

EDITORIAL

This issue of the *Bulletin* contains more information about conferences than is usually the case. The provisional programme for the Society's own colloquium in Munich is included, and this looks to be as interesting and well balanced as always. This is the second time the colloquium has been held outside Britain, following on from the very successful Amsterdam colloquium of 1998. It is of course pleasant for British members of the Society to have the opportunity to visit different places, but the membership of the Society is international and it is only right that this should be reflected from time to time in the venue for the September meeting. The executive committee is always happy to receive offers from potential colloquium hosts, wherever they may be. It is still possible to register to attend the Munich colloquium, and interested members should return the enclosed booking form to Prof. Sauer, the organiser, as soon as possible.

The Henry Sweet Society colloquium is, and always has been, a general meeting. Papers are invited on *any* topic within the history of linguistics. When the Society started in 1984 the history of linguistics did not have the level of involvement or the support network via journals and conferences that it has today, and it was not possible to consider anything other than a conference which could embrace the whole of the history of linguistics. Seventeen years ago those involved knew a lot less about the history of linguistics as a whole, and conferences were able to provide useful general descriptions of particular aspects of the subject. Topics of research have in the intervening period necessarily become narrower and have come to involve a larger number of specialists, hence the growth in the market for specialised conferences, focussing closely on some specific aspect of the history of linguistics. The meeting of the North American Society, like that of the Henry Sweet Society, maintains a broad spectrum of presentations, but the other meetings announced or reported in this *Bulletin* are specialised, in a way that the meetings of the Studienkreis 'Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft', for example, have also been since their inception. Specialised presentations in general conferences where there are no parallel sessions make heavy demands on their audience, some of whom find that their own area of research is completely unrepresented in the programme. It may be that there is a real need for the general small conference alongside the specialised meetings, or it may be that the general small conference was a necessary product of the subject's early phases and that it is now an anachronism.

A particularly valuable feature of the Munich colloquium will be the opening panel discussion on teaching the history of linguistics. In the same way that there are now narrower conferences alongside the general meetings, so the

teaching of the history of linguistics no longer simply involves a straightforward chronological journey through the history of western linguistics. The subject is being taught, and can be taught, in much more specific ways, appropriate to the degree programmes of which it forms a part. There are many university teachers who give courses on the history of a subdiscipline of linguistics, on the history of the teaching or study of a particular language, on the language work of a particular period or of a particular doctrine, perhaps without realising that they are 'doing the history of linguistics' at all. Coupled to this diversity in the way the subject is taught is a new generation of focussed textbook, like Pieter Seuren's *Western Linguistics: an Historical Introduction* (1998, Blackwell), which concentrates on grammar and meaning, or like *The History of Linguistics in the Nordic Countries* by Even Hovdhaugen et al. (2000, Societas Scientiarum Fennica). This is not to mention other teaching issues, like the potential diversity of teaching methods for the subject (see Jan Noordegraaf's article in *Bulletin* 33), the availability of resources, assessment techniques. It is to be hoped that this panel session might lead to one of those specialist conferences, but a specialist conference where all historians of linguistics working in educational institutions would be able to be involved.

Andrew R. Linn, *Sheffield*

R. H. Robins, J. R. Firth, and Linguistic Historiography

0 *Introductory Remarks*

I was asked by members of the Executive of the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas to participate in a special session at the 2000 colloquium in Edinburgh, commemorating the life and work of Professor Robert Henry Robins (1921-2000), Doctor of Letters and Fellow of the British Academy. As his intellectual grandson — he was the thesis director of the late Geoffrey Bursill-Hall (Ph.D., London 1959),¹ who was my thesis director — I felt that I could not decline the invitation to say a few words at that meeting. It had been suggested to me to say ‘something that involved whatever mix of reflections on those parts of Bobby’s contribution to the field that you know best, and personal reminiscences: balance up to you’. The reader must be the judge as to what extent I succeeded in fulfilling this mandate.

1 *Robins as the Father of the History of Linguistics?*

For reasons that may not be difficult to explain, Robins, as the author of *A Short History of Linguistics*, soon became the prime reference when the History of Linguistics was the subject matter of discussion. Appearing a year after the publication of Chomsky’s *Cartesian Linguistics*, which appeared to make the subject respectable, the timing was excellent. Interestingly, as Robins acknowledged himself in his interview of 18 December 1996 with Pierre Swiggers in Leuven (Robins 1997b: 189), it was not his own impetus to write the book, but he had been invited by his London publisher, Longman, to do so. Another reason which explains at least part of the success of his *Short History* was that it was the only book on the market that had been written in English by a native speaker, and written well, and in the kind of format and length that it was very suitable as a textbook for teaching the subject. (I purchased my copy in 1969 when I took Bursill-Hall’s History of Linguistics course.)

