

## EDITORIAL

History is popular again in Britain. To be fair, there has for a number of years been a strong general interest in the past, witnessed amongst other things by the growth in 'heritage tourism' and, as I mentioned in the November 1999 editorial, by the extraordinary number of historical dramas and films currently being made. This time, however, it's real, facts-and-figures history that the British public is consuming so hungrily. The BBC is showing a 16-part series of one-hour programmes entitled 'A History of Britain'. So convinced are they of its popularity that each episode is shown on prime-time, mid-week television and repeated the following Sunday. There are attractive locations and there's a little bit of music, but really the series is a course of sixteen illustrated lectures on British history, given by Simon Schama, professor of history at Columbia University. Schama is not a specialist in British history and this has the advantage of the presentation not being too technical or detailed, but the content has not been 'dumbed down' and Schama's style is that of a lecturer rather than a natural T.V. presenter. This is real schoolroom or even undergraduate history. It seems that television viewers like it, and the BBC is not worried about selling it to those viewers. It's interesting. History sells itself.

We historians of linguistics are sitting on a mine of interesting things we should not be embarrassed about selling to a willing public. It's very important for the continued strength of university linguistics to win over first-year undergraduates to our subject the moment they arrive in our lecture rooms. It's easy enough to give a lively and compelling presentation of basic phonetics, for example. "And this is how you phonetically transcribe a kiss on your letters home so that your family thinks you've learnt something" - "ha ha!". "And all these technical phonetic terms were originally anything but technical - *uvula* means 'little grape' and *velum* actually means 'veil'". Those are interesting little facts, and make the terms a lot easier to remember as well. But this isn't phonetics at all. It's history of linguistics. Before we even get on to phonetics in our introductory course and are still giving the sceptical first years the mandatory background, there's a wealth of facts at our disposal. There were those who really used to think of English as the 'scum' amongst languages. People really used to think that the adjective was not separate from the noun. People really used to think that the modern languages could be described as if they were Latin - look here's a page from a sixteenth-century grammar.

'It's not rocket science', as they say, but linguistics badly needs demystifying and popularising. There was a spoof soap opera on British television a number of years ago. It was called *Acorn Antiques* and starred an extremely slow-witted cleaning lady called Mrs Overall (played by Julie

Walters). In one episode Mrs Overall said something quite mind-numbingly stupid, at which her boss observed something like: 'Who would have guessed, Mrs Overall, that you had a degree in Linguistics and Advanced Semantics'. 'Linguistics and advanced semantics' had been chosen by the script-writer as the most difficult and clever-sounding degree course imaginable. That is the public perception of Linguistics, but the public perception of History is quite the opposite. We historians of linguistics should not be ashamed to take our fascinating subject out of its ivory tower. Popularisation is not trivialisation, as 'A History of Britain' shows.

\*\*\*\*

Mrs Marjory Szurko has left her post at Keble, College, Oxford to take up a new position at Worcester College. She therefore ceases to be librarian for the Henry Sweet Society. Mrs Szurko has carried out a great deal of work for the Society over the years, for which we are extremely grateful. We thank her most warmly for all that she has done and wish her every happiness in her new job.

Please note that the booking form for the 2001 colloquium in Munich is enclosed with this issue of the *Bulletin*. We are sending it out rather earlier than usual since Prof. Dr Sauer and his colleagues in Munich need to make accommodation bookings in good time. Please return your form to Prof. Sauer as soon as you are able to do so.

Also included with this *Bulletin* is information about subscriptions for 2001. Do ensure that your subscriptions are up-to-date and that you are paying at the right rate and using the correct method of payment. The treasurer's job is not an easy one, but members can make it easier.

A final thing to note is the Society's website which has been updated and tidied through the good offices of Mike MacMahon and Stephen Miller in Glasgow. Prof. MacMahon has managed to secure a more transparent address – <http://www.henrysweet.org> - which is printed on the back cover of this *Bulletin*. It can still be accessed via the old address – <http://www.gla.ac.uk/socialsciences/henrysweet/>. Do visit the site.

Andrew Linn, *Sheffield*

## In Memoriam R. H. Robins

*Eulogy delivered by Professor F. R. Palmer on the occasion of RHR's funeral at St John's Church, Caterham, Surrey on Monday 15 May 2000*

### Bobby (R. H. Robins)

It is, of course, with great sadness that I stand here today, but my sadness is touched with the happiness that I feel from the privilege of being able to say a few words about my oldest friend Bobby and a very distinguished colleague, Professor R. H. Robins – a man that I have known well for almost sixty years and whose career has been so very close to my own.

The scholar, the Professor of Linguistics, R. H. Robins was interested in language from an early age. In a draft of an autobiographical essay that he sent me in anticipation of its publication next year, he tells of his fascination, as a child, with Latin grammar and with the similarities and differences between French and English. He won a scholarship to Tonbridge School in 1935, and a scholarship for Classics to New College Oxford in 1940 (where I first met him). He completed his university studies in 1948 with First Class Honours in 'Mods' and 'Greats' – Classical Literature, Ancient History and Philosophy. After completing his university studies he was appointed to a Lectureship in the Department of Phonetics and Linguistics in the School of Oriental and African Studies that was headed by J. R. Firth. During the war, which had interrupted his university studies, he had worked with Firth teaching Japanese, and Firth was delighted to offer him the appointment. He stayed in this department until his retirement, deservedly and expectedly becoming its Head in 1966.

He was a superb teacher and researcher, completely devoted to his subject and often speaking of his aim of 'advancing the subject' of Linguistics. This he certainly achieved by the publication of one of the best ever introductions to Linguistics – his *General Linguistics: an Introductory Survey*. His first research publication was a fine description of Yurok, a native language of America, and he later published work on Sundanese, a language of Indonesia. But he will be best remembered as the pioneer and for years the leading scholar in a subject that had been almost completely neglected – the History of Linguistics. He published a little book entitled *Ancient and Medieval Grammatical Theory in Europe* in 1951 and the longer *A Short History of Linguistics* in 1967. Even after his retirement in 1986, he continued with his research and published a further volume on *The Byzantine Grammarians*. Not surprisingly, when the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas was formed, he was chosen as President.

He will also be remembered for his close association with the Philological Society, the oldest linguistic society in Britain, for he was its Secretary for eighteen years, and then its President and, when he retired from that presidency, he was awarded the unique honour of being made President Emeritus. His eminence in scholarship was widely acknowledged. Many honours were bestowed upon him nationally and internationally - most notably he was made a life member of the Linguistic Society of America, a Doctor of Letters at the University of London, a Fellow of the British Academy and a member of the *Academia Europæa*. I have mentioned his Presidency of the Philological Society and of the Henry Sweet Society, but he also served as President of the European Linguistic society, the *Societas Europæa*, and of the International Committee of Linguists.

Yet it is talking about the man himself that gives me most pleasure, for there are two very different personalities that he presented to the world. To those who knew him only as the very distinguished Professor Robins he probably appeared to be a rather aloof, patrician figure. Yet even this won him many admirers. I recall a session of an international conference that was chaired by him when I sat next to a distinguished American woman professor. She was quite ecstatic about his performance as chairman, his wonderful command of English and his beautiful accent - he was, she said, the perfect English gentleman.

To those of us he knew him well, those for whom he was always just 'Bobby', he was a very different person. He was kind, generous, friendly, easy to talk to, extremely good company and even willing to be teased by his friends. Indeed, even since I received news of his death, I have read the words 'much-loved' from two of his close colleagues. As a private person he was quite uncomplicated, with an almost child-like simplicity and even a little other-worldliness. He was quite incapable of making enemies, though he could recognise fools and rogues. He was a superb optimist who could always look on the bright side, often in an amusing way. I recall two instances of this when we were at college together. There was a serious book shortage, and we were asked to lend our books to other students. Bobby had this well organised, with a sheet of instructions and a note-book for signatures, but after a week or so complained the no-one had borrowed any books. So we decided to rectify this by hiding about twenty of his books under his bed and signing them out to all kinds of people, including college servants and politicians. That evening Bobby accosted us. 'You rogues' he said, 'but it was a good thing really, because they needed to be taken down and dusted'. So, when, a few weeks later, a minor illness kept him in the college sanatorium, we waited to hear from Bobby what would be the good thing about his illness, and we were not disappointed - he told us that he had the best bed in the place.

Yet Bobby's life was affected by great sadness. When he married, in 1953, he would speak with pleasure, rather to our amusement, about the

blessings that 'le bon Dieu' would bring to him and Sheila, but, unfortunately, they were not blessed and remained childless. Yet Sheila was a wonderful influence on him. Not only did she support him in his academic life, but she made him extremely happy, relaxed and even (may I say?) domesticated. And I remember, too, the joy of his aged parents, as she walked down the aisle at their wedding. Sadly, he lost Sheila not many years after they celebrated their silver wedding anniversary. Being Bobby, although he spoke openly about her final illness, he did not show his enormous grief, even to those of us who shared it.

Today we say 'Farewell' to a remarkable, indeed quite unique, individual, whose loss affects us all and one who will be missed by many others, both as a friend and a scholar. But it is his outlook on life (and also on death) that touches me most. About a year ago he said to me – and this I shall never forget, for it was so typical of him - 'I'm not afraid of dying. Either I shall just go to sleep for ever or I shall see my beloved Sheila again'.

*Appreciations of RHR delivered at the Henry Sweet Society conference in Edinburgh on Wednesday 20 September 2000*

*Vivien Law:*

The main facts in Bobby's life are quickly told.

He was born on 1 July 1921, the son of a Kentish doctor - hence the allusions to *Gray's Anatomy* in his contribution to the 1993 HSS colloquium. History only caught his imagination towards the end of his schooldays, when one of his teachers introduced him to American history. His degree in Classics at New College, Oxford, was interrupted by the War, and this proved crucially important to his career. He was sent to Bletchley Park to learn Japanese, and then to the School of Oriental and African Languages, London, to teach it to airforce men destined for the Pacific. Once the War was over and his degree completed, he was invited back to SOAS to take up a lectureship in what was then very much J. R. Firth's department. It was the strong-willed Firth who pointed him in the direction of endangered languages and also towards the history of linguistics, subjects which were dear to his heart throughout his life. He was promoted to a Readership in 1955 and to the Chair of Linguistics and Headship of the Department in 1966. Head for nearly two decades, he took great pleasure in the fact that he had never exchanged a cross word with any of his colleagues throughout that period. Honours followed: visiting professorships, honorary degrees, election to the British Academy and the Academia Europæa. So in many respects his was a smooth, tranquil and highly successful career - though not without its challenges - in an age when professors and heads of department could still expect to carry out research during the academic year, and administration could be kept within manageable limits.

By the time he retired, in 1986, all that was changing, and that was the point at which I got to know him. I'd met him first in 1978, just after finishing my thesis, when I sat in on part of the lecture course on the History of Linguistic Thought that he was then giving at Cambridge; but I really started to get to know him properly in 1987, at the Trier ICHoLs and in long evening walks around the grounds of the chateau at Chantilly during the subsequent meeting on ancient and medieval linguistics. His wife Sheila, to whom he was devoted, had died some eighteen months earlier. Instead of retreating into himself, or seeking solace only in the company of old friends, he now sought the company of younger people. (I was neither the first nor the only one to benefit.) I vividly remember my shock at the first of a series of conversations that went roughly like this:

RHR: Are you playing in any concerts these days?

VL: Yes, there's one next Saturday.

RHR: Excellent! Could I come and partake of your and Nick's hospitality?

VL (feeling overawed): Err... Of course!

And that established a regular pattern. Bobby would arrive at our home on Friday in time for tea and leave on the Sunday or Monday, with as much music and conversation in the intervening time as we could organise. And I was very grateful to have him at my concerts, for I found that there could be no question of playing anything less than my very best with him in the audience!

So I got to know him on those occasions, and when he stayed with us when teaching on my behalf during my sabbaticals, and over dinner at the Athenæum after Philological Society meetings, and of course during conferences. I marvelled at his enormous capacity for enjoyment, enhanced by his keen eye for the good in things, no matter how bleak or uncomfortable they might seem. The only context in which that ability deserted him was when he talked about the goings-on at his former institution, which distressed and angered him. The worse things got at SOAS in his view, the more he identified himself with the new university of Luton, where he was teaching up until his death; and also with my class at Cambridge, which he was likewise teaching, with his accustomed generosity, during my leave this year. He loved the students, his 'boys and girls', and they were devoted to him.

Three things he returned to repeatedly in his last years:

1. One was his second *Festschrift*. After reading the study of his intellectual development with which it begins, he declared he could now die content, for he knew what his obituaries would say.
2. He always claimed he'd never turn down an invitation to a conference once he had retired, for he didn't want people to take it as a signal that "Old Bobby is past it" and stop inviting him. In fact they never had a chance, for he returned from his last one, in Cyprus, less than a fortnight before his death.
3. He dreaded the prospect of having to move out of his much-loved home with a huge garden which he tended himself. (He was justifiably proud of his roses and his potatoes.) His wish to be carried out feet first rather than to have to move into some dismal old people's home was granted. He died with his faculties intact, with his capacity for the enjoyment of human company if anything on the increase, and with an enviably large circle of friends and well-wishers at home and abroad. An exemplary life.

*Werner Hüllen:*

My first acquaintance with Professor Robins (as I then called him) coincided with my first attendance at a Henry Sweet Society conference in Oxford. It was in the autumn of 1989. It was also the first time I offered to read a paper there. The prospect of meeting many people for the first time whom I knew from their scholarly publications and who would now listen to me did not set my mind at ease. And among them would be Professor Robins.

What I found was a benevolent and friendly group of colleagues, and among them one imposing and unforgettable figure who quickly asked me to call him Bobby. He did this although he certainly belonged to a generation and to a group in society where a certain formality in conversation mattered. Bobby was not at all a person to chat his time away. But underneath his somewhat old-fashioned politeness was an attitude of friendliness and well-wishing, a character who wanted his partners in conversation to feel good and who 'avoided inflicting pain' on anybody. This is the oft-quoted definition of a gentleman by Cardinal Newman, and it is in the light of this characterological concept that I always saw Bobby. It was a pleasure to speak to him. He raised questions in scholarly discussions in order to clarify points, not in order to show that he had an opinion of his own. He never cornered a speaker. He was generous in acknowledgement and praise.

Outside the academic sphere I remember a conversation between Bobby and me which should, perhaps, be mentioned today. On the occasion of the fall of the Berlin Wall we exchanged some thoughts on politics, in particular because I mentioned that I had happened to be in Berlin on that very day. In the course of our conversation, Bobby said 'I have the feeling that now the War has come to an end'. Although politics had never played the slightest role in our relationship, I sensed right away that this was a very special remark addressed to me. After all, we both had a personal, though different, experience of the War. But Bobby was telling me that even these experiences did not matter any more now (if they had somehow, unspoken, mattered somewhere beneath the surface of our contacts).

I wish to close these reminiscences with a poem by Bertolt Brecht which I quote in the English rendering by David Cram:

I do not need a gravestone.  
 If *you* think I need one,  
 Write on it: He made suggestions,  
 And we accepted them.  
 This will honour us all.



*R. E. Asher:*

As I stand up to speak, it occurs to me that my connection with Bobby Robins began some time before I met him, in that his wife Sheila and I were contemporaries at University College London as students in the Department of French. Moreover, it was the post that she vacated when she married that I filled when I joined the academic staff of SOAS. What I have to say will be very un-Robins-like — in two respects. Firstly, because I am a very late addition to this panel, it is not well prepared — in contrast with Bobby Robins's meticulous preparation of all his public performances. Secondly, mainly for the same reason, it will be rather informal, while Bobby was above all a great master of formal discourse. He was also, when speaking in public, quite unflappable. I remember once, during one of the lectures on his course on general linguistics, given on the third floor of SOAS, one of the windows opened and a man came in and walked from the back to the front of the lecture room and out of the door. A few minutes later he returned and climbed back through the window on to the painters' cradle, but on neither occasion did the lecturer given any indication of being aware of any interruption.

The course was one that Robins took over from J. R. Firth after the latter's retirement. This at the time seemed a very bold undertaking, for Firth's lecture every Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock throughout the session had become very much an institution in those parts of the University situated in Bloomsbury (SOAS, UCL and Birkbeck, and even colleges further afield). The two courses, as one might expect, differed considerably in both content and style. They shared, however, a strong awareness of the contribution to linguistic theory of linguists of earlier periods.

This respect for the value of earlier work led Firth to encourage younger colleagues who had the appropriate background and knowledge to publish not only in the area of contemporary theory but in the field of the history of linguistics. Part of that history in due course became Firth's own work. Robins's own presentation of Firthian theory in both phonology and semantics is marked by a clarity which is not always the dominant feature of Firth's own writing, as exemplified, say, by 'Sounds and prosodies' with which Firth presented to a meeting of the Philological Society some of his unorthodox thinking on phonological analysis. I remember, soon after joining Firth's department at SOAS, visiting my phonetics guru at UCL, the redoubtable Dr Hélène Coustenoble, who greeted me with the words 'Comment va votre chef?' and followed this up with the comment, 'He talks of prosodies. I don't know what he means!' Anyone who later read Robins on Firth, however, did know what Firth meant.

This clarity is one of the strong features of Robins's writing, whether in presenting his own theories or those of others, and it may well be one of the reasons why he was so influential, particularly but by no means solely in the UK, in creating an increasing interest among linguists in the history of their

science. His was not a lone voice, nor was he the first to attempt a survey of earlier theories of language structure. But Robins's 1951 book on ancient and medieval theory in Europe and his 1967 textbook which aimed to cover the whole period from antiquity to modern times did much to make a relatively new field very accessible. The second of these surveys also included sections on the contribution from early times of Indian, Chinese, Arab and Hebrew linguists, a timely reminder that the roots of modern theory also drew nourishment from outside Europe.

It is, I think, important not to suppose that Bobby Robins contributed to the history of linguistic ideas only through his books (to which one must also add his book on German linguistic scholarship in the nineteenth century and his 1993 work on the Byzantine grammarians) and articles tracing the development of linguistic thought and speculation through the ages. It seems to me that he made two other types of contribution. One was his descriptive work on non-Indo-European languages from very different parts of the world and with very different typological features, namely Yurok from North America and Sundanese from Indonesia, in which he also presented new ideas on the technique of linguistic analysis. The other was his contribution to thinking on current issues, the prime examples of which are 'Noun and verb in universal grammar' and 'In defence of WP'. These combine reference to earlier ideas with the presentation of new and challenging ones, and themselves become relevant to both the history and the historiography of linguistics. All these different aspects of his contribution are nicely represented in the 1970 collection of some of his papers.

After retirement, Bobby Robins not only continued research and writing but also kept up the practice of attending conferences and other meetings where linguistic ideas were discussed. His presence was always warmly welcomed both for personal reasons and for his contribution to discussions. There are, one might say, three types of people who listen to conference papers: those who always comment on a paper whether they have something worthwhile to say or not; those who never comment, even though the comments or questions in their minds would be of real interest; and those who comment if they have something relevant and helpful to say. As I remember him, Bobby Robins rarely failed to have something to say, and what he had to say was worth listening to — not least because he was so very well informed on the history of linguistic ideas. He even had the knack of asking pertinent questions when some of those present supposed that the speaker had not engaged his full attention! When I last saw Bobby, at the Cambridge meeting of the Philological Society earlier this year, I fully expected that we should have the pleasure of welcoming him in Edinburgh in the autumn. We are all sad that in the event this could not be.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Firth, J. R. 1948. 'Sounds and prosodies'. *TPhS* 1948, 127–152.
- Robins, R. H. 1951. *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe with Particular Reference to Modern Linguistic Doctrine*. London: Bell.
- 1952. 'Noun and verb in universal grammar'. *Language* 28, 289–298.
- 1958. *The Yurok Language: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- 1959. 'In defence of WP'. *TPhS* 1959, 116–144.
- 1967. *A Short History of Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- 1970. *Diversions of Bloomsbury. Selected writings on linguistics*. Amsterdam/London: North-Holland.
- 1973. *Ideen- und Problemgeschichte der Sprachwissenschaft. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.
- 1993. *The Byzantine Grammarians. Their Place in History*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

*Ildi Halstead:*

I miss Bobby very much.

I first met him personally when I sat in on his course in the History of Linguistics at SOAS. Amazingly, he only had two people in his audience, including myself. At that time, the University of Luton was in the process of becoming a university, and we were planning our first degree in 'humanities and linguistics'. I asked Bobby if he would consider teaching his course at Luton, and to my surprise and delight he said yes.

