

EDITORIAL

It is very sad to have to open this issue of the *Bulletin* with the announcement of the death of R. H. (Bobby) Robins, a friend and colleague to many members of the society. The tall, commanding figure with the splendid moustache was a constant presence at history of linguistics conferences, and even those who did not have the good fortune to know him personally cannot have failed to notice him. For people of my generation he was very much the grandfather of the subject, the head of the family, the one we all looked up to. Even historians of linguistics who had not met him or seen him held him in the same high regard, because his *Short History of Linguistics* (which appeared in its fourth edition only three years ago) remains the first point of reference for our subject. With his characteristic (and rather surprising) lack of formality, Bobby once confided in me that the first thing he did when he went to a new library was to check whether his *Short History* was on the catalogue. I'm sure he was rarely disappointed. The *Short History* is certainly the work for which he is best known, but the 15-page bibliography printed in the *Festschrift* presented to him on his 75th birthday, shows that there was much, much more besides, and the 'panel on the contribution of R. H. Robins (1921-2000) to the history of linguistic ideas' which will open this year's colloquium will paint an impressive picture.

R. H. Robins was the first president of the Henry Sweet Society and remained the society's chairman. He was absolutely part of the fabric and identity of the society, and a colloquium without him (sometimes dozing - or was he?) in the front row will be a strange and sad experience for us all. There will be many obituaries and appreciations in many journals,¹ and an unofficial one here isn't necessary. However, I should like to use my editorial freedom to add a personal remark to the many remarks which will follow. Bobby was enormously kind and supportive to me as I started my academic career, and although he was nearly half a century older than me, he became a good friend. I shall always be thankful for that, and I am sure that scholars around the world will nod their heads here, gratefully recognising their own experience of him. R. H. Robins was not just a professor, a chairman, an author, a teacher (he was still teaching an undergraduate course when he died). He was a kind and generous human being and he will be greatly missed. To his family and to his countless friends, the officers of the Henry Sweet Society extend their sincerest sympathy.

¹ The first ones to have appeared, by Vivien Law and Dick Hayward, can be found on the *Linguist List* at <http://linguistlist.org/issues/11/11-1020.html>.

The provisional programme for September's Edinburgh colloquium appears on page 62. It is a varied and exciting programme, and we hope that as many members as possible will be able to attend. The booking form for contributors and auditors alike is included with this *Bulletin* and your attention is drawn to the 28 August deadline for all colloquium payments. Contributors to the colloquium are alerted to the existence of the *Paul Salmon - Pieter Verburg Memorial Fund* which has been set up to provide financial assistance for those who might otherwise find it difficult to attend. As is explained on page 69, this fund is due to generous donations from the families of Pieter Verburg (see Jan Noordegraaf's article), and of Paul Salmon who translated Verburg's *Taal en Functionaliteit* into English, and the society is very grateful for this generosity.

As usual I would encourage members of the society to continue to contribute to the *Bulletin* and ensure that it remains an interesting and informative focus for the subject of the history of linguistics. An innovation in this issue, which it is to be hoped will continue, is the reprinting of a historically important text, in this case Bloomfield's brief review of Saussure. 'Re-reviews' or reappraisals of major writings in the history of linguistics, or indeed of writings which did not have any great impact in their day but which have subsequently proved to be in some way important, are also encouraged. The HSS *Bulletin* can be creative and non-conformist if it likes (i.e. if the editors like!). Reinterpretation of the received wisdom is certainly something which would be very welcome in these pages.

Andrew Linn, *Sheffield*

A Radical Plan for Spelling Reform: Thomas Spence's *Grand Repository of the English Language* (1775)

Since his discovery as a 'forgotten phonetician' by Abercrombie (1948, reprinted 1965), Thomas Spence has intermittently aroused the interest of historical linguists (Shields 1973, 1974; Beal 1993, 1994, 1999), largely because of the phonetic script which he devised and first set out in his pronouncing dictionary, the *Grand Repository of the English Language* (1775). Spence is, however, much better known to historians of politics, by whom he is regarded as the father of what McCalman in his eponymous work (1988) termed the 'radical underground', and as an important 'link man' (Franklin 1982: 42) standing as he does on the cusp of radicalism and socialism. In this paper, I shall attempt to develop the theme introduced by Shields (1974: 34), that of 'the relationship between radical politics and linguistic reform' in Spence's works, and in particular, the radical agenda behind his *Grand Repository of the English Language*.

Unlike the majority of eighteenth-century orthoepists and grammarians, Thomas Spence came from a working-class background. His father had come to Newcastle upon Tyne from Aberdeen and worked at various trades, including netmaking and shoemaking. Thomas, born in 1750, was one of nineteen children in the Spence family, who lived on the Quayside, then one of the poorest areas of Newcastle. Despite these harsh living conditions, the environment in which Thomas Spence grew up was by no means intellectually impoverished. Ashraf (1983: 12) notes that he 'began his working life at his father's trade of netmaking at the age of ten after some schooling', but we know from Spence's own account in *The Important Trial of Thomas Spence* that his father had his own method of educating his sons: 'My father used to make my brothers and me read the Bible to him while working at his business, and at the end of every chapter, encouraged us to give our opinions on what we had just read. By these means I acquired an early habit of reflecting on every occurrence which passed before me, as well as on what I read' (1803: 65). The Spence family belonged to a network of radical dissenters in what was, in the eighteenth century, a radical and dissenting city. One of Spence's mentors was the Reverend James Murray, a famous Presbyterian preacher at the time described by Ashraf (1983: 19) as 'well to the left of Whig tradition [...] an egalitarian democrat'. Bindman (1989: 198) describes the Spence family as 'leading members of the Glassite congregation at the Forster Street meeting house', the Glassites being a millennialist Congregationalist group who advocated a return to the communal ownership of property practised by the

early church. The context in which Spence gained his education was one in which the Bible was read as a political document and the doctrine preached from the pulpit was one of justice, liberty and equality. As a young man, Thomas Spence was active on the lively political scene in Newcastle. According to his friend, the engraver Thomas Bewick, Spence 'got a number of young men together and formed into a debating society, which was held in the evenings in his schoolroom in the Broad Garth' (1862: 71, quoted in Robinson 1887: 34). Spence, along with Bewick and the Reverend Murray, was a founder member of the Newcastle Philosophical Society in 1775. Although Spence's ideas were to prove too extreme for this Society, it was radical enough to be visited by Jean-Paul Marat (Horsley 1971:206) and to vote against the war with America and in favour of a Republic. By the time the Newcastle Philosophical Society was formed, Spence was a schoolteacher, with his own school 'in the Keyside' (1775: Sig. A1 recto).

Spence continued as a teacher in the Newcastle area until 1787. His own school can not have been successful, for by 1776 he was employed at Haydon Bridge Grammar School, where Bewick paid him a visit. Between 1779 and 1787, he was employed at St. Ann's public school in Newcastle but by 1792, Spence had left the teaching profession and gone to London. The memoir of Spence in *The Newcastle Magazine* January 1821, suggests that Spence 'became discontented with Newcastle, and resolved to seek the Metropolis. He was often heard to say that there was no scope for ability in a provincial town, and that London was the only place where a man of talent could display his powers.'

Spence certainly threw himself headlong into political activism in the capital, for his first work published in London is *The Case of Thomas Spence, Bookseller* (1792), which relates how he was imprisoned for selling Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man*. Spence became a member of the London Corresponding Society, which was founded in 1792. According to Bindman (1989: 56), Spence 'was on the radical wing of the LCS; a "violent democrat", in the words of an informer, with "levelling" tendencies that worried the more moderate executive'. During his time in London, Spence made his living largely by selling books and pamphlets, as well as a drink called saloup, in the first instance from a street stall. He continued to publish pamphlets, as well as the periodical *Pigs' Meat*. In 1793, Spence opened a shop called 'The Hive of Liberty', and began to sell tokens as well as printed material. Spence was arrested three times between 1792 and 1794, when, along with other members of the London Corresponding Society, he was arrested under the Suspension Act, imprisoned for seven months, charged with High Treason, and finally acquitted in December 1794. Publication of *The Restorer of Society to its Natural State* (1801), led to Spence's arrest on a charge of seditious libel, for which he was sentenced to a year's imprisonment and a fine of £20. After his release from Shrewsbury Jail. Spence continued to promote his political ideas

through informal meetings. Ashraf (1983: 84-5) refers to a handbill dated 18 March 1801, in which 'well-wishers' are recommended to 'meet frequently [...] after a free and easy Manner to converse [...] provoke investigation, and answer such Objections as may be stated, and to promote the circulation of Citizen Spence's pamphlets'. Spence died on 1 September, 1814, but his followers continued to meet as 'The Society of Spencean Philanthropists'. Their propagation of Spence's ideas led to the trial of four of its members on a charge of High Treason in 1816, and in 1817 an Act was passed 'for more effectively preventing seditious meetings and assemblies', which explicitly prohibited 'all societies or clubs calling themselves Spencean or Spencean Philanthropists'. (57 George III c. 19. quoted in Ashraf 1983: 98).

How could the ideas of a poor provincial bookseller and former schoolteacher be so dangerous that an Act was passed forbidding people to meet in his name, and how were the ideas of this dangerous radical connected with those of Spence the 'forgotten phonetician'? To answer these questions, we must return to the year 1775, which was to prove pivotal in the development of Spence's ideas and in his fortunes. On 8 November of this year Spence took his turn to read a lecture to the Newcastle Philosophical Society. Shortly after this, Spence was expelled from the Society. Although the Society's own minutes state that the reason for Spence's expulsion was his breaking the rules by having it published and selling it in the streets, the *Newcastle Chronicle* report on 25 November 1775, states that the Newcastle Philosophical Society 'disclaim all patronage' of Spence's lecture, 'being informed that he [...] became a member, apparently, for the purpose of obtruding upon the world, the ERRONEOUS and dangerous levelling principles, with which the lecture is replete'. The gist of this lecture, later published as *The Rights of Man* (1793) and *The Meridian Sun of Liberty* (1795), and the nub of what the author was to refer to later as 'Spence's Plan', was that, since Natural Right gives everybody an equal claim to what Nature provides, then all land should be the common property of those who live on it. It was Spence's unswerving and uncompromising belief in common ownership of the land which, in the context of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, made Spence too hot for even the London Corresponding Society to handle. Spence dedicated his whole life to the propagation of this Plan, disseminating it not only in his pamphlets, but through all the media available to him. His tokens carried radical slogans and iconography (see Bindman 1989: 54-8), he wrote songs to be sung at his 'free and easy' meetings, and, though we cannot tell whether Spence himself or his followers were responsible for the graffiti, Ashraf (1983: 87) points out that 'the Home Secretary drew the attention of the police to sayings like "Spence's Plan and Full Bellies" which had appeared on every wall in London.'

At this point, the reader might ask what place a pronouncing dictionary such as the *Grand Repository of the English Language* could have in a life so dedicated to political activism? To Spence such a question would not have

arisen, for he regarded his political and linguistic ideas and agendas as inextricably linked. In his account of his trial for seditious libel in *The Important Trial of Thomas Spence*, the author sums up his achievements:

When I first began to study, I found every art and science a perfect whole. Nothing was in anarchy but language and politics. But both of these I reduced to order, the one by a new alphabet, the other by a new Constitution.' (1803: 59)

Just as the new Constitution was first outlined in his lecture to the Philosophical Society, Spence's New Alphabet was first set out in the *Grand Repository of the English Language*, also published in 1775. Spence had formulated the twin remedies to all society's ills at the age of 25. To understand the link between Spence's political and linguistic agendas, we need to examine the *Grand Repository* in its historical context, bearing in mind Crowley's statement that 'language becomes a crucial focus of tension and debate at critical historical moments, serving as the site upon which political positions are contested' (1989: 258).

Although the *Grand Repository* is one of a number of pronouncing dictionaries produced in the late eighteenth century (see Mugglestone 1995 for a fuller account of these), it stands apart from all the others in several ways. We have already seen that Spence, unlike the authors of more famous and successful pronouncing dictionaries, notably Sheridan (1780) and Walker (1791) was from the lower classes. Sheridan and Walker were both actors and elocutionists, who gave private lessons in elocution and undertook successful lecture tours. The audience for their lessons and lectures was drawn from the professional and middle classes and the readership for their pronouncing dictionaries was made up of the *nouveaux riches* who were eager to avoid the twin evils of vulgarity and provincialism in pronunciation. Sheridan's and Walker's dictionaries, in defining and prescribing what could be considered 'proper English' pronunciation as that of the middle and upper classes with no taint of provincial or 'vulgar' usage, had an agenda which was essentially elitist. The full title of Spence's work is *The Grand Repository of the English Language: containing, besides the excellencies of all other dictionaries and grammars of the English tongue, the peculiarity of having the most proper and agreeable pronunciation*. This seems to suggest an agenda similar to those of Sheridan and Walker. However, if we examine closely the preface to the *Grand Repository*, it becomes apparent that Spence takes arguments, indeed whole passages, from Sheridan's *Dissertation on the Causes of the Difficulties which Occur, in Learning the English Tongue* (1761), but, by quoting selectively from this work and making his own additions, subverts Sheridan's work to his own agenda. Spence acknowledges his debt to Sheridan as follows:

Having, since the proposals for publishing the following work were delivered to the public, met with Mr. Sheridan's Dissertation on Language &c. and finding that he was so much in my mind with regard to the difficulties in learning English, and the methods which ought to be taken to remove them, that he has expressed almost everything I would or could say on the subject, *and as it cannot but be to the credit of any design that different persons, unknown to each other, should think equally well of it*, I beg leave to give here some part of his Dissertation on the causes of the difficulties which occur in learning the English tongue. (1775: Sig. A2 recto, my emphasis)

The part that I have italicised suggests that Spence thought of the ideas contained in Sheridan's *Dissertation* independently and was delighted to have them confirmed by so eminent a man: 'great minds think alike'. However, Spence uses Sheridan's *Dissertation* very selectively in his Preface, omitting Sheridan's conclusion, which differs radically from Spence's ideas on spelling reform. The last paragraph quoted from Sheridan is as follows:

But to this it will be immediately objected, that however right the design might appear in theory, it would be impossible to carry it into execution. That to follow the example of the latter Hebraeans, the whole graphic art must be changed; that new characters must be introduced into the alphabet, to mark all the differences of the vowels, both in quantity and quality; that there would be no use of these if they were not transferred into our books, which must be all reprinted according to the new alphabet [sic]; and that people must be taught their alphabet anew to enable them to read such reprinted books. (1775: Sig. B1 recto)

Sheridan at this point goes on to write:

indeed any design of that sort must prove to the last degree impracticable, and consequently fail of its end. Nor could a thought of this enter into the head of any one, who knows that, the whole power of a Roman Emperor, was in vain exerted, to introduce a single letter into their alphabet [...] though such a character was confessedly wanting. (1761: 29)

Spence, on the other hand, without informing his readers why he has done so, parts company with Sheridan at this point and instead argues as follows:

That many of the books would be reprinted in this new method of spelling, I make no doubt, if it was pretty generally used and approved of; yet I cannot see how this could be made an objection. For who would

suppose any body would throw the books he at present reads into the fire because there were new editions of them in a new method of spelling? Might he not still read them, and if he would have his children to read them might he not learn them, or get them learned to read them as well as at present? (1775: Sig. B1 recto)

Olivia Smith suggests that the fact that Sheridan's 'theory was identified and appropriated by Spence is one measure of the scarcity of radical interpretations of language and of the subject's importance to a critique of class structure' and points out that 'by shifting its emphasis from the language of the court to the literacy of the labouring classes (Spence) alters Sheridan's remarks' (1984: 99-100). In fact, Spence's motivation for writing the *Grand Repository* is not to provide an elitist guide to pronunciation for the middle classes, but to launch a programme of spelling reform which will provide access to education for the lower classes. At the end of his Prefacē, Spence writes: 'I cannot but think it possible such a method of spelling may take place, especially among the laborious part of the people, who generally cannot afford much time or expence in the educating of their children' (1775: Sig. B2 recto, my emphasis). In the advertisement on the facing page, Spence suggests that the *Repository of Common Sense and Innocent Amusement*, for which he is soliciting subscriptions is 'designed chiefly for those who cannot spare time, expence, and patience sufficient for learning to read in the usual way'. (1775: my emphasis). Whilst Spence was not averse to seeking subscriptions for the *Grand Repository* from amongst the middle classes (for instance, Welford (1895: 432-3), relates that he approached the Rev. H. Moises, master of the Grammar-School and morning lecturer of All Saints' Church), his prime concern was with 'the laborious part of the people'. The *Grand Repository* was designed primarily to introduce Spence's reformed spelling, and spelling reform was the key to the linguistic aspect of Spence's political agenda.