Yet, as we know, Robins had published a 104-page essay as early as 1951, during the lean post-war years; only Terracini (1949) could be cited as a serious earlier study. Though more than double the length of Robins’s *Ancient and Mediaeval Theory*, it was devoted to the history of 19th-century linguistics

¹ Cf. Bursill-Hall (1972), which is based on his doctoral dissertation, and also Bursill-Hall (1971). The late Francis Patrick Dinneen, S.J. (1923–1994), of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., was another of Robins’s students (Ph.D., London 1960) who became a distinguished scholar in both general linguistics and the history of linguistics (see Dinneen 1967, 1990).

exclusively (cf. Koerner 1978: 25). (Another book which appeared in 1951 was Kukenheim's survey of Renaissance linguistics.) Again, as Robins reports (1997b: 185-186), the 1951 booklet had its origin in a series of three lectures given at Birkbeck College, London, in 1950 which originally J. R. Firth had been approached for, and which he asked Robins to do in his stead. As Robins recounts (185), Firth 'practised linguistics in the causative voice'; he was 'a forceful man' and 'a very good academic politician, as well as a very fine scholar' (183), and there are indications that this applied to the study of the history of linguistics too. Robins (185) reports that Firth had encouraged W. Sidney Allen (b.1918) 'to study the ancient Sanskrit phoneticians and grammarians, because he was convinced that they had something important to say to us today' (see Allen 1953), and I am sure that it was Firth too who got David Abercrombie (1909-1992) interested in the History of Phonetics a few years earlier (see Abercrombie 1948; cf. Firth 1946). Indeed, in his 'Forgotten Phoneticians' paper he (1965 [1948]: 46 n.1) refers to Firth's earlier paper on the subject (Firth 1946). More interestingly, in a subsequent paper dealing with the history of English phonetics, we read in footnote 1 (Abercrombie 1965 [1949]: 76): 'I am indebted to Professor J. R. Firth for the original suggestion that I should write this article, and for criticism and advice'. Whether acknowledged or not, one would expect Firth to proceed similarly in other instances, with other students of his.

In his interview with Pierre Swiggers, Robins (184) appears to take credit for having placed the History of Linguistics on a sure footing when he said:

[...] perhaps in part because I wrote my book *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory*, and then the *A Short History of Linguistics* [...] and other weightier reasons, the history of linguistics developed as an important branch of linguistic studies.

The writer of the Robins obituary in the *London Times* (Anon. 2000) turned the subjunctive into an indicative when s/he stated that he 'shaped the history of linguistics into a coherent subject capable of being taught in his *Short History of Linguistics* (1967)'. Robins did not elaborate what he meant by 'other weightier reasons', but we may be sure that Chomsky's *Cartesian Linguistics* of 1966, at least initially, had something to do with it. No doubt Robins's *Short History* was an influential publication. Translations into Italian (1971), Spanish (1974), French (1976), and possibly other languages would attest to this, but I am not quite sure that this book galvanised many into turning their attention to studying the history of linguistics — although it certainly made it easy for interested parties to get a fair initial idea of what the subject was about.

We should not forget that by the 1960s — and well before the appearance of *Cartesian Linguistics* — a considerable number of studies devoted to the subject had been published. In my 1978 survey, I listed 45 publications from

1962 to 1966 [alone] (Koerner 1978: 34-48); in 1967 alone, 15 works appeared (49-52), and between 1968 and 1970 another 38 titles (52-61). To refer just to a few important pre-1967 books dealing with the history of linguistics: Maurice Leroy's (1909-1991) *Les grands courants de la linguistique moderne* of 1963 was translated into Italian by Anna Morpurgo Davies in 1965, into English by Glanville Price (1967), into Spanish in 1969 and Brazilian Portuguese in 1971 (for details see Koerner 1978: 37-38); Bertil Malmberg's (1913-1994) *New Trends in Linguistics* of 1964 had first appeared in the Swedish original in 1959;² Milka Ivić's (b.1921) *Trends in Linguistics* of 1965 is a translation of a 1963 book in Serbo-Croatian. I'd also like to mention the fact that in preparation for the 1962 International Congress of Linguists, at which Chomsky was to make his first big splash, Christine Mohrmann (1903-1988) and colleagues of the *Comité International Permanent de Linguistes* put together two collective volumes surveying the history of early 20th-century linguistics both in Europe and America (cf. entries in Koerner 1978: 31 and 38). All these efforts suggest to me that there was an intense, widespread stock-taking of linguistics under way when Robins's *Short History* made its first appearance. It seems to me that attribution to particular individuals, especially in obituaries, are the result of what the American sociologist of science Robert K. Merton has called, with reference to St Matthew Chapter XXV, verse 29,³ 'the Matthew effect' (Merton 1973: 445). As regards Professor Robins's true merits and influence, I shall gladly leave it to those who had the benefit of knowing him much better than I ever had the privilege of doing so, and who actually worked under or with him.