From then on he made the cause of furthering the study of linguistics at Luton his own. The module he eventually taught - 'Motivations and Methods in Writing Grammars' - was truly unique and very much his own. It included his field-work in Yurok, and he used to say that this course would die with him. It did. Nobody was able to take his place. But his legacy lives on. He managed to inspire his 'boys and girls' -as he used to refer to the students - to think for themselves, and his enthusiasm for the study of language, past and present, was infectious. Just to give one example: following Bobby's encouragement, one of his students is now wandering around somewhere in South America doing research into endangered languages. His students felt great respect and warm affection for him in equal measure. We all did. Bobby was a wonderful man, as a scholar, teacher, colleague and friend. He was generous with his praise, uncompromising in his beliefs, straight and honourable in his dealings with people, warm and affectionate with his friends, and too modest by far.

He is part of the history of linguistics now and we, his successors, must ensure that his life and work will continue to inspire.

To honour his memory, the University of Luton has decided to establish a special prize - the R. H. Robins Memorial Prize - to be awarded each year to the student achieving the highest marks in the history of linguistics.

*[The contribution by Prof. Konrad Koerner which deals with RHR's work in a rather different way will appear in a subsequent edition of the Bulletin]*

## Wilkins's 'Tables' and Roget's 'Thesaurus': An Investigation into Traditions of Onomasiology

### 1. *Onomasiology*

**L**exicography' deals with dictionaries. It is an applied discipline, i.e. it facilitates certain knowledge-based activities concerning language. Its generalising statements support either the writing of new dictionaries or the use of existing ones. To the latter belong dictionaries of the present and of the past.

Concerning the arrangement of lexemes, there are two kinds of dictionaries (if we consider only such languages as are expressed in alphabetical writing), and we find them both in the present and in the past: their entries are either in alphabetical order or in order of topical affinity. The sub-branch of lexicography that deals with alphabetical dictionaries is called 'semasiology', the sub-branch for topical dictionaries 'onomasiology'. The alphabetical order is precise and non-ambiguous. It is easy to handle. It presupposes only a knowledge of the fixed sequence of letters. Some minor difficulties arise with homographs. Its perfect formality is at the cost of complete semantic emptiness.

Topical affinity, however, is extremely difficult to handle. It presupposes an arrangement of semantic domains which, in comprehensive word-collections, must cover the whole universe of human experience and thought. This is so because the sequence of entries is in itself meaningful. We all know that, at least where they are free to do so, people disagree in their opinions about the universe. So they also disagree in their judgment of topical dictionaries. This gives onomasiology what could be called philosophical depth. Using the famous statement of the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte ('Was für eine Philosophie man habe, hängt davon ab, was für ein Mensch man sei') we could say: what kind of onomasiological dictionary you accept depends on what kind of human being you are.

Semasiology and onomasiology are not just two ways of organising the same matter, language. They are the consequence of two different approaches to it which can be best explained by the two types of language acquisition. Children either point to something and ask: *What's it called?*, or they hear a word and ask: *What does it mean?*. With the first question they go from reality to language (from meaning to form), with the latter from language to reality (from form to meaning). The onomasiological approach from meaning to language serves linguistic production, i.e. uttering one's own meaningful expressions; the semasiological approach from language to meaning serves linguistic reception, i.e. understanding other people's meaningful expressions.

This difference entails that the dictionaries of each of the two types serve different ends. In so far as dictionaries are planned to serve *both* purposes (as is mostly the case nowadays) they combine semasiological and onomasiological methods in various ways. The same happens in natural language acquisition and language use, where production and reception always occur concomitantly. (Needless to say, it is the philosophical background of onomasiology which I find most interesting in this branch of lexicography.)

From what has been said so far, it is clear that onomasiological dictionaries depend very much on philosophical assumptions. Arguments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, under the general headings of 'cultural relativity' and 'pragmatism', have convinced us that there is no apprehension of what might be called the objective truth, among other reasons because the experience of reality and human ways of thinking depend just as much on language as language depends on them. Logically speaking, onomasiology proper is, thus, caught in a vicious circle. But earlier in the history of European thought this was different. This is why, in principle, older works of the topical tradition were thought of as objective and universal, i.e. denoting reality as it is and doing this in such a way that everybody was obliged to agree. These are exactly the two assumptions which John Wilkins made in his universal language project: meanings are objectively and universally true, it is only the surface-signs of languages (to use a modern term) in which they (languages) differ. Lexical meanings possess the same universality as general grammar. Therefore it is a fully legitimate undertaking to treat Wilkins's *Tables* under this lexicographical concept.

## 2. John Wilkins's *Tables*

I In paragraphs II and III of chapter V, part I, of the *Essay* (pp. 19-21), John Wilkins explains his onomasiological programme. Although the author is unfortunately not very precise in the use of his terms, this programme is sufficiently clear. Its pivotal point is the conviction that people generally agree on the principle(s) of reason and the apprehension of things. Concerning the latter, Wilkins distinguishes between *reality*, the *mind*, and the *expression* of the mind for the sake of communication. *Reality* is the realm of 'things'. They are 'natural', they have their own 'nature', 'shape', and 'use'. In the *mind*, notions correspond to things. Notions are called 'mental' and 'internal', allowing things to be called 'real (= natural)' and 'external'. Moreover, the terms 'conceit', 'apprehension', and 'conception' are used for denoting them. The *expression* of notions (etc.) is by sounds which we find in 'articulate voice' and 'words'. Writing, which is also carried out in words, gives a 'figure' or 'picture' of the sounds. The words which express the notions of things are also called 'names', 'marks', and 'characters'.

There are at least two bewildering problems here. One is that Wilkins speaks of ‘things *and* notions’, but just as often of ‘things *or* notions’, leaving undecided whether notions *always* stem from things and go together with them, or whether there are also notions as such, for example abstract notions, as independent products of our thinking. This is, of course, the old problem of nominalism and realism in logic. We cannot decide this matter here. It would need a thorough reading of the whole *Essay* to sort this vagueness out, and the result of this reading could very well be that Wilkins is indeed undecided on this point. But we can safely assume that Wilkins, obviously, conceived of two kinds of notions, one type corresponding to things like trees or horses (his examples, p. 20), the other type functioning as ‘predicaments’ (i.e. the categories of Aristotle) and to ‘such matters, as by reason of their Generalness, or in some other respect, are *above* all those common heads of things called Predicaments’ (p. 24) (i.e. notions like *being*, *thing*, *notion* itself, also *genus*, *difference*, and *species*, hence the so-called *predicabilia*). In genera I, II, and III of his *Tables*, he enumerates this latter kind of ‘Universal notions’ (p. 23), which he is going to use as ordering schemata for Tables V to XL. Again, nobody has investigated so far whether this was done coherently, i.e. whether the notions of Tables I, II, and III do indeed reappear as ordering categories in the following ones.

That *language* is made a prerequisite for ordering the universe and is, therefore, included (as Table IV) in this first chapter, was certainly far-sighted of Wilkins, but the relations of things and/or notions with reference to language are even less clear than they are in general. The title of this *Table* reads ‘Of Discourse, Or the several notions belonging to Grammar or Logick’, but the introductory text speaks of ‘The several things and notions belonging to discourse [...]’ (p. 44). According to its nature as ‘external expressions, whereby men do make known their thoughts to one another [...]’ (p. 44), language is located between notions and things.

The second bewildering problem is the difference between ‘name’, ‘mark’, ‘note’, ‘word’ and ‘character’. Suffice it to say that, obviously, what are formally termed ‘words’ are functionally ‘names’ which are made up of marks, notes, or characters. For our present purposes, however, we need not discuss this in more detail, and will use the term ‘name’ only.

2 The main philosophical assumption of onomasiological lexicographers is that there is order in this world and that this order defines the nature of things. It is their programme to arrange the names of things in such a way that the sequence itself reflects the arrangement of notions which, as we know, reflects the arrangement of things. Note:

[...] The first thing to be considered and enquired into is, Concerning a just Enumeration and description of such things or notions as are to have

Marks or Names assigned to them. The chief Difficulty and Labour will be to contrive the Enumeration of things and notions, as that they may be full and adequate, without any Redundancy or Deficiency as to the Number of them, and regular as to their Place and Order. (p. 20)

It is the order of entries in the *Tables* which 'contribute[s] to the defining of them, and determining their primary significations' (p. 22).

If we look at the macrostructure of the *Tables*, we find that this order follows the general principles of traditional logic and ontology. In their ultimate source, they are both Aristotelian, just as the differentiation between the thing, the mental image, and the word is Aristotelian. This does not mean that John Wilkins actually used Aristotle or some commentary like Porphyrius as his model. At least, I do not know this, and, quite likely, nobody does. What I presume is that he depended on one or some relevant books of the so-called schoolmen which were available at his time and which represented the broad stream of traditional, i.e. essentially Aristotelian, philosophy, often in a discussion of the works of Ramus. I am thinking, for example, of the books by Dudley Fenner (1584), Thomas Blundeville (1599), or Samuel Smith (1627). But there may be others (Hüllen 1999: 284-292).

After the introductory epistemological chapter I, i.e. genera I to IV, there follows chapter II, i.e. genera V and VI, on God and the world as a whole. It has a bridging function which may be left undiscussed in our context. After this, the macrostructure of the *Tables* is determined by the five predicaments (categories) *substance*, *quantity*, *quality*, *action* and *relation* as the headings of the relevant chapters of word-lists, and then by the differentiation between *genus*, *difference*, and *species* within each of them. In chapters III to VI, i.e. genera VII to XX, governed by the predicament *substance*, we find entries which pertain to natural history, i.e. the elements and the various kingdoms of nature. In chapter VII, i.e. genus XXI to XXIII, governed by the predicament *quantity*, we find entries which pertain to geometry and algebra. In chapter VIII, i.e. genera XXIV to XXVIII, governed by the predicament *quality*, we find a mixture of entries which have in common that they pertain to certain states and faculties of human beings. They deal with the dispositions of characters and the body, with the senses, manners, habits, etc. Chapter IX, i.e. genera XXIX to XXXII, governed by the predicament *action*, deals with human behaviour and activities in the world, including games and sports, arts, crafts, and trades. Finally, chapters X and XI, i.e. genera XXXIII to XL, governed by the predicament *relation*, deal with houses and everything belonging to them, and with the great societal systems, i.e. the law, military forces, the navy, and the church in terms of people, offices, objects, instruments, activities, etc. All these areas of reality and their corresponding areas of lexemes are well-known from the tradition of glossaries, nomenclators, and topical dictionaries.



Wilkins calls these entries 'radicals'. By far the greatest number come in pairs, which are either antonyms or otherwise related to each other. The meanings of the 'radicals' are provided for by their position in the *Table*, i.e. by the logical derivation above them. Most of these entries are complemented by one or several (or many) lexemes which are obviously thought to be synonymous. These synonyms are not considered in the following analysis. Only the 'radicals' are taken into account.

3 In their ordering function, the predicaments are necessarily abstract. But what is the vocabulary like which is carefully and neatly distributed into the abstractly defined semantic compartments?

For most of the chapters, though not for all, it is marked by its semantic concreteness, by the visual, palpable, audible, the easily imaginable character of word meanings. For Wilkins, reality indeed seems to consist of *things* with their own characters and shapes, and also with their natural use. No proof is needed for the entries under *substance* (genera VII to XX). The word-lists here swarm with names (in Wilkins's sense) of the objects of nature. His lament that he is unable to enumerate them exhaustively shows in itself that this was actually his aim. Even the headings of the genera and species, i.e. abstract terms, are introduced with quite concrete features. Elements, for example, are 'the great Masses of natural Bodies, which are of a more simple Fabric than the rest' (p. 56); fire is 'the hottest and lightest' element (p. 57); air is known 'for its Levity and Warmth' (p. 58); and water for 'its Gravity and Moisture' (p. 58); finally 'the Coldest, Thickest, Heaviest, of any of those Bodies counted Elements, is called Earth' (p. 59). The, essentially, descriptive taxonomy of biology at Wilkins's time supported his method. In this way, the whole taxonomy of minerals, stones, plants, and animals, including their exterior and interior parts, is rendered. The entries under *quantity* (genera XXI to XXIII), divided into 'magnitude' and 'measure' also contain lexemes with concrete meanings, because they denote the simple and complex figures of geometry, the numbers of algebra, the units of value (money), of quantity and duration. Only the chapter 'Of Space' between them (genus XXII) is different in that it does not enumerate imaginable chunks of reality but ideas (see below).

With the Tables under *quality* (genera XXIV to XXVIII) the picture is slightly different. Lexemes denoting the powers of the soul (e.g. understanding, judgement) and the body (e.g. the senses), habits (e.g. emotions, virtues), manners (e.g. candour, patience), and sensible qualities (e.g. sweetness, fattiness) indicate ideas rather than things or actions, mostly expressed by nouns derived from adjectives (like *equity*, *vigilance*, *peaceableness*, *condescension*, *submission*). But there then, again, follow entries with names of diseases (genus XXVIII) which denote fairly concrete phenomena and states (e.g. ulcer, wart).

Derived lexemes denoting ideas are also to be found among the entries of the Tables under *action* (genera XXIX to XXXII), in this case mostly nouns derived from verbs (like *blessing*, *assurance*). But they are to be understood as ‘actions of (blessing, assurance, etc.)’ which gives them a concrete appearance again. Whereas among the ‘spiritual actions’ it is sometimes difficult to decide whether an abstract idea or its concrete realisation is meant, there is nothing equivocal about entries pertaining to ‘corporeal actions’ (like *drinking*, *reading*, or *laughing*, including gestures), ‘motions’, and ‘operations’. To the latter belongs everything people can do with the help of instruments (like *forging*, *casting*, *kneading*, or *turning*), i.e. the whole world of crafts and labour. Finally, the Tables under *relation* (genera XXXIII to XL), probably the most abstract of all the predicaments, are almost exclusively the names of concrete objects. ‘Oeconomical (i.e. domestic) relations’ are defined by grades of consanguinity (like *parent* and *child*), possessions (like *farms* or *bridges* and everything pertaining to buildings), and finally provisions (i.e. eatables and drinkables). ‘Civil relations’, ‘judicial relations’, ‘military relations’, ‘naval relations’, and ‘ecclesiastical relations’ are merely the cover terms for people, offices, objects, actions, processes, etc. in families, law courts, the army, the navy, and the church. It is here that Wilkins’s system of categorial order is actually the least convincing.

I freely concede that this differentiation between the concrete and the abstract in entries may in a number of cases be open to debate. When put to the test, the difference between an abstract term and the name of a concrete thing (in Wilkins’s sense) is not always that clear. But in my opinion it is still safe to say that, starting from genus VII, the vocabulary of Wilkins’s *Tables* is dominated by lexemes expressing well-delimited, clearly imaginable, concrete things, presenting *in toto* to readers a universe of experience, though ordered in a categorial system of thought. The real exceptions in genus XXII and genera XXIV to XXVII (i.e. space, and then natural powers, habits, manners, and sensible qualities) may find an easy explanation. Entries here point in the majority to adjectives. Elsewhere in the *Essay*, however, entries consist in the majority, though not exclusively, of nouns. Wilkins may have changed most adjectival entries of genera XXII, XXIV to XXVII to nouns on purely formal grounds. He may have written ‘gentleness’ instead of *gentle*, ‘prosperity’ instead of *prosperous*, and ‘redness’ instead of *red*, without wishing to indicate that he was changing the level of abstraction. This is also why verbs are generally, though again not exclusively, rendered in the nominalising *ing*-form.

### 3. Peter Mark Roget’s Thesaurus

1 Disregarding present-day topical dictionaries, compiled with the help of computers, John Wilkins’s *Tables* in his *Essay Towards a Real Character And*

*a Philosophical Language* of 1668 and Peter Mark Roget's *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases*, first published in 1852, are the two outstanding English achievements in onomasiology. Moreover, there was no work of this kind between 1668 and 1852 worth mentioning. The two books have different aims, the earlier one is meant to establish a universal language for humankind, the latter one is meant to 'Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and Assist in [English] Literary Composition' (subtitle). Common to both is that their aims are to be achieved by a certain arrangement of words. However, like Wilkins, Roget believes that 'the principles of [the work's] construction are universally applicable to all languages, whether living or dead' (Introduction, p. xxiii). He explicitly agrees with the seventeenth-century universal language plan and sees his own book as conducive to the great goal of a 'strictly Philosophical Language' which would eventually be adopted 'by every civilized nation' (p. xxiv). Note:

Nothing, indeed, would conduce more directly to bring about a golden age of union and harmony among the several nations and races of mankind than the removal of that barrier to the interchange of thought and mutual good understanding between man and man, which is now interposed by the diversity of their respective languages. (p. xxv)

The philosophical background of Roget's *Thesaurus* is quite different from that of Wilkins's *Essay*, and, because of this, presents the most interesting reason for a comparison. According to the 'Preface' of the first edition, which remained essentially unchanged in the many ones following, 'Words are the instruments by which we form all our abstractions' (x). Where Wilkins spoke of things (in reality) and notions (in the mind) which are expressed (in language) for the sake of communication, Roget speaks of ideas or abstractions which are communicated with the help of language. The external world does not enter the picture at all, except through the term 'abstraction', which presupposes an experiential substratum from which to abstract. But in spite of being an instrument, language is not merely a vehicle (p. x). Note:

Metaphysicians are agreed that scarcely any of our intellectual operations could be carried on to any considerable extent, without the agency of words. None but those who are conversant with the philosophy of mental phenomena, can be aware of the immense influence that is exercised by language in promoting the development of our ideas, in fixing them in the mind, and in detaining them for steady contemplation. (p. x)

This gives words two functions. They have a creative role in organising the human mind and establishing memory, and they are instrumental for the

exchange of ideas between humans. Whereas Wilkins concentrated on reality which, after passing through the mind, reappeared in the nominating function of words, Roget concentrates on the mind, whose ideas form a world of abstractions with and under the influence of words. As far as I can see, this is the spirit of John Locke, whom Peter Mark Roget, however, does not mention by name.

2 The pivotal point of Roget's project is obviously that the 'classification of the ideas which are expressible by language' is a matter of 'practical utility' (p. xi). Philosophy is no more than an underpinning to this end. As with John Wilkins, no direct model for this classification is to be found. All Roget himself says is that:

[t]he principle by which I have been guided in framing my verbal classification is the same as that which is employed in the various departments of Natural History. Thus the sectional divisions I have formed, correspond to Natural Families in Botany and Zoology, and the filiation of words presents a network analogous to the natural filiation of plants or animals. (p. xxiii)

As forerunners of his *Thesaurus* he mentions the *Vocabulary of Sanskrit* by Amara Cōsha, 'The well-known work of Bishop Wilkins', and the anonymous book *Pasigraphie, ou Premiers Eléments du nouvel Art-Science d'écrire et d'imprimer une langue de manière à être lu et entendu dans toute autre langue sans traduction* of 1797. (In fact the book was published, in French and in German, by Jean de Maimieux.) These are 'the only publications that have come to my [Roget's] knowledge in which any attempt has been made to construct a systematic arrangement of ideas with a view to their expression' (p. xxiii).

The macrostructure of the *Thesaurus* is determined by six classes which branch into between two and eight sections. Most of these sections are broken down into sub-sections (my term) with varying numbers of entries, viz. 1000 in all, counted with ordinal digits. There is an exception in class IV and V, where some sections have no sub-sections, but where two so-called 'divisions' mediate between the classes and them. There are some other irregularities which, obviously, have the aim of enhancing the usability of the *Thesaurus*. Apparently, the idea is that the number of entries in one unit must not exceed a certain limit. As soon as more than forty entries appear, they are broken down into smaller units in variously differing ways.

The numbered entries have one headword (what Wilkins called 'radical') followed by a series of synonyms of varying length. Entry 697, for example, with the headword PRECEPT has fourteen synonyms in two lines, the following entry 698 with the headword SKILL several hundred extending over

one and a third pages. Thus, it would probably be better to speak of 1000 entry articles. 780 of them come in pairs, i.e. they are antonyms or otherwise related to each other. It is only the distribution of headwords that will be considered in the following analysis. The synonyms will be mentioned only if they throw light on the headwords, although the internal system of entry articles would be worth analysing.

3 The two systems of entry arrangement, Wilkins's and Roget's, show characteristic differences. The main one is that there is a much less logical hierarchy in Roget than in Wilkins and that word meanings are not defined by the location of their appearance. Roget simply assumed that his readers as native speakers would understand every lexeme. He merely helps them retrieve it. The six overarching classes are devoted to I: 'Abstract Relations', II: 'Space', III: 'Matter', IV: 'Intellect', V: 'Volition', and VI: 'Affections'. This is no Aristotelianism any longer, rather we are vaguely reminded of Galileo or Newton: formal (mathematical) principles come first, there then follow space (as the container of reality), reality (as matter) and the human animal with intellect, volition, and affections. For Wilkins, 'relations' came last, 'space' was a concretisation of 'quantity', 'matter', called 'substance' came first (after the epistemological terms), and 'intellect', 'volition', and 'affections' belonged to 'quality'. These are indeed two different worlds.

