner
"Periphrasic *Tun* in Present-day Bavarian and Other German Dialects". Tieken-Boon van Ostade, van der Wal & van Leuvensteijn 1998, 139-157.

ESCHBACH, Achim
"Gerold Ungeheuers Bühlerstudien". Krállmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 329-340.

FISCHER, Annette
"*TUN* Periphrasis in Early New High German". Tieken-Boon van Ostade, van der Wal & van Leuvensteijn 1998, 121-138.

FISCHER, Ernst
"Biographische Dokumentation zur Emigration von Verlegern, Buchhändlern und Antiquaren aus Deutschland und Österreich nach 1933/1938". Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich. *Mitteilungen.* 1 (Frühjahr 1999), 4-6.

FORMIGARI, Lia
"La teoria semantica di Heymann Steinthal". Ivčenko & Taranenko 1996, 287-297.

FRANČUK, Vira
"Ukrajins'ka mova v naukovij i hromads'kij dijal'nosti O. O. Potebni". [The Ukrainian Language in Alexander Potebnia's Scientific Works and Public Life] (in Ukrainian). Ivčenko & Taranenko 1996, 140-146.

FRANK, Peter R.
"Auswahl der Forschungsliteratur seit 1980 nach Themen, Perioden". Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich. *Mitteilungen.* 1 (Frühjahr 1999), 25-32.

FRANK, Peter R.
"Ein Abonnentenverzeichnis der Zeitschrift des *Wiener Zuschauer* aus dem Jahr 1842. Eine Marginalie". Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich. *Mitteilungen.* 1 (Frühjahr 1999), 6-9.

FRANK, Peter R.
"Topographie der Buchdrucker, Buchhändler und Verleger in der österreichischen Monarchie 1750-1850". Project description. Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich. *Mitteilungen.* 1 (Frühjahr 1999), 13-14.

GEIßNER, Hellmut
"Sympeithein: Von der Notwendigkeit des Überzeugens". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 391-405.

GLAVE, Dieter
"Was ist eine Melodie? Eine Zeit-gemäße Betrachtung". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 81-92.

HALL, Murray G.
"Bibliographische Hinweise". Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich. *Mitteilungen.* 1 (Frühjahr 1999), 15-23.

HAMMARSTRÖM, Göran
"Die Ebenen der Sprachbeschreibung". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 201-204.

HAMMARSTRÖM, Göran
"Gerold Ungeheuer - mein Freund". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 11-15.

HANKE, Michael
"Dialektik und Kommunikation. Antike Dialektik. Psychagogie und rhetorische Steuerung in Ungeheuers Theorie menschlicher Kommunikation". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 407-421.

HAßLER, Gerda
"XIIe Congrès international de Linguistique et Philologie romanes". Section I: "Histoire de la linguistique". [23.-29. 7. 1998, Brussels]. Report on meeting. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 298-301.

HAßLER, Gerda
"Métalangage et terminologie linguistique". [International Colloquium, 14.-16. 5. 1998, Université de Grenoble 3]. Report on meeting. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 286-288.

HAßLER, Gerda, NEIS, Cordula & VELDRE, Georgia
"Metakategorien, historische Positivität und ein Nachdenken über Sprache. Plädoyer für eine nichttriviale Metahistoriographie". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 61-68.

HEINZ, Karl Eckhart
"Öffentliche Kommunikation und privater Konsens. Zum Charakter gemeinschaftsbezogener Kommunikationshandlungen". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 205-217.

HEINZ, Sabine
"Zur Geschichte der Berliner Keltologie bis 1945". [Internationale Fachtagung: *Keltologie an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität vor und während der Nazizeit* 27.-28. 3. 1998, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin]. Report on meeting. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 281-286.

HESS-LÜTTICH, Ernest W. B. & SCHIEWER, Gesine Lenore
"'Der Gebrauch ist der Meister'. Zeichen, 'Wortstreite', einfache Begriffe. Über das kommunikationstheoretische Interesse an der Semiotik des Johann Heinrich Lambert". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 341-356.

van der HORST, J. M.
"*Doen* in Old and Early Middle Dutch: A Comparative Approach". Tieken-Boon van Ostade, van der Wal & van Leuvensteijn 1998, 53-64.

HOVDHAUGEN, Even
"Some Remarks on the Term 'Research Program'. A Footnote to Peter Schmitter's Paper (pp. 133-152) ". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 153-154.