2 *Firth as the Grandfather of the History of Linguistics in Britain*

What I have been much more interested in is the work of John Rupert Firth (1890-1960), of whom Robins was a protégé, as Victor Golla (2000) called it. Although Robins always acknowledged his indebtedness to Firth in general terms (see e.g. Robins 1961) and defended his linguistic ideas against misapprehensions (Robins 1969), it seems that he only late in life acknowledged that he also was indebted to Firth with regard to his interest and work in the history of linguistics. In his 1997 invited paper 'The Contribution of John Rupert Firth to Linguistics in the First Fifty Years of *Lingua*', it is only in the last couple of paragraphs of a rather discursive article that he comes to speak about the importance that Firth placed on the history of linguistics in

² Instead of listing these bibliographical details, I refer the reader to Koerner (1978a) where chronological order has been followed.

³ 'For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.'

effect saying that ‘Firth’s integration of speech and language within the whole picture of human life impelled him to place great emphasis on the long history of linguistics, under whatever title’ (Robins 1997a: 219), drawing attention to Firth’s 1937 book *The Tongues of Men*,⁴ in which ‘no fewer than four of its twelve chapters are centrally concerned with the history of linguistics’ (220). Robins goes on to refer to chapters 5, ‘The expansion of Europe and the discovery of Babel’ (Firth 1964 [1937]: 53-61), and 6, “‘Real character and universal languages’: Debabelization’ (62-73), characterising them as ‘brilliantly sum[ming] up several important effects on the discovery by Europeans of the “New World” on linguistics’, and adding:

It cannot be claimed that Firth was himself wholly responsible for the current growth in the history of linguistics, but [...] he may have caught the first breeze of a coming wind. (Robins 1997a: 220)

Robins’s concluding paragraph appears to be significant as regards the role that I believe Firth has played in fostering the kind of research that Robins will be remembered for, and so I shall quote it almost in full.

Firth’s direct intervention in the encouragement of studies in the history of linguistics may be seen in a theme paper on the scholastic grammarians of the late Middle Ages and their use of Priscian’s Latin grammar, which he set as part of his assignment when he was teaching in the Linguistic Institute in the summer of 1948 in Ann Arbor. He vigorously encouraged his departmental colleagues to lecture and to write on the European and the Sanskritic pioneers in linguistics, leading to Robins (1951) and Allen (1953); they were followed by later publications on the history of linguistics in the 1950s and 1960s [e.g. Robins 1967; Allen 1968]. [...] [W]hat can be said is that it is wholly in the course of action that Firth was encouraging, that there should now be a British society for studies in the history of linguistics. (Robins 1997a: 220)⁵

⁴ It appears that Firth kept a life-long interest in India, where he must have had a number of followers of his linguistic ideas. The most distinguished of these was none other than Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of modern India. Compare Robert D. King’s *Nehru and the Language Politics of India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), where it is reported (p. 160) that in a letter of 16 March 1938 to a writer asking Nehru what books he was reading, he listed Firth (1937).

⁵ Vivian Salmon, commenting on an earlier version of this paper, wrote me in a letter of September 2000 that it was Firth who directed her interest to the history of linguistics when she was a lecturer at Birkbeck College in London. My guess is that this was in the later 1950s (see her list of publications in Salmon 1979: 206-211).

We may refer to articles like 'The Technique of Semantics' (1935), 'Atlantic Linguistics' (1949), and a couple of others which Firth selected for his 1957 book (e.g. Firth 1946), in addition to his 1937 *Tongues of Men*, to demonstrate how much Firth cared for the history of linguistics as part of the study of language.⁶ As a result, it seems to me that if we regard Robins as the 'father of the History of Linguistics in Britain' today, we should perhaps call Firth the grandfather of this field of human curiosity about language and the manner in which it has been treated and used during the past 2500 years (cf. Robins 1997b: 187).

3 Concluding Remarks

It would of course be rather inadequate to identify Firth as a pioneer in linguistic historiography. As the record shows, he has done much more in linguistics *tout court* than in the history of linguistics.⁷ Unfortunately, he published relatively little of what he wrote and taught, and various unpublished papers (beyond what was included in the 1968 volume edited by his student Frank Palmer) as well as sets of rather complete lecture notes taken down by his students at the University of London exist. It might be worth contemplating a kind of compilation comparable to what Bally and Sechehaye did with students' notes from Saussure's lectures on general linguistics.⁸ A work like this would be the ultimate tribute to the memory of Bobby Robins, who in his Foreword to my 1978 book identified the 'editing and publication of previously unedited texts' as one of the four main tasks of a historian of linguistics (Robins 1978: xii).

REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, David 1948. Forgotten phoneticians. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1948, 1-34. (Repr. in Abercrombie 1965: 45-75).
 ---- 1949. What is a 'letter'?. In: *Lingua* 2, 54-63. (Repr. in Abercrombie 1965: 76-85).
 ---- 1965. *Studies in Phonetics and Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.

⁶ A full appraisal of Firth as a historian of linguistics would have to be the subject of a separate paper.

⁷ Typically, Palmer (1995) does not even mention Firth's interest in the history of linguistics.