Roget's division of the six classes into sections, etc. remains rather abstract and formal, down to the entries. 'Space' (Class II), for example, is divided into "pace in General" ('abstract' 'relative', 'existence in space'), 'Dimensions' ('general', 'linear', 'central'), 'Form' ('general', 'special', 'superficial'), and 'Motion' ('general', 'degrees', 'conjoined with force', 'direction'). Of course, the idea of a logical hierarchy is not totally absent here, among other reasons because of the recurrent sequence of 'general' and 'specific'. But, for Roget, it is certainly not as prominent as it was for Wilkins. Also the content aspect as distinct from the formal one is not extinct. Among Class III 'Matter', for example, inorganic and organic matter are separated. But under the latter, sub-headed 'Vitality' ('general' and 'special') we find the entries 'Animality/Vegetability', 'Animal/Vegetable', 'Zoology/Botany', etc. (364-369), but not a taxonomy of the species of plants and animals.

Such characteristic disparities between Wilkins and Roget are to be found on almost every page. One consequence is that lexemes figuring as 'radicals' in Wilkins's word-lists do not appear as headwords in Roget's *Thesaurus*, but as synonyms annexed to a more abstract headword. 'Consanguinity', for example, is introduced by Wilkins as the first difference under the genus 'Oeconomical Relation'. Roget makes it one entry in the subsection 'Absolute Relation' of Section II 'Relation' in Class I 'Abstract Relations'. The relevant entries are (number of synonyms and synonymous expressions in brackets):

**Wilkins:** Progenitor/Descendant (7/13), Parent/Child (8 etc./9), Uncle/Nephew (1/1), Brother/Half Brother (1/-), First Cosin/Cosin (1/-). (p.249)

**Roget:** Consanguinity (47: among them: kindred, blood, parentage, cousin, brother, sister etc. etc., brotherhood, sisterhood, cousinhood [etc.]) (p.4).

Although by force of nature the same words appear in these entries of Wilkins and Roget, the latter apparently stresses the theoretically definable relationship between persons more than Wilkins does, who merely gives an enumeration of consanguinity names. An even more striking example is *number*. For Wilkins, 'Number', synonymous with 'Multitude', is the first difference of the genus 'Measure', belonging to the predicament 'Quantity'. For Roget, 'Number' is Section V of Class I 'Abstract Relations'. The relevant entries are:

**Wilkins:** one (6), two (9), three (10), four (7), five (3), six (5), seven (3), eight (3), nine (2) (p. 190).

**Roget:** 1° Number in the Abstract: Number, Numeration, List;  
2° Determinate Number: Unity/Accompaniment, Duality, Duplication/Division, Triality, Triplication/Trisection, Quaternity, Quadruplication/Quadripartition, Five/Quinquepartition;  
3° Indeterminate Number: Plurality/Zero, Multitude/Fewness, Repetition, Infinity.

(I refrain from counting the synonyms and synonymous expressions, which are rather many, sometimes amounting to almost 100.)

Here again, by force of facts, entries are partly overlapping. And yet the difference seems quite clear: Wilkins gives an enumeration (in the literal sense), Roget gives ideas that underlie the handling of numbers.

Possibilities for further comparison are, of course, countless. They may also lead to examples which run counter to what I think is the general nature of the two onomasiological works. And yet, I allow myself these generalisations:

John Wilkins presents a world of experience in his word-lists ordered according to the abstract ideas of traditional philosophy. Experience by the senses and nomination are perhaps his strongest sources, besides the logical principles already mentioned. Peter Mark Roget presents a world of thought in his word-lists ordered according to ideas and linguistic principles. I attribute this change to the influence of John Locke's philosophy.\* Whereas Wilkins, as a lexicographer, stood vis-à-vis the world and attached names to its items, Roget, as a lexicographer, entered the human mind and unfolded what he found there.

As far as I can see, the two onomasiological works represent two different traditions, which I have called *speculative* and *mental* lexicography respectively. They are the corollary, in linguistics, of those far-reaching philosophical developments which occurred from the end of the seventeenth century onwards. In moving from Wilkins to Roget, we move from referential semantics to the beginnings of cognitive semantics.

\* *Note*: Roughly speaking, there are 150 years between Locke's work and Roget's *Thesaurus*. This means that there may be many authors and books which mediated between the philosopher and lexicographer. Note, for example, Joseph Priestley who, in *A Course of Lectures on the Theory of Language and Universal Grammar* (1762), saw a parallelism between the growth and copia of a language and the simple and complex ideas expressed in its words (lectures X and XII). This, too, is certainly a Lockean argument which Roget may have known of. And there is even a link to the *Thesaurus* here. Although Priestley discusses in which way the diversity of languages can be advantageous to a universal one, he thinks highly of John Wilkins's project. 'The principle thing that is wanting to the perfection of it is a more perfect distribution of things into classes than, perhaps, the present state of knowledge can enable us to make' (lecture XIX, p. 301). This means that it is only the thesaurus in Wilkins's *Essay*, which Roget mentioned as one of his models, that needs further development. However, as Peter Mark Roget is neither a historian nor a theorist of linguistic ideas, it is not really important to find the exact path which leads from Locke to his books. It is 'the ideas in the air' which count.

#### REFERENCES

- Roget, Peter Mark 1863. *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and Assist in Literary Composition*. Fifteenth edition. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green.
- Wilkins, John 1668. *An Essay Towards a Real Character, And a Philosophical Language*. London: Printed for Sa: Gellibrand[...]. [Ann Arbor / London: University Microfilms International, 1979].
- Aarsleff, Hans 1995. Locke's Influence. In: Vere Chappel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Locke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Emblen, Donald L. 1970. *Peter Mark Roget. The World and the Man*. Longman: London.

Göbels, Astrid 1999. *Die Tradition der Universalgrammatik im England des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen

Hüllen, Werner 1999. *English Dictionaries 800-1700: The Topical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---- (2000, forthcoming) John Locke, semanticist.

**Werner Hüllen**, Düsseldorf  
[werner.huellen@uni-essen.de](mailto:werner.huellen@uni-essen.de)



## Jespersen and Franke – an Academic Friendship by Correspondence

**T**he death of Franke is an irreparable loss. He really seemed to be the only German who took a practical view of phonetics and the study of living speech. Viëtor, who is looked on as an authority seems quite unable to grasp the idea of Satzphonetik. Sievers is, of course, absorbed in historical researches, and has no time for working on the details of phonetics[...] (8 January 1887. Danish Royal Library NKS 3975).

Those were the words with which Henry Sweet (1845-1912), in a letter to Otto Jespersen (1860-1943), commented on the premature death 8 months earlier of Felix Franke (1860-1896), the young gifted German scholar who might have become one of the great linguistic names if his fate had been less cruel. The grouping together of the three names, Henry Sweet, Otto Jespersen and Felix Franke, already at this point is suggestive of what is to follow.

If we imagine a pyramid and place Henry Sweet at the top, then the two sloping lines lead to Otto Jespersen at one side and Felix Franke at the other. Sweet deserves the top position because he was the older, the already famous scholar, who inspired his younger colleagues; and the bottom line may be understood as the friendship between Jespersen and Franke, a friendship which was to a great extent founded on their common admiration for Henry Sweet. It is primarily this friendship that I intend to concentrate on in the present article.<sup>1</sup>

It all began in the year 1884 and ended abruptly about two years later with Franke's death. Otto Jespersen and Felix Franke were both born in the year 1860; having finished school, neither of them, for different reasons, followed the normal courses for the university studies they had taken up, so in 1884 they were technically still undergraduates. This, however, did not prevent them from contacting older scholars of world-wide renown in order to discuss their ideas with them and ask for their advice. So, young as they were, they already had what we would today call 'a good network', although, of course, communications were much more difficult in those days than now.

The fact that Otto Jespersen, the Dane, (in 1884) happened to find a small book, written by a German, Felix Franke, was, therefore, not surprising. The title of this book was *Die praktische Spracherlernung auf Grund der Psychologie und Physiologie der Sprache dargestellt von Felix Franke* and it had just been published. The contents immediately appealed to him, expressing as they did attitudes quite similar to his own. Those were the days when new

---

<sup>1</sup> This piece was originally intended as a paper to be read at the Edinburgh conference of the Henry Sweet Society.

ideas within the areas of phonetics and grammar were about to break through and to all appearances both Franke and Jespersen were eager to be among the most conspicuous of the linguistic reformers.

Much later, when Otto Jespersen wrote his biography (*Af en sprogmands levned*, 1938), which was translated into English in 1995 as *A Linguist's Life*, he expressed what he felt when he first established contact with Felix Franke and how important the ensuing friendship by correspondence had been for him:

I have never met a human being who to such an extent shared all my interests and views [...] We became as good friends as is possible for people who never got the chance of meeting; we each learned much from the other and stimulated each other greatly. (48)

The first contact between them came about because, having finished reading Franke's little book, Jespersen felt that its message ought to be spread to the Scandinavian countries and that he might be the person to do so by translating it into Danish. Jespersen was a man of action, so he immediately sent a note to Felix Franke, through the latter's German publishers, asking for permission to make a translation of this sort. Franke himself promptly answered – and in very positive terms:

Ihre durch Vermittelung der Gebr. Henninger heute erhaltenen Zeilen haben mir viel Freude gemacht: ich ersehe daraus mit Vergnügen dass Ihnen das Büchelchen gefällt. Ich gebe Ihnen natürlich gern die Zustimmung zur Veröffentlichung einer dänischen Bearbeitung der ‚Spracherlernung‘.

This letter was the first personal letter between Franke and Jespersen, and Jespersen must have felt obliged to thank Franke privately for the permission – which he duly did. In this short letter of thanks, Jespersen includes some information which might be understood as slightly offensive – but surely was not meant as such – namely that as there existed some kind of formal arrangement between publishers in Denmark and Germany, a permission like the one he had just been given was actually superfluous! Why he had nevertheless asked for it, he does not reveal. Was it because he would like to be polite, to show off, or simply to try to find out what kind of man/scholar Felix Franke was? At that moment and actually a long time after, they - both of them - thought that the other was much older and more established in the academic world than they actually were! This may explain the wary way in which they approached each other in the beginning, as if they were afraid of being caught off guard!

Otto Jespersen mastered German and of course these first two letters exchanged between them were written in that language. They were, as one might expect, very formal beginning with 'Sehr geehrter Herr' and ending with 'Ihr dankbar ergebener' (Jespersen), and 'mit besten Empfehlungen' (Franke).

By then, the correspondence might easily have stopped; Otto Jespersen had – necessary or not – got his permission to translate Franke's book and had thanked the latter because he had looked so favourably on the proposal. But somehow these short and formal notes must have set off something in the minds of the two young people, especially perhaps in Franke's, whose life at that time was so difficult and undoubtedly lonely because of the severe illness - tuberculosis – that he had been suffering from for years – the illness which was to kill him a few years later. His bad health had prevented him from completing his studies and getting his doctorate (in French) and he had had to retire from university life at German universities and in Geneva, and return to the small provincial town of Sorau in Nieder Lausitz where he lived in his father's house and at his expense. When he felt well enough, he devoted all his time to linguistic studies (of various languages, also Scandinavian), but on and off he was forced to be inactive. So, for him the prospect of finding a friend with similar academic interests, and a friend whose friendship he could cultivate when he felt up to it, must have been a godsend. That may be the reason why he promised in his first letter to send Jespersen a copy of his book with hand-written marginal notes which might come in useful when the translation was going to be worked out. The book duly arrived and in the accompanying letter (his second letter) Franke – directly and indirectly – put a number of questions to Jespersen, probably in the hope that they might attract his attention and provoke some kind of answer. He says for instance:

Ich möchte noch bemerken dass Sweet ein *Elementarbuch der gesprochenen Englisch* unter der Presse hat das nach Schröers Angaben phonetisch geschriebene Texte [...] und eine kurze, grammatische Skizze, Lautlehre, Formenlehre und Syntax enthalten wird - also ein Buch zu dem wir uns gratulieren können.

And he goes on:

Wann wird Ihre Bearbeitung etwa erscheinen? Sollte ich vorher Sweets Buch zu sehen bekommen, dann will ich Sie gern in Kenntnis davon setzen.

He surely wants to leave an opening for adding something in the Danish version if Sweet's expected book contains new and interesting opinions. This hidden plan is revealed indirectly in the next sentence:

Ist es Ihnen bekannt, dass die deutsche Bearbeitung von Storms *Engelsk Filologi* vor der Originalausgabe Vorzüge hat? Prof. St. hat den ‚Stoff bedeutend vermehrt‘ und sehr vieles genauer und deutlicher dargestellt.

Contrary to Franke, Jespersen was anything but inactive – rather the opposite – because he had to work very hard in order to survive; along with his language studies, to which he had changed after having studied law for some years, and which he seems to have carried out mainly in his spare time, he worked as a parliamentary stenographer and as a language teacher in a (lower) secondary school. But he too must have felt that Felix Franke might in the near future mean something special to him, so he willingly took up the challenge handed to him by the latter, and soon letter upon letter was sent northwards to Copenhagen and southwards to Sorau, letters filled with scholarly observations, academic gossip and (albeit rarely) personal information. Sometimes they wrote two letters in one day, sometimes months passed without any communication, but the tie never broke until death put an end to it all. The personal meeting between them that they often discussed and hoped for – and even planned – came to nothing, for economic reasons and especially for reasons of health.

At the beginning of their correspondence they both used the German language in their letters, but when Jespersen discovered that Franke was able to read Danish, and also wanted to learn more of it, he suggested that he might use his own language in his letters, arguing to do so in the following way – translated from Danish (by the present writer) and quoted from the first letter that he wrote in Danish (dated 22 October 1884):

I hope you will not mind that I use my own language; I do so knowing that you understand it and also because when I try to express something in a foreign language I always feel how right a compatriot of yours, a lady, was when she said that in a foreign language you may express what you are able to, but in your own language what you want to.

Felix Franke, of course, continued to use his own language and this system seems to have worked well.

All in all, about 200 letters (including a number of postcards) were sent across the Baltic, and when read as a whole they very well reveal the impressive level of learning and scholarly scope of these two very young and very gifted men. For us, in Denmark, it is of special interest to get to know Otto Jespersen at this early age because we usually see him as the old, grey, well-established, indeed world-famous professor rather than as the somewhat insecure and even melancholic person that we meet on and off in these early letters, although now and then he reveals glimpses here of the self-confidence that some of his contemporaries later came to dislike – Johan Storm, for instance.

All these letters and postcards are kept at the Danish Royal Library (NKS 3975) and – surprisingly – as far as I know, they have never been subject to systematic and close study. Nor have they ever been printed. They are sporadically and briefly mentioned in modern linguistic literature, and in 1944/1945 dr.phil. Svend Smith, a Danish phonetician, wrote a short article partly based on them. The title of this article was *En Fonetikers Fødsel* ('The Birth of a Phonetician'). Smith's reason for discussing the letters was, however, rather to give his readers an idea of Jespersen as a young scholar than to describe the friendship and the dialogues between Jespersen and Franke; as I see it - that is all.

Therefore I have now (together with my colleague, Hanne Lauridsen) begun studying all these letters one by one with a view to publishing a long article on them (including quotations from them where relevant), hopefully in *Fund og Forskning (fra det kongelige biblioteks arkiver)*. This journal is reserved for publications of still unprinted material found in the archives of the above-mentioned Danish Royal Library, and thus a proper forum for it. We have decided to write our article in Danish and use the quotations as we find them – in Danish and in German – in order not to create confusion by introducing a third language (English), but this does not mean that we may not later make a (maybe abbreviated) English version, if there is a public for it.

As we have by no means finished our studies of the correspondence, I shall in the following only pick out a few themes for discussion, asking readers all the time to remember that what is put forward below is based on 'work in progress' and cannot be considered as a report on 'work completed'.

Both Jespersen and Franke wanted to convert the budding new theories of the linguistic reformers – themselves included – into publications of a practical kind; they had several plans and introduced them to each other, but only two were realised during the years of their correspondence. These publications, as Jespersen later says, were both inspired by Felix Franke's first little book:

The book became the opening shot in a campaign waged over several years to get language-teaching onto a different track: the use of phonetics, phonetic script, translation as little as possible, sensible grammar and not too much of it, particularly not meaningless rote-learning, in brief to empathize with the foreign language as much as possible. (*A Linguist's Life*, 47-48)

Until then (i.e. the 1870s and early 1880s) most teachers of English had based their teaching on texts – mostly independent sentences – which they demanded to be translated rather than read aloud. Moreover they asked their pupils, with a Latin-inspired grammar of English as their reference, to analyse the texts in every detail. Jespersen and Franke, under the influence of Sweet and Storm, did

not sympathise with these methods: only by knowing in addition 1) the colloquial, oral side of a given language and 2) precisely how to pronounce the sounds of the language - would it be possible to master any foreign language to perfection. To quote Storm on this matter:

Det egentlige Sprog er Talesproget, og Talesproget bestaar af Lyd. Den første betingelse for at kjende et Sprog er altsaa at kjende dets Lyd. Uden dette kan man vistnok til en vis Grad trænge ind i dets Aand, men det bliver dog kun som et dødt Sprog.

And in my English translation:

The spoken language is the real language, and the spoken language consists of sounds. Thus, if you want to know a language, the first thing to know is its sounds. Without that you may, to a certain degree, penetrate into its spirit, but it will be like a dead language.  
(Storm 1879: 2)

But in order to describe *on paper* how a sound was to be pronounced, a good system of phonetic signs and instruction in how to use it would be necessary. Much of the correspondence concerns the phonetic alphabets that had been/were being developed in those years, but this is a point that I shall not discuss here but leave for our future publication mentioned above.

Early on in this correspondence (11 November 1884) Jespersen announces his plan to write an elementary grammar of English and he immediately secures Franke's assistance, although the latter would have preferred that he had devoted his time to a phonological study of Danish. I quote Jespersen on this matter:

Then at last I may mention my plan to write a small English Gram. Maybe a little bigger than Viëtor's, which I shall of course draw upon quite often. The main difference between Viëtor and myself will probably be that I would like to include a chapter on syntax and – mark my words – make it part of the chapter on accidence. (My translation)

Further on in the same letter he makes a confession which with hindsight seems absurd:

But I know so little English that I would very much appreciate revision by an expert, and that is the reason why I take the liberty to ask your permission to send my MS to you either little by little or when it is all finished. (My translation)

Considering that Jespersen actually only studied English as one of his minor subjects and French as his major subject, this request was not so absurd after all – at that time.

Four days later Franke promises to advise Jespersen with regard to the correctness of his English, though he does not feel that he is the right person to ask:

[...] Sehr interessant war mir, was Sie über Ihre eng. Grammatik sagen. Ich stelle mich Ihnen mit Freuden zur Verfügung für Ihr MS und zwar ganz nach Ihrem Wunsche [...] Nur fürchte ich, ich werde Ihnen nicht genüg nützen können: ich kann wirklich nur ‚meget lidt engelsk‘ [...]

Jespersen worked steadily on his grammar in which he included phonetic script - much to the annoyance of especially elderly teachers when it was published. It appeared in July 1885 carrying the title *Kortfattet engelsk Grammatik for Tale og Skriftsproget*.

The reason why I have dwelt so much on the history of this grammar is that its influence has been so great. All other grammars of English published in Denmark were for many, many years to come modelled on it and all middle-aged Danes have been taught English according to the principles found in it.

As for Franke, his one realised plan – which he completed within weeks of his death – was to write a French phraseology; he too asked for assistance, and from the letters we see that Jespersen was very helpful in reading and correcting the proof-sheets immediately after their arrival by post. All the time he encouraged his friend, praised him (but also pointed out errors), cautiously pressing him to finish the work. It is not said, of course, but it can easily be felt that Jespersen now feels that time is running out and he surely wants Franke to see the results of his work. Jespersen's letters from the last months still contain scholarly material, but they have somehow become more conventional and conversational – apart from the discussions of Franke's phraseology. Young as he was at that time, Jespersen was undoubtedly shocked and very sad, because it was now so obvious that the end was near.

Another plan, thought out by Franke and supported by Jespersen - but which was never carried out - was to compose a book consisting of texts in several languages, only written in phonetic transcription. An expert from each of the countries involved was to write the texts, and they got so far as discussing names: apart from themselves, Sweet, Storm and Lundell (the Swede) seemed natural choices. But nothing more came of this, except that Sweet mentioned it as a good idea in the letter quoted at the head of this article, and suggested that Jespersen should go on with it alone.

At the beginning of the correspondence, when they tried to get to know each other, many linguistic themes of various kinds were eagerly discussed. Many scholars in Germany/Denmark and other European countries were

praised (or the opposite) and recently published books and articles on linguistic subjects were recommended (or *not* recommended) by one to the other. A system of buying book for each other was soon organised. It was especially difficult for Franke, who lived in a small provincial town, to buy new books, so Jespersen kindly found them for him in Denmark and sent them to Sorau, and now and then Franke is also able to reciprocate Jespersen's readiness to help. Both of them pay much attention to the amount of money they owe each other. Especially Jespersen seems to have had problems making ends meet. This is even reflected in the question of postage! Practically all his letters are of the same length, no doubt corresponding to a certain weight and postage!