HÜLLEN, Werner
　　　[offprint]
"ghoti – das Leittier der internationalen Kommunikation, oder: das Englische
als National- und als Weltsprache". In Ingrid Gogolin, Sabine Graap & Günter
List (eds.). *Über Mehrsprachigkeit.* (Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1998),
275-292.

HÜLLEN, Werner
"Die Historiographie als Aufforderung zum kritischen Anachronismus".
Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 171-181.

JÄGER, Thomas
"Gerold Ungeheuers 'Skizze eines kommunikativen Lehrprogramms'".
Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 433-444.

JOHANNES, G. J.
"'Elk weet wat dichtkunst, wat welsprekendheid is'. Retorca en de Maatschappij
der Nederlandse Letterkunde, 1780-1830". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de
Neerlandistiek* 17 (1997 & 1998), 65-96.

JUCHEM, Johann G.
"Verstehen: ein aussichtsloses Unterfangen? Ungeheuer und Leibniz".
Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 357-369.

KALAŠNYK, Volodymyr & KARNAUŠENKO, Halyna
"Dvomonist' u traktuvanni O. Potebni j ukrajins'ko-rosijs'kyj bilingvizm". [The
Treatment of Bilingualism by Alexander Potebnia and Ukrainian-Russian
Bilingualism] (in Ukrainian). Ivčenko & Taranenko 1996, 277-281

KELZ, Heinrich P.
"Hochlautung und Fremdsprachenewerb". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 29-
38.

KLEMOLA, Juhani
"Semantics of DO in Southwestern Dialects of English English". Tieken-Boon
van Ostade, van der Wal & van Leuvensteijn 1998, 25-51.

KLÜVER, Jürgen
"Computerisierung sozialwissenschaftlicher Rationalität. Zur Integration zweier
wissenschaftlicher Kulturen". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 109-129.

KNOBLOCH, Clemens
"Anmerkungen zur Kommunikationssemantik". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1,
219-230.

KOHRT, Manfred
        [offprint]
"Historische Graphematik und Phonologie". [IV. Geschichte und Prinzipien der
Sprachgeschichtsforschung nach Beschreibungsebenen, 34], In Werner Besch,
Anne Betten, Oskar Reichmann & Stefan Sonderegger (eds.).
*Sprachgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und
ihrer Erforschung, 2nd ed., 1. Teilband.* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998),
551-572.

KOOIJ, Suzanne
"*Enargeia* - het beeld in de taal in de retorische traditie van de klassieke
oudheid en de Renaissance". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 17
(1997 & 1998), 97-115.

KRALLMANN, Dieter
"Kommunikationstheoretische Grundlagen des Basismodells des LDV".
Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 131-137.

KRALLMANN, Dieter & SCHMITZ, H. Walter
"Vorwort". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 1-3.

KUCHARCZIK, Kerstin
        [offprint]
"*Organisch* - 'um den beliebten aber vildeutigen ausdruck zu gebrauchen'. Zur
Organismusmetaphorik in der Sprachwissenschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts".
Sprachwissenschaft 23:1 (1998), 85-111.

LAUWERS, Peter & LIOCE, Nico
"L'histoire de la praxis linguistique et grammaticale". [XIth International
Colloquium of the Studienkreis "Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft, 2.-4. 7.
1998, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven]. Report on meeting. *Beiträge zur
Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 289-298.

LAW, Vivien
"In Defence of Contextualism". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 119-125.

de LEEUW, Wouter
"Het postmoderne van Gerrit Krois beschouwend werk. Een voetnoot bij 'De abstracte roman'". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 17 (1997 & 1998), 117-139.

LENDERS, Winfried
"Kant und die cognitio-symbolica-Tradition". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 371-387.

LENKE, Nils
"Kruziale und nichtkruziale Kummunikation im Softwareentwicklungsprozeß". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 139-151.

LINDNER, Gunnar
"Analyse cerebrale Sprachstörungen auf der Grundlage von Gerold Ungeheuers Kommunikationstheorie". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 513-520.

LOENHOFF, Jens
"Zur kommunikativen Relevanz von Wahrnehmungen". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 231-242.

LUTZ, Hans-Dieter & SPRENGER, Michael
"Zur Integration von Ungeheuers kommunikationstheoretischem Ansatz in einen Informatik-Studiengang". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 445-459.

LUTZ-HENSEL, Magdalene
"Aufdeckung von Alltagswissen in Sprachhandlungen". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 243-256.

NERLICH, Brigitte & CLARKE, David D.
"Reconstructing Research Programmes. Problems with Semantics and Pragmatics". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 155-163.