In introducing and advocating a reformed spelling, the *Grand Repository* once again sets itself apart from the majority of eighteenth-century pronouncing dictionaries. According to Dobson (1957: 310) the phoneticians of the seventeenth century can be characterised as 'abandoning as a proved failure the attempt to reform English spelling alone and to evolve an alphabet on phonetic principles' and concentrating instead 'on the study of phonetics for its own sake.' By the late eighteenth century, the prevailing opinion was that of Dr Johnson: 'for pronunciation, the best general rule is to consider those as the most elegant speakers who deviate least from the written word' (1755: Sig. A2 verso). In other words, if spelling and pronunciation do not match, then the pronunciation should be made to fit the spelling and not *vice versa*, hence the restored <f> in *handkerchief*, for instance. As both Emily (1948, reprinted 1965) and Abercrombie (1981) demonstrate, the most popular method of representing pronunciation in eighteenth-century pronouncing dictionaries was

the use of diacritics, especially the superscripted numbers first used in John Warden's *A Spelling Book*, published in Edinburgh in 1753, but popularised in England by Kenrick (1773) and, above all, Sheridan (1780). Spence stands alone in adopting an alphabet which is truly 'phonetic' in the sense of 'one sound = one spelling' (see Beal 1999: 69-80 for a fuller discussion of this matter). Despite Dobson's assertion that spelling reform was a dead issue by the seventeenth century, Spence was not the only eighteenth-century spelling reformer: Abercrombie (1945, reprinted 1965) discusses *Magazine* by G. W. (1703) and an anonymous work entitled *The Needful Attempt to Make Language and Divinity Plain and Easie* (1711), both works of spelling reform, whilst Jones (forthcoming) introduces John Wild of Littleleek as an early eighteenth-century spelling reformer. If we add to this list Elphinston in Britain and Franklin and Webster in America, it becomes apparent that Spence is not alone, but part of a minority advocating spelling reform for English in the eighteenth century.

That spelling reform was a vital part of 'Spence's Plan' can be demonstrated by examining his political writings. In Spence's view, the education of the lower classes was the key to the reform of society and the New Alphabet was the key to the education of the lower classes. In *A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe*, Spence describes how the people of Lilliput, having been given the benefit of a phonetic alphabet (the *Crusonean* being one of Spence's names for his orthography), find it very easy to learn to read, with revolutionary consequences:

As they could now learn as much in a Month, as formerly in a Year, the very poorest soon acquired such Notions of Justice, and Equity, and of the Rights of Mankind, as rendered unsupportable, every species of Oppression. (1782: 40)

Spence was so convinced of the rightness and justice of his plan that he truly believed that if only the 'laborious part of the people' could learn to read, then the scales would fall from their eyes and they would rise up against the landlords. This may sound impossibly naïve to twenty-first century readers, but, as Olivia Smith points out, the education of the poor was a live political issue in the late eighteenth century: 'educational policy considered the problem of keeping students obediently in their social place despite their receiving the advantage of an education' (1984: 12). If the poor could read, then they could read Thomas Paine, and activists such as Spence were willing to risk imprisonment in order to bring radical pamphlets to a working-class readership. Although the early biographers Hyndman (1882) and Rudkin (1927) suggest that spelling-reform was a youthful distraction which Spence put behind him once in London, they are clearly wrong. Spence published *The Important Trial of Thomas Spence* firstly in reformed spelling (1803) and later (1807) in

conventional spelling, and in his last extant work, *The Giant Killer, or Anti-Landlord* (No. 1. August 6. 1814), he stresses the importance of phonetic spelling as a guide to pronunciation: 'why should People be laughed at all their lives for betraying their vulgar education, when the Evil is so easily remedied. How ridiculous it is to hear People that can read saying *Any Think - A Horange - Idear - Noar.*' In his last publication, as in his first (the *Grand Repository*), Spence is concerned with pronunciation and spelling reform.

This brings us back to the *Grand Repository* as a pronouncing dictionary. Was Spence, like Sheridan and Walker, primarily concerned with providing a guide to 'correct' pronunciation? According to Shields, Spence considered that, in order to ensure that all men could be equal 'the primary need was to correct the lower classes' defective pronunciation' (1975: 40). This is certainly hinted at in the quotation from *The Giant Killer* above and in the designation of the *Grand Repository* as '*having the most proper and agreeable pronunciation*'. However, if we look more closely at both these works, it becomes apparent that a wholesale 'levelling up' of pronunciation is not part of Spence's agenda. The 'vulgar' pronunciations mentioned in *The Giant Killer* are just that: they represent, not the regional accent that a Northerner (like Spence) or a Scot might wish to lose, but the three shibboleths which Mugglestone (1995) recognises as 'symbols of the social divide': the dropping and unetymological insertion of /h/; 'dropping the /g/' in final /ɪŋ/ (with possible hypercorrection to /ɪŋk/; and intrusive /r/. None of these features would have been prevalent in Newcastle speech in 1775, but Spence recognised them as 'mistakes' which would be common in lower-class London speech in the early nineteenth century and which, as Mugglestone so amply illustrates, would be used to lampoon the lower classes and keep them in their place. In the *Grand Repository*, Spence provides no special guidelines for the citizens of Newcastle other than the New Alphabet itself, whereas Sheridan gives his fellow-countrymen a set of 'Rules to be observed by the Natives of Ireland, in order to attain a just Pronunciation of English', and Walker not only copies these but adds rules for the Natives of Scotland, remarks on the incorrect pronunciations of Northerners and an account of 'the peculiarities of my countrymen, the Cockneys' (1791: xii). I have argued elsewhere (1999: 83) that Spence's New Alphabet is 'a practical, "user-friendly" system, in which the recommended pronunciation of each word would be clear to Spence's readers. However, Spence provides no detailed descriptions of the sounds represented by the letters of his 'New Alphabet' and no general prescriptions or proscriptions. If he had been interested in advising his fellow-citizens how to avoid sounding Northumbrian, then some remarks on the pronunciation of /r/ would have been in order, for the Northumbrian 'burr', realised as [ʀ] or [ʁ], was heavily stigmatised at the time. It was first noted by Defoe, who wrote:

I must not quit *Northumberland* without taking notice, that the Natives of this Country, of the antient original Race or Families, are distinguished by a *Shibboleth* upon their Tongues in pronouncing the Letter *R*, which they cannot utter without a hollow Jarring in the Throat, by which they are as plainly known, as a foreigner is in pronouncing the *Th*: this they call the *Northumberland R*, or *Wharfe*. (1724-27: vol. iii. 232-3)

Kenrick describes it as 'very awkwardly pronounced, somewhat like a *w* or *oau*' (1773: 31) and Jones (1798: 49) writes of 'the rough sound of *r*, as it is pronounced by the natives of Durham, who sound it in their throats with a disagreeable rattling'. Spence himself is described by Francis Place, as having 'a strong northern "burr in his throat" and a slight impediment in his speech' (BM add.Ms. 27,808: 154) and by Welford as having had 'a strong Northern accent' (1895: 432). We know from the transcriptions in the *Grand Repository* that the pronunciations described by Spence are rhotic, but his system is phonemic rather than phonetic and so the actual articulation of /r/ is not described. Either Spence saw no reason to proscribe the 'burr' or he felt that differences of articulation which affected neither the inventory nor the incidence of phonemes and therefore did not interfere with learning to read, were not important. Either way, Spence's silence on this matter contrasts sharply with the explicit proscriptions of Walker.

If we examine further Spence's article in *The Giant Killer*, it becomes apparent that he does not believe that a pronouncing dictionary can be a foolproof guide to 'correct' pronunciation. His theory is that: 'Language as well as Music is acquired by Attention and Imitation. This is the Way we learn like Parrots, when Infants our Mother-Tongue, and is the Way we must get the better of any Inaccuracy of Speech or provincial Brogue'. Spence urges his readers not to read pronouncing dictionaries, but to 'pay attention to the Clergy in the Pulpit, from whom they will have language which may be depended upon.' This echoes Spence's riposte to the Rev. H. Moises who, when asked to subscribe to the *Grand Repository*, enquired as to how Spence, with his Northern accent, could have access to a model of correct pronunciation: 'Pardon me', said Spence, 'I attend All Saints' Church every Sunday Morning!' the joke being that the Rev. Moises was a reader at All Saints' (Welford 1895: 432-3). Once again, evidence from the beginning and end of Spence's career is consistent: 'good' pronunciation can be learnt by imitating the clergy, a model which would be accessible to the poorest Christian.

I would argue then, that, whilst the *Grand Repository* is clearly a pronouncing dictionary, Spence's agenda is different from those of Sheridan and Walker. Although it can be used as a guide to the pronunciation of individual words, it gives no general advice to its Northern readers as to what 'provincial' pronunciations should be avoided. The spelling system is phonemic

rather than phonetic and as such provides a clear and accessible account of the incidence and inventory of phonemes in the 'modified' educated Northern variety which it describes. The primary purpose of the *Grand Repository* and indeed the whole of Spence's linguistic agenda, was to set out and promote a system of spelling reform which would facilitate literacy for 'the laborious part of the people'. At a time when petitions from the disenfranchised were rejected, not because of their content, but because of the 'indecent and disrespectful language' in which they were written (Smith 1984: 30), the issue of literacy was highly politicised. In this context it was not entirely fanciful of Spence to believe that, by giving the people literacy, he would give them a voice which would demand to be heard. Olivia Smith opens her account of the politics of language with a reference to one of Spence's admirers, William Cobbett, who 'considered grammar [...] as an integral part of the class structure of England, and the act of learning grammar by one of his readers as an act of class warfare' (1984: 1). Far from being an elitist guide to 'correct' pronunciation, Spence's *Grand Repository of the English Language* was intended, like Cobbett's grammar later, as a weapon in the class war.

REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, D. 1948. Forgotten Phoneticians. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1-34.
- 1965. *Studies in Phonetics and Linguistics*. Oxford and London: Oxford University Press.
- 1981. Extending the Roman Alphabet: some orthographic experiments of the past four centuries. In: R. E. Asher and E. Henderson (eds), *Towards a History of Phonetics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ashraf, P. M. (1983). *The Life and Times of Thomas Spence*. Newcastle: Frank Graham.
- Beal, J. C. 1993. Lengthening of *a* in Eighteenth-century English: a consideration of evidence from Thomas Spence's *Grand Repository of the English Language* and other contemporary Pronouncing Dictionaries. *Newcastle and Durham Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 2-17.
- 1994. The Jocks and the Geordies: modified standards in eighteenth-century Pronouncing Dictionaries. *Newcastle and Durham Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 1-19
- 1999. *English Pronunciation in the Eighteenth Century: Thomas Spence's 'Grand Repository of the English Language' (1775)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bewick, T. 1862. *A Memoir of Thomas Bewick Written by Himself*. Newcastle and London.

- Bindman, D. 1989. *The Shadow of the Guillotine: Britain and the French Revolution*. London: British Museum Publications.
- Crowley, T. 1989. *The Politics of Discourse: the Standard Language Question in British Cultural Debates*. London: Macmillan.
- Defoe, D. 1724-27. *A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain*. London.
- Dobson, E. J. 1957. *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Franklin, R. A. 1982 The political ideas of Thomas Spence *Journal of Local Studies* 2: 1, 42-56.
- Horsley, P. M. 1971. *Eighteenth-Century Newcastle*. Newcastle: Oriol Press.
- Hyndman, H. M. 1882. *Thomas Spence: the Nationalization of the Land (1775)*. London.
- Jones, C. (Forthcoming) An early eighteenth-century spelling reformer: John Wild of Littleleek.
- Jones, S. 1798. *Sheridan Improved. A General Pronouncing and Explanatory Dictionary of the English Language* 3rd edition. London: Vernor and Hood, J. Cushell, Ogilvie and Son and Lackington, Allen & Co.
- Kenrick, W. 1773. *A New Dictionary of the English Language*. London: John and Francis Rivington, William Johnston (*et al*).
- McCalman, I. 1988. *Radical Underworld: Prophets, Revolutionaries and Pornographers in London, 1795-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mugglestone, L. 1995. *Talking Proper*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Robinson, R. 1887. *Thomas Bewick: His Life and Times*. Newcastle.
- Rudkin, O. 1922. *Thomas Spence and his Connections*. London: Augustus M. Kelley.
- Sheridan, T. 1761. *A Dissertation on the Causes of the Difficulties, which Occur, in Learning the English Tongue*. London: R. and J. Dodsley.
- 1780. *A General Dictionary of the English Language*. London: J. Dodsley, C. Dilly and J. Wilkie.
- Shields, A. F. 1973. *Thomas Spence and the English Language*. University of Newcastle upon Tyne M.A. Dissertation.
- 1974. Thomas Spence and the English Language. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 33-64.
- Smith, O. 1984. *The Politics of Language 1791-1819*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Spence, T. 1775. *The Grand Repository of the English Language*. Newcastle: T. Saint.
- 1782. *A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe*. Newcastle: T. Saint.
- 1792. *The Case of Thomas Spence, Bookseller*. London.
- 1793. *The Rights of Man*. London.
- 1803. *Dhě ' Impōriānt Triāl ōv Tōmīs Spēns*. London.
- 1807. *The Important Trial of Thomas Spence*, 2nd edition. London.

- 1814. *The Giant Killer, or Anti - Landlord*, Numbers. 1, 2. London.
Walker, J. 1791. *A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary*. London: G. G. J. and J.
Robinson, and T. Cadell.
Welford, R. 1895. *Men of Mark 'Twixt Tyne and Tweed*. Newcastle: Walter
Scott.