What did they know about each other on the personal level? We know that their friendship began in a very formal way and that was also how it continued for some time, but then they must, both of them, have felt that a proper introduction would now be suitable. Franke began and Jespersen followed up. Each wrote a short autobiography and later they also exchanged photos. Whereas Franke's life-story was a story of wasted talents and of years of ill health, Jespersen's was one of hard economy and spells of melancholy but also of a strong will and youthful courage to go on, to survive and to acquire success. I shall quote both Franke and Jespersen, beginning with Franke:

*Letter of 21 November 1884:*

Ich fasse mich so kurz wie möglich. Geb. am 8. Aug. 1860 in einem kleinen schlesischen Städtchen, kam ich 1865 nach Krossen a/Oder. 1869 wurde mein Vater hierher (Sorau) berufen. 1869-1879 besuchte ich das hiesige Gymnasium. In das Jahr 1878 fällt eine kurze Italiensreise ohne linguistischen Gestand, doch nicht ganz ohne Anregung für später. Seit 1879 trieb ich mich auf verschiedenen Universitäten herum, um Bibliotheken zu durchstöbern und Kollegien – „schwänzen“ („to cut a lecture“ sagen die Engländer). Ich verdanke den Professoren wenig Anregung, desto mehr den Büchern. Erst in Berlin – dann Halle – 1881 in Genf: hier kommt eine Pause. Es stellte sich heraus dass ich ein gefährliches Lungenleiden hatte: so verbrachte ich den Winter 1881/82 im Kurort Görbersdorf (Schlesien). Die Lehrerkarriere wurde nun definitiv aufgegeben – trotzdem ging ich wieder nach einer Universität um die Studien fortzusetzen, was sollte ich sonst thun? Die Wahl fiel auf Göttingen – zu meinem Heil! Denn hier fand ich Anregungen verschiedener Art – auf der einen Seite wurde ich auf ein etwas eingehenderes (objektiv gesehen freilich sehr oberflächliches) historisches Sprachstudium hingetrieben, auf der andren machte sich der Einfluss Storms und der Engländer geltend, auch das Studium der lebenden Sprachen wurde nun erst wissenschaftlich. In Göttingen blieb ich zwei Jahre. Leider verschlimmerte sich dann der Zustand meiner Lunge wieder, so dass ich Zuflucht im Elternhause suchen musste. Recht



unangenehm ist es mir dass ich meiner Studienzzeit nicht durch den ‚Dr.‘ habe einen gewissen Abschluss geben können. Ich habe in den letzten Jahren mehrfach Ansätze dazu gemacht, aber wenn’ s zur Sache – d. h. zum ‚Einochsen‘ des Quantums‘ an Wissen, das ausserhalb *meiner* Studien lag, kam, versagten meine physische Kräfte. Nun habe ich dies Projekt vorläufig ad acta gelegt. – Das Weitere wissen sie. Noch ein Paar Worte über das *Milieu*, in dem ich lebe: Sorau ist eine Stadt von 14.000 Einwohnern mit im ganzen ziemlich materiellen Interessen; als Vertreter der neueren Sprachen stehe ich allein da – wenigstens als Fachmann. Bibliotheken, wissenschaftliche Zeitschriften u. dgl. sind nahezu Mythen – was davon hier zu finden ist, betrifft alte Philologie. Ich selbst kann und mag mir nicht *zu* viel Bücher kaufen – da ich den Geldbeutel meines Vaters schon seit Jahren ungebührlich belaste, wenn auch mein Vater sehr gut ist und mir alle Wünsche zu erfüllen sucht. Mein Vater ist Kgl. Musikdirektor, Organist und der gesuchteste Musiklehrer der Stadt; ausser ihm und der Mutter habe ich noch zwei jüngere Geschwister, Bruder (14 Jahre) u. Schwester (13 Jahre). So, nun wissen Sie ungefähr Bescheid, wenn Sie, was *uns alle* sehr freuen würde, einmal her kommen könnten. Sie wissen nun auch, dass ich direkte Anregung für meine Studien hier nirgends finde, und Sie begreifen, wie wertvoll mir Ihre Briefe sein müssen! [...]

Jespersen, when his turn comes, describes – in a more lively and fluent style – what happened to him in his early years:

I was very pleased to see that - as in so many other areas – we are also alike with regard to age; I was, you see, born July, 16th 1860 in Randers. My father was a civil servant in this town and upon his death in 1870 my mother moved with all her children (we are nine in all, out of which only four were then able to provide for themselves) to Frederiksborg; here my mother also died four years later, but thanks to the economic support provided by some relatives it became possible for me to attend the local grammar school from which I graduated in 1877. Then I came to this town [Copenhagen] where I have been living ever since. Already at school I began taking an interest in linguistic studies. I was quite carried away by a biography on Rask, his many adventurous voyages to Iceland to do research there, and [his journeys] later, via Russia, to India to follow in the footsteps of our forefathers through linguistic affinity – all this set fire to my young imagination and I began studying Old Norse when I got hold of his [Rask’s] ‘handbook’ and a textbook, so that – when we took up this subject at school (1875) I already knew most of what the teacher told us. Somewhat later a benevolent old uncle and his well-assorted library made it possible for

me to study French, Italian and Spanish works – to study Tasso, Ariosto and Manzoni in the original. And, finally, it also became possible for me, through my headmaster – to acquire knowledge about the results of comparative linguistics, first of all by studying Max Müller's and Whitney's popular expositions. Then I began my studies at the university of this town – law studies, that is! My parents had wanted me to do so, and everybody said that this was most sensible, much more lucrative than language studies! But when I had wasted some years on these studies without increasing my interest for them - whereas the desire for learning languages and finding out how they were related was still alive – then one fine day I made the decision to sell my law books and buy Diez and Littré instead – which I have not regretted. (My own translation and not the one found in *A Linguist's Life* because the Danish version behind that is not exactly the same as the (original) one found in this early letter, dated 1 December 1884)

When Franke died, his father wrote a very touching letter, dated 19 June 1886, to Jespersen thanking him for his faithfulness and loyalty his son:

Mein Felix schätzte Sie ausserordentlich. Sie war sein *liebster Freund* und er hat mir vielemals es ausgesprochen, dass die Wissenschaft von Ihnen *Grosses zu erwarten habe!* Möchte es Ihnen besser ergehen, wie meinem armen Sohn, der zu Anfang seiner Laufbahn schon das Ende bald vor sich sehen musste. Und wie geduldig hat er den inneren Kampf ertragen! Möge es Ihnen beschieden sein, Alles zu erreichen, was meinem Sohn versagt war [...] (Quoted in Smith 1994(5): 49)

I think one may safely say that Franke senior's warm wishes did indeed come true, and maybe Felix Franke, by his inspiring friendship, contributed no little to this.

#### SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Franke, F. 1883. *Die praktische Spracherlernung auf Grund der Psychologie und der Physiologie der Sprache dargestellt von Felix Franke*. Leipzig: Reisland.
- 1884. *Praktisk Tilegnelse af fremmede Sprog*. Dansk bearbejdelse ved O. Jespersen. Copenhagen: Carl Larsen.
- Howatt, A. P. R. 1984. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jespersen, O. 1885 *Kortfattet Engelsk Grammatik for Tale og Skriftsproget*. Copenhagen: Carl Larsen.

- 1890. Preface to Franke, Felix. *Die praktische Spracherlernung and Grund der Psychologie und der Physiologie der Sprache*. 2nd rev. ed. Leipzig: Reisland.
- 1938. *En sprogmands levned*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- 1995. *A Linguist's Life with notes etc.* Odense: Odense University Press. [English translation of Jespersen 1938.]
- Sandved, A. O. 1998. *Fra "kremmersprog" til verdensspråk. Engelsk som universitetsfag i Norge 1850-1943*. Oslo: Forum for universitetshistorie.
- Smith, S 1944(5). En Fonetikers Fødsel. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Tale og Stemme* 8.
- Storm, J. 1879 *Engelsk Filologi. Anvisning til et videnskabeligt Studium af det engelske Sprog for Studerende, Lærere og Viderekomne*. Kristiania: Alb. Cammermeyer.
- 1881. *Englische Philologie. Anleitung zum wissenschaftlichen Studien der englischen Sprache. Vom Verfasser für das deutsche Publikum bearbeitet. I. Die lebende Sprache*. Heilbronn.
- Sweet, H. 1877. *A Handbook of Phonetics, including a Popular Exposition of the Principles of Spelling Reform*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1885. *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Inge Kabell , Copenhagen**  
[kabell@hum.ku.dk](mailto:kabell@hum.ku.dk)

## Grammarians Under the Influence: a Surfeit of *Sea-Water*

The early grammarians of English often commented on expressions such as *sheep-fold*, in which, to use their terminology, a substantive *sheep* was being used as an adjective. From the end of the seventeenth century such an expression was also called a compound noun. It was usually taken for granted, and sometimes stated, that a hyphen was necessary between the two components, but by the 1780s a few writers were maintaining that the subordination of *sheep* to *fold* held even if there was no hyphen. Only one writer, the important but shadowy A. Lane, in *A key to the art of letters* of 1700, refers to stress. The two elements of the compound must, he says, be evenly accented and joined by a hyphen. A characteristic rule governing the feature is that given in *The true method of learning the Latin tongue by the English*, 1696: 'When two Nouns are joyn'd together by an *Hyphen*, as if they were but one Compound Noun, then the former of them is taken Adjectively'.

But it is not the grammatical feature with which I am concerned. It is the illustrations of the rule which have caught my eye and raised my eyebrows. Thomas Tomkis, in his unpublished grammar of English, written in Latin in 1612, is the first grammarian to refer to this kind of compound. He gives four English examples: *sea water*; *feild mouse*; *water ratt*; *sky color*. (It is worth noting at this stage the interconnections between these examples: *sea WATER* and *WATER rat*; *water RAT* and *field MOUSE*). Alexander Gill in 1619 and 1621 calls this category 'substantiva sterilia', and gives *sea water* as one of his examples. *Sea water* is not used again until 1763 when Lowth uses it to illustrate a paragraph which he added to the second edition of his grammar. In 1772 Alexander Adam and in 1778 Joshua Story, both acknowledging an obligation to Lowth, use the *sea water* example, which appears again in 1770, three times in 1787, again in 1788, twice in 1795, and again in 1796 and 1799: fourteen appearances of it since Tomkis in 1612; a clear line of descent to Lowth, whose grammar was so widely used that the later appearances may all derive from him. So far, *sea water* would seem to be an interesting, but not very informative, trace element.

But there is more to it. In 1653 John Wallis, who of course knew Gill's work, had adopted the category and named the first element in the compound a 'respective adjective'. His first illustration of it is *sea fish*. It is scarcely rash to suppose that *sea fish* is a variant of Gill's and Tomkis's *sea water*. The interconnections between the illustrations is again conspicuous. As well as *sea fish* Wallis gives *SEA voyage* and *river FISH*; as well as *sea VOYAGE* he gives *Turkey VOYAGE*. He gives also a new and suggestive group of linked examples: *man-slaughter*, *self-murder*, *self-tormentor*. Wallis's eleven illustrations are completed by *gold-ring*, *wine-vessel*, *home-made* and *sun-*

*shiny*. All but one of these examples occur in later grammars to an extent which is surprising, if not interesting.

*Sea-fish* appears as an illustration of this same grammatical category in at least thirty-two further grammars, as late as Cobbett in 1818. *Gold-ring* appears in fourteen further grammars up to 1848. Each of the other illustrations appears up to five times before the end of the eighteenth century.

But there is more to it than that. The majority of those writers who wanted to use Wallis's illustrations seem to have felt it necessary to alter them in the same way as he (we assume) had altered Tomkis's and Gill's *sea-water* into *sea-fish*: just enough to be different, but sufficiently similar to suggest, perhaps, that the later writer wishes to show he is indebted to, but is not just copying, the earlier. Later grammarians used 26 illustrations which contain variants of either the first or the second element of Wallis's eleven compounds. By far the most frequent element is *sea*. Just as Tomkis's *sea-water* was used fourteen times, so Wallis's two *sea* compounds (*sea-fish* and *sea-voyage*, themselves appearing 32 times) generate *sea-horse* (six times), *sea-trout* and *sea-man* (twice each), *sea-coal*, *sea-crab*, *sea-sick*, *sea-fowl*, *sea-swallow*.

Wallis's *river-fish* generates *shell-fish* (3), *man-fish* and *river-trout*. *Self-murder* is modified eleven times into *self-love*, twice into *self-conceit*. And so on. There is no point in throwing out more figures, but it is worth recording that the 117 instances of an example, or direct variant, of Wallis's eleven illustrations are spread over 63 different grammars. And only a minority of grammars, of course, discuss this grammatical feature at all.

The category was illustrated also by examples which show no signs of Wallis's influence. They tend to be homely: *giblet-pie* (1746); *tea-pot* (1793); *rum-puncheon* (1784). Two things, however, are puzzling. Why was it necessary for any grammarian to give more than one illustration? And why were the illustrations given by the same grammarian so alike? Tomkis's example *sea-water* surely illustrates the category clearly enough; nothing is gained by adding *sky-colour*. And when he adds *field-mouse* is there any point in further adding *water-rat*? In 1685 Christopher Cooper, who is following Wallis closely, gives eighteen illustrations, adding to nine derived from Wallis others such as *weather-glass*, *whirl-pool*, *moor-hen*. In 1784 John Fell provides fourteen illustrations. When he gives *foot-man* why add *chamber-maid*? When he gives *marsh-mallow* why add *mountain ranunculus*? When he gives *foot-guards* why add *horse-guards*? Why does Wallis give both *Turkey-voyage* and *sea-voyage*; *sea-fish* and *river-fish*?

It is characteristic of grammars, of works on language, of expository writing generally, to have lists which are longer than seems necessary for any illustrative or representative function. Why? Because lists are fun. As children we had fun making lists of all sorts of things, and collecting all sorts of things. It is still fun, as writing this paper shows.

The interconnectedness of the illustrations given by one writer are presumably the result of association: rat with mouse; self-murder with manslaughter and self-torment. In 1776 Daniel Fenning gives three illustrations: *malt-loft, wheat-barn, barley-chamber*. In 1785 George Ussher gives *brick-house, room-door, stone-wall*. One must suspect a pedagogical intention as well as the inertia of association. There seems to be an implied belief that the pupils' learning will be reinforced both by having many illustrations and by having related illustrations. Yet the practice of the grammarians provides as much evidence to contradict this view as to support it. It is all very puzzling.

The important question is: to what extent does the appearance of some of these distinctive illustrations in more than sixty grammars measure Wallis's influence, and through him that of Gill and Tomkis? Are *sea-water, sea-fish, gold-ring* and *self-love* tracers by means of which we can measure the importance of an innovative grammar? If computers were adequately instructed could they, by tracing such distinctive expressions, increase our understanding of how innovations are transmitted and give us some means of measuring their effects?

It may seem that, to a very limited extent, these illustrations might be treated as tracers, but we have to be careful when handling the idea of influence. We know from other evidence that some writers were directly influenced by Wallis, and acknowledged their obligations. Such were Greenwood, Gildon, Horne Tooke, Charles Coote. Such, in a small way, was Ellin Devis. In 1777 she said of her *Accidence*, 'The greatest part is selected from the works of our best Grammarians', but added that most of them were 'too abstruse [...] or too concise'. Such an opinion would without doubt direct her to Lowth, whom she quotes. She repeats verbatim his description of the respective adjective, together with one of his illustrations, *land-tortoise*, which had not then appeared in any other grammar. Lowth himself had added this reference to the respective adjective in his second edition. Of his three illustrations *forest-tree* and *land-tortoise* had not been used before, and *sea-water* had been used only by Gill and Tomkis, a hundred and fifty years earlier. Had Lowth read Gill? He might have done, but his grammatical interests were more contemporary than antiquarian. What led him to insert this grammatical feature into his revised edition? It may have been the influence of Gill. It may have been the influence of Buchanan, whose *British Grammar* had come out the previous year, the year of Lowth's first edition. Buchanan had used the illustrations *sea-horse* and *sea-trout*. Perhaps Lowth, in varying Buchanan's illustrations, hit by chance on *sea-water*? Too much speculation.

In 1743 W. Richards, in *The young man's new companion*, refers to 'the Name put after the Manner of a Quality and united to the subsequent Word by a Hyphen'. The use of the 'new' term *quality* instead of *adjective* marks, at this date, the direct influence of Gildon. Gildon's two illustrations had been *sea-fish* and *self-love*; Richards' two illustrations are *self-love* and *shell-fish*. *Self-love*

could have come from Gildon or from three other works; *shell-fish* could have come from Cooper. But the compilers of young men's companions were not scholars, reading widely. Richards, 'perhaps', took this material from Gildon but changed *sea-fish* to *shell-fish*.

But we are just playing games. Influence, as a tool for cultural history, is useful only when it is so obvious that it is unnecessary. It is useful when it is direct, from father to son. When borrowing is widespread within the family, and the second cousins are borrowing from their great-aunts by marriage, the degree of dilution is so great that influence ceases to be a meaningful or a measurable concept. Sam Johnson, in the preface to the dictionary, seems to have had the same kind of doubts:

I have sometimes, though rarely, yielded to the temptation of exhibiting a genealogy of sentiments, by showing how one author copied the thoughts and diction of another: such quotations are indeed little more than repetitions, which might justly be censured, did they not gratify the mind, by affording a kind of intellectual history.

'A kind of intellectual history' is a question-begging expression. It does not suggest an important or an interesting exercise. I would go further, and question whether 'influence' is a valid critical and historical term. In literary and aesthetic criticism (especially in art history) it leads to little more than name-dropping. In the history of ideas, including linguistic ideas, it provides facts only when they are self-evident.

And yet: It is surprising that one of Tomkis's illustrations persists through nearly two centuries, and that Wallis's were echoed in so many grammars. But perhaps only a *self-tormentor* would be puzzled.

**Ian Michael**

## Seventeenth Annual Colloquium of the Henry Sweet Society

Edinburgh, 20-23 September 2000

### *Conference Report*

It was inevitable that one of the most immediately striking things about this colloquium was going to be an absence, and so it proved: the death of R. H. Robins earlier this year deprived the Edinburgh proceedings of perhaps their most characteristic participant. The panel discussion chaired by Vivien Law that got the colloquium underway (see pp. 8-14 of this *Bulletin*) was thus an entirely appropriate tribute to his achievements, dwelling upon many aspects of the man – personal, professional, academic and anecdotal. Tellingly, no contributor to the discussion could recall an HSS colloquium prior to this one at which Robins had not been present.

Nevertheless, it is a testament to the quality and organisation of the Edinburgh colloquium that despite this loss the gathering was a great success, and highly enjoyable to be involved with. This was a view shared, I think, by colloquium veterans and relative novices like myself alike, and is greatly to the credit of conference organiser, John Joseph. Though he expressed some unease at playing ‘mother duck’, everything – both within and without the conference room – was managed with enviable invisibility and ease. On top of this, he found time to prepare and deliver an acute assessment of international English and its status; unquestionably, he deserves our gratitude and congratulations.

Needless to add, one organiser does not a colloquium make, and all would have been in vain in the absence of high-quality papers. This was emphatically not the case: those delivered at Edinburgh this year ranged from the seventeenth century to the present day, from Cornwall to the Sahara, and from Balkan grammars to the ontological status of function words. Individually and cumulatively, they were never less than thought-provoking. A number of well-known figures in the history of linguistics were reconsidered from a variety of new angles, including Hobbes, Leibniz, Peirce and Palmer. Werner Hülsen’s comparison between the onomasiological methods of Wilkins and Roget also nicely exploded the oft-cited dependence of the latter upon the former’s work, sounding a cautionary note about taking linguists’ professions about their antecedents too much on trust. However, many papers concerned some of the less prominent characters within our tradition. Reflecting no doubt the parochiality of my interests, I found the most enjoyable of these to be



concerned with comparative bit-part players in the British tradition, in particular the thoughts of Jaap Maat on Robert Hooke, Jon Mills on Edward Lhuys, Gabriele Knappe on George Campbell and Richard Steadman-Jones on William Marsden. Though these figures may be familiar from other fields, and however different their areas of language interest, a useful corrective was provided against any potential neglect of their linguistic pursuits. Many areas of interest from further afield were also examined, prominent amongst which was Nadia Kerecuk's energetic and thoroughly convincing advocacy of O. O. Potebnia: a Ukrainian linguist seemingly comparable in stature to de Saussure and considerably more sound in his conclusions. Elsewhere, the presentations of the patterns of vernacular standardisation across Europe as well as the relationship between Hebrew linguistic scholarship and its sources in the Jewish Enlightenment were, to me, of equal novelty and interest.