NOTHDURFT, Werner
"Interaktive Bedeutungskonstitution. Ein Beitrag zur Kommunikationssemantik Gerold Ungeheuers". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 257-271.

PAVLIDOU, Theodossia
"Zum Stellenwert der phatischen Kommunion in einer Theorie der Kommunikation". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 273-284.

PERCONTI, Pietro
"Iconismo Linguistico". [Fifth Congress of the Società Italiana di Filosofia del
Linguaggio 14.-16. 5. 1998, University of Bologna]. Report on meeting.
Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 8:2 (1998), 275-280.

POSNER, Roland
"Der Reagan Effekt. Eine semiotische Analyse von Selbstdarstellung und
Selbstwerdung". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 461-483.

POUSSA, Patricia
"DO and Dialect Death". Tieken-Boon van Ostade, van der Wal & van
Leuvensteijn 1998, 7-24.

RENNER, Gerhard
"Ein virtueller Katalog der österreichischen Landesbibliotheken im Internet -
www.landesbibliotheken.at". Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich.
Mitteilungen. 1 (Frühjahr 1999), 9-11.

RICHTER, Helmut
"Der Deduktionshintergrund der 'Botschaft': Situationstheorie und Welttheorie".
Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 285-313.

RIEGER, Burghard
"Warum Fuzzy Linguistik? Überlegungen und Ansätze einer
computerlinguistischen Neuorientierung". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 153-
183.

RODRÍGUEZ de RIVERA, José
"Kommunikation und Organisationstheorie". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2,
485-512.

ROTH, Volkbert M.
"Gerold Ungeheuers Vor-Urteile (über Sprechen, Mitteilen, Verstehen) und
zwei neuere Ansätze in der Sprachtherapie: PAKT & Neue WEGE-Sprechende
Bilder". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 521-536.

RYCKEBOER, H.
"Substituting *Doen* in Tag Questions and Short Replies in Southern Dutch
Dialects". Tieken-Boon van Ostade, van der Wal & van Leuvensteijn 1998, 65-
81.

SCHMITTER, Peter
"Der Begriff des Forschungsprogramms als metahistoriographische Kategorie der Wissenschaftsgeschichtsschreibung". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 133-152.

SCHMITTER, Peter & van der WAL, Marijke
"Editors' Preface". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 7-9.

SCHMITTER, Peter
"Erwiderung auf Hovdhaugen und Nerlich/Clarke". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 165-169.

SCHMITZ, H. Walter
"Linnaeus - oder die Sichtung der metahistoriographischen Instrumententasche". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 69-76.

SCHMITZ, H. Walter
"Über kommunikative und extrakommunikative Betrachtungsweisen". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 315-326.

SCHUFFEL, Jaconelle
"'Comt alle menschen, schept consten'. De Zeven Vrije Kunsten in de spelen van de Olijftack en de Goubloeme op het Landjuweel van 1561". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 17 (1997 & 1998), 141-167.

SENDLMEIER, Walter F.
"Phonologische Kategorien und ihre experimentelle Überprüfung". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 39-61.

SGARBI, Romano
"Sur un lavoro di frontiera all'intersezione tra linguistica e filosofia". Review of Raffaella Petrilli, *Temps et détermination dans la grammaire et la philosophie anciennes*. (Münster: Nodus, 1997). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 311-316.

SIEDINA, Giovanna
"Dejaki prymitky do *Dictionarium Latino-Slavonorossiacum* Ivana Maksymovyča". [Some Remarks on Ivan Maksymovyč's *Dictionarium Latino-Slavonorossiacum*] (in Ukrainian). Ivčenko & Taranenko 1996, 140-146.

SKORYK, Marfa
"Oleksandr Potebnia: vid tradyciji do kontekstu". [Alexander Potebnia: From
Tradition to Context] (in Ukrainian). Ivčenko & Taranenko 1996, 281-287.

SLUITER, Ineke
"Metatexts and the Principle of Charity". Schmitter & van der Wal 1998, 11-27.

SMULDERS, Frits
"Gorter als vissertje; de geschiedenis van een gedicht en het gedicht van een
geschiedenis". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 17 (1997 & 1998),
169-190.

SUBBIONDO, Joseph L.
        [offprint]
"17th-Century Universal Grammar and Contemporary Linguistics. John
Wilkins and Noam Chomsky". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*
8:1 (1998), 1-9.