Joan C. Beal, *Newcastle upon Tyne*
Joan.Beal@ncl.ac.uk

Pieter A. Verburg and the History of Linguistics: a bio-bibliographical account

1 Academic and historical background

After studying classical languages at the Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, and spending two semesters at German universities, first in Freiburg and later in Berlin, Pieter Adrianus Verburg (1905-1989) worked in London for some time as a private tutor.¹ There he started his research for a doctoral dissertation on metaphor as an essential feature of language in general, using the extensive library of the British Museum. On his return to the Netherlands, he consulted his former teacher, Professor Hendrik J. Pos (1898-1955), who informed him that a dissertation on this subject was already in preparation. This was the thorough and voluminous study of *The Concept of Metaphor* by Cornelis F. P. Stutterheim (1903-1991), which appeared in 1941; and it was a result of these "special circumstances" as he put it, that Verburg was among the first to publish a review of Stutterheim's work.

In 1938, Verburg, now a Classics teacher at Wageningen, set out on another project. Inspired by Dr Anton J. B. N. Reichling, S. J. (1898-1986), later to become professor of General Linguistics at the Municipal University of Amsterdam, and his dissertation on *The Word. A Study of the Basis of Language and Language Use* (1935), Verburg undertook an investigation into *The Concept of the Root in Linguistics*. During the Second World War he became involved in the resistance movement - where he was known as 'Piet' or '(Piet) van Wijngaarden' - and, as a result, his research activities slackened and eventually came to a standstill. The book was nearly finished, however, when in the turmoil caused by the Battle of Arnhem in 1944, his manuscripts, notes and library were destroyed. Remnants of the lost dissertation are still to be found in an article (Verburg 1951b) dealing with some trends and facts in the development of the theory of language in the period 1800-1940, in the course of which the concept of the root in the works of Franz Bopp (cf. also Verburg 1950), Friedrich Schlegel, Jacob Grimm and August Schleicher is briefly discussed.²

¹ The editors are most grateful to the author and to John Benjamins Publishing Company for permission to reprint this article, with minor alterations. It was originally published as the Foreword to Verburg 1998.

² This paper was part of a lecture given at a conference of the Association for Calvinist Philosophy at Amsterdam in January 1944, as Verburg acknowledged in a footnote.

Early in 1944 Verburg unfolded his views about the place to be held by the resistance movement after the liberation; to his mind, the resistance should become the centre of a national spiritual revival. He launched a series of five clandestine pamphlets under the title *De Nieuwe Wijnszak*, in which he developed his ideas further. *De Nieuwe Wijnszak* was meant to be an explicitly national and non-political journal for the resistance movement itself.³ For his activities in the underground resistance Verburg was awarded the 'Verzetshedenkingskruis' (Cross of the Resistance).

In the papers contributed by him to *De Nieuwe Wijnszak* Verburg stressed among other things the moral obligation to support the victims of war and persecution and the surviving relatives of the members of the resistance. In addition to that, he argued for the foundation of a national organization which was to promote the deepening of the national consciousness. The first initiative resulted in the establishment of the 'Stichting 1940-1945', which still exists (cf. Verburg 1951c; Boucher et al. 1985: 17-19); the second one led to the creation of 'Het Nationaal Instituut', a foundation which in the beginning was generously supported by the Dutch government (cf. for interesting details Verheul & Dankers 1990). Verburg became one of the two directors of the 'Instituut', and sought to put his grand and lofty ideas into the practice of the Dutch post-war society. Among other things, he organized a Congress on the Future of Dutch Culture which was held in Nijmegen in August 1946 (cf. Algra 1946).

Verburg was forced to spend some time in Switzerland from mid-1946 for health reasons; in the meantime the activities of the National Institute stagnated and eventually came to an end.⁴ It was only in mid-1948 that Verburg resumed his activities as a teacher, and motivated by Anton Reichling decided to start research for another dissertation. That Verburg's *magnum opus* was composed in a relatively short time is a fact which the reader may find reflected in its style. 'Reading the book is [...] not reading a polished and reworked final arrangement of scholarly research but a long and always arresting creative discourse', Shetter (1966: 189) commented on the original Dutch version. On 30 November 1951 Verburg received his doctorate *cum laude* at his alma mater having defended his *Taal en Functionaliteit. Een historisch-critische studie over de opvattingen aangaande de functies der taal vanaf de prae-humanistische philologie van Orleans tot de rationalistische*

³ At the SD, the German *Sicherheitsdienst*, the journal was characterized as 'Blatt für Intellektuelle zwecks Zusammenschliessung zur politischen Einheit', as Verburg related to Lydia Winkel (letter of 19 May 1950, Nederlands Instituut voor Oorlogsdocumentatie (NIOD), Amsterdam). For a concise characterisation of these brochures cf. Winkel 1989: 164-165.

⁴ The National Institute was officially closed down on 1 March 1947. Its body of ideas, however, live on in the well-known 'Prins Bernhard Fonds', which stimulates and promotes Dutch cultural life.

linguistiek van Bopp. The year 1957 saw his appointment as a Professor of General Linguistics at the State University of Groningen, which meant the further enlargement of General Linguistics as an autonomous discipline, a broadly based development which was underway in Dutch universities in the 1950s. In the mid-sixties Philosophy of Language was officially added to Verburg's teaching commitment. On the occasion of his retirement, in 1975, he was presented with a Festschrift under the title of *Ut Videam. Contributions to an understanding of linguistics* (Abraham 1975).

It is obvious that *Taal en Functionaliteit* was not the output of research done by a young linguist, but the work of a secondary school teacher in his mid-forties, a widely-read classical scholar who in the course of the 1930s and 1940s had been engaged in writing two other books, and consequently had had the opportunity to develop views of his own, not only on linguistics and its history, but also on matters philosophical.

2 *Formative factors in the genesis of Taal en Functionaliteit*

Verburg's valedictory lecture in the University of Groningen, *Stand en Zin van de Historie der Taaltheorieën* ('The Condition and Purpose of the History of the Theories of Language', 1975), opens with a reference to the courses in general linguistics he had followed when a young student at Amsterdam. These courses were given Hendrik Josephus Pos, a linguist and philosopher who had been appointed professor of general linguistics and classical philology at the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam in 1923. In these (unpublished) lectures (1924-1932) the history of linguistics was discussed extensively. Pos made an attempt to delineate the development of western linguistic thought from the discussions of the Greeks to contemporary linguistics. Verburg recalled how his teacher followed a dual method in his lectures:

On the one hand, he developed a positive statement of his own theoretical understanding of the essence - or, as it was called then, the idea of language. At the same time, he discussed critically and historically concepts of other linguists, past and present. The two methods were intimately linked. The design and development of his own theory gained depth and perspective by simultaneous confrontation with other basic models and, conversely, in adopting a critical stance, this historical research drew on the essential criteria from his own theoretical principles, or more specifically, on principles of linguistic philosophy.

[Enerzijds ontwikkelde hij thetisch eigen theoretisch inzicht in het wezen - of, zoals dat toen heette: de idee der taal -, anderzijds

behandelde hij kritisch-historisch concepten van anderen in verleden en heden. De twee methoden stonden in nauwe correlatie tot elkaar. Opzet en uitbouw van eigen theorie wonnen aan diepte en perspectief door de gelijktijdige confrontatie met andere grondmodellen en, omgekeerd, ontleende dit historisch onderzoek, om kritisch te kunnen wezen, de nodige criteria weer aan eigen theoretische, wil men: taal filosofische principiën. (Verburg 1975: 3)⁵

Although Verburg did not consider himself one of Pos's disciples in the proper sense of the word, he stated that he had found this "dual method" most instructive, and consequently had sought to apply it in his own academic teachings (ibid.). 'My dissertation likewise adopted this double approach, both historical and critical' (*Auch meine Doktorschrift [...] war 'zweiseitig' kritisch-historisch*), Verburg noted as late as 1983 (Verburg 1983: 2). Thus it is apparent that Verburg deemed Pos's courses on the history of the theories of language to be most valuable; they may indeed be considered to contain the germs of Verburg's final doctoral dissertation, Pos's biographer argued (Derckx 1994: 50), and I would endorse this view. As Verburg himself acknowledged, he actually returned to Pos's lecture notes on several occasions when preparing his book; and as late as September 1951, he wrote a letter to his former teacher requesting more specific information on Knaustinus (1524 - c. 1590) and his *Lingua* (1566), referring to Pos's lectures from the late 1920s which included a discussion of this work.⁶

Touched by a cordial and personal letter Pos had written to him following the defence of his doctoral dissertation Verburg replied that as a student he had been captivated 'by your inner critical reservation (*epoche*)'. Moreover, as Verburg knew, Pos had 'decidedly and resolutely made the choice for the resistance' during the Second World War. Therefore, 'your appreciation gives me intense satisfaction'.⁷ In 1954, Pos wrote to Verburg that he would applaud 'your possible acting as a "privaat docent" in the history of (general) linguistics'.⁸ The next year, however, saw Pos's untimely death.

⁵ In his 1957 inaugural lecture he had also referred to the approach Pos used in his linguistic and philological lectures.

⁶ For an overview of the contents of Pos's unpublished lectures cf. Noordegraaf 1990: 172-175, Derckx 1994: 521-524. Note that Pos himself did not publish very much on the history of linguistics.

⁷ Letter of 15 January 1952. Archief Pos, University Library Amsterdam. Note that Pos had secured him a scholarship so that Verburg could spend the winter semester 1932-1933 in Freiburg i. Br. (van Houten 1989: 5; cf. Verburg 1988: 287).

⁸ Letter of 14 April 1954, private collection. A 'privaat docent' was an external unsalaried lecturer.

It was Anton Reichling, Professor at the Municipal University of Amsterdam, who in 1948 had given Verburg a decisive impetus to write *Taal en Functionaliteit*. Even so, he decided to pursue his study as a doctoral dissertation under the supervision of Jacobus Wille (1881-1964), Professor of Dutch Language and Literature at the Vrije Universiteit. Wille, a specialist on the eighteenth century and keenly interested in the history of the study of Dutch, also taught General Linguistics after Pos had left this university to take up the chair of Philosophy at the Municipal University of Amsterdam. Thus, after twenty-odd years Verburg returned to his alma mater, and he did that, I feel, not just for sentimental reasons. The point is the following: the Vrije Universiteit was not a state university or a church university, but a *free* university, funded by a Society which in the 1950s was still based on rather strictly Calvinist, that is to say Reformed principles which Verburg had always felt a close affinity with. It may be argued then that part of the background to Verburg's studies is to be found in the author's life-long loyalty to these principles. As Verburg related himself in 1983:

At the end of the 1920s two Amsterdam professors, H. Dooyeweerd [(1892-1978)] [...] and D. H. T. Vollenhoven [(1894-1977)], advocated a new direction in philosophy. Their philosophy was known as the *Wijsbegeert der Wetsidee* ('Philosophy of the Concept of Law'), known in the U.S.A. and elsewhere as 'Cosmonomics'.

[...] Pos's philosophy of language seemed to me to be confined to a very indefinite description; hence I was all the more deeply impressed by the Cosmonomists' pronounced tendency towards a creative realism which was totally different from mediaeval realism, but as I came to realize only later, bore a certain resemblance to Nicolai Hartmann's realism - though the latter's secularist principles stood in stark contrast to the Christian inspiration of cosmonomic philosophy.

[Ende der zwanziger Jahren vertraten in Amsterdam zwei Professoren eine neue philosophische Richtung: H. Dooyeweerd [...] und D. H. T. Vollenhoven, der als Theologe begonnen hatte. [...] Ihre Philosophie wurde bekannt als 'Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee' (Philosophie der Gesetzesidee); in den USA und auch anderswo kam der Name 'Cosmonomics' auf.

[...] Die Sprachphilosophie von Pos blieb mir zu sehr in einer unentschiedenen Beschreibung stecken. Desto mehr war ich von den Kosmonomikern wegen ihrer entschiedenen Wendung zu einem schöpferischen Realismus beeindruckt, der keineswegs dem mittelalterlichen glich, sondern - wie ich freilich erst später

erkannte - eine gewisse Ähnlichkeit zu Nicolai Hartmanns Realismus aufwies, dessen Säkularismus jedoch in einer unversöhnlichen Antithese zur christlich inspirierten kosmologischen Philosophie steht. (Verburg 1983: 2)].

The 'normative' stance the reader will find in *Language and its Functions* and, among other things, the idea that language and its autonomy have to do with the fact that Verburg was an adherent of the 'philosophy of the concept of law'.⁹ It was Vollenhoven to whom Verburg owed the distinction between 'scientism' and 'practicalism',¹⁰ and to whose Festschrift of 1951 he contributed a paper on the history of linguistics; in a contribution to a Festschrift for Dooyeweerd (1965) he expounded his own 'delotic' (expository) linguistic theory (cf. Verburg 1971a and 1983). A member of the Calvinist Association for Philosophy, founded in 1935, Verburg published his first papers on matters linguistic (1941 ff.) in the journal of this association. In a lecture given in 1944, he claimed that only the *Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee* was able to 'place' certain developments in linguistics; it could give excellent service in elucidating linguistic viewpoints (cf. Verburg 1951b: 30-31). Verburg's philosophical basic views, then, took shape under the influence of the Calvinist philosophy as it began to develop in the early 1930s. It provided him with the framework he needed to analyse the wealth of linguistic-historiographical data. In this sense, too, one might say that not only Pos's lectures but also a wide variety of other 'difficult material has for better or worse been passed through the writer's personal mill' (Shetter 1966: 189).

One of his reviewers thought it salutary that 'in opposition to the often rather hollow relativistic attitude of the present-day Verburg does not disavow his Calvinist orthodoxy' (de Witte 1954: 514). It goes without saying that not all of his critics shared this type of philosophy of life, but, at any rate, it did not render 'the historiography less acceptable to different-minded readers', as Stutterheim (1954a: 219) dryly remarked.¹¹

3 *The intellectual context of Taal en Functionaliteit*

In the Netherlands at least, Pos's historical-critical approach in his courses on general linguistics seems to have been something of a novelty at the time. At other Dutch universities Hermann Paul's (1846-1921) *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (1880) or introductions to historical-comparative grammar

⁹ For details concerning this type of philosophy, see Dooyeweerd 1954-1958; ²1969.

¹⁰ The two terms are rendered in the translation of *Taal en Functionaliteit* as 'axiomatic rationalism' and 'pragmatic rationalism' respectively.

¹¹ Note, however, that Beth (1953: 94) pointed to the risk of a certain dogmatism, 'from which the author, as it appears to me, has not always escaped'.

were used as textbooks for general linguistics. Moreover, as it appeared to Verburg (1975: 10), there was never any keen interest in the history of linguistics among the inter-war generation of linguists. He was of the opinion that the histories of linguistics which had appeared since Benfey's voluminous *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 1869 had been of slender compass, and in addition gave little more than a recital of facts. It seems that Pos has had similar feelings. Several of his statements reflect this: 'A correct assessment of Scaliger's contribution to the development of grammar can only be made when the history of linguistics has been studied methodically', Pos remarked in 1927. A few years later, he spoke about the history of linguistics as having been neglected up to that time (cf. Noordegraaf 1990: 166; 1997: 167).