One of the great strengths of this colloquium was the way in which the papers were arranged to feed into one another, a benefit both to the audience and the speakers. For example, the juxtaposition of papers on Leibniz and Schottelius (the latter of which posited the interesting conundrum of the German language tree only growing in oriental soil) in one session was able to bring out the constitutive rather than decorative metaphorical elements contended by the two speakers to be a part of their subjects' linguistic endeavours in a way that would not otherwise have been the case. Credit is again due to the organiser. One of the most prominent topics of debate through the colloquium was that of the most propitious form of linguistic historiography, as touched upon in the entertaining (and innovative) panel discussion on developing the history of applied linguistics, but brought inescapably to the forefront by Andrew Linn's fictioneering rendition of Johan Storm's 'Diaries'. Once the audience had recovered from its initial shock at having the wool pulled so comprehensively over its eyes, it became clear that the issues raised were of seminal importance to the activity to which the HSS aspires. Discussions on those issues will surely continue, even heatedly. The colloquium was provided with a fitting conclusion by Konrad Koerner's fascinating discussion of truth and fiction in the relationship between Chomsky and morphophonemics.

Aside from the colloquium itself, the trip to Edinburgh was a pleasant one. The colloquium participants were lucky enough to have a tour by Angus Stewart, Q.C., of the Advocates' Library in which David Hume and almost the whole gamut of Scottish Enlightenment *éminences grises* went to read and work. This also took in the site of the original Scottish Parliament, complete with its astonishing ceiling. The conference dinner, on Wednesday night, was an extremely salubrious affair at Nicolson's restaurant. The colloquium was also graced by the presence of Pieter Verburg's son, marking the establishment of the Paul Salmon - Pieter Verburg Memorial Fund in memory of Verburg senior and Paul Salmon. This has been brought about through the beneficence

of the Verburg family and of Vivian Salmon, and will enable young scholars to attend HSS colloquia that might otherwise be beyond their means. (Full details are to be found on page 69 of issue 34 of the *Bulletin* (May 2000).) A memorial that befits the names of the two scholars it bears as well as the HSS “family” as a whole.

**Rhodri Lewis, Oxford**  
[rhodri.lewis@jesus.ox.ac.uk](mailto:rhodri.lewis@jesus.ox.ac.uk)

## THE SEVENTEENTH HSS COLLOQUIUM 2000

### Abstracts of papers

#### *Function Words: Do they Exist?*

Els Elffers (Amsterdam, els.elffers@hum.uva.nl)

From Antiquity onwards, a distinction has been made in Western linguistics between ‘content words’ (e.g. substantives, adjectives) and ‘function words’ (e.g. conjunctions). Aristotle can be considered as the first of a long and still continuing series of linguists, philosophers and psychologists who divide the traditional word classes into two types along these lines. Interestingly, the criteria involved have been changing throughout the centuries. Grammatical, etymological, philosophical and psychological considerations and mixtures of these have alternately been prominent, nevertheless yielding a relatively constant division of the word classes, described in various terms (‘full’ vs. ‘empty’ words, ‘autosemantika’ vs. ‘synsemantika’ etc.). In this paper I pay attention to a quantitatively less important line of thought: opposition against the distinction between content words and function words. Arguments against this distinction usually take the shape of a denial of the alleged ‘emptiness’ or ‘purely grammatical’ character of the words classified as function words. Apollonius Dyscolus was the first of this minority of anti-divisionists; he eloquently combatted Aristotle’s distinction between ‘semantikai’ (onoma, rhema) and ‘asemoi’ (sundesmos, arthron). More recent defenders of this view have appealed to more sophisticated arguments. 19th-century grammarians made use of psychological insights that gradually became available in their day. 20th-century structuralists like Jakobson appealed to the rapidly growing systematic knowledge of grammatical differences throughout the languages of the world. Nowadays, in linguistics, but not in psycholinguistics, Wittgenstein’s view of the word-classes as the inventory of a toolbox, each tool with its own function, seems to be preferred to the older analogy with building materials: stones (content words) and cement (function words).

\*\*\*\*

***Ogden, Richards, Ramsey, and the Long Shadow of Peirce***  
**W. Terrence Gordon** (Halifax, Nova Scotia, wtgordon@is.dal.ca)

There is evidence to support the view that I. A. Richards maintains a consistent attitude toward C. S. Peirce throughout his writings, whereas an inconsistent attitude toward Peirce (or at least ambivalence or a revised view of him) is characteristic of C. K. Ogden. Such evidence provides the basis for a hypothesis regarding the effect of the disparate views of Peirce on the textual dynamics of Ogden's and Richards's only jointly authored work, *The Meaning of Meaning*. This paper examines 1) early and late references to Peirce in independently authored works by Ogden and Richards in contrast to references to Peirce in *The Meaning of Meaning*; 2) the holograph manuscript of *The Meaning of Meaning* in contrast to both its original serial publication in the *Cambridge Magazine* and its publication in book form; 3) Frank Ramsey's criticisms of early draft chapters of *The Meaning of Meaning* (solicited by Ogden) and their implications for the Peircean subtext of the work.

\*\*\*\*

***Wilkins's 'Tables' and Roget's 'Thesaurus': An Investigation into the Principles of Onomasiology***

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

Roget mentions Wilkins as one of the forerunners of his own work. By a close reading of some entries I plan to show that this is true only in a very broad sense. Wilkins's extensive list of words is actually quite traditional and follows the encyclopedic principles of the Renaissance. Roget's extensive list of words, however, is organised according to a system of ideas as John Locke had explained them. Between the two there is the historical caesura which separates (what I call) speculative lexicography from mental lexicography.

\*\*\*\*

***The Passions and the Manifest Destiny of English***  
**John E. Joseph** (Edinburgh, John.Joseph@ed.ac.uk)

The perception that English is spreading across the globe at an unprecedented pace, fuelled by commercial interests and technological developments and

wiping out other languages in its wake, has a venerable history dating back at least to the 1870s. This paper examines the discourse of the 'manifest destiny' of English, particularly from the first half of the 20th century, with an emphasis on views from within the international language movement (W. J. Clark, A. L. Guérard). We find there some intriguing and contradictory ideas about how an international language must be both 'sympathetic' and 'impersonal', with English said to fail on both counts. The paper considers how this trope of 'sympathy' relates to the theory of the passions and their role in speech and language, including reputed racial and national differences, in Aristotle, Epicurus and Descartes, and with a modern counterpart in the vitalism of B. De Sélincourt's *Pomona, or the Future of English* (1926).

\*\*\*\*

***Perception, Child Language Acquisition and Conscious Thought in O. O. Potebnia's Theory of Language***

**Nadia Kerecuk (London, [nadia.kerecuk@virgin.net](mailto:nadia.kerecuk@virgin.net))**

This paper aims at examining some of the main aspects in the child language acquisition component in O. O. Potebnia's (1835-1891) theory of language. Potebnia argued that we do not know how man transformed himself from a non-speaker to a speaker. Although the pre-linguistic period in a child is substituted by the linguistic in a swift and almost unnoticed manner, many observations can be made of this period that could lead to credible assumptions about the origin of language (1910: 109, 112-3).

In the chapter on *Reflex movement and Articulate Sound in Thought and language* (1862),<sup>1</sup> Potebnia discusses perception in both man and animals with specific reference to the articulate sound. In this context, Potebnia examines the difference between what is instinctive and what is conscious thought. Potebnia argues that we do not 'hand language over' to a child that is learning to speak. The means by which a child learns has a series of indications of how we apperceive the world, ascribe meaning to it within our own subjective universes and express it (1862/1913: 184) by means of language.<sup>2</sup> Also the view that the first words are onomatopoeic and devoid of grammatical features is mistaken according to Potebnia as these words already contain formal grammatical features of the speech community where the child is learning to speak (1862/1913: 124). A developmental process of conscious thought accompanies the language acquisition process in a child. The development of language is concomitantly a development of cognition. This encompasses the capacity that a child has to apperceive real and imaginary universes, the capacity to create

metaphors, concepts and meaning. Potebnia also refers to aesthetic and poetic capacity in the process of language acquisition.

In Potebnia's subsequent works, the process of child language acquisition is used as one of the fundamental principles in his theory of language.

<sup>1</sup> See annotated translation of *Thought and Language* by N. Kerecuk (forthcoming 2000).

<sup>2</sup> More detailed discussion in my ICHoLS VIII paper (1999) to be published in *Histoire Epistémologique Langage* (Kerecuk forthcoming) - 'Consciousness in Potebnia's Theory of Language'.

\*\*\*\*

#### *George Campbell on Idioms*

Gabriele Knappe (Bamberg, gabriele.knappe@split.uni-bamberg.de)

George Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776) has its place in the philosophical, the rhetorical and the grammatical traditions of thought. Its three books emerged within the context of the Philosophical Society of Aberdeen at whose meetings substantial sections of them were first presented. In the second book, which deals with grammar and is entitled 'The Foundations and Essential Properties of Elocution', we find what appears to be the first 'systematic' treatment of phraseological word combinations ('idioms') in Britain.

The paper provides an analysis of George Campbell's treatment of phraseological units from his grammatical, rhetorical and philosophical points of view within the 'Canons of Verbal Criticism' and elsewhere in his *Philosophy of Rhetoric* and relates it to modern phraseological scholarship. Compared to works on grammar, rhetoric, translation and lexicography contemporary with George Campbell, he emerges as a scholar who was highly innovative with regard to the structural / semantic analysis and classification of phraseological units. But although he was in general rather broad-minded in the question of correct language use, his strong objection against 'illogical' idiomatic usage is in the mainstream of eighteenth-century linguistic thought.

\*\*\*\*

*A Case of Dichtung und Wahrheit: Origins of Morphophonemics*

E. F. K. Koerner (Ottawa, koerner@uottawa.ca)

As recently as 1997, Noam Chomsky reiterated what he had stated on several occasions during the 1970s, namely, that when working out his ideas of his 1951 Master's thesis on *Morphophonemics of Modern Hebrew* at the University of Pennsylvania, he had not had access to Leonard Bloomfield's 1939 paper on 'Menomini Morphophonemics' published in a Trubetzkoy memorial volume in Prague, thus in effect suggesting that the generative model of linguistic analysis he developed at the time was entirely original with him. The present paper demonstrates that Chomsky's memory of his early work has at best been rather sketchy, and that in effect even if he did not have direct access to a copy of volume 8 of *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* during the late 1940s and prior to the completion of his M.A. thesis in December 1951, he had no doubt been able to absorb the essentials of Bloomfield's ideas about rule ordering through reading the proofs of his supervisor's main theoretical work, *Methods in Structural Linguistics*, during late 1946 and maybe early 1947, in which Zellig Harris discusses the salient points of Bloomfield's 1939 argument, in fact in a section entitled 'Morphophonemics'. As a matter of fact, the main points of Bloomfield's 1939 paper had already been made in his *opus magnum* of 1933, *Language*, to which Chomsky certainly had direct access during 1949–1951, like any aspiring American linguist of the time. Indeed, although Harris's book was not published until 1951, it had been circulating in manuscript form since 1946, and, according to Harris's preface, signed January 1947, no other than Noam Chomsky is thanked there for helping with the proofs. Furthermore, it should be pointed out (since the salient passages are conveniently ignored by historians of generative linguistics) that Harris's *Methods* contains the essentials of the generative approach to language which is by now almost exclusively associated with Noam Chomsky's name. The paper suggests that, contrary to the *fable convenue* (which Chomsky himself has rarely tired of fostering), there has been much more continuity and cumulative advance in American linguistics than we have been led to believe.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1939. Menomini Morphophonemics. *Études phonologiques dédiées à la mémoire de N. S. Trubetzkoy* (= *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 8), 105-115.
- Bromberger, Sylvain & Morris Halle. 1989. Why Phonology is Different. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:1, 51-70.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1951. *The Morphophonemics of Modern Hebrew*. M.A. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. [Facsimile reproduction, New York: Garland, 1979.]

- 1964 [1962]. *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1975 [1973]. Introduction. *The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory*. New York: Plenum Press, 1-53.
- 1997. Knowledge of History and Theory Construction in Modern Linguistics. *Chomsky no Brasil/Chomsky in Brazil*, edição bilingüe. São Paulo: D.E.L.T.A, 103-120
- Encrevé, Pierre. 1997. L'ancien et le nouveau: Quelques remarques sur la phonologie et son histoire. *Langages* 99, 100-123.
- Fought, John G. 1999. Leonard Bloomfield's Linguistic Legacy: Later uses of some technical features. *Historiographia Linguistica* 26:3, 305-346.
- Harris, Zellig S[abbetai]. 1941a. Linguistic Structure of Hebrew. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 61, 143-167.
- 1941b. Review of Trubetzkoy (1939). *Language* 17, 345-349.
- 1942a. Morpheme alternants in linguistic analysis. *Language* 18:3, 169-180.
- 1944b. Simultaneous Components in Phonology. *Language* 20, 181-205.
- 1948. Componential analysis of a [modern] Hebrew paradigm. *Language* 24:1, 87-91.
- 1951. *Methods in Structural Linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Preface signed "Philadelphia, January 1947".]
- 1990. La genèse de l'analyse des transformations et de la métalangue. *Langages* 99 (Sept. 1990), 9-19.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1948. Russian conjugation. *Word* 4, 155-167.
- Kilbury, James S. 1976. *The Development of Morphophonemic Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Koerner, E. F. K. 1989. The Chomskyan 'revolution' and its historiography: observations of a bystander. *Practicing Linguistic Historiography* by Koerner. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 101-146.
- 1993. Zellig Sabbetai Harris: A comprehensive bibliography of his writings, 1932-1991. *Historiographia Linguistica* 20:2/3, 509-522.
- Trubetzkoy, N. S. 1929. Sur la 'morphologie'. *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 1, 85-88.
- 1931. Gedanken über Morphologie. *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 4, 160-163.
- 1939. *Grundzüge der Phonologie*. [= *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 7.].
- Voegelin, Charles F[rederick]. 1940. Review of *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 8 (Prague, 1939). *Language* 17, 251-257.

\*\*\*\*



*E. B. Tylor and the 'English' School Of Linguistics*  
 Joan Leopold (London, joanleopold@hotmail.com)

This paper will discuss the reaction of an incipient anthropologist, Edward B. Tylor (1832-1917), later the first professor of anthropology in the United Kingdom, to the so-called 'English' school of linguists, including such figures as R. G. Latham, J. Crawford, Hensleigh Wedgwood, A. J. Ellis, Henry Sweet and 'Dictionary' Murray.

\*\*\*\*

*Johan Storm's Diaries.*  
*Historical fact - Historiographical Fiction*  
 Andrew R. Linn (Sheffield, A.R.Linn@Sheffield.ac.uk)

This paper begins with a series of fictional extracts as if from the diary of Johan Storm for 1884. Johan Frederik Breda Storm (1836-1920) was professor of English and Romance Philology at the University of Kristiania (Oslo) and a pioneer in the fields of Phonetics, Dialectology and Language Teaching Reform. These 'diary extracts', completely founded on real historical views and events as well as direct quotation from Storm's writings, include his opinions on the Norwegian language situation, on the importance of phonetics and on dialectological method, as well as referring to a number of contemporaries and to his visit to Edinburgh to receive an honorary doctorate. The paper goes on to explain why I have chosen to present 'historical fact' as 'historiographical fiction'. The principal reason is that from the old 'Positivist' vs. 'Pluralist' debate in the discipline of history new and productive ways of looking at history have emerged. These are briefly described, and my exercise in 'history as fiction' (inspired in part by the work of the historian, Simon Schama) is offered as one example of the sort of history writing which could fruitfully be adopted by historians of linguistics.

\*\*\*\*

***The Linguistic Ideas of Robert Hooke (1635-1703)*****Jaap Maat (Amsterdam, maat@hum.uva.nl)**

When John Locke dismissed any attempt to construct a universal language as ridiculous (in his *Essay* of 1689) he seemingly expressed the general attitude of scholars associated with the Royal Society at the time. Accordingly, modern commentators have generally taken for granted that by the end of the 17th century the universal language movement, which had occupied so many scholars in the 1650s and 1660s, had quietly died out. Although on the Continent Leibniz endeavoured to create a philosophical language until the end of his life in 1716, most modern accounts of Leibniz's work in this area assume that this was quite different from what had been tried in England, notably by Dalgarno and Wilkins — a point emphasized by Leibniz himself. The present paper aims to show that Robert Hooke's linguistic ideas present a somewhat different perspective both on the dominant views within the Royal Society and on Leibniz's supposed uniqueness concerning his idea of a language which was to enhance and guide scientific discovery.

\*\*\*\*

***Leibniz and his Metaphorical Models: the Metaphor of the Way*****Cristina Marras (Tel Aviv, cristina@post.tau.ac.il)**

In relation to tropes the German philosopher G. W. Leibniz (1646 - 1716) refers directly to the rhetorical tradition. He knew the rhetorical treatises of his time very well and he was a witness and a protagonist of the process of secularisation of the significance and of the role of metaphor. Leibniz is aware of the tradition which concentrated on the importance of the complementary relationship between rhetoric and dialectic, and he acknowledged the political-civil function of rhetoric itself. A consideration of the topic not only as a strategy of argumentation but also as a foundation concerning argumentation of thought manifests the necessity of an intervention of language through all of its resources, including the imagination. Furthermore, this consideration has to cope with the defects that have been made evident by formal language and technology. Leibniz considers metaphors or, more generally, tropes, from two different perspectives: on the one hand as rhetorical figures with a merely auxiliary role in the economy of the discourse; on the other hand, if language has a social, political and epistemological function, as Leibniz pointed out in several texts (e.g. *Nova Methodus Discendae Docendaeque Jurisprudentiae*; A

VI.1:338), the tropes become an essential element of linguistic creativity (*Dissertatio Praeliminaris Marii Nizolii*; A VI.2:409).

My paper concentrates on the analysis of the metaphor of the 'way', and in particular I focus on a quotation from the text *Recommandation pour instituer la science générale*, written by Leibniz in 1686.

The metaphors used by Leibniz in this quotation show how the philosopher manages a refined play of counterbalance between the necessity to institute a rigorous method, the necessity to return to first principles, to reduce all the truths into prepositions with the consciousness that science opens infinite space, that are not foreseeable or manageable from the beginning, and in which the imagination is indispensable.

In Leibniz the philosophical theories and thesis, the conceptual categorisation, need to be read with a pragmatic approach in order to save all of his dimensions of expressiveness. To investigate Leibniz's theory of language and especially his use of language, definitely means to dwell on the *semantic* domain, and in particular on the *pragmatic* one. These fields are complementary rather than opposing.

Leibniz's ideas of the world and knowledge were based on a 'multi-perspectival' vision of reality, a vision where the confrontation of different points of view requires a flexibility of language compatible with their harmonisation. In this respect, I think, the metaphor is exactly what articulates a space of implicit relations, and thereby permits us to unfold our knowledge of a world where everything 'expresses' everything.

\*\*\*\*

*Schottelius - Language, Nature and Art*  
Nicola McLelland (Dublin, nicolamc@tcd.ie)

This paper focuses on two notions in the rhetoric of the *Lobreden* (orations in praise of the German language) which make up the first book of the Schottelius *Ausführliche Arbeit* (1663): nature (*Natur*) and art (*Kunst*).

The two views are perhaps most obvious in the sustained metaphors of language which run through the orations: language as a tree and as a building. On the one hand, Schottelius sees the German language as a fertile tree. Through its roots - the monosyllabic (and sometimes onomatopoeic) 'root-words' - German comes closer to expressing the true nature of things and thoughts than do other languages. Specifically, Schottelius's image of the banyan, or Bengali fig tree, which propagates itself with its prominent aerial root system, supports the notion not just of German's fertility, but also of an unchanging German language essence, characterised by its root-words and

maintaining its unique identity even as it grows and changes across time and space.

Yet at the same time, a language is (or should be) a *Kunstgebäu* (AA, p.173), the product of human artful endeavour, of which grammar is an important part. As a corollary, to be able to speak German naturally is not to master it: for this, *kunstmessige Anleitung* - a study of its art/grammar - is needed. Essential to the building are its foundations (*Gründe*); right foundations assures *Grundrichtigkeit* - which is also Schottelius's technical term for the key notion of *analogia fundamentalis*. Thus rhetoric and linguistic theory are intermingled.

Schottelius would have us believe that the two images of the German language - as nature and as art - can be reconciled, for both nature and art rest on reason (*Vernunft*). He even once synthesises art and nature into a single *Kunstgewächs* (artful growth). However, I shall argue that the banyan and the building correspond to two quite distinct views of the German language, and that Schottelius's rhetoric and imagery not only provide some of the key terms in his theory, but they also serve to conceal some of its inconsistencies.