SUBBIONDO, Joseph L.
        [offprint]
"Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* and John Wilkin's *Essay*: Educational reform
and philosophical language in 17th-century England". In Vivien Law & Werner
Hüllen (eds.). *Linguists and Their Diversions. A Festschrift for R. H. Robins on
His 75th Birthday*. (Münster: Nodus, 1996), 123-139.

SUBBIONDO, Joseph L.
        [offprint]
"From pragmatics to semiotics: The influence of John Wilkins' pulpit oratory
on his philosophical language". *Historiographia Linguistica* 23:1/2 (1996),
111-122.

SUBBIONDO, Joseph L.
        [offprint]
"Ralph Lever's *Witcraft*: 16th-century rhetoric and 17th-century philosophical
language". In Kurt R. Jankowsky (ed.). *History of Linguistics 1993. Papers
from the Sixth International Conference on the History of the Language
Sciences (ICHoLS VI), Washington D.C., 9-14 August 1993*. (Amsterdam and
Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995), 179-186.

SWIGGERS, Pierre, DESMET, Piet & JOOKEN, Lieve
"Metahistory Meets (Linguistic) Historiography". Schmitter & van der Wal
1998, 29-59.

SWIGGERS, Pierre, DESMET, Piet & JOOKEN, Lieve
"A Reply to Haßler/Neis/Veldre and to Schmitz". Schmitter & van der Wal
1998, 77-85.

TAVERNARO, Thomas
"Der Verlag Franz Eher GmbH. Vom Parteiverlag der NSDAP zum
Verlagskonzern im 'Dritten Reich'". Project description. Gesellschaft für
Buchforschung in Österreich. *Mitteilungen*. 1 (Frühjahr 1999), 14-15.

TEDESCO, Salvatore
"*Elocutio*. Sprache, Stil und Übersetzung in der *Critische[n] Dichtkunst* J. J.
Breitingers". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 177-
208.

TIEKEN-BOON van OSTADE, Ingrid, van der WAL, Marijke & van
LEUVENSTEIJN, Arjan
"DO in English, Dutch and German: An Introduction". Tieken-Boon van
Ostade, van der Wal & van Leuvensteijn 1998, 1-6.

VAKULENKO, Serhii
"Estetyčna vartist' slova v koncepciji Dmytra Ovsianyko-Kulykovs'koho". [The
Aesthetic Value of the Word as Conceived by Dmytro Ovsianyko-
Kulykovs'kyj]. (in Ukrainian). Avksent'jev et al. 1998, 20-26.

VAKULENKO, Serhii [WAKULENKO, Serhij]
"Warum hat Alexander Potebnja keine Semasiologie bzw. Semantik
geschaffen?". Ivčenko & Taranenko 1996, 263-269.

VERHAGEN, Arie
"Changes in the Use of Dutch *Doen* and the Nature of Semantic Knowlege".
Tieken-Boon van Ostade, van der Wal & van Leuvensteijn 1998, 101-119.

VIEREGGE, Wilhelm H.
"Sprache und Musik. Ungeheuers Sicht der 70er Jahre verglichen mit
gegenwärtigen Auffassungen". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 93-106.

VIEREGGE, Wilhelm H.
"Ungeheuers Vokalartikulationstheorie und deren implizite Deutung als
'Quantal nature of speech'". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 1, 63-77.

WESTERHOFF, Jan C.
"Poèsis Combinatoria. Relations between the Project of the Characteristica
Universalis and German Baroque Poetry". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der
Sprachwissenschaft* 8:2 (1998), 209-244.

WÖRNER, Markus H.
"Rhetorik als Logik der Rede". Krallmann & Schmitz 1998, 2, 423-432.

WORTEL, Dick
"Het woordenboekcitaat in de oudste *WNT*-delen". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor
de Neerlandistiek* 17 (1997 & 1998), 191-206.

ZUBKOVA, Ljudmila
"Znakovaja teorija jazyka A. A. Potebni: semantika, pragmatika, sintaktika".
[A. A. Potebnja's Semiotic Theory of Language: Semantics, Pragmatics,
Syntactics] (in Russian). Ivčenko & Taranenko 1996, 269-275.

ZUTT, Lida
"J. H. Halbertsma en de taalkundige opvattingen van Willem Bilderdijk en
Jacob Grimm". *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 17 (1997 & 1998),
207-227.

A Bibliography of the English Language
From the Invention of Printing to the Year 1800.
A Systematic Record of Writings on English, based on the
Collections of the Principal Libraries of the World.
Compiled by R. C. Alston. £75.