It should be noted, however, that since the turn of the century the Netherlands have seen a fairly continuous interest in the history of the individual language disciplines, which yielded various articles and dissertations dealing with specific historical aspects of the study of, for instance, Greek, Dutch or French. In addition, one can point to the noted and frequently practised 'introductory' genre, composed in the wake of Berthold Delbrück's (1842-1922) well-known *Einleitung in das Studium der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Methodik der vergleichenden Sprachforschung* (1880), books offering a concise historical survey, in which the author presents a brief overview of the development of linguistics from Plato's *Cratylus* to the present day, the main point, however, being the development of nineteenth-century comparative historical linguistics.

Be this as it may, in the early 1950s the state of the art of general linguistics was such that Stutterheim, who may be considered an expert in the field at the time, was forced to conclude that in the Netherlands 'very few studies were devoted to the history of language theory' (Stutterheim 1954a: 220). One might seriously doubt whether the situation elsewhere was much more favourable, the more when one remembers Aarsleff's dictum on the late 1950s: 'In those days there was no interest in the history of linguistics' (Aarsleff 1982: 5). At any rate, in the 1950s it appears to have been common practice, 'a matter of principle, in fact, to regard all investigations and statements made before the time of Wilhelm von Humboldt and Franz Bopp as 'pre-scientific' and utterly unremarkable. There were few exceptions, and, De Mauro (1990: 159) decided, Verburg was one of them.

As a matter of fact, it was R. H. Robins's *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe with Particular Reference to Modern Linguistic Doctrine* (1951) and Verburg's *Taal en Functionaliteit* (of the same year) which have been regarded as the first serious linguistic-historiographical studies in the post-war era, to which Arens's 1955 well-known anthology of texts in the history of linguistics may be added. As one of the contemporary reviewers put it: Verburg's study 'should be recognized as probably the most important general treatment of the subject since the basic works of Benfey and

Steinthal [...] Yet, it is something more than a supplement to earlier studies of theories of language. It marks an advance in the understanding of the place of theories of language in the history of ideas' (Faithfull 1953: 144). In 1974, Hymes considered the importance of this 'pioneering, unique study' to lie in its relevance to those engaged in sociolinguistics and other related approaches, wherein functional questions loom large (Hymes 1974: 27).

Following the rapid expansion of linguistic historiography in the last quarter of the twentieth century the present-day reader may ask other questions or deem other issues of more importance. Certain questions and certain issues, however, appear to be perennial, and these about language and its functions are definitely among them.

REFERENCES AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION

N.B. For further details about the life and times of Pieter A. Verburg the reader is particularly referred to Abraham & Stuart 1975, and to Verhaar 1989. References to writings by Verburg himself cited in the text above are omitted here, but included in the list of his works given below.

- Aarsleff, Hans 1982. *From Locke to Saussure. Essays on the Study of Language and Intellectual History*. London: Athlone.
- Abraham, Werner (ed.) 1975. *Ut Videam. Contributions to an understanding of linguistics. For Pieter Verburg on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Lisse: de Ridder.
- & Don Graham Stuart 1975. A brief biography of Pieter A. Verburg, professor of general linguistics in the National University at Groningen. In: Abraham 1975, 8-15.
- Algra H. et al. 1946. *De toekomst der Nederlandse beschaving. Verslag van het Congres van 28-30 Augustus 1946 te Nijmegen, gehouden door Het Nationaal Instituut*. Amsterdam.
- Arens, Hans 1955. *Sprachwissenschaft. Der Gang ihrer Entwicklung von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Freiburg & München: Alber. (2nd ed., revised and enlarged, 1969).
- Benfey, Theodor 1869. *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und orientalischen Philologie in Deutschland seit dem Anfange des 19. Jahrhunderts mit einem Rückblick auf die früheren Zeiten*. München: Cotta. (Repr. New York & London: Johnson, 1965).
- Boucher, Florine, Els Kalkman & Dick Schaap (eds) 1985. *Woord gehouden. Veertig jaar Stichting 1940-1945*. 's-Gravenhage: Staatsuitgeverij.
- Daalder, Saskia 1999. *H. J. Pos (1898-1955): studies over zijn filosofie van taal en taalwetenschap met een bibliografie van gepubliceerde*

- commentaren op zijn persoon en werk*. Two vols. Doctoral diss. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- De Mauro, Tullio 1990. Nachwort. In: Donatella di Cesare & Stefano Gensini (eds.), *Iter Babelicum. Studien zur Historiographie der Linguistik. 1600-1800*. Münster: Nodus, 159-164.
- Derkx, Petrus H. J. M. 1994. *H. J. Pos, 1898-1955: Objectief en partijdig. Biografie van een filosoof en humanist*. Hilversum: Verloren.
- Dooyeweerd, Herman 1953-1958, ²1969. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought* [Translation of *De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee* (1935)]. 4 vols. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris & Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co.
- Faithfull, R. G. 1953. Review of Verburg 1952. *Archivum Linguisticum* 5, 144-150.
- H[outen], T. B. van 1989. Prof. Dr. P. A. Verburg. *Mededelingen I.C.F. Nederland* 33.2, 5-6.
- Hymes, Dell 1974. Introduction. Traditions and paradigms. Dell Hymes (ed.), *Studies in the History of Linguistics. Traditions and Paradigms*. Bloomington & London: Indiana Univ. Press, 1-38.
- Koerner, E. F. Konrad 1978a. Linguistic Historiography till 1970. *Towards a Historiography of Linguistics. Selected essays*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 3-20.
- 1978b. *Western Histories of Linguistic Thought. An annotated chronological bibliography, 1822-1976*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Noordegraaf, Jan 1990. Pos als geschiedschrijver van de taalwetenschap. In: Saskia Daalder & Jan Noordegraaf (eds.), *H. J. Pos (1898-1955). Taalkundige en geëngageerd filosoof*. Amsterdam: Huis aan de drie Grachten, 153-175. (Repr. in *Voorlopig verleden. Taalkundige plaatsbepalingen 1797-1960* by Jan Noordegraaf. Münster: Nodus 1997, 155-177).
- 1991. Hendrik J. Pos (1898-1955) and the History of Linguistics. In: Elisabeth Feldbusch, Reiner Pogarell und Cornelia Weiss (eds.), *Neue Fragen der Linguistik. Akten des 25. Linguistisches Kolloquiums, Paderborn 1990*. Band 1: Bestand und Entwicklung. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 55-63. (Repr. in *The Dutch Pendulum. Linguistics in the Netherlands 1740-1900* by Jan Noordegraaf. Münster: Nodus 1996, 159-174).
- & Frank Vonk 1996. An 'Anatomy of Melancholy'. Writing the History of Linguistics in the Netherlands, 1900-1990. In: Herbert Brekle, Edeltraud Dobnig-Jülch & Helmut Weiß (eds.), *A Science in the Making. The Regensburg Symposia on European Linguistic Historiography*. Münster: Nodus, 137-163.
- Parret, Herman & Roger Van de Velde 1980. Structuralism in Belgium and the Netherlands. *Semiotica*. 29, 145-174.

- Robins, Robert H. 1951. *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe with Particular Reference to Modern Linguistic Doctrine*. London: G. Bells & Sons.
- Shetter, William Z. 1966. Review of Verburg 1952. *Foundations of Language* 21, 187-189.
- Stutterheim, Cornelis F. P. 1941. *Het Begrip Metaphoor. Een taalkundig en wijsgerig onderzoek*. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris. (Doctoral dissertation Municipal University Amsterdam).
- 1954a. Review of Verburg 1952. *Levende Talen* 1954, 218-220.
- 1954b. Review of Verburg 1952. *Museum* 59, cols. 113-116.
- 1988. Reminiscences of an old language researcher. *Historiographia Linguistica* 15, 317-329.
- Verhaar, John W. M. 1989. In memoriam P.A. Verburg. *Studies in Language* 13, 253-255.
- Verheul, Jaap & Joost Dankers 1990. Hét Nationaal Instituut. *Tot stand gekomen met steun van [...] Vijftig jaar Prins Bernhard Fonds, 1940-1990*. Zutphen: De Walburg Pers, 44-93.
- Winkel, Lydia E. 1989 *De ondergrondse pers 1940-1945*. Geheel herzien door Hans de Vries. Amsterdam: Veen (1st ed. 's-Gravenhage, 1954).

PUBLICATIONS BY PIETER A. VERBURG

N.B. This list does not claim to be complete in respect either of Verburg's unsigned papers or of his papers concerning the Nationaal Instituut.

1941

Review of Cornelis F. P. Stutterheim, *Het begrip Metaphoor*. Amsterdam 1941. *Correspondentiebladen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte* 6, 85-87.

1942

Steekproeven (Review of Karl Bühler, *Sprachtheorie*. Jena 1936). *Correspondentiebladen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte* 7, 59-61.

Review of Karl Vossler, 'Benedetto Croce's Sprachphilosophie', *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* XXIX, 2 (1941). *Correspondentiebladen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte* 7, 113-116.

1944

De Nieuwe Wijnsak. Leidraad tot verdieping van het staatsburgerlijk denken - door en voor werkers en verzetters. S.I., s.a. No. 1-4 (Febr. 1944 - August 1944); plus one special issue. [In these brochures one also finds anonymous papers written by other authors; cf. Winkel 1989:165].

1945

Het Nationaal Instituut, Department voor Volksvoorlichting, dat [...] geen departement is; waarom? waartoe? hoe? Amsterdam: Het Nationaal Instituut. 12 pp.

Gedachte en doel van het Nationaal Instituut. Het probleem van ons nationaal bewustzijn en onze nationale gemeenschapszin. Amsterdam: Het Nationaal Instituut 19 pp. [original stencilled edition 1944]

[Address]. *Kort Verslag van de Constituerende Vergadering van het Nationaal Instituut gehouden op Vrijdag 12 en Zaterdag 13 October 1945 te Amsterdam, 16-22.* [Amsterdam: Het Nationaal Instituut].

Steekproeven. K. Bühler (vervolg). *Correspondentiebladen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte* 8, 15.

1950

The Background to the Linguistic Conceptions of Bopp. *Lingua* 2, 438-468.

1951

(1951a). *Taal en functionaliteit. Een historisch-critische studie over de opvattingen aangaande de functies der taal vanaf de prae-humanistische philologie van Orleans tot de rationalistische linguïstiek van Bopp.* Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen. Doctoral dissertation Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1951. xx, 464 pp.; 27 'stellingen' (theses or points to be defended) appended on a separate sheet, 4 pp.

(1951b). Enkele lijnen en feiten in de ontwikkeling der taaltheorie. In: S.U. Zuidema (ed.). *Wetenschappelijke bijdragen door leerlingen van Prof. Dr. H. Th. Vollenhoven aangeboden ter gelegenheid van zijn 25-jarig hoogleraarschap aan de Vrije Universiteit.* Franeker & Potchefstroom: Wever, 13-32.

(1951c). De Stichting 1940-1945. In: H. van Riessen et al. (eds.), *Het grote gebod. Gedenkboek van het verzet in LO en KP*. Two vols. Kampen: Kok. Vol. 2: *Het verzetswerk in de LO en KP*, 546-555. (⁴1989).

Zonsopgang. *Correspondentiebladen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte* 15, 11-13.

1952

Taal en functionaliteit. Een historisch-critische studie over de opvattingen aangaande de functies der taal vanaf de prae-humanistische philologie van Orleans tot de rationalistische linguïstiek van Bopp. Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen 1952. (Commercial edition of 1951 dissertation. With an English summary, chronological table, index rerum, addenda.) XVI, 490 pp.

Reviewed by [Antonius] J. J. de Witte, O.P. (1952), *Tijdschrift voor Philosophie* 16, 513-514; Evert W. Beth (1953), *Algemeen Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte* 46, 94; A. Carnoy (1953), *Leuvense Bijdragen* 43, Bijblad, 108-110; R. Glyn Faithfull (1953), *Archivum Linguisticum* 5, 144-150; Walter Couvreur (1954), *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 32, 864; Cornelis F. P. Stutterheim (1954a), *Levende Talen* 1954, 218-220; idem, (1954b), *Museum* 59, cols. 113-116; William Z. Shetter (1966), *Foundations of Language* 21, 187-189.

De humanistische taaltheorie van Juan Luis Vives (1492-1540). *Handelingen van het twee en twintigste Nederlands Philologen-congres te Utrecht*. Groningen: Wolters, 69-70.

Taal en wet (I). *Correspondentiebladen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte* 16.2, 17-18.

1953

Taal en wet (II). *Correspondentiebladen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte* 17.2, 22-24.

1954

Model-gedachte, sub-functie, betekenis. *Handelingen van het drie en twintigste Nederlands Philologencongres te Nijmegen*. Groningen: Wolters, 65-66.

1957

Algemene taalwetenschap en encyclopaedie. Rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van hoogleraar in de Algemene Taalwetenschap aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen op 26 november 1957. Groningen & Djakarta: J. B. Wolters. (Inaugural lecture State University of Groningen). 23 pp.

1961

Bacon als vernieuwer van de encyclopaedische idee. *Algemeen Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte en Psychologie* 53, 169-180.

Het optimum der taal bij Wittgenstein. *Philosophia Reformata* 26, 161-172.

Het schaakspel-model bij F. de Saussure en L. Wittgenstein. *Wijsgerig Perspectief* 1, 227-234.

Hearer-Speaker Relation in Language Theory. In: Henk C. Huizing et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Course in Paedo-Audiology, June 13 - June 16, 1961*. Groningen, 29-35.

1962

Some Remarks on 'Communication' and 'Social' in Language Theory. *Lingua* 11 (= *Studia Gratulatoria* dedicated to Albert Willem de Groot in the year of his seventieth birthday), 453-468.

Een boek over moderne Engelse taalfilosofie (Review of Maxwell John Charlesworth, *Philosophy and Linguistic Analysis*. Pittsburgh & Louvain 1959). *Bijdragen. Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* 23.1, 12-22.

1963

Review of Arno Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel. Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*. Stuttgart 1957-1963. 6 vols. *Lingua* 12, 309-319.

1964

Vicissitudes of Paradigms. Paper prepared in advance for participants in the 25th Burg Wartenstein Symposium (August 15-12, 1964) on the theme 'Revolution vs. Continuity in the Study of Language'. Groningen. 31 pp.

1965

Delosis and Clarity. Philosophy and Christianity: Essays dedicated to Prof. Dr. Herman Dooyeweerd. Kampen: Kok, 78-99.

Albert Willem de Groot (Groningen, 13 januari 1892 - Laren N. H., 14 december 1963). *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde te Leiden 1964-1965*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 66-74.

1966

The Background to the Linguistic Conceptions of Bopp. Thomas Sebeok (ed.), *Portraits of Linguists. A biographical sourcebook for the history of Western linguistics, 1746-1963*. 2 vols. Vol. I. *From Sir William Jones to Karl Brugmann*. Bloomington & London: Indiana Univ. Press, 221-250. (Reprint of Verburg 1950).

1967

Review of J. A. Hutchinson, *Language and Faith, Studies in Sign, Symbol and Meaning*. Philadelphia 1963. *Linguistics* 34, 118-123.

1968

Ennoësis of language in 17th century philosophy. *Lingua* 21 (= In Honour of Anton Reichling on the occasion of his seventieth birthday), 558-572.