\*\*\*\*

*Edward Lhuyd's Researches into the Cornish Language*  
Jon Mills (Luton, jon.mills@luton.ac.uk)

The Celtic philologist Edward Lhuyd (1660-1709) was possibly the first qualified scholar to make a serious study of the Cornish language. In fact he spent four months in Cornwall in 1700, learning Cornish. Lhuyd had originally intended to include a Cornish-English vocabulary in his *Archaeologia Britannica*. However, since the book turned out to be longer than he had expected, he postponed the publication of his Cornish vocabulary, *Geirlyfr Kyrnweig*, until the second volume. Unfortunately this second volume never appeared, due to Lhuyd's tragic death at the Ashmolean Museum in 1709. Nevertheless Volume I of *Archaeologia Britannica* contains 'A Comparative Etymology' and 'A Comparative Vocabulary of the Original Languages of Britain and Ireland'. The 'Comparative Etymology' includes 'Parallel Observations relating to the Origin of Dialects, the Affinity of the British with other Languages, and their Correspondence to one another'. In the 'Comparative Etymology' Lhuyd notes the semantic differences between cognates of the various Celtic languages. An important feature of Lhuyd's work is his orthography. He devised his own phonetic script, based on an extended Latin alphabet and use of diacritics. After his death, Lhuyd's manuscripts disappeared. Several years later, however, his *Geirlyfr Kyrnweig* was

discovered in the National Library of Wales. This consists of a small notebook, presumably the one he used during his stay in Cornwall. According to Lhuyd, he obtained most of his knowledge of Cornish from manuscripts of the dramas, provided by Sir Jonathan Trelawny, Bishop of Exeter. The *Vocabularium Cornicum*, identified by Lhuyd as Cornish, provided him with another source; and words taken from the *Vocabularium Cornicum* are marked with a dagger symbol. A third source were his field notes made during his stay in Cornwall.

\*\*\*\*

*Hobbes's Thesis of the Arbitrariness of the Sign*  
Olga Pombo (Lisbon, opombo@fc.ul.pt)

The thesis of the arbitrariness of the sign is both the main thesis of Hobbes's theory of language and of his political anthropology. It is by that arbitrariness that man escapes natural determinism (transferring 'mental discourse' into 'verbal discourse') and becomes able to institute a new mechanical and artificial order: political society. By discussing the slight differences between the several topoi in which Hobbes presents this thesis, in *Leviathan*, *De Homine* and *Human Nature*, the aim of this paper is to look for what could be the foundation for such arbitrariness in a mechanistic system like the one of Hobbes. We will stress that, behind the difficulties of the arguments put forward by Hobbes, there is a theory of signification which, even if not sufficiently developed, can be seen as the root for the foundation of the Hobbesian thesis of the arbitrariness of the sign.

\*\*\*\*

*Harold E. Palmer's Alternative 'Applied Linguistics'*  
Richard C. Smith (Warwick, R.C.Smith@Warwick.ac.uk)

The origins of 'applied linguistics' are usually traced back to the first issue of the journal *Language Learning — A Quarterly Journal of Applied Linguistics*, founded at the University of Michigan in 1948. Academic recognition of this new discipline came later in Britain, with the establishment of the School of Applied Linguistics at the University of Edinburgh in 1957. Over-literalism (and an over-confidence in 'progress') may have prevented post-war applied linguists from acknowledging significant precursors, and from noting useful alternative conceptions developed before World War II. Indeed, it seems clear

that Henry Sweet himself took an eminently 'applied linguistic approach' to the analysis of language teaching problems. In this paper, though, we highlight the significance of another important but neglected precursor, Harold E. Palmer (1877-1949), who carried forward the tradition established by Sweet and other Reform Movement theorists. In Daniel Jones's Department of Phonetics at University College London, Palmer made a pioneering attempt to establish a 'science of language-study' (devoted to problems of language learning and teaching) on the basis of insights from a range of background disciplines, including psychology, general pedagogy and up-to-date (Saussurean) linguistics. Palmer's 1915-1921 lectures established the rudiments of this new 'science', but — after his departure to become linguistic adviser to the Japanese Ministry of Education in 1922 — there followed a 35-year hiatus before the investigation of language teaching was taken up again at university level in Britain. In Japan, however, Palmer continued to put into practice and further develop his theoretically justified yet flexible and problem-oriented conception of applied linguistic activity. In this paper we chart the development of Palmer's 'applied linguistics', referring to archive documents and publications previously neglected outside Japan. We aim to establish that Palmer succeeded in creating a viable alternative to the relatively top-down (theory-driven) conception of applied linguistics which came to dominate in the second half of the 20th century.

\*\*\*\*

*William Marsden and the Politics of Language Study in the Romantic Period*

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

During the Romantic Period the British scholar William Marsden (1754 - 1836) wrote, published, and corresponded widely on a range of linguistic subjects. He was particularly involved with the description and classification of non-European languages and participated in debates concerning the languages of a variety of different regions: the Indian Subcontinent, South-East Asia, Africa, and Britain itself. Thus, he was a member of the Asiatic Society, published articles on Indian languages in the Society's journal, and was a personal friend of the Sanskritist Charles Wilkins; he wrote and published a dictionary and grammar of Malay, produced a history of Sumatra, and corresponded with Stamford Raffles on the cultures of South-East Asia; he was an active member of the African Association, published an article on Berber, and advised the 1816 Congo expedition on the types of linguistic 'specimens' they should bring home; and in 1784 he published the first English-language account of the relationship between Romany and the languages of northern India, an

intervention intended to demonstrate that the language of the Rom was not a 'fabricated gibberish' or a 'cant in use amongst thieves and beggars' as it had usually been represented previously. When one considers his central position in British linguistic scholarship of the Romantic Period, comparable in many ways to that of William Jones, Marsden is a sadly neglected figure. A particularly interesting feature of his linguistic work is the manner in which his scholarly concerns were interwoven with the politics of European expansion. The fact that he was active in so many different areas of exploration allows one to compare the ways in which different varieties of cultural and colonial encounter shaped the nature of the knowledge produced in the metropolis. In this paper, therefore, I shall use Marsden's work as a basis to discuss the relationship between language study and European expansion into the larger world, focusing particularly on the differences between the various encounters in which he was involved.

\*\*\*\*

*Two Types of Standard Language History in Europe*  
Giedrius Subacius (Vilnius / Chicago, subacius@ktl.mii.lt)

In my work I am concerned with coming to some conclusions as to what standard language types most of the European languages could be allocated to according to relevant criteria. I want to concentrate on the selection of a dialect for a written standard. It appears that European languages could choose a dialectal basis in at least two different periods. The origins of certain standards lay in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, e.g. Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Spanish, Swedish, etc. Users of certain other standard languages made their dialect selection much later, during the Enlightenment, Romanticism or even afterwards: Belorussian, Bulgarian, Estonian, Faroese, Finnish, Croatian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Norwegian, Russian, Serbian, Slovakian, Slovenian, Ukrainian, etc. Such different origins make it possible to discern two groups of European standard languages according to the time a dialect was 'chosen'; i.e. early or late selection. Dominant vernaculars furnished standards much later than dominant ones. Dominant languages usually belong to the early dialect selection type. Generally, the late selection languages are to be characterised as shaped less circumstantially (a higher degree of engineering) than those of the early selection. (Cf. K. A. Hermann's influence for Estonian, J. Jablonskis's for Lithuanian, V. S. Karadzic's for Serbian, L. Stur's for Slovak, etc.). The whole history of a standard depends on the time of dialect selection. Early selection is usually followed by a comparatively long period of only partly uniform

orthography and an extended period (even centuries perhaps) lacking a spoken standard. The history of late selection standard can be characterised by a very short period (decades perhaps) after the final selection of a dialect before the stable uniformity of orthography comes about and before the emergence of a spoken standard. However, late selection usually means that previous unsuccessful efforts at selection could have taken place over an extended period. One has also to remember that 'Every generalization we can make yields a counterexample' (J. E. Joseph 1987: 58).

\*\*\*\*

*Language Variation in Grammars of the Baltic Area in the 17th and 18th Centuries*

Peteris Vanags (Riga / Stockholm, pvanags@acad.latneiv.lv)

The languages of the Baltic area began to be documented in the 17th century. The first published grammars (Estonian 1637, Latvian 1644, Lithuanian 1653) develop into extensive descriptions in the 18th century. The most important grammars of this period are Hupel's Estonian Grammar (1780), Stender's Latvian Grammar (1783) and the Lithuanian grammars by Ostermeier (1791) and Mielcke (1800). The main aim of the grammars is didactic — language instruction for foreigners — but a tendency towards language standardisation is discernible. Various examples of language variation — in phonetics, morphology, syntax and vocabulary — are mentioned. The variants are sometimes described as belonging to a different dialect than the one the grammar is based on, or as having resulted from children's pronunciation. Variants are often subjectively evaluated. Objective evaluations are based on the dialect from which the written language is developed and on correspondence to spoken language. Literal translations from German, Polish and Latin result in variants which are rejected. The more comprehensive grammars mention the existence of language registers. Territorial dialects are briefly described and evaluated, usually subjectively, reflecting a tendency to standardise. The first descriptions of social dialects and registers are encountered, as well as descriptions of poetic expression. The 17th-18th century grammars of the languages of the Baltic area follow the example of contemporary European examples in that they are aware of synchronic variation in language, but do not even mention the importance of diachrony in the origin of variation, which could possibly be related to the fact that the written language had only been in existence for a short while (since the 16th century).



\*\*\*\*

***The Influence of Jewish and non-Jewish Traditions on Late 18th- and Early 19th-Century Hebrew Linguistic Writings in Germany and the Netherlands***  
Irene Zwiép (Amsterdam, izwiep@hum.uva.nl)

The tradition of Jewish Hebrew linguistics as such dates back to the Middle Ages (9th-10th centuries), when Jewish scholars under Muslim rule began to formulate their grammars and dictionaries of biblical Hebrew under the influence of Arabic grammar and lexicography. This linguistic tradition was the main source of inspiration for all Jewish Hebrew studies until the early modern period. During the Jewish Enlightenment or Haskalah (late 18th century onwards), however, we witness a change: though still ultimately inspired by the results of traditional Hebrew scholarship, Hebrew manuals henceforth were shaped, to a greater or lesser extent, by other, foreign, traditions as well. This paper will concentrate on two related trends in this hitherto virtually neglected genre, especially in the Hebrew linguistic writings that appeared in Germany (the Berlin Haskalah) and the Netherlands (under the influence of the Berlin Haskalah) during the late 18th and early-19th centuries: (a) the (at times critical, at times pragmatic, at times objective and historicising) reception of earlier Jewish Hebrew scholarship, and (b) the impact of the non-Jewish, often academic vernacular (and Semitic?) traditions.

**Brekle, H. E., Dobnig-Jülch, E. and H. Weiss (eds.)**  
*A Science in the Making. The Regensburg Symposia on European Linguistic Historiography.*  
 Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1996. 296 pp. ISBN 3-89323-254-0.  
 DM 84,00.

In the mid 1990s (January and April 1994) two symposia were held at the University of Regensburg in Germany with the purpose of taking stock of the historiography of linguistics in Europe, and considering 'possible future developments in the Historiography of Linguistics' (p. 7).<sup>1</sup> The volume under discussion constitutes a record of these symposia. The volume contains fifteen papers (eight in German, four in English, two in French and one in Spanish) which, structurally speaking, reflect the different orientations of the two meetings. Papers 1-8 give a survey of research activities in the historiography of linguistics in selected European countries. These include surveys of work in Belgium (Droixhe and Vanwelkenhuyzen), France (Saint-Gérard), Great Britain (Robins), Italy (Gensini), the Netherlands (Noordegraaf and Vonk), Norway (Hovdhaugen), Spain (Sarmiento) and Sweden (Forsgren). Papers 10-15 give an overview of topics researched by colleagues in Germany ('*die Forschungssituation in Deutschland*', p. 9).

Originally, there was to be a volume devoted to each symposium. However, it was decided subsequently to the symposia to condense the originally projected two volumes into one, with some differences with respect to the list of speakers originally participating. The consequence of this is that the volume falls into two distinct sections: the European survey (papers 1-8) and the German contribution (papers 10-15). The fifteenth paper (No. 9 - Vonk) is in essence a distillation of the main themes of the first section. In his wide-ranging contribution Vonk raises a number of issues which concern (or, if they don't, they ought to) historians of linguistics, certainly within the European context.

The volume opens with a review of linguistico-historiographical activity in the United Kingdom (not quite the same as 'the English-speaking world', since the United States are excluded.) In short compass, Robins gives a concise account of the historical development and current state of such studies. At the

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Andrew Linn for looking through this review in advance of submission and drawing my attention to a number of typos and other slips. Errors still remaining are all my own.

same time he touches on the major themes which are taken up in the papers which follow: theory, teaching, publications, institutions etc. Robins sees the history of linguistics as a 'branch of linguistics as a whole and of the history of ideas' (p. 11). Publications fall into two major categories - those which '[...] trace the history and development of a grammatical category or a theory of grammar' and those which 'provide a modern critical edition of an earlier historically important text' (*loc. cit.*). The focus of attention in writing the history of linguistics is, according to Robins, essentially twofold: it is 'either on aspects of historiographical method in relation to the study of language, or on the sequence of events and persons in the development of the subject' (pp. 14-15). With these parameters in mind, Robins discusses the main movements in the historiography of linguistics in the United Kingdom. To the important works he introduces and discusses, he might have added a number of other works of the second type which, for the history of English grammaticography, at least, are of seminal importance - for instance, Alston (1965), Bland (1991), Gwosdek (1991), Thomson (1984).

The historiography of linguistics in Scandinavia is covered by Forsgren (Sweden) and Hovdhaugen (Norway). As with many - or even most - of the countries represented in this volume, neither author can point to an extensive and continuous tradition in the historiography of linguistics. Rather, achievements in this field have been largely the work of relatively isolated individuals. Nevertheless, significant work has been done in Sweden in each of the areas Forsgren picks out: General Linguistics, German, Classics, Scandinavian Studies, Romance Languages and Slavic Studies. The most striking weakness, according to Forsgren, has been the paucity of work on original materials (p. 89), a deficiency which he himself has helped to remedy with conspicuous success.

In Hovdhaugen's account, the historiography of linguistics in Norway is - for understandable reasons - almost entirely displaced by the history of linguistics. Although Hovdhaugen himself describes the Norwegian contribution to the historiography of linguistics as 'not very impressive' (p. 95) his account is full of interest and insight, and sheds welcome light on the state of linguistic studies in Scandinavia as a whole. In view of the attitudes to a large degree shared by the Scandinavian countries, and the social, political and cultural connections between them, Hovdhaugen's paper provides a useful backcloth against which to view developments in Finland, Sweden and Denmark, as well as Norway. In most of these countries resistance to modern linguistic ideas from the traditional national language departments had to be overcome before change could come about and a closer rapprochement achieved - with United States Structuralism in particular. This was effected in Sweden from the 1950s (to a significant degree through Malmberg) and in Finland from the 1960s. Though Sommerfelt had a significant rejuvenating influence in Norway, it was only with the foundation of new universities and

the rise of a new generation of academics in the 1960s that modern linguistics became firmly established there. Denmark seems to have been a case apart - with Hjelmslev and the *Cercle linguistique de Copenhague* (cf. p. 98) - which makes it a pity that no colleague was found to document Denmark's achievements in this area.

None of this, of course, constitutes historiography of linguistics in the narrower sense. It was with justifiable pride then, that Hovdhaugen was able to announce an international cooperative project on the history of linguistics in the Scandinavian countries involving Norway (Hovdhaugen), Denmark (Henriksen), Sweden (Sigurd) and Finland (Wiik). (The results have since been published - cf. Hovdhaugen et al. (2000) under 'References' below.)

The Romance area is represented in this volume by contributions from Spain, Italy and France. Whereas Robins locates the beginning of continuous interest and activity in this field in Britain in the work of J. R. Firth (1890-1960), Saint-Gérard pinpoints the beginning of French activity as 1770, and Sarmiento (for Spain) in the 1940s. Saint-Gérard and Gensini in particular develop their arguments in some detail, which enables the reader to draw useful comparisons with other positions, and also to better appreciate the historical developments which led to these positions.

Saint-Gérard's contribution falls naturally into two major sections: first, a preamble, plus a historical review of developments in important areas of French linguistic history from 1770 - 1994 (pp. 21-37); and second, a synopsis of the areas covered by the eight working groups currently run under the aegis of the URA (*Unité de Recherche Associée*) 381 of the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* (pp. 37-45). The French approach to the *Histoire des Sciences du Langage* is basically two-pronged, with one direction covering the 'institutional space' of language, including language as *parole* (p. 21) and the other covering a 'conceptual space' corresponding to *épistémologie*. This opposition is maintained as a balance between the description of empirically observable facts, and explanatory rationalism (pp. 23; 26 ff). Gensini's paper covers three broad areas: the state of linguistic historiography in Italy and its current academic standing; a historical review of its development, showing 'the way in which studies in linguistic historiography are rooted in the tradition of the linguistic sciences in Italy' (p. 54); and finally, comments on more general questions. History of linguistics in Italy has traditionally been practised in different contexts: within the history of the Italian language; within *Glottologia*, or linguistics in general; and within the philosophy of language. Not surprisingly, the respective contexts offer some explanation for the way the historiography of linguistics has grown up there. Inevitably, institutional considerations intertwine with theoretical preoccupations. These are clearly developed in one of the most interesting passages of the book (2.1 and 2.2, pp. 54-56). These sections, as do comparable sections in the other papers - particularly that of Noordegraaf and Vonk -, make clear what a debt

practitioners owe to forerunners and colleagues, both within and outside the discipline.

As mentioned above, Sarmiento locates the beginnings of the historiography of linguistics in Spain in the 1940s. Until the late nineteenth century Spain was more or less cut off from scientific developments in the rest of Europe by the Pyrenees. Having made this point, Sarmiento goes on to describe the achievements of three generations of the Madrid School, including their theoretical positions, the combination of historical positivism with Vosslerian idealism, followed by the reception of the ideas of de Saussure and Trubetzkoy and the later contributions of Historicism, Idealism and Structuralism. The areas of interest covered by Spanish scholars include phonetics and orthography; cultural history and language; and the history of grammatical, rhetorical and (more general) linguistic ideas. A bonus for Romance scholars is the excellent, (almost) exhaustive bibliography of Spanish publications on the history of linguistics covering the period 1492-1700, chronologically arranged.

Finally in this short tour of the historiography of linguistics in Europe - the Low Countries, represented by Droixhe and Vanwelkenhuyzen (Belgium) and Noordegraaf and Vonk (the Netherlands). For various reasons - among others, the confessional (Protestant/Roman Catholic) and the language divide - Droixhe and Vanwelkenhuyzen do not attempt to cover systematically all the studies in the historiography of linguistics in Belgium (p. 107). They draw a careful distinction between history and historiography, and then go on to outline the history of the historiography of linguistics in Belgium in three steps: from the beginnings in the late nineteenth century to World War II; from World War II to Chomsky; and from Chomsky to the present. Like a number of other contributors, they attest the powerful influence exercised by the publication of *Cartesian Linguistics* in 1966. The period since the Second World War has seen a number of centres of historiographical activity grow up in Belgium, which the authors present almost as 'schools'. They include historical etymology (Gent - Piron); palaeo-comparativism (Brussels - Leroy); the grammar of English (Louvain - Vorlat); and - more recently - methodology and epistemology of the historiography of linguistics, with applications in diverse fields (the Catholic University of Louvain - Mertens and Swiggers), and general grammar at the Free University of Brussels. A particularly useful feature of this contribution is the survey the authors give of unpublished works (dissertations) produced at the Catholic University of Louvain (pp. 119-121) and of bio- and bibliographical material (p. 122). Pages 122-132 provide an extensive bibliography of specifically Belgian publications.

The contribution by Noordegraaf and Vonk (interestingly entitled 'The Anatomy of Melancholy') deals with three major topics: Dutch linguistic history, institutions, and methodology. They distinguish four ways of approaching history: (1) the introductory (e.g. Delbrück); (2) the historico-

critical (Pos, Stutterheim, Verburg); the historico-philological (exemplified by the historical series *Trivium. Oude Nederlandse geschriften op het gebied van de grammatica, de dialectica en de rhetorica*, published from 1953 to 1972; - this direction may be characterized by the view that 'there was no need for an in-depth and explicit discussion about methodology' - (p. 143). And (4) the discipline-orientated approach. This latter seems to produce a kind of discipline-internal history, strongly represented in the Classics and oriental languages.

Noordegraaf and Vonk display a keen awareness, both in this section and the next, of social and institutional factors as influences on the direction of research. In the Netherlands after the Second World War the historiography of linguistics seemed to be stagnating. But then, as in Norway, 'it was Chomsky's *Cartesian Linguistics* of 1966 that made the history of linguistics *salonfähig*' (p. 144). The next three decades saw the inauguration of a linguistics foundation (*Stichting Taalwetenschap*) and the creation of small research communities (*werkgemeenschappen*), and this in turn stimulated the historiography of linguistics by providing posts - academic stepping-stones - for younger scholars. In 1987 the Dutch *Werkverband Geschiedenis van de Taalkunde* (society for the history of linguistics) was founded.