Research on this multi-volume work started in 1958. The first volume appeared in 1965, and 15 volumes have been published to date: volume III in two parts; volume XII in two parts; and a Supplement. Now, after a lapse of over 10 years, it has been possible to resume publication and in March 1999 will appear volume XIII, devoted to the Germanic languages: German, Dutch, Danish & Swedish. This volume includes *Addenda* to those items relating to the Germanic languages listed in Volume II, nos 344-583. It also includes references to ESTC [*English Short Title Catalogue*] which I started in 1976 as a machine-readable catalogue of books printed in the British Isles as well as books printed in British territories before 1800. There are references to microfilms of eighteenth-century books, both commercially published and privately commissioned by myself and subsequently deposited in the British Museum Library, now the British Library. There are numerous facsimiles.

The libraries on which this bibliography is based include research and public libraries in over seventeen countries: more, perhaps, than in any other published bibliography. The correspondence files alone number over 10000 letters and lists provided by a generation of generous and scholarly librarians throughout the world. Since 1990, when the first university catalogues became available on the Internet, the opportunities for bibliographical research have been remarkably enhanced; there are, today, over two thousand machine-readable files available to the researcher. However, there are hundreds of small libraries throughout the world for which remote access is till only a dream.

Completion of the *Bibliography* is now well in hand, and it is hoped that the final volume will appear in the year 2003 - to coincide with the compiler's 70th birthday!

R. C. Alston, *Brockford, Suffolk*

David Abercrombie's Papers

Before David Abercrombie died he passed his personal notes and papers to John Kelly, who has in turn given them to the Department of Linguistics and Phonetics at the University of Leeds. Abercrombie began his teaching career in Leeds. Arrangements are being made for the papers to be housed in the Leeds Brotherton Library's Special Collections, in order to allow easier access for scholars who will benefit from the notes.

The collection contains 33 alphabetised notebooks. 26 of these contain Abercrombie's notes on articles and books he read, organised by author. Four notebooks refer to phonetic terms - where they are referred to in the literature, apposite quotations, and occasionally Abercrombie's opinions of them. Another notebook contains similar comments on phonetic symbols. The remaining two books form an alphabetic index to the rest of the collection.

It is no exaggeration to say that the collection as a whole is a veritable mine of information, and will be particularly valuable to scholars working in the history of phonetics and linguistics. For further information, I can be contacted at:

Department of Linguistics and Phonetics
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT

p.foulkes@leeds.ac.uk
tel: 0113-233 3564 (secretary: 233 3563)
http://www.leeds.ac.uk/linguistics/

Paul Foulkes, *Leeds*

Researching the History of the Book in Central Europe, Austria

A comprehensive history of the book in Austria has yet to be written. A work which will be published shortly (*Geschichte des Buchhandels in Österreich*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz) will cover, as most others before it, only the German part, that is today's Austria. This neglects the fact that for the longest period of this history, up to 1918, books were not only published in Vienna or Graz, but also in other parts of the Habsburg Monarchy, in Lemberg (Lviv/Lwów), Cracow, Prague, Brno, Budapest, Trieste, Hermannstadt and elsewhere.

Under such circumstances book research in this region has been and still is a difficult task primarily because of the language barrier. Books were published in about fourteen languages spoken in the Monarchy. There is a mass of secondary literature in Polish, Czech and other Slavic languages as well as in Hungarian, which has rarely been used by Western scholars. The situation has been different in the Bukovina or Galicia or else in Bohemia or German-Austria. Material related to the booktrade is now not only to be found in archives in Vienna, but also in cities of the so-called 'successor states', such as the Czech Republic or Hungary, and so on. All these difficulties, and several other circumstances, may explain why research of the history of the book in Austria has long lagged behind the intensive research done in Germany or in other countries. As a consequence, larger parts and periods of this history are still a *terra incognita*.

To change this situation, the *Gesellschaft für Buchforschung in Österreich* (Society for Book Research in Austria) was established in 1998. The founding session was held in the Oratorium of the Austrian National Library on October 9. Appointed to the Board of Directors were Dr. Helmut W. Lang (Austrian National Library), Dr. Josef Seethaler (Austrian Academy of Sciences - Historische Pressedokumentation), the publishers and antiquarian dealers Walter Drews and Dr. Otmar Seemann, among others. Dr. Peter R. Frank was elected first president, Dr. Murray G. Hall was appointed secretary. After the announcement of the foundation of the *Gesellschaft* there were encouraging responses from Budapest, Edinburgh, Cracow, London, Madison/USA, Mainz, Paris and Wolfenbüttel, expressing the hope for close co-operation.