Review of Nikunja Vihari Banerjee, *Language, Meaning and Persons*. London 1963. *Linguistics* 39, 109-113.

1969

Hobbes' Calculus of Words. *ITL. Tijdschrift van het Instituut voor Toegepaste Linguïstiek te Leuven* 5, 62-69.

Computational Linguistics en de buitenlandse samenwerking. *Universiteit en Hogeschool* 16.1, 77-82.

1970

Hobbes' Calculus of Words. *Statistical Methods in Linguistics* 6, 60-65.

1971

(1971a) De mens in de taalkunde. *Truth and Reality. Philosophical perspectives on reality dedicated to Professor Dr. H.G. Stoker / Waarheid en Werkelijkheid. Wysgerige perspektiewe op die werklikheid opgedra aan Professor Dr. H.G. Stoker.* Braamfontein: De Jong, 262-282.

Het lege woord. *De Gids* 134, 156-158.

1974

Vicissitudes of Paradigms. Dell Hymes (ed.), *Studies in the History of Linguistic Traditions and Paradigms.* Bloomington & London: Indiana Univ. Press, 191-230.

1975

Stand en zin van de historie der taaltheorieën. Afscheidscollege gegeven op 28 oktober 1975 bij zijn afreden als hoogleraar in de Algemene Taalwetenschap en de Wijsbegeerte der Taal aan de Rijkuniversiteit te Groningen. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff. (Valedictory lecture State University of Groningen). 20 pp.

1976

The Idea of Linguistic System in Leibniz. In: Herman Parret (ed.), *History of Linguistic Thought and Contemporary Linguistics.* Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 593-615.

1980

Discipline versus Philosophy. In: Dick J. van Alkemade et al. (eds.), *Linguistic Studies offered to Berthe Siertsema.* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 137-154.

1981

Ars oder Scientia, eine Frage der Sprachbetrachtung im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. In: Horst Geckeler et al. (eds.), *Logos Semantikos. Studia*

linguistica in honorem Eugenio Coseriu, 1921-1981. Vol I: *Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie und der Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin: de Gruyter / Madrid: Gredos, 207-214.

1982

De plaats der taal bij onderwijs en filosofie in de Westerse cultuurgeschiedenis (tot 1700). In: Lodewijk F. van Driel & Jan Noordegraaf (eds.), *Studies op het gebied van de geschiedenis van de taalkunde*. Kloosterzande: Duerinck-Krachten, 11-34.

1983

Die Philosophie hinter einer Sprachtheorie: eine Skizze. In: Manfred Faust et al. (Eds.), *Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Sprachtypologie und Textlinguistik. Festschrift für Peter Hartmann*. Tübingen: Narr, 1-10.

1988

Soph. Oid. Kol. 939: legw oder legwn?. In: Jörn Albrecht (ed.), *Energiea und Ergon: Sprachliche Variation - Sprachgeschichte - Sprachtypologie. Studia in honorem Eugenio Coseriu*. 3 vols. Band III (ed., with introduction by Jens Lüdtke): *Das sprachtheoretische Denken Eugenio Coserius in der Diskussion (2)*. Tübingen: Narr, 287-291.

1998

Language and its functions; a historical-critical study of views concerning the functions 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 & Philadelphia: Benjamins (*Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science*, 84). xxxiii, 577 pp.

Reviewed by Paul T. Roberge 1999, *Historiographia Linguistica* 26, 225-231.

Jan Noordegraaf, Amsterdam
j.noordegraaf@let.vu

Bloomfield on Saussure

In 1923 Leonard Bloomfield published a review of the second edition of Ferdinand de Saussure's *Cours de linguistique générale* (*Modern Language Journal*, volume 8, pages 317-319). This offers a fascinating glimpse of how the origins of European structuralist linguistics appeared from a contemporary American viewpoint.

—oo0000oo—

Cours de Linguistique Générale. By Ferdinand de Saussure. Publié par Charles Bally et Albert Sechehaye, avec la collaboration de Albert Riedlinger. Deuxième édition. Paris: Payot et Cie.; 1922.

It is gratifying to see a second edition of de Saussure's posthumous work on language; the popularity of the book betokens not only an interest in language, but also a willingness of the scientific public to face linguistic theory, which at almost every step shocks our preconception of human affairs.

In de Saussure's lifetime¹ the history of the Indo-European languages was widely studied; he himself had made at least one great contribution to it, his *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes* (1878). But in lecturing on "general linguistics" he stood very nearly alone, for, strange as it may seem, the nineteenth century, which studied intensively the history of one family of languages, took little or no interest in the general aspects of human speech. After de Saussure's death the present book was put together, largely from lecture-notes.

The value of the *Cours* lies in its clear and rigorous demonstration of fundamental principles. Most of what the author says has long been "in the air" and has been here and there fragmentarily expressed; the systematization is his own. It is known that the historical change in language goes on in a surprisingly mechanical way, independent of any needs, desires, or fears of the speakers; we do not know, for instance, in what direction we, in our time, are changing the English Language.² Outside of the field of historical grammar, linguistics has

¹ A portrait of de Saussure and an outline of his life and work by W. Streitberg appeared in *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch*. vol.2, Strassburg 1915. The first edition of the *Cours* appeared in 1916.

² That is, as actually spoken: the literary language is a thing apart.

worked only in the way of a desperate attempt to give a psychologic interpretation to the facts of language, and in the way of phonetics, an endless and aimless listing of the various sound-articulations of speech. Now, de Saussure seems to have had no psychology beyond the crudest popular notions, and his phonetics are an abstraction from French and Swiss-German which will not stand even the test of an application to English. Thus he exemplifies, in his own person and perhaps unintentionally, what he proves intentionally and in all due form: that psychology and phonetics do not matter at all and are, in principle, irrelevant to the study of language. Needless to say, a person who goes out to write down an unknown language or one who undertakes to teach people a foreign language, must have a knowledge of phonetics, however, these things are all on a par, and do not form part of linguistic theory.

De Saussure distinguishes sharply between “synchronic” and “diachronic” linguistics. At any given time (“synchronously”), the language of a community is to be viewed as a system of signals. Each signal is made up of one or more units; these units are the “sounds” of the language. Not only has each signal a definite meaning (e.g. *hat*, *put*), but the combination of these signals proceeds by definite rules and itself adds definite elements of meaning; for instance, the signal *s* in English is not used alone; added to certain other signals it gives plural meanings (*hats*), added to certain others, it gives the third-person present-tense verb form (*puts*). All this is a complex and arbitrary system of social habit, imposed upon the individual, not directly subject to psychologic interpretation: all psychology will ever be able to do is to provide the general background which makes the thing possible. Similarly, the physiology of the thing (phonetics) does not matter: instead of the thirty-five or so sounds of English, and thirty-five distinct symbols, of whatever nature, would suffice to reproduce the system of the English language.

This rigid system, the subject-matter of “descriptive linguistics”, as we should say, is *la langue*, the language. But *le langage*, human speech, includes something more, for the individuals who make up the community do not succeed in following the system with perfect uniformity. Actual speech-utterance, *la parole*, varies not only as to matters not fixed by the system (e.g., the exact phonetic character of each sound), but also as to the system itself: different speakers at times will violate almost any feature of the system. This brings us to “historical linguistics”, *linguistique diachronique*; when such personal and temporary features of *la parole* become general and habitual in the community, they constitute a change, such as are recorded in our historical grammars.

In detail, I should differ from de Saussure chiefly in basing my analysis on the sentence rather than on the word; by following the latter custom de Saussure gets a rather complicated result in certain matters of word-composition and syntax. The essential point, however, is this, that de Saussure has here first mapped out the world in which historical Indo-European grammar

MAY 2000

HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN

(the great achievement of the past century) is merely a single province; he has given us the theoretical basis for a science of human speech.

Mechtild Bierbach***Grundzüge humanistischer Lexikographie. Ideengeschichtliche und rhetorische Rezeption der Antike als Didaktik.***

Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1997. (Kultur und Erkenntnis 18). 522 pp.
ISBN 3-7720-2409-2.

Mechtild Bierbach exemplifies her ideas on 'Humanistic lexicography' by analyzing twelve selected works published in France between 1517 and 1618. They are: (i) Guy de Fontenay, *Magna Synonyma* (French-Latin), 1517; (ii) F[rère] G[odefroy] R[egnier], *Hieronymi Cingularii Aurimontani tersissima Latini eloquij Synonymorum Collectanea* (French-Dutch), 1539; (iii) Robert Estienne, *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae Thesaurus* (Latin-French), 1531; (iv) id., *Dictionarium Latinogallicum*, 1538; (v) id., *Dictionaire francoislatin*, 1539; (vi) id., *Dictionaire Francoislatin, corrigé*, 1549; (vii) Charles Estienne, *De re hortensi libellus* (Latin-French), 1535; (viii) Léger Duchesne, *In Ruellium de stirpibus epitome* (Latin-French), 1539; (ix) Hadrianus Junius, *Nomenclator* (Latin-Greek-German-Dutch-French-Italian-Spanish-English), 1567; (x) Maurice de la Porte, *Les Epithetes* (French), 1571; (xi) Jean Le Frère and Étienne Tabourot, *Dictionnaire des rimes française*, 1588; (xii) Pierre de La Noue, *Synonyma et aequivoca gallica*, 1618. This selection shows that 'humanistic' pertains here to the era to which we give this name and, consequently, to a certain doctrine of language pedagogy which is best illustrated by Erasmus of Rotterdam's *De ratione studii* (Paris 1511), Ludovicus Vives' *De tradendis disciplinis* (Bruges 1531), and by *Ratio studiorum et institutiones scholasticae Societatis Jesu* (1599), the guidelines for teaching in the Jesuit colleges which came into being after the 1560s. The common source of all these publications is Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria libri XX* and its own source, Cicero's *De oratore*.

According to the author, the various types of French dictionaries are to be regarded as schoolbooks collected and provided by the teachers at the *collèges* for their students. In their teaching they combined the various functions of *poeta*, *orator*, and *grammaticus* of the Humanist (mainly Italian) tradition. The knowledge of Latin was useful for everyday life (*utilitas*) and, at the same time, was a prerequisite for higher intellectual activities (*otium*). But a knowledge of Latin, even for that time, depended directly on a knowledge of the authoritative classical texts whose language had to be imitated and evaluated according to its correctness and aptness (*imitatio, iudicium*). Indeed, the dictionaries were the direct result of reading these texts, having *notitiae*

collectae as an intermediary stage of their composition. Increasingly, the dictionary replaced the authoritative text itself, thus ensuring the closest possible imitation of its linguistic substance.

A second aim of linguistic training was language use according to the principle of *eruditio*. The various types of dictionaries did not simply “quote” the ancient authors as models of use, they also stored encyclopedic knowledge in the wealth of names, proper and common, that existed for objects of all kinds. Dictionaries in a topical arrangement (*nomenclatores*) mirrored the worlds of *res et verba* and provided the factual knowledge (*eruditio*) which provided the foundations of correct and apt language use. The central idea of Humanist learning, the availability of *copia verborum* (Erasmus), depended on the integrated use of the *imitatio* of the ancients and the *eruditio* in handling names, both directly learnable from dictionaries.

Mechtild Bierbach explains these interconnections between the *Zeitgeist* of Humanism in (Italy, Spain and) France and its lexicographical practice. She does so in great detail, analyzing many dictionaries and referring to many concomitant texts on language pedagogy, turning the elaborate footnotes of the book with their long quotations and translations almost into a book in their own right. Beneath the careful and methodical brush strokes of this historical picture, the French dictionaries of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries take on a shape of their own which sets them apart from our own categories of lexicography. The overriding aim of these dictionaries is not the inventory of lexis (of a whole language or some limited area of it) and its, preferably semantic, monoglot explanation, but the patterning of authoritative language use according to the principles of teaching and the provision of aids for language use and usage. This makes our present-day criteria of dictionary evaluation almost totally unfit for application to these historical texts. Although at all times dictionaries were and are meant to stimulate learning and to move from the unknown to the known, the French Humanist dictionaries under analysis here are schoolbooks in a much more direct sense than could generally be said of dictionaries and demand the appropriate didactic explanation which the author dwells upon.

It remains to be shown in what direct way the works of French lexicography were geared to the direct aims of teaching Latin under Humanist auspices. Vives and Erasmus, but also Battista Guarino (1434-1513) and other representatives of the Latin and Spanish development, stress as the aims of *exercitationes* translation, paraphrasis (*conversio*), *thesis* (written argument) and *declamatio* (spoken argument). All of them are served in one way or the other by the books under discussion here. The homogeneous way in which these exercises spread all over France under the enforcing validity of Jesuit regulations made them a permanent component of Latin teaching in schools, and which in many ways is even valid today. Guy de Fontanay’s and Godefroy Regnier’s works (1517 und 1539) are seen as supportive of the general aim of

letter writing, in the sense of Valla, marked by the copiousness and elegance of lexis. Besides fixed phrases for letters, it contains recurrent expressions from students' dialogues, thus preparing the way for the collection of *colloquia* which emerged towards the end of the fifteenth century and soon became popular. Robert Estienne's various dictionaries (1531, 1538, 1539, and 1549) serve oral education rather than written but still observe the general ideas of *proprietas, constructio, usus figuratus*, etc. They introduce phrase-oriented as opposed to lexeme-oriented learning and collect material for the technique of double translation, i.e. Latin-vernacular and then vernacular-Latin, popular in France, England, and Germany (Estienne, Palsgrave, Ascham, Agricola, etc.) The provision of proper words for the nomination of things was to be found in the works of Charles Estienne, Léger Duchesne, and Hadrianus Junius. The function of such dictionaries as those of de la Porte and Fèvre/Tabourot (1571 and 1588) for the technique of versification and theatre plays, eagerly cultivated by the Jesuits in their *collèges*, is almost too direct to need special mention. The use of vernacular French in all these dictionaries varies. The author distinguishes between a Latin period, where the French equivalents served only the semantisation of Latin, a bilingual period where a kind of a patriotism emerged which arranged Latin and French as independent entries of dictionaries in parallel without making one the mere translation of the other (e.g. Estienne's later dictionaries), and a vernacular period where French is indeed cultivated in imitation of the foregoing Latin Humanism.

Although the author warns us time and time again not to misinterpret the bilingualism (or multilingualism in the case of Junius) of dictionaries at that time as an 'explanation' of Latin with the help of French, she discusses the various techniques of semantisation, particularly as they appear in Robert Estienne's books. She makes out such techniques as factual information, confrontation (i.e. synonymous comparison) of words, antonymy, etymology and derivation, definition, glosses, and mixtures of these techniques. They all have their home in classical rhetoric where they serve as the proof of *proprietas*. Finally, there is the marking of the special ornate character of words.