⁸ My information derives from Dr C. Thomas Mason III of Tucson, Arizona, who owns copies of various unpublished papers. It was he who drew my attention to Merton's concept of 'the Matthew effect'.

- Allen, W[illiam] Sidney 1953. *Phonetics in Ancient India*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 1968. *Vox Graeca*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anon. 2000. Shaping the history of language into a university subject: Professor R. H. Robins. In: *The Times* (London, 26 July 2000).
- Bursill-Hall, G[oeffrey] L[eslie] 1971. *Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages: The doctrine of partes orationes of the Modistae*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1972. *Thomas of Erfurt: Grammatica speculativa*. Latin text with English translation and commentary. London: Longman.
- Chomsky, Noam 1966. *Cartesian Linguistics: A chapter in the history of rationalist thought*. New York & London: Harper & Row.
- Dinneen, Francis P[atrack], S.J. 1967. *Introduction to General Linguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. [Essentially a history of linguistics (cf. Koerner 1978a: 49)].
- 1990. *Peter of Spain: Language in Dispute*. An English translation of Peter of Spain's 'Tractatus' called afterwards *Summulae Logicales*, based on the critical edition by L. M. de Rijk. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Firth, J[ohn] R[upert] 1935. The technique of semantics. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1935, 36-72. (Repr. in Firth 1957a: 7-33).
- 1937. *The Tongues of Men*. London: Watts & Co. (Repr., together with Firth 1930, in Firth 1964: 1-138).
- 1946. The English School of phonetics. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1946, 92-132. (Repr. in Firth 1957, 92-120).
- 1949. Atlantic linguistics. In: *Archivum Linguisticum* 1:2, 95-116. (Repr. in Firth 1957a: 156-172).
- 1957. *Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951*. London-New York-Toronto: Oxford University Press. [Reprints Firth's most important papers; see above].
- 1964. *The Tongues of Men and Speech*. Ed. with a preface by Peter Strevens. London: Oxford University Press. [Reissue of Firth (1937) and (1930)].
- 1968. *Selected Papers of J. R. Firth, 1952-59*. Ed., with an Introduction [1-11], by F[rank] R[obert] Palmer. London & Harlow: Longman. [Includes several previously unpublished papers by Firth].
- Golla, Victor 2000. Robert Henry Robins (1921-2000). *Newsletter of the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas* 19:2, 4 (July 2000).
- Koerner, E. F. K[onrad]. 1978. *Western Histories of Linguistic Thought: An annotated chronological bibliography, 1822-1976*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1978b. *Toward a Historiography of Linguistics*. Foreword by R. H. Robins.

- Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1999. J. R. Firth's musings on Saussurean tenets. In: Koerner, *Linguistic Historiography: Projects & prospects*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 151-166.
- Kukenheim, Louis 1951. *Contribution à l'histoire de la grammaire grecque, latine et hébraïque à l'époque de la Renaissance*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Langendoen, D. Terence 1968. *The London School of Linguistics: A study of the linguistic theories of B. Malinowsky and J. R. Firth*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Merton, Robert K. 1973. The Matthew effect in science. In: R. K. Merton (ed.), *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 439-459.
- Palmer, Frank Robert 1995. Firth and the London School of linguistics. In: E.F.K. Koerner & R. E. Asher (eds), *Concise History of the Language Sciences*. Oxford & New York: Pergamon, 268-272.
- Robins, R[obert] H[enry] 1951. *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe; with particular reference to modern linguistic doctrine*. London: G. Bell & Sons. (Repr., Port Washington, N.Y. & London: Kennikat Press, 1971).
- 1961. John Rupert Firth. In: *Language* 37, 191-200. (Repr. in Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.) 1966, *Portraits of Linguists*, vol. II. Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press, 543-554).
- 1967. *A Short History of Linguistics*. London: Longman. (4th extended ed., 1997).
- 1969. Review of Langendoen (1968). In: *Language* 45, 105-116.
- 1978. Foreword. In: E. F. K. Koerner, *Toward a Historiography of Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, ix-xiii.
- 1979 [1967]. *A Short History of Linguistics*. 2nd corrected ed. London & New York: Longman. (4th ed., 1997).
- 1997a. The contribution of John Rupert Firth to linguistics in the first fifty years of *Lingua*. In: *Lingua* 100, 205-222. (Repr. in Vivien Law (ed.) 1998, *Texts and Contexts: Selected papers on the history of linguistics* by R. H. Robins. Münster: Nodus, 286-310).
- 1997b. 'Ask not for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee': General linguistics, the history of linguistics, and the responsibilities of language students. Interview with Pierre Swiggers. *Orbis* 39, 181-207.
- Salmon, Vivian 1979. *The Study of Language in 17th-Century England*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (2nd ed., 1988).
- Terracini, Benvenuto Aronne 1949. *Guida allo studio della linguistica storica*. Part I: *Profilo storico-critico*. Rome: Ateneo.