After the Börsenverein der deutschen Buchhändler in Leipzig was established in 1825, a 'Historische Kommission' was created in 1876. Documents related to the German booktrade were systematically collected, to be held in the archive and library. Thanks to this collection of material,

research work and publishing in this field have been very intensive in Germany ever since. And it gained new momentum after the 1960s and 70s.

The Austrian counterpart of the Börsenverein, the Verein der österreichischen (later: österreichisch-ungarischen) Buchhändler came into existence relatively late, in 1859. It was established at the suggestion of a bookseller in Lemberg, the Pole Milikowski. But already in 1858, and again in 1862, the Austrian booksellers and publishers Rudolf Lechner, Moritz Gerold, Friedrich Manz and others, proposed the establishment in Vienna of an archive and library for documents of the booktrade in Austria. But unlike the Börsenverein, the Verein never decided to set up a 'Historische Kommission'. Only Carl Junker, then secretary of the Verein, among a few others, published some substantial studies. After Junker's death in 1928, interest in this field declined and scarcely more than a handful of books and articles appeared.

The situation has changed for the better in recent years with the publication of works such as Helmut W. Lang's *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts in Österreich* (Baden-Baden 1972), Anton Durstmüller's 3-volume study *500 Jahre Druck in Österreich* (Vienna 1982-1986), or Murray G. Hall's 2-volume history *Österreichische Verlagsgeschichte 1918-1938* (Vienna 1985), to name but a few contributions in German. To give these and other works a broader recognition, the *Gesellschaft* wants to co-ordinate and promote the research of printed works (books, newspapers and magazines, sheet music, maps, pamphlets) as well as the booktrade and publishing. Special focus will be placed on the Austrian Monarchy (including Galicia, Bohemia, Hungary, Transsylvania, etc.) and the republics up to the present day. Publishing in exile will also be a topic as will the Hebraic book trade in Austria. Younger scholars in particular will be encouraged to explore theory and practice of the history of the book.

Members of the *Gesellschaft* will receive twice a year *Mitteilungen* (Newsletter), with the first issue due to appear in the Spring of 1999. The format will be that of a small journal. Aside from news about the *Gesellschaft* and its members the issues will contain articles (e.g. about Austrian printers, dealers and publishers in exile after 1938, news of a history of the Nazi publishing concern Eher-Verlag), a report on research in progress and relevant bibliographical references.

The *Gesellschaft* is willing to help students, scholars, antiquarian dealers and others with their research, referring them to relevant sources. It will also serve as contact for scholars from abroad.

Academies and libraries, university teaching staff, antiquarian and retail booksellers and publishers as well as private researchers and collectors at home and abroad are invited to become a member.

If you want to join the society and receive the *Mitteilungen,* write to Dr. Murray G. Hall, Kulmgasse 30/12, A-1170 Vienna, Austria-Europe. (FAX +43 (1) 485 87 10; E-mail: buchforschung@bigfoot.com).

Annual membership fee ATS 300.- (DM 45), students ATS 150.- (DM 22), libraries and institutions ATS 500.- (DM 75), sponsors ATS 1,000,- (DM 145) or over. Banks: Bank Austria 601 779 408, BLZ 20151; Dresdner Bank Heidelberg Kto. Gesellschaft 4 686 160 03; BLZ 67280051.

Peter R. Frank
Murray G. Hall

VIIITH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE SCIENCES

14-19 September 1999

THE VIIITH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE HISTORY OF LANGUAGE SCIENCES (ICHOLS VIII) will be held at the École Normale Supérieure de Fontenay-Saint-Cloud, from Tuesday, September 14th to Sunday, September 19th, in partnership with the Société d'Histoire et d'Epistémologie des Sciences du Langage and the Laboratoire d'Histoire des Théories Linguistiques, (URA 381 du CNRS-Université de Paris VII).

The work sessions will take place on the premises of the E.N.S. (20 minutes from Paris by metro) and the participants can be given accommodation on the premises.

The provisional programme may be viewed at:
                    http://www.ens-fcl.fr/neuf/colloques/ichols.htm
and enquiries concerning attendance may be addressed to:

Madame Claudette Soum
ENS Fontenay/Saint-Cloud
31, avenue Lombart
F-92260 - FONTENAY AUX ROSES, FRANCE

FAX : 01 41 12 85 07
Tel : 01 41 12 85 28
email: Soum@ens-fcl.fr