Mechtild Bierbach's book is a rare combination of a panoramic view of some hundred years of French lexicography with clear didactic ideas on the routines of foreign language teaching at that time. She proves that many early publications which we have come to regard as 'scientific' ('academic') are in fact schoolbooks and have to be understood as such. Thus, the dichotomy between 'scientific' and 'applied' (never used by the author but in general use today) becomes dubious. She shows how dangerous it is to transfer present-day categories of understanding into the past, without, now and then, looking into their own historical conditions. And yet we also learn how epigonal many seemingly modern ideas on foreign language teaching and learning in fact are. Most theorists of modern foreign language teaching probably see their own

canon of ideas has having been conceived in distinct distance from the teaching of Latin. In looking into early lexicography as explained and illustrated here, they can learn that some Latinists outdistanced them by centuries. What could broadly be called 'functional language teaching' is in fact a Humanistic, not a modern asset. This pertains already to the early textbooks for the teaching of vernaculars, i.e. textbooks of the *Introito e porta* and the *Colloquia et dictionariolum* type, which are after all not so far away from Latin textbooks as is believed (Hüllen 1999). Perhaps Mechtild Bierbach somewhat overstates her case when maintaining time and time again that modern lexicography aims at inventorizing language whereas Humanist lexicography aimed at providing learning material. In the case of the OED, for example, which is certainly among the foremost of the inventorizing types of dictionaries, the many authentic examples of language use in literally every single entry show that for the makers of this dictionary the proof of inventorising was in using (just as the proof of the pudding is in the eating). But this is a topic for discussion which does not mean the slightest drawback for Mechtild Bierbach's erudite study.

REFERENCE

Hüllen, Werner 1999. *English Dictionaries 800-1700. The Topical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon. [See pp 46-48 of this *Bulletin* for a review]

Werner Hüllen, Düsseldorf
werner.huellen@uni-essen.de

Astrid Göbels

Die Tradition der Universalgrammatik im England des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts.

Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1999. 377 pp.

ISBN 3-89323-279-6. DM 120,00.

This is an exhaustive survey and a thorough analysis of all treatises on universal language/grammar and on language/grammatical universals in 17th- and 18th-century England (and beyond, in as far as necessary to analyse and characterise those numerous English works).

The creation of a universal language was a typical concern in 17th-century England; it was meant to be an artificially created language for scientific purposes - many of them with international contacts - to avoid misunderstanding and equivocation among scientists after the disappearance of Latin as their lingua franca. No wonder the Royal Society encouraged the initiative.

Inevitably, in order to make a universal language possible, the question arose which categories in the domains of phonetics, syntax, alphabet and lexicon were really necessary to make a universal language possible and what exactly the function of each of them was. Linguists and philosophers (in search of a 'philosophical grammar') tackled the problem, realising that the whole endeavour should be based on a theory of knowledge (mainly of the Aristotelian and Baconian kind). Scientists also understood that this universal language was to be a semantically unequivocal language, for which they started creating taxonomies, reflecting the achievements of 17th-century science.

The leading figure here was John Wilkins, aided by several members of the Royal Society. He created a 'philosophical' language, for the realisation of which he had to develop a theory of fundamentals of language. He had Francis Lodwick, George Dalgarno and Cave Beck as his predecessors, and though his whole enterprise foundered after (or even before) his death, his influence could still be traced in 18th-century works.

In the English 18th century no further attempts were made at creating a universal language, though Wilkins's concern somehow survived in the quest for language universals and for the origin of the phenomenon language. The underlying epistemology is mostly Lockean now. Words are no longer believed to directly 'mean' things, but to reflect people's ideas about reality; and these ideas are not universally the same. Therefore, a universal language cannot be created. As a matter of fact, it is possible to examine whether there are any

basic grammatical universals, and which ones they are. This was the concern of James Harris, Joseph Priestley and Lord Monboddo, amongst others. Authors of English grammars, as John Brightland/Charles Gildon, James Greenwood and many others also believed that grammatical universals constituted a useful basis for their work.

The 18th century further discerned the social function of language; and with the ongoing interest in the origin of society, the quest was launched for the origin of language. It was one of Lord Monboddo's concerns. Untouched by Lockean problems and insights and firmly believing in a literal interpretation of the Bible, some authors believed that the original, truly 'universal' language was the one created by God via Adam. This oldest language - which did not survive the Babel calamity - had an extreme purity and there existed a 'natural' relation between referent and word. There were endeavours, in the second half of the 18th century, to retrace and recreate that language of Eden, viz. by Rowland Jones.

John Horne Tooke's virulent attack on the belief in language universals meant more or less the end of a search that had inspired the philosophers and grammarians for two centuries (though it survived, for instance, in 19th-century comparative linguistics).

To trace this history, with all its interdependencies in all 17th- and 18th-century English works, has been the aim of Astrid Göbels. The author has also examined the links - far beyond the English frontiers - between these works and philosophical and other treatises in Antiquity (Plato, Aristotle), the Middle-Ages (the Modistae) and modern times (Sir Francis Bacon, the Port-Royal grammar, John Locke, Etienne Bonnot de Condillac, Adam Smith, Johann Gottfried Herder...). She has chosen not to limit herself to the leading figures (Wilkins, Harris, Priestley, Monboddo), but has also traced their influence on lesser works dealing with universal grammar and even with English school grammars. She expected there to be a cross-fertilisation, which, indeed, there was since the boundaries between English and universal grammars were not clear-cut at all. She has analysed a very large number of works and has done this very carefully and with unflagging energy. I can best illustrate all this by describing her work in some more detail.

Chapter 1 deals with the status of language in the 17th century and sketches the waning influence of Latin and the development of a new, largely taxonomic, knowledge, which was believed to require an unequivocal lexicon and grammar. By the end of the century Locke will question the existence of an unequivocal relation between object and word, thus sapping the basis of what Wilkins and others tried to realise with their universal language.

Chapter 2 sketches the philosophical tendencies of the 17th century. These are mainly Descartes's philosophy (more might have been said, also at other places in Göbels's work, about his proposal of a universal language) and Bacon's critical contribution. The latter in a nutshell concerns the inadequate

relation between existing languages and the presumed order in reality, an ideographic writing system and a universal grammar. This leads directly to Wilkins's endeavours.

To put Wilkins's work in a larger universal grammar tradition, chapter 3 treats Aristotle, the Modistae, Sanctius, Scaliger and Campanella, and Wilkins's immediate predecessors in the second half of the 17th century, who have projects for a universal grammar on a philosophical basis. Also the English grammarians Alexander Gill, John Wallis and Jeremiah Wharton are referred to.

Chapter 4 then offers a very detailed, systematic and clear description and analysis of Wilkins's work. He is situated in his time, as a real scholar (not only in linguistics and philosophy) and as a religious person, concerned with a return to Adam's language via his work on universal language. His many contacts with other members of the Royal Society and his cooperation with several scientists are dealt with. Göbels particularly discusses his universal philosophy and his natural grammar, as well as their interrelation. Wilkins's universe was ordered and human knowledge was believed to be universally the same. Therefore it was possible for this to be reflected in a perfect, universal language with a 'natural' grammar, syntax and phonetics. Unfortunately, this grammar was not based on an analysis of existing languages, but postulated an isomorphism between the order of reality and representations of this reality on the one hand and the human structures of thinking and language on the other hand.

Chapter 5 discusses Wilkins's disciples in the 17th century. They were language teachers and writers of practical, mostly English or Latin, grammars. But some of them also had 'philosophische Sprachbetrachtungen' (p. 105). In my opinion, these latter preoccupations were rather vague in Archibald Lane's work (he just claims to have defined his word classes in a 'universal' way and he remains vague about the 'unalterable Rules of Right Reason'). In a certain sense this also holds for Mark Lewis and William Clare (and some authors in other chapters). But I admit that it is useful to find even minor grammars dealt with for completeness's sake. But why, then, not deal with Christopher Cooper, who was not a minor author, as well?

By the end of the 17th century the term 'universal' no longer refers to a natural order in the world, but to 'das Aufdecken von Beschreibungsmustern, die allen Sprachen gemeinsam sind' (p. 113). Rather than leaving 70 years unaccounted for in jumping straight from Wilkins to Harris, chapter 6 deals with the first half of the 18th century. No major works are to be mentioned, but a few grammars are much beyond the average school grammar. They teach English and at the same time they are in search of universal language patterns. They also switch from a word-centred to a syntax-centred approach, and link language up with mental operations. Essential language categories are the ones that are found in all (western), 'civilised' languages. In that respect the

grammars of Brightland/Gildon and of Greenwood, the *Bellum Grammaticale*, and Michael Maittaire's work are thoroughly analysed, and the influence of the Port-Royal grammar, of Wilkins, Wallis and Locke is traced.

The long chapter 7 (why not split it up?) discusses the second half of the 18th century. As a matter of fact, Harris's work is analysed in detail. His sources and references are shown to be mainly situated in antiquity (Plato, Aristotle, and also Priscian) and in the 16th century (Bacon, Scaliger), to which Locke's work is to be added. Harris combines universal and specific language analysis, which had run parallel since the Renaissance.

Then follows the discussion of Daniel Farro's Royal Universal British Grammar (mark the combination of universal and British). The underlying idea of this and some other works is that the basic principles of grammar are the same in all languages. Add to this the dream for English to become the universal language of the future, so many centuries after the Babel incident.

The 17th-century search for Adam's language, which - according to Genesis - disappeared at the confusion of Babel, is traced a bit further on in chapter 7, when Rowland Jones's work is discussed. He believes this 'first universal language of mankind' (however small 'mankind' may have been in Eden) to have been English, which he also considers to be the universal language of all future believers.

But in between there still is the important work of Priestley, especially his *Course of Lectures*. He no longer expects to rediscover Adam's language, provided there be one. He sees human beings as historical beings - i.e. language develops over time - and as social beings - i.e. they need verbal and non-verbal communication. These two natural principles underlie language, as they should underlie the study of it. Universal grammar can only be found by comparing the existing languages to discover what they have in common.

In the last quarter of the century we meet Monboddo, who is even more interested in the origin and development of humanity, as a basis and prerequisite for the study of the origin and development of language. Influenced by Rousseau and Condillac, he sketches the history of human beings from solitary savages to beings in a 'political state', with a slowly growing intelligence and thinking capacity and slowly growing needs to communicate. Accordingly, their language, once it comes into being, gradually becomes more perfect. He does not believe that a universal language has ever existed or will ever exist. (Incidentally, for this author and this period, I wonder why Göbels has not consulted more works on what is commonly called 'missionary linguistics').

After discussing James Beattie, the Gough brothers and Charles Coote, she finally deals with John Horne Tooke, who attacks and tries to destroy the work of most grammarians and thinkers dealing with universal grammar and language universals.

Göbels's work is a doctoral dissertation, submitted at the Universität Gesamthochschule Essen. I can imagine that she defended it with verve. It is mature, transparent, well-structured, a unique contribution to English 17th- and 18th-century linguistics within a European framework. I just want to make some minor remarks:

Occasionally she seems all too readily to believe what some grammarians claim. To give just one example, is Gough's claim in his preface (quoted on p. 175 and also dealt with on p. 179) not mainly (or merely) a means to have his book sell well? This may also apply to some other grammarians.

I have already made a remark on the inclusion (and exclusion) of some (minor) authors. I know there are pros and cons for most of them, but why for example include Ann Fisher's grammar, which is intended as (and is not more than) a good school grammar, by 18th-century pedagogical standards?

I regret that Descartes has not been more carefully consulted. Another question: why rely on an English translation of Wallis's work?

I have serious doubts concerning the so-called influence of Ramus on 18th-century English grammar (p. 107). Nor do I think that Priestley's distinction between 'names of things and qualities' and 'words adapted to denote the relations' (p. 202, fn. 8) can so easily be compared with the theme-rheme distinction in modern linguistics.

I would further advise the author to insert the long footnote 8 on p. 118 into the text, for example somewhere on or around p. 105. And I also wonder whether the same should not be done with footnote 6 on p. 223. This is not due to the length of those footnotes (there are other long, interesting footnotes which are exactly at their place), but because they give rather basic information.

Finally, I regret the many typos.

But these remarks do not at all diminish my sincere admiration for an outstanding piece of work.

Emma Vorlat, *Leuven*

Murray G. Hall / Herbert Ohrlinger

Der Paul Zsolnay Verlag 1924-1999. Dokumente und Zeugnisse.

Vienna: Paul Zsolnay Verlag, 1999. 103 pp.

ISBN 3-552-04948-7.

This is the story of the metamorphoses of a publishing house in Vienna from 1924 to 1999, when the 75th anniversary was celebrated. It is even more the story of a remarkable publisher who launched the enterprise and guided it until political events made it impossible for him to maintain control.

Paul Zsolnay was originally a producer of flowers rather than best-sellers. However, in 1924 he was persuaded to undertake the mission of presenting international works of literature to the German-speaking public. He became involved with authors such as John Galsworthy, Pearl Buck and Colette as well as other authors such as Heinrich Mann who wrote originally in German. His generosity and his devotion to the authors themselves was a key to his success, although he would claim that he was never suited to being a publisher.

When the National Socialist regime came to power in Germany in 1933, the biggest market for the publications of Paul Zsolnay was adversely affected. Some of his authors were *personae non gratae*. In a revealing correspondence with Mrs. H. G. Wells it was necessary to point out why her husband's books were no longer selling well in Germany. For a while, authors of various persuasions were accommodated within the Paul Zsolnay Verlag, but after the *Anschluß*, no further accommodation was possible. In 1939 the publisher himself was obliged to join the diaspora in London.

Faithful service did not protect those Jewish people who remained with the firm. The literary director Felix Costa was deported and not seen again.

Names changed with the times. During the war the Paul Zsolnay Verlag became the Karl H. Bischoff Verlag. However, the establishment continued to be productive in spite of interventions from the Propaganda Ministry against the appearance of books by authors such as Pearl Buck.

When Paul Zsolnay eventually returned to his publishing house again after the war, he did so with his old remarkable spirit. In his view, what made a publishing house successful was love - love for the book, love for those to whom the book would bring pleasure and grateful love for those who have written the books.

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

Werner Hüllen

English Dictionaries 800-1700 The Topical Tradition.

Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. 525 pp. ISBN 0-19-823796-0.

This is a most welcome and surprisingly overdue addition to the literature of lexicography, and - more generally - to early modern intellectual history.

The topical dictionary is a dictionary arranged by topic rather than by the order of the alphabet. Alphabetical ordering we now take for granted in English dictionaries, but from the earliest Old English glosses well into the 17th century - and arguably beyond, if we can regard thesauruses as akin to topical dictionaries - the onomasiological tradition was regarded as equally, if not in fact rather more respectable, with its seemingly scientific application of an overarching taxonomic principle to the real (and unreal) world as reflected in the lexicon. The present book investigates this collateral line in the evolution of the 'English dictionary'.

It is an axiom of lexicography that dictionaries provide information about words, not things - for information about things we turn to the encyclopedia, usually itself arranged alphabetically, of course; but encyclopedic dictionaries formerly frowned upon by 'serious' lexicographers have made a distinct comeback in the final decades of the 20th century. In practice, as anyone who tries will soon discover, it is almost impossible to provide information about how a particular word which happens to be a concrete noun is used, without also providing a considerable amount of 'encyclopedic' information about the thing denoted by that word.