E. F. K. Koerner, Ottawa
koerner@aix1.uottawa.ca

‘Standard-Germanic’**Halifax Hall, University of Sheffield****4 - 7 January 2001***Conference Report*

This conference, held over two-and-a-half days at Halifax Hall at the University of Sheffield, was organised to gain an oversight of the processes of standardisation in Germanic languages and language varieties, and was, to my knowledge, the first such gathering to concentrate on standardisation within one language family. As an experiment it proved more than successful. It was very interesting to compare languages with genetic commonalities because the social factors influencing standardisation in each example were thrown into much sharper relief - not to mention that the focussed field of the conference created a splendid opportunity to meet like-minded people with similar research interests. Languages and language varieties in the West, East and North Germanic branches of the family were represented, although papers were not necessarily restricted to languages in continental Europe and Scandinavia: as well as these, there were papers on Afrikaans, on older language varieties, on languages such as English and Yiddish which extend well beyond any one national border, and for balance, some comparisons with standardisation in non-Germanic languages. Overall, the papers were consistently stimulating and flowed well into one another. All are mentioned below, although if I can attempt to summarise, several clear patterns in the direction of the papers emerged for me during the course of the conference; they are therefore grouped thematically here.

A very appealing aspect of this conference was the number of papers tracing the development of standardisation in various languages, permitting a survey of many branches of the family tree in a relatively short space of time: Luc de Grauwe's paper illustrating the divergence of Dutch and German as separate entities, oriented towards different prestige dialect models; Gerald Newton's paper tracing the history of the codification of Luxembourgish to the present day; a paper by Anthonia Feitsma emphasising the alternating trends of introducing planned and natural norms in Frisian orthography and lexicon, and Truida van der Merwe's paper on the rapid development of Afrikaans and examples of its ongoing standardisation; likewise Ane Kleine's paper on the status of Yiddish, the development of two successive literary standards and the alternation between dialectal diversity and unifying tendencies, and Francisco

Espirito-Santo's paper comparing Alemannic-based Classical Middle High German with the spectrum of phonetic forms tolerated in New High German. These offerings also conveniently provided a context for papers which delved into more specific aspects of standardisation, and for which some background was quite useful.

The dissemination of linguistic forms throughout speech communities also formed another body of papers: particularly outstanding, not only in this category, but for the conference as a whole, was Ana Deumert's study of the emergence and diffusion of Cape Vernacular Dutch in the 19th century; Deumert's work nicely complemented the earlier historical sketch of Afrikaans. Other interesting offerings on the same theme were by Stephan Elspaß on literacy and standardisation processes in 19th-century German correspondence, tracing change in forms of the diminutive, comparative particles and *wegen* + dat./acc./gen., and Wim Vandebussche on the standardisation of spelling in 19th-century Flanders in middle- and lower-class correspondence. Studies addressing the development of specific standard forms were exemplified by Arjan van Leuwensteijn's paper on forms of address in 17th-century Dutch and the competing forms of *U Edelheid* and *ghij* in the correspondence of Hooft, Spinoza and Grotius, and also by Amanda Pounder's study on the history of adverb marking in West Germanic languages, especially in Dutch, German and English. Pertinent here also is a discussion of the creation of stigmatised forms, as exemplified in Nils Langer's paper on the importance of early L2 grammars for a history of standard German, in providing metalinguistic commentary on stigmatised constructions.

Many of the papers focussed on norm-setting and authority, a subgroup of which concerned official bodies and authority in norm-setting: here the involvement of representatives of associations concerned with language policy was quite a drawcard. A unique insight into national planning issues came from Arthur Sandved of the Norwegian Language Council, who presented a paper on the history of the tri-standard situation in Norwegian, and the public rejection of attempts to introduce certain norms. A paper by Neil Fulton of the *Oxford English Dictionary* provided a counter example to this, showing the paradoxically prescriptive force of a descriptive approach to dictionary-making through illustrating the changing representation of Received Pronunciation in English dictionaries. Another paper on planning, by Jetje de Groof, traced the history of language policy in Belgium and the contentious status of Flemish in Belgium over the last 200 years. Meanwhile, Kendra Willson's paper on the debate over the selection of surnames in Icelandic examined the grammatical and political arguments for and against introducing uninflected names used by competing progressive and conservative forces in society, and the connection with Icelandic nationalism. However, participation in standardisation is not only the province of official bodies, but is also manifested in the work of language professionals at community level: the question of norm selection

formed an associated theme within the proceedings, and speakers considered this from a historical viewpoint as well as discussing contemporary developments. The role of printers, for instance, in norm selection, was explored in Giedrius Subačius's paper comparing English and Lithuanian, focussing particularly on the part played by 19th-century Lithuanian printers in determining appropriate orthography and punctuation, while Alexander Zheltukhin's presentation addressed the pursuit of orthographic norms by different chanceries in 16th-century Sweden and their identification with different religious outlooks. More recent developments in language standardisation were also addressed: Marko Modiano's thought-provoking paper on the emergence of a new variety of English, Mid-Atlantic English, raised the issue of teacher authority and norm selection and rejection by non-native speakers, illustrating the growing influence of non-British varieties of English in Europe. The theme of selection and rejection was carried further in Wini Davies's paper, which examined the role of trainee teachers in Germany in norm creation and transmission.