In their concluding comments Noordegraaf and Vonk give a lucid account of the state of the art in their country and, in an extremely fruitful discussion, present and evaluate the various philosophical positions. All in all, they come to the conclusion that though 'there is some methodological awareness in historiographical research in the Netherlands' (p. 148) there is more interest in the constitution and development of linguistics and its sub-disciplines, and in related fields, - in practice, in other words, - than there is in epistemological theory and historiographical method (p. 153).

This survey covers only the first eight papers. As has already been observed, the ninth, by Frank Vonk, acts, in this volume, as a kind of link holding the structure together. I shall return to Vonk's paper later because of the nature of its far-reaching observations. The remaining six papers are devoted to samples of linguistico-historical or historiographical research in Germany. They constitute a deviation from the original conception to the extent that two contributions (those of Knobloch and Schlieben-Lange) were adopted subsequently to complete the volume. (It should be stressed, though, that these papers in no sense constitute a weakness; they fully hold their own in the context of the existing plan.)

Of the six papers concerned, those of Schlieben-Lange, Knobloch, Haßler - and perhaps Eichinger - will presumably have the widest appeal, because they deal essentially with conceptual matters. The papers by Naumann and Weiss rather constitute individual case studies. Even here, however, more general conclusions of wider validity can be drawn.

Eichinger's theme in 'Regionalität als Kategorie der Sprachwissenschaftsgeschichte' ('Regional variation as a category in the history of linguistics') is eighteenth-century German on its way to becoming a central European literary language. To Eichinger's conceptual apparatus belong the ideas that distribution in space is a cardinal feature of language (he actually says, also, of '*Kommunikation*', p. 216) and that the world of language is structured by '*Interaktionsräume*' - spaces in which interaction can take place. Standardisation he sees as one attempt to extend certain spaces at the expense of others. Following a phase in the eighteenth century of orientation to pseudo-universal values on the French pattern, Eichinger detects a subsequent resurgent awareness of regional patterns of speech. This movement led to the period of instability which he documents - a zone of transition in which regional features are caught up in the tension between the normative pressures of an abstract standard on the one hand, and the reality of actual speech on the other. An important underlying concept in this treatment is the idea of *Denkstil* (style of thought). In the course of his discussion Eichinger also draws on Moritz's interesting distinction between a norm as an abstract entity, and the individual through whom the norm is expressed.

The contributions by Schlieben-Lange ('Über die Notwendigkeit des Diskurs-Begriffs in der Sprachwissenschaftsgeschichte' - 'On the need for a concept of discourse in the history of linguistics') and Haßler ('Intertextualität. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Feststellung von Beziehungen zwischen sprachwissenschaftlichen Theorien' - 'Intertextuality. Possibilities and limits of identifying relations between linguistic theories') have much in common. Schlieben-Lange's contention is that the concept of discourse requires both methodological and theoretical development. Considering that the term 'discourse' is used in at least seven different ways, one might be tempted to propose that it should be discarded altogether. Instead, Schlieben-Lange puts forward a number of reasons for retaining it, one of which is its importance for the concept of 'intertextuality' - the theme of Haßler's paper. Haßler opposes an 'intertextual' approach to the '*seriellen Methode*', which seeks to elucidate a series of texts and to reconstruct as fully as possible the history of a given text-type. In trying to answer the question of what constraints intertextuality imposes on understanding and interpretation ('*Bedingungen des Verstehens und Interpretierens*') (p. 243), Haßler in a fruitful way refines and develops the notion of intertextuality further.

Knobloch's concern is to make out a case for the importance of *Problemgeschichte* (history of problems?) for the history of concepts (*Begriffsgeschichte*), the description of which is one important task of the historian of linguistics. This task Knobloch defines as the description of not one particular strand in linguistic history, but two: the phenomenon itself, but also the society which constitutes its context. In the course of his argument he develops a rich and complex system of descriptive categories, the most

important of which is that of the *Problemhorizont*, under which he includes such aspects (he calls them 'frames') as culturally-determined patterns of interpretation, a consideration of the social group embodying the development concerned, and public perceptions of the development. 'One of the main tasks of *problem- and begriffsgeschichtlichen* historiography would be to lay bare the respective specific logics of such constellations of forces, the motives at work in them, oppositions, unquestioned assumptions [...]' (p. 260). Here we have a subtle shift of attention away from the individual achievement towards the 'anonymous social pre-conditions for discipline-internal and discipline-external communication' (p. 272). The eminently hermeneutic purpose of capturing the totality of the disciplinary and cultural reference systems of the authors, epochs, theories etc. studied (p. 261) is then extended by the requirement that the historiographer's own conceptual system should also be explicitly expounded as exhaustively as possible. The importance of these ideas for assessing change in history is well illustrated in a number of examples extending up to the present day: what changes in public and professional perception has 'The Chomskyan Revolution' brought about, and what effect do these perceptions have on the treatment of subsequent or competing theories? What changes in the public perception of medicine have taken place in the last few decades, and how has the medical profession responded to them?

Weiss discusses a number of issues arising from his work on the *Bibliographisches Handbuch* (1992-94, – favourably mentioned by Saint-Gérard in the same volume, p. 26). Weiss's two main questions are: how much 'discipline-external' information does the historian need? And how resistant are 'facts' to interpretation? (p. 223). He discusses these questions in the context of two case studies (La Roche and Lowe) skilfully showing how interpretations may vary, depending on how much of the historical context one is aware of or is prepared to admit in the interpretation. Fundamental to Weiss's interests are such concepts as *influence*, and *relative historical importance*. While – or perhaps because – tracing 'influence' can be a tricky business (cf. also Habler's contribution), Weiss distinguishes between proofs of influence on the one hand and different degrees of probability on the other. It is an insight of fundamental importance, that it makes a significant difference which kind or kinds of discourse one has recourse to, in order to reconstruct a theory. Towards the close, Weiss makes an apposite and amusing reference to Borges's Pierre Menard and his strategy for writing a contemporary *Don Quixote* (p. 228) – an insight which deserves to be pondered.

These concerns overlap in a sense with those of Knobloch insofar as they are embedded in a hermeneutic tradition which implies putting oneself as far as possible in the position of a contemporary, located as close as possible to the historical object. As a historiographer, one has - in order to identify the 'most representative' works of a particular genre - to have examined all the others (p. 227).



Equally, in a sense, a case study of a period of transition, is Naumann's treatment of J. E. L. Walch (1725-1778). Walch was a kind of figure more commonly seen in the eighteenth century than today in that he was active – with some success – in two entirely different fields: the earth sciences - or geology - and philology. Naumann demonstrates how Walch, with a foot in each of two different research traditions, embodied the methodological parallelism this implies, but also how the transfer of ideas and perceptions took place from one field to the other. Trained to collect, classify and evaluate classical inscriptions in terms of their individual character, their variety and their aesthetic qualities, Walch seems to have applied the same criteria to his geological collections. Samples were collected, arranged and selected for presentation not in terms of mineralogical criteria, but according to their curiosity value, their rarity and their beauty. At a time when the earth sciences were moving away from an approach based on authority to one based on empirical observation, from antiquarian curiosity to systematic taxonomy, this was a paradigm change which Walch never quite succeeded in making. This paper, too, gives food for thought along the lines indicated by Knobloch – namely, to what degree are we ourselves aware of our own *Problemhorizont* and the conceptual system we inhabit, and how far are we their prisoners?

Space does not unfortunately permit a fuller treatment of all the good things to be found in this volume – every researcher in the history of linguistics will find something to interest him or her in the papers assembled here. It is left to Vonk to take a step back, as it were, and provide a synoptic view of the issues which concern colleagues currently working in the field.

The two dimensions which emerge most clearly from Vonk's observations are the philosophical (How and why should we study the history of linguistics?) and the political (What institutional frameworks are conceivable for the pursuit of the history of linguistics? How far have they been or could they be realised in a European context?)

As far as the philosophical aspects are concerned, Vonk makes out a number of distinct positions. There is in the Netherlands a strong pragmatic tradition which prefers to tackle concrete questions. This tradition has, it is true, become increasingly aware of such problems as the establishment and the selection of 'facts', 'influence' and the importance of the respective scientific, political, economic and cultural contexts. Nevertheless, while lip-service may be paid to them, the consequences of these aspects for the actual practice of historiography have, as he puts it, all too often been swept under the carpet (p. 175). Against this strong pragmatic tradition, the development of a critical methodological viewpoint has too often been seen as getting unnecessarily bogged down in theory, and as not particularly fruitful. For some, it is sufficient to deal with questions of philosophy and epistemology when the 'real' work on an era, a particular work, or a historical figure has been completed. For others, these questions are an essential prerequisite to an

adequate treatment of the topic. Much of this debate revolves around the question of the proper relationship between historiographical theory and historiographical practice, and it is clear that the matter is still far from being satisfactorily resolved.

Along the political dimension, Vonk draws attention to the pressing problem of continuity: while the historiography of linguistics in Europe seems to be at significantly different stages of development in the countries covered, it has no accepted body of doctrine – no philosophy, in fact – as a scientific discipline comparable to that of, say, physics or philosophy, or biology. In some countries, in which the historiography of linguistics has enjoyed significant financial support, a mood of uncertainty seems to be setting in as to what the future holds. Support for research initiatives has not necessarily led to the establishment of a discipline in terms of university curricula and teaching posts. Finance in general – for researchers, and for the training of younger scholars in particular – seems to have reached a point where things may begin to get worse rather than better.

Despite an increased awareness of the pressures towards ‘globalisation’, its effects on the discipline – perhaps because of our organisation in national societies – have been relatively small. One way of going forward, suggests Vonk, may be the construction of working-groups to further international co-operation. Altogether, Vonk provides an excellent survey and a sober, critical but realistic picture of the historiography of linguistics within Europe.

Generally speaking, the volume has been edited to a high standard. Its greatest weakness is in my view the lack of a subject index, though it does have an ‘Index nominum’. The fact that each paper has its own set of references inevitably leads to redundancies, especially since the individual speakers were requested to concentrate on a limited theme. Despite the editors’ care, a number of errors have inevitably crept in. The following is not a complete and systematic record. However, readers may like to note the following. Knobloch’s paper under the Contents (‘Inhalt’, p. 6) should read 259 (for 279); p. 13, l. 2 should read *reverence* for *reverance*; p. 13, l. 14 should read *Reverend* for *Reverand*; p. 39, l. 4 should read *conditions* for *condition*; p. 42, l. 5 should read *l’époque* for *l’oque*; p. 64, l. 1 should read *Formigari* for *Fomigari*; p. 87, last line: hyphen missing after ‘Peder’; p. 98, l. 2 should read *regarded* for *regardced*; p. 99, l. 8 should read *an organisational* for *a organisational*; p. 100, l. 11 should read *unwarranted* for *unwarrented*, and p. 224, l. 2 should read *sprachwissenschaftlichen* for *sprachissenshaftlichen*.

Finally, it is not always easy to follow up references from the text. For instance, no reference is given for Joseph Suchy (mentioned on p. 31); a reference for Hulshoff (1985) (p. 156 and p. 159) is not provided, although they are for Schmitter (1982) and Noordegraaf (1985) – both mentioned in the same quotation; and the date of publication of Hamann’s work has been inadvertently omitted (p. 226; p. 231).

Altogether, this volume records a laudable effort to take a supra-national view of activities in the historiography of linguistics. From a historical perspective its value to future generations will lie in the fact that it documents the state of the art for considerable parts of Europe at a particular moment in history. Coverage, though, was too selective for it to be considered a definitive statement: too many countries – Denmark, Greece, Portugal, for instance, as well as the whole of central-eastern Europe have been omitted – for that to be possible. Nevertheless, it documents a wide variety of approaches and achievements, products of the impact of ideas on the historiography of linguistics on different national traditions and institutional contexts.

To contemporaries, its value will lie in the diversity of themes and approaches it records across large parts of Europe. It also contains much factual information of contemporary relevance – on areas of work, publications etc., and also on the structure and financing of the discipline.

If there are any reservations to be expressed, it would be that despite the wealth of approaches to the historiography of linguistics documented here, there are few points at which one can find connections with wider historical concerns, whether thematic or methodological. Although some contributions do claim to see the history of linguistics as part of history (as opposed to linguistics) many practitioners still seem to be more interested in exploring the discipline from within, as it were, than in looking beyond it. One further message this book sends out is that if we want to participate fully in research developments in the foreseeable future, we must increasingly look to see what is happening on the European as opposed to the national level. We ought also perhaps to consider whether the structures we have developed are likely to prove adequate to sustain ongoing research in this area for the coming decades.

## REFERENCES

- Alston, R. C. (ed.) 1965. *A Bibliography of the English Language from the Invention of Printing to the Year 1800*. Leeds: Arnold.
- Bland, C. R. (ed.) 1991. *The Teaching of Grammar in Late Medieval England*. East Lansing, Michigan: Colleagues Press.
- Brekle, H., E. Dobnig-Jülch, H. J. Höller and H. Weiss (eds) 1992-1994. *Bibliographisches Handbuch zur Sprachwissenschaft des 18. Jahrhunderts. Die Grammatiker, Lexikographen und Sprachtheoretiker des deutschsprachigen Raumes mit Beschreibungen ihrer Werke*. 3 vols. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Gwosdek, H. (ed.) 1991. *Early Printed Editions of the Long Accidence and Short Accidence Grammars*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Hovdhaugen, Even, Fred Karlsson, Carol Henriksen & Bengt Sigurd 2000. *The History of Linguistics in the Nordic Countries*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Thomson, D. (ed.) 1984. *An Edition of the Middle English Grammatical Texts*. New York: Garland.

**John Walmsley, Bielefeld**  
[john.walmsley@Uni-Bielefeld.de](mailto:john.walmsley@Uni-Bielefeld.de)

**Wilhelm von Humboldt*****On Language. On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and Its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species.***

Edited by Michael Lososky. Translated by Peter Heath.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

(Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy). xli + 296 pp.

ISBN 0-521-66089-0 (hardcover); ISBN 0-521-66772-0 (paperback).

Thanks to Chomsky's "re-introduction" of Wilhelm von Humboldt's linguistic achievements into the modern (English-speaking) linguistic world, we have had good opportunities to read in English Humboldt's 'famous but rarely studied introduction to general linguistics' (Chomsky 1965: v), namely *Einleitung zum Kawi-Werk, Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluß auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts* (1836).

According to Koerner (1973: 683), an English translation of excerpts from the writings of Humboldt was already available in the 1960s (cf., e.g., Cowan 1963), which Koerner assumes Chomsky may have referred to. But it is not a sheer coincidence that a complete translation of Humboldt's 'famous but rarely studied' work appeared for the first time at the beginning of the 70s (cf. Humboldt 1971). Chomsky's frequent reference to Humboldt in his various publications during the latter half of the 60s may have triggered, or at least inspired, the desire for the complete translation of the most famous book of Humboldt's linguistic studies.

The first English version of Humboldt's *Einleitung — Linguistic Variability and Intellectual Development* — is badly flawed (Sweet 1989: 388) on account of some translation problems (Percival 1973: 257ff.; Koerner 1973: 683f.). But it remained the only translation available in English until Peter Heath published a new version entitled *On Language. The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind* (cf. Humboldt 1988).

The present book is to be introduced as the latest issue of the English version of Humboldt's *Einleitung*. Precisely speaking, however, it cannot be counted as the third' English translation because the main text itself has not been revised from the 1988 version. Heath's translation remains just as it was, which, in a sense, means that Heath's text is perfect and invincible enough to be regarded as standard.

There are of course some changes in the new version. First, we find minor changes in the English translation of the title. More importantly, there is a complete revision in the introductory pages. Besides the seven additional pages of 'Chronology', 'Further Reading', and 'Note on the Text', we would do well to direct our attention to a new 'Introduction' by Michael Losonsky of Colorado State University. This 28-page introduction consists of four major parts, i.e. (1) The author, (2) The themes and arguments (*Language, action, and power. Freedom and autonomy. Sound-form and inner form. Universality and diversity. Form and linguistic determinism. Community and alienation. Holism. Classification and quality. Individuals and nations*), (3) Influences and development, and (4) Humboldt today (*Science, freedom, and art; finite means and infinite uses; development and environment*).

My first impression tells me that the introduction is written in a thoroughly 'colorless' manner, that is, from a neutral point of view. Besides, each part of the introduction is concisely and eruditely organised, providing enough material to present briefly but comprehensively the life of Humboldt and his linguistic views and major achievements. Especially in the part on 'Humboldt today' we find a clear description of the influence of Humboldt on Chomsky and an excellent insight into the nature of Humboldt's view of language with regard to the development of cognitive linguistics.

As most of the readers of this *Bulletin* know, the 1988 version of the book contains an introduction by Hans Aarsleff. I have no clue as to why Aarsleff's introduction has been replaced with that of Losonsky's. In any case, I am convinced that the present book is of great significance for us, at least because of the new introduction. Those who already own the last version may not have to buy the new one, since the main text has not changed at all. But just for the introduction by Losonsky the new book is worth being kept at hand.

The popularity of Humboldt never ceases. During the last five years a reprint edition of *Einleitung* (cf. Humboldt 1995) and an English translation of Humboldt's linguistic anthology (cf. Humboldt 1997) have been published. This new English version of Humboldt's *Einleitung* appeared in the series of Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy — the former in the series of the texts in German Philosophy. In the sphere of linguistics, too, Humboldt's insightful reflection on the nature of language will never lose its value, as long as language is scrutinised on a profoundly speculative basis, which is newly confirmed by the appearance of this newly published, but un-revised translation of Humboldt's *Einleitung*.

## REFERENCES

- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Cowan, Marianne. 1963. *Humanists without Portfolio: An Anthology of the Writings of Wilhelm von Humboldt*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1836. *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluß auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*. Berlin: F. Dümmler.
- 1971. *Linguistic Variability and Intellectual Development by Wilhelm von Humboldt*. Transl. by George C. Buck & Frithjof A. Raven. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press.
- 1988. *On Language. The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*. Transl. by Peter Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1995. *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues*. With a new introduction by Chris Hutton. Vol. 5 of *18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century German Linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- 1997. *Essays on Language*. Ed. by T. Harden and D. Farrelly. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Koerner, E. F. Konrad. 1973. Review of *Linguistic Variability and Intellectual Development by Wilhelm von Humboldt*. Transl. by George C. Buck & Frithjof A. Raven (Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press, 1971). *Language* 49:3, 682-685.
- Percival, Keith W. 1973. Review of *Linguistic Variability and Intellectual Development by Wilhelm von Humboldt*. Transl. by George C. Buck & Frithjof A. Raven (Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press, 1971). *International Journal of American Linguistics* 39.4, 255-260.
- Sweet, Paul R. 1989. Review of *On Language. The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*. Transl. by Peter Heath (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). *Historiographia Linguistica* 16.3, 387-392.

**Hiroyuki Eto, Nagano/Japan**  
[etoh@georgetown.edu](mailto:etoh@georgetown.edu)

**Geoffrey Lewis**

*The Turkish Language Reform. A Catastrophic Success.*

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. vii + 190 pp. ISBN 0-19-823856-8.

£35.

The twentieth century reform of the Turkish language is referred to here as a catastrophic success. It was a success since the goal of drastically changing the language was achieved. Most modern Turks, it appears, find it extremely difficult to understand documents written before 1928, even when the documents are read aloud. The reform was catastrophic because modern Turks have been cut off from their literature of an earlier era and because the process of 'purifying' Turkish by banishing Arabic and Persian expressions has resulted in an impoverishment of the language. Words with subtle nuances of meaning were often replaced by simple words inadequate to the task. New vocabulary was often contrived and was often introduced by trial and error. The result has been considerable uncertainty and confusion.

It had long been recognised that the official Turkish language of the Ottoman Empire needed to be reformed. It was elitist and obscure to the majority of the Turkish people. The author tells the tale of the cleric who tried to buy mutton from a butcher's boy. The cleric expressed his wishes in an elegant style coloured by Arabic and Persian. Unable to understand, the butcher's boy imagined that it was some sort of prayer and responded simply with 'Amen'.

The reform had the good fortune, or perhaps the misfortune, to be promoted by the most powerful man in Turkey, Mustafa Kemal, later known as Atatürk. He involved himself in linguistic details and possessed a relevant library including Jespersen's *Essentials of English Grammar* and *The Philosophy of Language*. On the basis of his own investigations he would occasionally resort to making an official change in the Turkish language by decree.

Colleagues would meet with Atatürk around a table laden with spirits and hors d'oeuvres and discuss questions of language reform. Certain of the most active reformers were not qualified linguists. They were in no position to control Atatürk when he espoused the fantastic 'sun-language' theory. Turkish was held to be the original language and the original sound of Turkish was said to be 'Aa' uttered by a human being in response to the sun. The stimulus for this theory was a typescript which Atatürk received in 1935. It was entitled 'La



psychologie de quelques éléments des langues turques', the author being Hermann F. Kvergic of Vienna.