The earliest 'English' dictionaries are, of course, bilingual; the first monolingual English dictionary is usually said to be Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall* (1604), but it is not what we would recognise as a dictionary today, for it contains only 'hard words', it will be another century before a recognisably 'modern' English dictionary is produced. Not that bilingualism was universally viewed as a good thing: one of the *nomina reprehensibilium uirorum* cited here from the seventh chapter of the 15th-century *Mayer Nominale* (and passing over the *kukwald ... cui non sua sufficit uxor*), is that of the *bilinguis, qui habet binas linguas*, which Hüllen glosses as 'obviously something reprehensible', leaving the reader uncertain as to quite what he means - does he understand it literally? A whole-text search on the invaluable *OED* CD-Rom turns up an apposite citation from the roughly contemporary *Catholicon Anglicum* (1483), s.v. *double-tongued*, defined as 'Speaking contrary or inconsistent things; deceitful or insincere in speech': *Dubylle-tonged, ambiloquus, bilinguis* - clearly as figurative as *two-faced*, or the (probably invented North American) *forked tongue*.

The late medieval *Nominales*, as the name suggests, 'are marked by a preponderance of nouns [...] and are predominantly a mirror of people's awareness of

the world around them'. Later these books came to be known as *Nomenclators* and their inventories are still heavily noun-dominated; Hüllen is surely right to link them with the learning of a foreign language and in this context cites the Bangor Friar School Statutes of 1568: *They shall begin with words that concern the head reciting orderly as nigh as they can every part and number of the body and every particular of the same, after that they shall teach the names of sickness, diseases, virtues, vices, fishes, fowls, birds, beasts, herbs, shrubs, trees, and so forth.*

Hüllen is generously inclusive in his definition of 'topical dictionaries' and the fourth chapter is taken up with surveying *Colloquies, wordbooks, and dialogues for teaching foreign languages*, incorporating, in particular, his earlier published close reading of the *Dialogues in French and English* printed by Caxton in 1483. In this connexion the statement that 'The early fifteenth century was not a time when the printing of oral speech could be considered a normal thing' is decidedly odd - the early fifteenth century was not a time when the printing of *anything* (except the occasional devotional woodcut) could be considered normal! Chapter five analyses various treatises on particular branches of technical expertise, e.g. husbandry, rhetoric, geometry and seafaring.

At times the author is perhaps *over*-generous, and there is an *embarras de richesse*. The third section of the book, running to well over 100 pages or a quarter of the total, is entitled *The European Scene 1400-1700*, and while undeniably of some interest in contextualising the Insular experience, is arguably excessive in a book calling itself *English Dictionaries* - one cannot altogether suppress the suspicion (strengthened by a browse through the author's own bibliography) that a certain amount of recycling has been going on here. Indeed, there is something potentially misleading about that main title, for even tolerably well-informed readers might expect it to imply *mono-lingual* dictionaries containing *definitions* of English words, whereas the great bulk of the works discussed, even those which style themselves 'dictionaries', are bilingual productions which aim to give translation equivalents.

Lexicographers and those who write about lexicography soon become inured to accusations of having 'swallowed the dictionary', but the temptation to use 'inkhorn terms' is sometimes overwhelming. Sometimes it's just nice to give some of the rarest words an outing. It was with some trepidation that I recently ventured to suggest to a colleague that, in a book aimed at students, the word *fissiparous* was perhaps a touch recondite, painfully aware of playing the pot to his kettle. That said, and fully aware of the dangers of living in glass houses (earlier it would have been 'having a glass head' - an even more alarming image), I have to say that 'aureole' struck me as a mite aureate: '*Eikon Basilike* [...] created an aureole around the House of Stuart after the regicide'. Perhaps, however, the use of the word should be put down to the fact that the author is not a native English speaker, for, though it feels somewhat churlish to say so, and despite the best efforts of Richard Brunt of Essen (*Preface*), there are occasional awkwardnesses in the English.

Three chapters in the middle of the book analyse particular works in some detail: *John Withals' dictionary for young boys (1553)*; *James Howell's dictionary for the genteel (1660)*; and *John Wilkins' comprehensive thesaurus of English (1668)*.

Throughout the present volume Hüllen quite properly also considers *The question of social reality* to be inferred from a close reading of these books, a welcome relief from the more solidly linguistic discussion. The reader must be grateful for his habit of quoting all sorts of entertaining titbits from these and the other books surveyed. From Withals (1553), for example, Hüllen notes that he includes *a childe borne with the feete forward* and points out that 'any irregularity in giving birth was superstitiously associated with unfavourable meanings' citing Shakespeare's references to Richard III's breech delivery - curiously, the only (late nineteenth-century) superstitions recorded at *Birth, breech* in the *Oxford Dictionary of Superstitions* suggest persons born thus are endowed with healing powers.

There is some alarming typography on pages 91-2; the bizarre thorn is bad enough (surely the Clarendon Press runs to a normal thorn?), but throughout the extracts quoted from the unique Trinity College, Cambridge manuscript of the early fifteenth-century Anglo-French *Femina*, the manuscript's 's' is transcribed as 'j', so that *les sag(e)s* appear as *lej sagj* and in the Middle English translation, these *wysmen* become *wyjmen*!

The book closes with a summary, followed by some forty pages of Appendix containing specimen excerpts and tables of contents of many of the books discussed, which readers are told they are not 'required to consult, but they may find it helpful and rewarding to do so' (!) There is also a comprehensive Bibliography and Index.

There is no doubt that Professor Hüllen has done a great service in reminding the scholarly world of this unaccountably neglected chapter in the history of lexicography, and any future overview of that subject will be the richer for having access to this book.

Malcolm Jones, Sheffield
M.H.Jones@Sheffield.ac.uk

Elke Nowak (ed.)

Languages Different in all their Sounds ... Descriptive Approaches to Indigenous Languages of the Americas 1500 to 1850.

Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1999. 181 pp.

ISBN 3-89323-131-5; ISSN 0271-7129.

This valuable contribution to our discipline starts (pp. 7–14) with an introduction provided by the editor herself. Given her customary clarity and lucidity, she provides an excellent beginning to a reading of the book.

She is followed by W. Keith Percival, who (pp. 15–29), treats of Nebrija's work as a model for missionary linguists. I found his advice in respect of possible future lines of research particularly inspiring.

A fruitful line of future investigation might be to continue examining the relation between the study of exotic languages and what else was happening to Europeans in that unprecedented period of global expansion. Second, I think we may need to look at the development of linguistic traditions in the Islamic and Jewish world, as well as India and the Far East, where we will again need to look carefully at the social and political functions of linguistic work. In this way, we may gain a better understanding of the multi-faceted role that linguistic study plays in civilized societies.

The following contribution is Cristina Monzón's account (pp. 31–51) of tradition and innovations in sixteenth-century grammars of New Spain. It provides a most interesting description of work by four Franciscan friars, with texts dated between 1547 and 1574.

Lindsey Crickmay then gives us an article (pp. 53–66) entitled 'Many Ways of Saying, One Way of Writing' and also furnished with a subtitle: 'European registration of Andean languages in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries'. This examines in much interesting detail various early ways of reducing Andean languages to writing.

In 'Of Children's Games and Brewing Maize Beer' (pp. 67–99), Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz treats us to the text and analysis of a vocabulary, mainly (see p. 73) in Quechua and Spanish from eighteenth-century southern Peru. This appears particularly valuable, in that the text in question has not previously been published, let alone edited as carefully as it is here.

Rüdiger Schreyer then contributes (pp. 101–115) an article entitled 'Gabriel Sagard's *Dictionary of the Huron Tongue* (1632)'. As he says himself (p. 110), 'Sagard was a pioneer and his dictionary of Huron a pioneering work

of Huron linguistics. It merits further study.' Surely Schreyer himself is the man for that, having got off to such a good start here.

In his account (pp. 117–154) of eighteenth-century descriptions of Arawak by Moravian missionaries, Peter van Baarle provides much interesting information material that is, of 'a fairly high quality' and, most importantly of all, 'still relevant to the study of Arawak as it is spoken today'.

The last contribution allows Michael Mackert to deal (pp. 155–173) with Horatio Hale's grammatical sketches of native languages of the American Northwest and in particular the case of Tsihaili-Selish. Like some of the other authors in the volume, Mackert insists (p. 170) on the need for further work on his topic. Having read his article, one feels certain that when forthcoming, such work will be just as interesting as the present article.

There is (pp. 175–181) an 'Index nominum'. More generally, the book has of course been produced in accordance with the unmistakable house style of Nodus Publikationen. All in all, I can recommend this book very highly indeed to all those that take the history of linguistics seriously.

Anders Ahlqvist, *Galway*
ahlqvist@ucg.ie

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(to 20 March 2000)

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 and articles in journals, will not normally be reviewed. It would be appreciated if the source of articles could be noted where not already stated on the offprints.

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

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

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

COLOMBAT, Bernard

La grammaire latine en France à la Renaissance et à l'Âge classique: Théories et pédagogie. Grenoble: ELLUG Université Stendal, 1999. 724 pp. ISBN 2-84310015-1.

CRAM, David, LINN, Andrew & NOWAK, Elke (eds.)

History of Linguistics 1996: Volume 1: Traditions in Linguistics Worldwide. Selected Papers from the Seventh International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHOLS VII) Oxford, 12-17 September 1996. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 94]. xx + 336 pp. ISBN 90-272-4582-7.

CRAM, David, LINN, Andrew & NOWAK, Elke (eds.)
History of Linguistics 1996. Volume 2: From Classical to Contemporary Linguistics. Selected Papers from the Seventh International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHOLS VII) Oxford, 12-17 September 1996. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 94]. xx + 385 pp. ISBN 90-272-4583-5.

CROWLEY, Tony
The Politics of Language in Ireland 1366-1922: A Sourcebook. London / New York: Routledge, 2000. xvi + 236 pp. ISBN 0-415-15717-X (hbk), 0-415-15718-8 (pbk).

GWOSDEK, Hedwig
A Checklist of English Grammatical Manuscripts and early Printed Grammars, c. 1400-1540. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 2000. [Henry Sweet Society Studies in the History of Linguistics, 6] 147 pp. ISBN 3-89323-456-X.

HELSLOOT, Niels
Vrolijke Wetenschap: Nietzsche als Vriend. Baarn: AGORA, 1999. 343 pp. ISBN 90-391-0752-1.

NÍ ÚRDAIL, Meidhbhín
The Scribe in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Ireland: Motivations and Milieu. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 2000. [Studien und Texte zur Keltologie, 3]. 320 pp. ISBN 3-89323-613-9.

SUBACIENE, Giedra and SUBACIUS, Giedrus
Newberry Lituanica: Books of Lithuanian and Old Prussian Interest at the Newberry Library, Chicago to 1904. Chicago: Lithuanian American Community, Inc., 1999. xviii + 64 pp. ISBN 5-420-01456-4.

VRIES, M. de
Brieven aan H.J. Koenen. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU Amsterdam / Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1998. 96 pp. ISBN 90-72365-54-2.

JOURNALS

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft. 9:2 (1999). ISSN 0939-2815.

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

ALTMAN, Cristina

“From ‘Insula Vera Crux’ to ‘Terra Brasiliensis’: History, (hi)stories and the historiography of Brazilian linguistics.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 71-80.

ARCHAIMBAULT, Sylvie

“Quelques repères dans la définition de la norme grammaticale en Russie au XVIIIe siècle.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 291-299.

ATHERTON, Mark

“King Alfred’s approach to the study of Latin.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 15-22.

BREVA-CLARAMONTE, Manuel

“Morphosyntactic analysis of exotic languages in Lorenzo Hervás (1735-1809).” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 81-89.

CHAPMAN, Don

“Notions of compounding in Priscian’s *Institutiones*.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 23-30.

CHEVILLARD, Jean-Luc

“The conception of ‘coordination’ in ancient Tamil grammar.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 313-320.

CHIRICÒ, Donata

“La philosophie linguistique de Maine de Biran et la naissance en France de la psychologie scientifique.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 217-225.

CHRISTY, T. Craig

“Saussure’s ‘anagrams’: Blunder or paralanguage?.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 299-305.

CRICKMAY, Lindsey

“Diverse sounds and similar meanings: Registration of Quechua and Aymara terms by Spanish lexicographers in the early colonial period.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 91-98.

DAVIS, Daniel R.

“Edward Davies and paradigm shift in nineteenth-century Celtic studies.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 175-180.

DEDENBACH-SALAZAR SÁENZ, Sabine

“An anonymous eighteenth-century Southern Peruvian vocabulary: Hybridisation, semantic peculiarities and socio-cultural contextualization.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 99-110.

DINI, Mehdi Meshkatod

“The development and the climax of the Persian grammatical tradition.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 271-276.

DUTZ, Klaus

“Ein kurzer Kommentar zu Eto und Glifz.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 9:2 (1999), 242-244.

ELFFERS, Els

“Predecessors of cognitive semantics and speech act theory?.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 307-320.

ETO, Hirokuyi

“Anlaß und Motivation der Neuartigkeit von der Glinzschen ‘Fünf-Wortarten-Lehre’. Eine kurze Stellungnahme zur Kritik von Professor Hans Glinz auf meinen letzten Beitrag.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 9:2 (1999), 238-242.

EWALD, Heinrich

“On the history of semitic linguistic philosophy: Ernest Renan and Heinrich Ewald.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 241-247.

FALK, Julia S

“‘Language as a living, cultural phenomenon’: Gladys Amanda Reichard and the study of Native American languages.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 111-118.

GALLARDO, Matilde

“The teaching of Spanish as a foreign language at the University of Oxford: Fernando de Arteaga y Pereira and his ‘Practical Spanish, a Grammar of the Spanish Language’ (1902).” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 227-232.

GARZA CUARÓN, Beatriz

“Main trends in the history of linguistics in Mexico.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 119-126.

GLINZ, Hans

“Ein Brief an Herrn Hiroyuki Eto.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 9:2 (1999), 231-237.

GODART-WENDLING, Béatrice

“De l’influence du «principe de dualité» sur le traitement algébrique des phrases.” *Logique & Analyse* 155-156 (1996), 389-409.

GODART-WENDLING, Béatrice

“Histoire de la notion de catégorie dans les premières grammaires catégorielles.” In Rodríguez, Mauro Fernández et al. (eds.) *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Historiografía Lingüística, 1997*. (Arco / Libros, S.L., 1997), 335-346.

GODART-WENDLING, Béatrice

“Le statut du mot dans les formalismes de Carnap et d’Adjukiewicz.” In Fradin, B. & Marandin, J.-M. (eds.) *Mots et grammaires*. (Paris: Didier Érudition, 1997), 181-197.

GODART-WENDLING, Béatrice

“Compositionnalité.” *Traitement Automatique des Langues* 39:1 (1998), 9-34.

GODART-WENDLING, Béatrice

“Mais que fait Bar-Hillel quand ‘le soleil siffle’?” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 321-329.

HASSLER, Gerda

“Diversity of human languages and universals of thought: An eighteenth-century debate in the Berlin Academy.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 163-174.

HINT, Mati

“Is a linguistic theory needed for successful applied linguistics? The Estonian experience.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 233-240.

HÜLLEN, Werner

Review of John Honey, *Language is Power. The Story of Standard English and its Enemies*. (London / Boston: Faber & Faber, 1997). *Sociolinguistica* 13 (1999), 286-291.

HÜLLEN, Werner

“Mit den gemeinen Leuten – der Aufbruch der *Royal Society* zu einer neuen Wissenschaftssprache.” In Weigand, H. E. (ed.) *Sprache und Sprachen in den Wissenschaften*. (Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 619-637.