Finally, Peter Hohenhaus's cogently-argued paper on standardisation, language change and linguistic threat in modern German was a reminder that there is nothing new under the sun: current resistance to both planned and natural changes to standard forms, most recently embodied in debates over the new orthography and the influence of English, has recycled old arguments against language change used repeatedly since ancient times.

I found the final panel discussion particularly valuable. It included not only individual contributions and summaries of the proceedings by the panel members (Linn, Sandved, Feitsma, McLelland, Subačius), but also kicked off a lively plenary post-mortem. Clearly the issue of language standardisation brings out a multiplicity of responses, some of which have emotional resonance. To mention only a few of the many issues raised, the discussion spanned questions such as whether it was ever possible to view standardisation with objectivity, or whether it was possible to achieve some sort of consensual model for standardisation and if this could have been a goal of the conference; other topics were the recurring themes in language legitimation, the prerequisite of legitimising minority languages for standardisation, and the desirability of creating a history of European language standardisation. In answer to the ultimate question, raised by Wim Vandenbussche: does standardisation really matter to anyone? I hope so: there are plans to publish a volume on the topic of this conference, to include offerings from the participants, and there are several papers which I would like to revisit in print!

The conference ran smoothly due to the organisational skills of Andrew Linn (Sheffield) and Nicola McLelland (Dublin). As well as assembling an informative line-up of papers, Nicola and Andrew not only arranged a thoroughly enjoyable programme of evening entertainment with the winning combination of jazz trio and college bar, but also saw to comfortable

accommodation and catering in Halifax Hall, with special highlights such as the superb lemon tart for dessert (!), and the culinary delights of the final conference dinner on Saturday night. Thank you to Andrew and Nicola, and ultimately thanks to all involved for making this conference such a success.

Fredericka van der Lubbe, *Wiesbaden*
fvanderlubbe@hotmail.com

Mortimer J. Adler***The Great Ideas: A Lexicon of Western Thought.***

New York: Scribner Classics, 1999.

xxxviii+958 pp. ISBN 0-684-85921-1.

In the bibliography of the history of linguistic sciences we seldom come across the name of Mortimer J. Adler (b. 1902). Needless to say, Adler is more widely known as one of the most distinguished philosophers and pedagogues of contemporary times in the United States, and famous worldwide as editor of the *Great Books of the Western World* (1952, ²1990) and the fifteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1974). He acquired a great reputation as the most serious advocate of the general — liberal arts — education based on reading and discussing the Great Books, insisting that ‘Philosophy is everybody’s business’.

In his last publication of the last millennium, namely *Great Ideas: A Lexicon of Western Thought* (1999), Adler calls our attention to the common ‘delusion’ in the cultural and mental spheres of the twentieth century, established and fostered by our own selves as a result of dramatic advances in all scientific and technological fields:

A cultural delusion is widespread in the twentieth century. The extraordinary progress in science and technology that we have achieved in this century has deluded many of our contemporaries into thinking that similar progress obtains in other fields of mental activity. They unquestioningly think that the twentieth century is superior to its predecessors in all the efforts of the human mind. (1999: ix)

It is no exaggeration to say that the remarkable progress in science — more precisely, the natural sciences — and technology during the last ten decades has made numerous advances possible that once were thought impossible, and, thanks to the progress, myths once unbelievable are now seen as facts. We have witnessed that the sheer imagination of yesterday has become the sober reality of today. Old bed-time stories no longer exist solely in Disney fantasy movies or in science-fiction novels. Since the dawn of the twentieth century many challenging problems to human beings have been settled by the miraculous power of science and technology, and many more will definitely be solved in the present century.

Experiencing the everlasting progress of science and technology, we are very likely to take it for granted that this 'progress' is undoubtedly and absolutely 'good' for people and society. We might come to be preoccupied with the idea of 'the newer, the better' in every field of human activity, not exclusively in science or technology, without so much as considering the value of the past human legacy. Such a 'progressionist blind faith' - paraphrasing Adler's negative interpretation of people's optimistic attitude toward human 'progress' - is a tendency that deludes us into falling victim to distorted thinking.

The so-called 'the-newer-the-better' doctrine may work in relation to sciences examining 'natural phenomena' which are dominated by 'natural laws'. This may result of new 'findings' in the natural sciences that almost always bring about a better understanding and more decisive law-making of the natural world. However, such a theory is not necessarily true in the fields of 'mental activity' with special regard to philosophical, moral and political phenomena.

If we could apply such an evolutionistic notion to the humanities, contemporary fiction, for example, should accordingly be interpreted as 'better' than the epics of Homer, and any of the ideas of today's philosophers should 'excel' those of Plato and Aristotle. As an inevitable result, we would neglect the importance of reading, scrutinizing, criticizing the works of past human intellectual achievements — in Adler's terms 'the Great Books'. Ordinary people, popularly known as laypersons in scientific matters, would think such an idea to be strange, groundless and even stupid.