The first major step in the language reform had been to replace the Arabo-Persian alphabet of Ottoman Turkish with the Latin-based alphabet used today. The new alphabet was adopted by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on 1 November 1928 to be implemented two days later. All official correspondence between private citizens and government departments would have to use the new alphabet from 1 June 1929 onwards.

The year 1932 witnessed major advances in the 'purification' of Turkish from Arabic and Persian influences. This was the year of the First Turkish Language Congress and also of the foundation of the Turkish Society for the Study of Language, eventually known as Türk Dil Kurumu. In that year a decree went out from the Directorate of Religious Affairs to the effect that the call to prayer should be made in Turkish rather than Arabic. To many Muslim leaders such an innovation must have been appalling.

The 'purification' of Turkish involved not only loanwords, but also loan constructions from Arabic and Persian. The prime examples were the Persian genitive constructions (*izafet*) which were omnipresent in Ottoman Turkish and which were referred to by one writer as 'unfamiliar and ponderous foreign locutions'. Even in Ottoman times beginnings of a shift away from the Persian genitive could be detected, as in the case of the following expression: 'People who had been used to calling the natural sciences *ulûm-i tabiiye* came to see that there was no harm in using the Turkish plural [*ler*] instead of the Arabic, dropping the Persian *i* and the Arabic feminine ending of the adjective [*ye*], and putting the adjective first: *tabii ilimler*' (p. 16, square brackets inserted by reviewer).

'Pure' Turkish words were drawn from many sources, including the Turkic languages of Central Asia. Interestingly, a word created for 'civilisation' *uygarlık* incorporated the name of a far eastern Turkic people, the Uyghurs of Eastern Turkestan acknowledged to have had a high level of civilisation in medieval times. Other 'pure' Turkish words were drawn from rustic speech and retained some of their rough edges when used in formal situations. It became rather difficult to deliver a public address that was both politically correct and appropriate to the formal occasion. Nor was the situation stable. Celebrated addresses by Atatürk had to be translated more than once to be suitable to different audiences through the years.

Technical terminology demanded great inventiveness and ingenuity. It eventually became clear that 'pure' Turkish needed to be protected not so much against Arabic and Persian as against English. Sometimes, when it seemed that a foreign word could not be resisted, there were attempts to discover a Turkic ancestry for that word.

The dynamic centre of the language reform was the Turkish Language Society, the Türk Dil Kurumu. This Society received financial support from

Atatürk's will when he died in 1938 and continued to flourish until 1950. After that it encountered increasing resistance until 1983 when it was deprived of its independence and absorbed into an Atatürk institute linked to the Prime Minister's office. Although a society with an identical name has been established more recently, it appears to be only a shadow of the original Türk Dil Kurumu, especially in its pre-1950 days. The original Society achieved a remarkable success in the extent of its language reform, but Turks today will often admit many of its achievements to have been catastrophic.

The author expressed two main objectives in publishing his study: (a) to acquaint the general reader with the bizarre and tragicomic story of the language reform and (b) to provide students of Turkish with some stimulating reading matter. The book succeeds on both counts. Much of it reads like a novel. It is hard to put down. Nevertheless, there is a price to pay for the dual purpose. The general reader may not be so enthusiastic about the extensive illustrative examples as the student of Turkish will be. However, almost all quotations in Turkish are presented together with an English version. Even for the non-specialist it is often interesting to observe how something was originally expressed in Turkish.

There is considerable interest in the Islamic world today in the limitations of the Arabo-Persian alphabet for representing various other languages. The author's chapter entitled 'The New Alphabet' is relevant here. He describes the failure of the old Arabo-Persian alphabet of Ottoman Turkish in clear detail. He also cites various attempts to reform that system from within. An attempt by Antepli Münif Pasha at solving the severe shortage of vowel marks is mentioned, involving 'the three diacritics inherited from Arabic and five newly devised as required by the phonology of Turkish' (p. 28). The general reader who may be eager to pursue this issue faces a reference in Turkish.

Two observations can be made here. (1) Having been very user-friendly to the general reader in the main text, the author might have been just a bit more user-friendly in the references. (2) If there is no good summary in English of attempts to reform the old Arabo-Persian alphabet of Ottoman Turkish from within, it is hoped that the author could be prevailed upon to provide one.

**Herman Bell, Oxford**  
[herman@nubia.u-net.com](mailto:herman@nubia.u-net.com)

## PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(to 25 October 2000)

**M**embers 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:

Dr David Cram  
(Henry Sweet Society)  
Jesus College  
Oxford OX1 3DW

Monographs by individual authors will be reviewed wherever possible; articles in collected volumes that relate to the history of linguistic ideas will be listed individually, 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

BÄCKSTRÖM, Kurt, FORSGREN, Kjell-Åke, GARTNER, Isabella & HOLLENSTEIN, Gerd (eds.)

*Österreichische Sprache, Literatur und Gesellschaft: Symposium zu Fragen des akademischen Sprachunterrichts.* Münster: Nodus, 2000. 164 pp. ISBN 3-89323-702-X.

BURKE, Lucy, CROWLEY, Tony, & GIRVIN, Alan (eds.)

*The Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader.* London & New York: Routledge, 2000. xvi + 509 pp. ISBN 0-415-18681-1.

CALVO FERNADÉZ, Vicente

*Estudio de la Gramática Latina en la Baja Edad Media Española.* Münster: Nodus, 2000. 189 pp. ISBN 3-89323-311-3.

DUTZ, Klaus D. (ed.)

*Interpretation und Re-Interpretation: Aus Anlaß des 1000. Geburtstages von Johann Leo Weisgerber (1899-1985)*. Münster: Nodus, 2000. 287 pp. ISBN 3-89323-280-X.

HÄBLER, Gerda & NIEDEREHE, Hans-J. (eds.)

*Geschichte des Sprachbewußtseins in romanischen Ländern*. Münster: Nodus, 2000. 272 pp. ISBN 3-89323-133-1.

LÉPINETTE, Brigitte

*L'enseignement du français en Espagne au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle dans ses grammaires: contexte historique; concepts linguistiques et pédagogiques*. Münster: Nodus, 2000. 381 pp. ISBN 3-89323-281-8.

SMITH, Richard C.

*The Writings of Harold E. Palmer: An Overview*. Tokyo: Hon-no-Tomoshia, 1999. xii + 218 pp.

## JOURNALS

*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*. 10.1 (2000). ISSN 0939-2815.

*Historiografia da Lingüística Brasileira*. Boletim IV, 1999 & V 2000. Universidade de São Paulo: Grupo de Estados em Historiografia da Lingüística Brasileira.

*Bulletin de la Société canadienne d'études coméniennes / Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Comenian Studies*. 8:1 (June 2000).

## ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

BARTENS, Angela

“Diasystematische Markierungen in den portugiesischen Grammatiken und Traktaten des 16. Jahrhunderts.” In Gerda Häbler & Hans-J. Niederehe (eds.) *Geschichte des Sprachbewußtseins in romanischen Ländern*. (Münster: Nodus, 2000), 53-74.

BENNANI, Azelarabe Lahkim

“Karl Bühler, Carl Stumpf und die Brentanoschule. Polare Struktur des

Bewußtseins und Darstellungsfunktion." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 10.1 (2000), 131-155.

BURR, Elisabeth

"Beschreibung und Normierung des Genus in frühen Grammatiken des Französischen, Italienischen, Portugiesischen und Spanischen." In Gerda Haßler & Hans-J Niederehe (eds.) *Geschichte des Sprachbewußtseins in romanischen Ländern*. (Münster: Nodus, 2000), 17-32.

HAFNER, Jochen

"Tugendhafte Sprachminimierung. Lakonismus und Antikendenken bei Saint-Just." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 10.1 (2000), 5-60.

HABLER, Gerda & NIEDEREHE, Hans-J.

"Überlegungen und Bausteine zu einer Geschichte des Sprachbewußtseins." In Gerda Haßler & Hans-J Niederehe (eds.) *Geschichte des Sprachbewußtseins in romanischen Ländern*. (Münster: Nodus, 2000), 7-16.

HELSLOOT, Niels & HAK, Tony

"La contribution de Michel Pécheux à l'analyse de discours." *Langage et société* 91 (2000), 5-33.

HÜLLEN, Werner

"A plea for onomasiology." In Wolfgang Falkner & Hans-Jörg Schmid (eds.) *Words, Lexemes, Concepts -- Approaches to the Lexicon: Studies in Honour of Leonhard Lipka*. (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1999), 343-352.

HÜLLEN, Werner

"Das Glockenspiel des Ablauts: National tones in German linguistic publications between 1914 and 1945." In Sheila Embleton, John E. Joseph & Hans-Josef Niederehe (ds.) *The Emergence of the Modern Language Sciences*. (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1999), 219-235.

MESSNER, Dieter

"Wörterbücher als Quellen zur Kenntnis des Sprachbewußtseins in Portugal im 18. Jahrhundert." In Gerda Haßler & Hans-J Niederehe (eds.) *Geschichte des Sprachbewußtseins in romanischen Ländern*. (Münster: Nodus, 2000), 117-126.

MÜLLER-LANCÉ, Johannes

"Sprachauffassungen in der Geschichte des Fremdsprachenunterrichts." In Gerda Haßler & Hans-J Niederehe (eds.) *Geschichte des Sprachbewußtseins in romanischen Ländern*. (Münster: Nodus, 2000), 33-52.

NEIS, Cordula

“Sprachwandeltheorien des 18. Jahrhunderts am Beispiel der Berliner Preisfrage von 1771.” In Gerda Häbler & Hans-J Niederehe (eds.) *Geschichte des Sprachbewußtseins in romanischen Ländern*. (Münster: Nodus, 2000), 175-188.

SAINT-GÉRARD, Jacques-Philippe

“Orthographie et génie de la langue française d’après le *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle (G.D.U.)* de Pierre Larousse.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 10.1 (2000), 61-90.

SCHMITTER, Peter

“Georg Forsters ‚allgemeine Naturgeschichte‘ und die ‚allgemeine Sprachkunde‘ Willhelm von Humboldts.” In Jörn Garber (ed.), *Wahrnehmung – Konstruktion – Text*. (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000), 162-192.

SCHMITTER, Peter

“Zur Rolle der Semantik in Humboldts linguistischem Forschungsprogramm.” *Language and Linguistics* (Language Research Institute, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul) 25 (2000), 207-237.

VORLAT, Emma

“On the originality of Lindley Murray’s prescriptive canon.” In Guy Tops, Betty Devriendt & Steven Geukens (eds.) *Thinking English Grammar*. (= *Orbis / Supplementa, Tome 12*; Leuven / Paris: Peeters, 1999), 319-329.

VORLAT, Emma

“Robert Baker’s dependence on Vaugelas.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 9 (1999), 1-19.

WESTERHOFF, Jan C.

“Polyhistor and Poeta Doctus. Notes on the baroque conception of signs and significations.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 10.1 (2000), 91-130.

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

**Summary of Accounts and Treasurer's Report for the Financial Years 1998-99 and 1999-2000**

<b>STERLING ACCOUNT</b>		<i>Expenditure</i>		
<i>Income</i>	1998-99	1999-2000	1998-99	1999-2000
Subscriptions (incl. arrears)	1340.00	2201.70	Admin. (incl. travel)	264.03
Advance subscriptions	158.00	60	<i>Bulletin</i> (incl. Index)	1422.66
Donations: Salmon-Verburg Fund	2500.00		Publications series	362.49
Donations (miscellaneous)	6.00	301.00	1999 Colloquium	79.00
Interest received	124.52	69.72	2000 Colloquium deposit	-
1998 Colloquium refund	71.00	-	Maintenance Sweet's grave	44.00
Publications subvention	983.59	-		
Advertising receipts	-	33.75		
	<b>5183.11</b>	<b>2666.17</b>		
Subtotal	<b>2212.18</b>	<b>3767.24</b>	<b>2212.18</b>	<b>3767.24</b>
less Expenditure				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£2970.93</b>	<b>£(1101.07)</b>		

<b>BALANCE SHEET</b>		<b>REPRESENTED BY</b>	
	£		£
Balance brought forward 1.8.1998	5330.22	Current a/c	649.01
add surplus 1998-98	2970.93	High Interest a/c	6497.75
	8301.15	Deposit a/c	53.32
less deficit 1999-2000	1101.07	Total	7200.08
<b>BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD 31.7.2000</b>	<b>7200.08</b>		

The Society also has the following assets: NG 18415,60 and DEM 3500,00 (see below)

**DUTCH GUILDERS ACCOUNT**

<i>Income</i>	1998-99	1999-2000	<i>Expenditure</i>	1999-2000
Subscriptions (incl. arrears)	728.00	874.00	Publications printing	6029.28
Donations: Salmon-Verburg Fund	8000.00	-		
1998 Colloquium surplus	5740.85	-		
Interest received	-	22.35		
Publications subvention	-	5853.32		
Publications sales income	-	3226.36		
Subtotal	14468.85	9976.03		6029.28
<i>less Expenditure</i>	0	6029.28		
	14468.85	3946.75		
<i>add Balance from 1998-99</i>	-	14468.85		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>NG 18415.60</b>		

**BALANCE SHEET**

		NG		
Opening balance 1.8.1998		0.00		
<i>add</i> surplus 1998-99	14468.85			
	14468.85			
<i>add</i> surplus 1999-2000	3946.75			
BALANCE CARRIED FWD	<u>NG 18415.60</u>	= Euros 8356.63	= approx.	£5600
31.7.2000				

**TREASURER'S REPORT**

The last report I presented was of an interim nature, covering the period from 1 August 1998 to 7 March 1999, that is to say, only about six months of the financial year 1998-99. The present report covers two financial years, August 1998 – July 1999 and August 1999 – July 2000.

The Society's financial affairs are rather complicated since we hold assets in various currencies.

Beginning with the sterling account, on 1 August 1998 the Society had a balance of £5,330.22. At the end of July 1999 we were able to add a surplus of £2970.93, very largely accounted for by the handsome donation to inaugurate the Paul Salmon – Pieter Verburg Memorial Fund and also by the receipt of a substantial subvention towards a publication. The year 1999–2000, in contrast, showed a deficit of £1101.07, chiefly because we were asked to make an advance of £799.62 towards the cost of the Edinburgh colloquium and also because we had to settle the printing bills for three issues of the *Bulletin* in the period concerned and also pay for the compilation and printing of the



cumulative index to the *Newsletter/Bulletin*. Consequently, our sterling assets on 31 July 2000 stood at £7200,08 (gross).

Subscription income in 1999–2000 totals £2261,70, including £60 in advance payments and also including £377,70 remitted by the US Treasurer (\$600). We also gratefully received a donation of £300 from the funds of ICHoLS. That the subscription income increased by about 50 per cent compared with 1998–99 is largely due to the increase in subscription rates which took effect in January 2000.

At the end of 1998 we established an account with the Dutch Postbank, in response to many requests from our members in the Netherlands for a more convenient way to pay their subscriptions. This account currently stands at NG 18415,60 (= E8356,63 [approx. £5600]). Of this total about NG 1600 is accounted for by subscriptions, while a magnificent donation of NG 8000 was received in respect of the Salmon–Verburg Memorial Fund. We also received NG 5740 from Professor Noordegraaf, representing a surplus on running the highly successful Amsterdam Colloquium in September 1998, and we also received NG 3226 from Nodus Publikationen in Münster in respect of income on sales of our publications. Against that, we paid NG 6029 to Nodus in respect of production costs of a further volume in the series.

We also hold DEM 3500 temporarily in a German bank account, received by way of subvention for another volume. This will be used to pay part of the printing costs of the next volume in the series. (It is complicated holding money in several currencies [Sterling, US dollars, Dutch Guilders, and German Marks, not to mention Euros], but this is preferable to paying high conversion charges on relatively small sums of money; the situation will be simplified once the Euro finally replaces national currencies in the Netherlands and Germany in 2002.)

The Paul Salmon – Pieter Verburg Memorial Fund has been most generously endowed by Vivian Salmon and Dr C. A. Verburg. From the total fund (made up of £2500 and NG 8000), the Executive Committee agreed to make annual awards of bursaries to help with the travel costs of younger scholars or overseas members who would otherwise find the cost of attending the Society's colloquia prohibitively expensive. The first award has been made in respect of the Edinburgh Colloquium.

As part of the report I have tried to summarise the situation regarding the Society's publications series. This is rather complicated since assets have been received and are held in three currencies. We have received substantial subventions in sterling (£983), Dutch Guilders (NG 5853) and German Marks (DEM 3500), as well as income of NG 3226 from sales in 1999. We have had to pay NG 6029 to print one volume and there has been expenditure of £362 over the two years in respect of reading fees, postage, and other miscellaneous items. NG 5853 is earmarked for the production of the next volume in the series. Taking these receipts, expenditure and provisions into account, the

publishing programme has generated a surplus of approx. £947 over the past two years.

The Society currently has gross assets of £7200, NG 18415, and DEM 3500, that is approx. £13,900, of which about £1755 is committed to publications and £4900 relates to the Salmon–Verburg Fund, leaving disposable funds of about £7250. This means that the Society is in a healthy financial state.

Finally, I would wish to inform members that the solicitors of the late Professor R. H. Robins have notified the Society of a bequest from Professor Robins's estate. Details have not yet been received.

**John L. Flood**  
*Honorary Treasurer*

30 August 2000

### **GUEST ROOMS AT KEBLE COLLEGE, OXFORD**

**K**eble College, Oxford kindly offers accommodation in college guest rooms to members of the society visiting the college in order to consult the Henry Sweet Society collection of books which is housed there. Unfortunately there have been some misunderstandings about this arrangement recently, and members are requested to note the following terms for this arrangement.

Members may stay at Keble for up to two consecutive nights (subject to availability) while they are working with the Henry Sweet Society collection, and they will be charged at the rate paid by Keble Old Members for college rooms. Members of the society may not make use of these rooms while carrying out other business in Oxford.

## NEWS OF MEMBERS

### NEW MEMBERS

Cristina Marras, Tel Aviv University, Department of Philosophy, Gilman Bldg.  
69978 Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv, Israel. E-mail: cristina@post.tau.ac.il

Publications include:

- 2000 'Materialien für ein linguistisches Lexikon zu G. W. Leibniz. Beispiel: Lemma "Zeichen"'. In Ingo Warnke (ed.), *Sprache-System-Taetigkeit*, 32 Schnittstelle. Text: Diskurs. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 163-171.
- 1999 'Analogische und metaphorische Verfahren bei G. W. Leibniz (1646-1716)'. In Gerda Haßler & Peter Schmitter (eds), *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprachen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 75-89.
- 1996 'Materiali per un Lessico Critico-Linguistico in G.W. Leibniz: i Termini Grammatica e Lingua'. In *Annali della Facoltà di Scienze dell'Educazione*, Nuova serie, vol. XIX, parte III. Cagliari, 63-88.
- 1995 'G. W. Leibniz e il Linguaggio: Alcuni Percorsi Bibliografici'. In: *Bollettino Filosofico Sardo*, 2/3. Cagliari: CUEC, 20-38.
- 1995 'Materiali per un Lessico Critico-Linguistico in G. W. Leibniz: il Termine Analogia'. In: Stefano Gensini, Elisabetta Gola, Gian Pietro Storari (eds), *Derive. Quaderno di Semiotica e Filosofia del Linguaggio*. Cagliari: CUEC, 121-134.

Peteris Vanags, Stabu Iela 46/48 - 5Ī, LV - 1011 Riga, Latvia.

### CURRENT MEMBERS

Hiroyuki Eto has completed his doctoral course at Georgetown University and defended his doctoral dissertation, *Philologie vs. Sprachwissenschaft. Historiographie einer Begriffsbestimmung im Rahmen der Wissenschaftsgeschichte des 19. Jahrhundert*, with distinction. He is now director of the Seifu Institute for English Linguistics and Philology in Osaka, and assistant lecturer at Nagano College of Nursing. He has published the following works:

- 1997 On the role of German grammarians as a bridge between traditional and scientific grammar in 19th-century England. In: Kurt R. Jankowsky (ed.) *Conceptual and Institutional Development of Europe and the United States*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 133-154.
- 1999 Die Neuartigkeit der Grammatik von Hans Glinz. Historische Interpretation auf dem Hintergrund von zwei Haupttypen in der traditionellen Grammatikbeschreibung des Abendlandes. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Glinzschen 'Fünf-Wortarten-Lehre'. In: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 9:1, 21-58.

Konrad Koerner has been awarded the prestigious Konrad Adenauer Award by the Royal Society of Canada, an award promoting academic relations between Canada and Germany, enabling the winner to carry out research at German research institutes. He has also been invited by the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences to be a fellow in residence for the academic year 2001-2002.