HÜLLEN, Werner

“Onomasiological dictionaries (900-1700): Their tradition and their linguistic status.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 89-103.

ISERMANN, Michael

“Substantial vs. relational analogy in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century linguistic thought.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 105-112.

JANKOWSKY, Kurt R.

“The works of Ernst Wilhelm Brücke (1819-1892) and Johann N. Czermak (1828-1873): Landmarks in the history of phonetics.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 241-253.

JEREMIÁS, Éva M.

“The Persian Grammar of Sir William Jones.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 277-288.

JOSEPH, John E.

“The colonial linguistics of Léopold de Saussure.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 127-137.

KELLY, Louis G.

“Time, the verb and Albertus Magnus.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 31-40.

KEMERTELIDZE, Nino D.

“Theories on the origin of Kartuli [Georgian] writing [alphabet].” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 227-233.

KOERNER, Konrad

“The concept of ‘revolution’ in linguistics: Historical, methodological and philosophical considerations.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 3-14.

KOERNER, Konrad

“What is the history of linguistics good for?” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 9:2 (1999), 209-230.

LAUZON, Matthew

“‘A Language More Peculiarly Circumstanced than any that has yet Appeared’: English as a ‘perfect’ language in eighteenth-century linguistic thought.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 175-182.

LEON, Jacqueline

“La mécanisation du dictionnaire dans les premières expériences de traduction automatique (1948-1960).” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 331-340.

LEOPOLD, Joan

“‘Orientalism’ and the development of the Volney Prize in Linguistics.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 257-266.

LINN, Andrew

“Charles Bertram’s ‘Royal Danish-English Grammar’: The linguistic work of an eighteenth-century fraud.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 183-191.

MAAT, Jaap

“Leibniz on rational grammar.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 113-122.

MACKERT, Michael

“Horatio Hale’s grammatical sketch of Tsihaili-Selish.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 139-146.

MARCONDES DE SOUZA FILHO, Danilo

“The relevance of the discussion of the nature of signs in ancient scepticism.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 41-49.

MATTHEWS, Stephen

“Y.R. Chao and Universal Chinese Grammar.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 217-224.

McKENDRY, Eugene

“J.G. Sparwenfeldt and Celtic linguistics in seventeenth-century Sweden.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 181-189.

McMAHON, William E.

“The semantics of Johann Alsted.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 123-129.

MERRILEES, Brian and EDWARDS, William

“From French-Latin to Latin-French: Reconstructing a medieval dictionary source” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 51-62.

MONZÓN, Cristina

“Innovations in a vernacular grammar: A comparison of Fray Maturino Gilberti’s Latin and Tarascan grammars.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 147-154.

MUNTEANU, Eugen

“On the object-language/metalinguage distinction in St Augustine’s works: De Dialectica and De Magistro.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 65-78.

NERLICH, Brigitte

“The pragmatic triangle: Gardiner, Bühler and Reichling on the word and the sentence.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 267-275.

NERLICH, Brigitte and CLARKE, David D.

“Wilhelm von Humboldt.” In Verschueren et al. (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics*. (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1997), 1-14.

NERLICH, Brigitte and CLARKE, David D.

“Are rules and entries enough? Historical reflections on a longstanding controversy”. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22:6 (1999), 1032-1033.

NOORDEGRAF, Jan

“Het einde van de retorica.” In Duits, Henk and van Strien, on (eds.) *Een Wandeling door het Vak: Opstellen voor Marijke Spies*. (Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU Amsterdam / Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1999), 81-90.

NOORDEGRAF, Jan

“Vaderland en moedertal: Een constante in het taalkundig denken.” In van Sas, N. C. F. (ed.) *Vaderland: Een geschiedenis van de vijftiende eeuw tot 1940*. (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999), 343-363.

NOORDEGRAF, Jan

“Willem Bilderdijk (1756-1831) and the science of language: A Dutch linguist between two worlds.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 193-203.

NOWAK, Elke

“Investigating diversity: Descriptive grammars, empirical research and the science of language.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 155-164.

OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, Judith

“The ‘Generall Grammer of Orientall Tongues’ and universal language schemes in 17th-century Britain: The contribution of Christian Ravius.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 131-141.

PERCIVAL, W. Keith

“On the metrical Priscian Major: A methodological dilemma.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 79-85.

POPPE, Erich

“Latinat terminology in ‘Auricept na nÉces’.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 191-201.

POTSKHISHVILI, Alexander

“Case System of a Name in Anton I. Bagrationi’s (1720-1788) Kartuli [Georgian] Grammar.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 235-238.

RUSSELL, Paul

“Moth, toth, traeth: Sex, gender and the early Irish grammarian.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 203-213.

SALGADO, Benigno F.

“The first Galician Academy Dictionary and its theoretical background.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 341-353.

SCHMITTER, Peter

“Georg(e) Forster und Wilhelm von Humboldt – oder: Von der vergleichenden Ethnologie zur Allgemeinen und Vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 15-39.

SCHMITTER, Peter

“Positivismus, Interpretation und Objektivität in der Wissenschaftsgeschichtsschreibung der Linguistik.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 9:2 (1999), 193-208.

SELDESLACHTS, Herman AND SWIGGERS, Pierre

“‘Ich erwarte mit Ungeduld das absolute Ende meiner elenden Existenz...’: The ‘image’ of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay in his correspondence with Hugo Schuchardt.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 277-288.

SÉRIOT, Patrick

“La théorie des deux sciences dans la linguistique russe et soviétique.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 301-310.

SEUREN, Pieter A. M.

“The subject-predicate debate X-rayed.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 41-55.

SHIMOMIYA, Tadao

“European tradition in the history of linguistics in Japan.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 261-268.

SMITH, Robin D.

“Language for everyone: Eighteenth-century female grammarians, Elstob, Fisher and beyond.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 205-213.

STEADMAN-JONES, Richard

“Learning Urdu in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries: Dialogues and familiar phrases.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 165-172.

STURMAN, Frits

“Scholars in schools.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 355-359.

TAKENAGA, Yoshimasa

“Kindaichi Kyosuke no Saisyō no Hon [A study of Kyosuke Kindaichi’s first book, *Sin Gengogaku*, ‘New Linguistics’].” *Journal of Saitama University Faculty of Education* 48:1 (1999), 1-24.

TAYLOR, Talbot J. and SHANKER, Stuart

“Ape linguistics (or: Is Kanzi a Cartesian?).” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 57-68.

TÉNÉ, David

“Abraham de Balme and his grammar of Biblical Hebrew.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.I, 249-257.

VAN der WAL, Marijke J.

“Interchange or influence: Grotius’ early linguistic ideas.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 143-151.

VONK, Frank

“Gustav Gerber and ‘Kantian Linguistics’: Presuppositions of thought and linguistic use.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 289-295.

WILDING, Nick

“‘An Essay towards a Real Character, and a Philosophical Language’ (1668):
Text/contexts.” In Cram, Linn & Nowak (eds.) 1999, vol.II, 153-159.

The Paul Salmon - Pieter Verburg Memorial Fund

The Henry Sweet Society has received two generous donations in memory of the late Paul Salmon and the late Pieter Verburg. Pieter Verburg was the author of a seminal work on the history of linguistic ideas, published in Dutch in 1952 and translated into English by Paul Salmon and published in 1998. (See the article by Jan Noordegraaf in this volume for an account of Verburg's life and historiographical work.)

The Society intends to award two annual bursaries of £100 each to members of the Society who wish to attend and present a paper at one of the Society's colloquia but whose financial circumstances make this difficult. Preference may be given to younger scholars. Applicants must be paid-up members of the Society before applications are made. Applicants should submit the following:

- a) letter of application indicating the reasons why support is sought
- b) an abstract of the paper to be read at the colloquium
- c) a brief curriculum vitae and list of publications (if any)
- d) a letter of support from an academic referee

Applications for the 2000 colloquium in Edinburgh should be sent to the Treasurer:

Prof. John L. Flood
University of London Institute of Germanic Studies
29 Russell Square
London WC1B 5DP

to reach him **NOT LATER THAN 30 JUNE 2000.**

Applications will be considered by a sub-committee of the Executive Committee whose decision shall be final. No correspondence can be entered into.

Subscriptions for 2000

Members who have not already paid their subscriptions for 2000 are reminded that subscriptions are now due. The current rates are set out below.

For members in the United Kingdom, and for members elsewhere paying by Eurocheque or Sterling draft:

ORDINARY MEMBERS: £15.00 (reduced to £14.00 if paid by standing order through a British bank)

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS: £5.00 (within 3 years of graduation only)

For members in The Netherlands:

Members in The Netherlands may pay subscriptions directly into the Society's bank account with the Netherlands POSTBANK, Girorekening 8121692. The following rates apply:

ORDINARY MEMBERS: NLG 46,00

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS: NLG 15,00 (within 3 years of graduation only)

This facility may also be more convenient for members living in Belgium and some other European countries.

For members in the USA and other members paying in US dollars:

Members in the USA and others paying in US dollars should send their subscriptions to Professor Joseph L. Subbiondo, President, California Institute of Integral Studies, 1453 Mission Street, San Francisco CA 94103, U.S.A. (E-mail: josephs@ciis.edu) The following rates apply:

ORDINARY MEMBERS: US\$ 30.00

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS: US\$ 15.00 (within 3 years of graduation only)

Note to members in countries outside the European Union and the USA To avoid disproportionate bank charges, overseas members are recommended,

wherever possible, to pay for three years in advance. Alternatively, banknotes (Sterling, Deutsche Mark, or US Dollars only please!) may be sent at sender's risk.

Members paying by cheque, Eurocheque or Sterling draft should send their payment, which should be made payable to THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY, direct to the Honorary Treasurer: Professor J. L. Flood, University of London Institute of Germanic Studies, 29 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DP.

The Henry Sweet Society Studies in the History of Linguistics

Volume 6

Published January 2000

Hedwig Gwosdek

A Checklist of English Grammatical Manuscripts and Early Printed Grammars, c. 1400-1540.

147 pp. ISBN 3-89323-454-3. Normal retail price DEM 69,-.

Members may obtain copies at the special members' price direct from the publisher: Nodus Publikationen, Postfach 5725, D-48031 Münster, Germany. Fax [+49] 251 66 16 92

E-mail dutz.nodus@t-online.de

Special members' prices apply to all volumes in the HSS series and also to all other books from Nodus Publikationen. For full list see their website:

<http://www.t-online.de/home/dutz.nodus/katalog.htm>

Henry Sweet's Grave

When the Society was established in 1983 the Executive Committee agreed that it would be appropriate for the Society to undertake the restoration and regular maintenance of Henry Sweet's grave in Wolvercote Cemetery (section E2), Oxford. The headstone was restored, cleaned and reset, and twice a year the grave is tidied and planted with flowers by Oxford City Council on

behalf and at the expense of the Society. This work has hitherto been funded from an appeal fund set up in 1984 to which many members, notably colleagues in Japan, contributed very generously.

Meanwhile, however, the fund is almost exhausted, and the Society is not at present able to contemplate authorising the further restoration work that will shortly be necessary. The cost of regular maintenance has also increased substantially since the fund was first established, some sixteen years ago. The Executive Committee therefore thinks that it is now time to invite members again to contribute to the Henry Sweet Memorial Fund to ensure that the Society may continue to support regular maintenance of Sweet's grave and keep it in a worthy condition. Donations to the fund, whether large or small, will be most welcome. They should be sent to the Treasurer: Prof. John L. Flood, University of London Institute of Germanic Studies, 29 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DP

Members' e-mail addresses

From time to time information is sent out by e-mail to as many members as can be reached by this method. Ideally we should like to be able to reach all members, collectively and individually, by e-mail. However, not all members yet have an e-mail address, or have yet notified the Society of it. Furthermore, experience shows that each time a message is sent out to members, a proportion are returned as 'undeliverable'. In some cases this may be because members have recently changed their e-mail address or have suspended their e-mail during periods of absence, in other cases it may be the result of an error in entering the e-mail address in our address book.

We would therefore ask any member who has NOT received e-mail communications from the Society recently to notify the Treasurer of his or her current e-mail address by sending a brief message comprising only his or her e-mail address to the Treasurer at the following address:

jlf@zetnet.co.uk

In Memoriam Pieter Loonen (1939-1999)

After his parents returned to the Netherlands from Java, where he was born, Piet Loonen followed a chequered path through various forms of education and training including a year at various day and boarding schools in England. He himself said that his *gymnasium - β* (= A-levels) was the only diploma he had acquired in the prescribed manner. He gained his Arts degree (*doctoraal*) from the University of Amsterdam, but was also a student at the University of Utrecht. After five years of teaching experience in secondary schools, he embarked on and, with the help of a British Council grant, obtained his M.A. in linguistics from Reading University in 1972. As tutor in English at the Ubbo Emmius teacher training college in Groningen, he gained considerable experience and insight into the administration and organisation of education in the Netherlands with a special interest in the teaching of English. He became extremely active in the *Leraren Informatiecentrum te Groningen* (Groningen Teacher Information Centre) and in the *Vereniging van Leraren in Levende Talen* (Association of Modern Foreign Language Teachers) where he held various offices. On appointment as a lecturer in English at the University of Groningen in 1987, he was given particular responsibility for teacher training. In 1990, he gained his doctorate from the university of Nijmegen on the basis of his book, *For to Learn to Buy and Sell; Learning English in the Low Dutch area between 1500 and 1800, a Critical Survey*. The research skills he acquired in the writing of this were to underpin his activities and provide support for his fellow scholars and students for the rest of his life.

In the course of 1993 he became a founder member, chairman and driving force behind the *Peeter Heynsgenootschap voor de Geschiedenis van het Taal- en Letterkunde-onderrwijs in de Nederlanden* (Peeter Heyns society for the history of language and literature teaching in the Netherlands). The nearest British equivalent is the Textbook Colloquium. One very practical benefit of the quarterly meetings of the *Peeter Heynsgenootschap* is that, in addition to the papers read, there is usually a special guided tour and introduction to the collections of the various libraries and archive collections in the country.

Piet was a very private person who kept his personal and professional lives strictly separated. He was also so very modest and diffident about his own achievements and so admiring of others that he himself tended to be overlooked. It was characteristic of the man that, when the members of the *Peeter Heynsgenootschap* introduced themselves in the zero number of their journal *Meesterwerk* (the pun is more obvious in Dutch), he confined himself entirely to his current research interests, which, by then, had extended to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and to the teaching of French.

In 1997 Piet took partial early retirement. We know now that there were heart problems and that he had made a decision which involved a risk for himself. He told me in 1998 that he was enjoying life with a reduced workload and no longer suffered from the more pressing demands of Dutch academe. His enthusiasm for his work was undiminished and he continued to publish articles in *Meesterwerk*, *Essences* and elsewhere. In February 1999 a speaker scheduled for a *Peeier Heynsgeenootschap* meeting in Leiden unexpectedly let us down. To save us from what would otherwise have been a rather thin programme, Piet stepped into the breach, extemporised on the basis of notes he had been preparing on his train journey south and kept us well entertained. His sudden death just six weeks later came as a terrible shock. He was a gentleman in all senses of the word and we miss him very much.

Robin Smith, Leiden
rdsmith@rullet.leidenuniv.nl