Nonetheless, many people today, including people educated under liberal arts curricula, may think that they are living in the most advanced society ever in the history of civilization. Adler criticizes this as a false belief fortified by the overwhelming impact of scientific and technological advancement on them:

Some of our contemporaries make this influence consciously and explicitly. They do not hesitate to declare that *the twentieth century has a better, a more advanced and sounder, solution of moral and political problems*, that it is more critically penetrating in its philosophical thought, and that it is superior in its understanding of, and even in its wisdom about, the perennial questions that confront human beings in every generation. (1999: ix; my italics)

In order to grasp Adler's point better, we can paraphrase the italicized part as follows: 'In the intellectual history of humanity, there *has never been* better, more advanced and sounder solutions to moral and political problems than those of the twentieth century'. As far as human mental activities are concerned, this proposition shall be acknowledged without any dispute,

because the 'novelty' is not necessarily the only crucial measurement for their true value.

This 'twentieth-century delusion' in moral and political problems seems also typically to arise in the sphere of the language sciences of the twentieth century. Kurt R. Jankowsky (b. 1928) insists on the importance of access to the cumulative knowledge of the past legacy underlying the 'development' of twentieth-century linguistics:

Linguistic Science is not an invention of the 20th century [...]. No linguist of today can afford to disregard the achievements of the past and still hope for effecting significant advance. He naturally proceeds from what is not his own, and proceeds from a very broad footing of past attainments to gain success in a field of specialization [...]. (Jankowsky 1972: 11)

The central point of this argument is basically identical with that of Adler's assertion in that the 'novelty' is not necessarily the only crucial device used to measure the true value of our intellectual achievements.

It is debatable, to be sure, whether 'linguistics' belongs to the natural sciences, to the humanities or to whatever else. The answers to these questions may possibly be derived according to the interest in language, purpose of its study, object of research of each linguist and even to his/her own 'Weltanschauung'. But, in any case, as Jankowsky asserts, all students of linguistics are well advised that they should obtain the basic knowledge — not to mention the profound and comprehensive erudition — of the history of the linguistic sciences.

As a student of the historiography of the language sciences, I must oppose the surrender to the 'progressionist blind faith' and novelty in the humanities. In order to stand against the uncritical application of the 'the-newer-the-better' doctrine to the study of language, we should pay more attention to the intellectual history of humanity, especially to the history of the universal and invaluable ideas, which are 'basic and indispensable to understanding ourselves, our society, and the world in which we live' (Adler 2000: xxiii).

Adler's *Great Ideas: A Lexicon of Western Thought* contains essays of 102 such great ideas: *Angel, Animal, Aristocracy, Art, Astronomy and Cosmology, Beauty, Being, Cause, Chance, Change, Citizen, Constitution, Courage, Custom and Convention, Definition, Democracy, Desire, Dialectic, Duty, Education, Element, Emotion, Eternity, Evolution, Experience, Family, Fate, Form, God, Good and Evil, Government, Habit, Happiness, History, Honor, Hypothesis, Idea, Immortality, Induction, Infinity, Judgment, Justice, Knowledge, Labor, Language, Law, Liberty, Life and Death, Logic, Love, Man, Mathematics, Matter, Mechanics, Medicine, Memory and Imagination,*

Metaphysics, Mind, Monarchy, Nature, Necessity and Contingency, Oligarchy, One and Many, Opinion, Opposition, Philosophy, Physics, Pleasure and Pain, Poetry, Principle, Progress, Prophecy, Prudence, Punishment, Quality, Quantity, Reasoning, Relation, Religion, Revolution, Rhetoric, Same and Other, Science, Sense, Sign and Symbol, Sin, Slavery, Soul, Space, State, Temperance, Theology, Time, Truth, Tyranny and Despotism, Universal and Particular, Virtue and Vice, War and Peace, Wealth, Will, Wisdom, World.

Each essay explains very concisely as well as precisely the conceptual development of one single idea with reference to other relevant ideas from the dawn of the Western Civilization to the present era with appropriate quotations from various passages of the 'Great Books'. Once we read a chapter on a particular idea, we grasp the stream of consciousness regarding the idea and find the wisdom of the idea unaffected and conditioned by time and space. Then we understand the words of Frederick Copleston, S.J. very precisely:

After all, the human intellect is quite capable of interpreting similar experiences in a similar way, whether it be the intellect of a Greek or an Indian, without its being necessary to suppose that similarity of reaction is an irrefutable proof of borrowing. (Copleston 1993: 11)

Although many of the titles of essays seem irrelevant to students of linguistics and languages, this lexicon of great ideas is useful and indispensable for those students of linguistics and languages to realize that their study is involved in a galaxy of ideas — or, 'topics' to use Adler's term — that 'has been going on across the centuries, in which any unprejudiced and undeluded mind will see the merit of what has been thought and said' (Adler 1999: ix). Indeed this lexicon is just a new collection of essays on the 102 ideas from *Syntopicon*, the second and third volumes of the *Great Books of the Western World* for the topical index to discussions, without any further revision and addition. Therefore, the present book is highly recommended especially to those who do not yet own the whole set of the Great Books and are searching for a reliable and impeccable source of general knowledge about important ideas — whether with relation to the study of the history of the linguistic sciences or not — in the intellectual history of the Western World.

REFERENCES

- Adler, Mortimer J. 1974. *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 15th ed. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.
 ---- 1990. *The Great Books of the Western World*. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica. [1st ed. 1952].

- 1999. *The Great Ideas. A Lexicon of Western Thought* by Mortimer J. Adler. New York: Scribner.
- 2000. *How to Think about the Great Ideas*. Ed. by Max Weismann. Chicago: Open Court.
- Copleston, Frederick Charles, S.J. 1993. *A History of Philosophy*. Vol. I. *Greece and Rome*. New York: Image Books. [1st ed. 1946].
- Jankowsky, Kurt R. 1972. *The Neogrammarians. A Re-Evaluation of Their Place in the Development of Linguistic Science*. The Hague: Mouton.

Hiroyuki Eto, Nagano & Osaka
etoh@georgetown.edu

Caryl Davies

Adfeillion Babel: agweddau ar syniadaeth ieithyddol y ddeunawfed ganrif

Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 2000.

x + 350 pp. ISBN 0- 83-1570-4.

There has been a rapid growth in interest in recent years in the history of early modern scholarship, in part due to the efforts of the Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies in Aberystwyth which has been engaged in a project on the social history of the Welsh language; one immediate outcome of that project has been a very useful volume, *Y Gymraeg yn ei Disgleirdeb. Yr Iaith Gymraeg cyn y Chwyldro Dywydianol*, ed. Geraint H. Jenkins (Aberystwyth, 1997). Another manifestation in this growth of interest, though not from the same stable, is the present volume ('The Ruins of Babel: aspects of eighteenth-century linguistic thought'). It has a more specific target indicated by its sub-title, namely, linguistic thinking in the eighteenth-century, and as it turns out, even more specifically in Wales. The author carefully traces the growth of linguistic thought in Wales in the eighteenth century from its Biblical origins in 'the ruins of Babel' of *Genesis* in the writings of scholars such as John Davies of Mallwyd, Edward Lhuyd, Henry Rowlands, Rowland Jones, and William Owen Pughe. She considers the influence on these writers of other scholars such as Pezron and Leibniz in the century running up to the famous statements of Sir William Jones concerning the relationship between Latin, Greek and Sanskrit.

Chapter 1 (pp. 1-30) deals with the classical and biblical origins of linguistic thought as a preliminary to considering how these ideas were handled in Wales. Chapter 2 (pp. 31-59) considers some of the earliest writers to discuss the Celts, namely Boxhorn and Leibniz, whose work was influential among Welsh thinkers of the eighteenth century. Chapter 3 (pp. 60-92) moves closer to home in discussing two views of the Celts and their language, those of Paul-Yves Pezron and Edward Lhuyd, while Chapter 4 (pp. 93-125) considers their effect on those who worked with Lhuyd and were influenced by Pezron, such as David Parry (who translated Pezron), Moses Williams, and John Morgan. Another aspect of Welsh interest in language is considered in Chapter 5 (pp. 126-52) which concentrates on the work of Theophilus Evans, author of *Drych y Prif Oesoedd*, whose linguistic work focused on Welsh itself, 'the language spoken commonly among the country-folk'; the latter part of the chapter discusses similar kinds of work being done in other parts of Europe by scholars such as Michaelis, Condorcet, le Pelletier, and others. Chapter 6 (pp.

153-69) discusses the attitudes to language displayed in the Welsh grammars and dictionaries of the mid-eighteenth century written by, for example, William Gambold and John Rhydderch, while Chapter 7 (pp. 170- 201) considers the contribution of the Morrises of Anglesey. In Chapter 8 (pp. 202-30) the work of Rowland Jones is discussed. Chapter 9 (pp. 231-66) provides a background survey of the views current in Britain and Europe in the closing decades of the eighteenth century as a preliminary to examining the circle of William Owen Pughe in Chapter 10 (pp. 267-94). The final chapter (pp. 295-320) then turns to the discoveries of Sir William Jones. The work is completed by an 'end-note' (pp. 321-6), full bibliography (pp. 327-44) and index (pp. 345- 50).

As the author states in the introduction, the eighteenth-century has very much been a lost chapter in the history of Welsh scholarship. This book goes a long way towards filling the gap. There is much to think about here, both great and small. The choice of quotation provides fascinating cameos of the characters involved. In more general terms, two points are striking and brought out very well in this book: the close connection between the scholars of Wales (wherever they were working) and the ideas circulating in Britain and Europe generally, and the length of the shadow cast by Pezron.

Paul Russell, *Radley College, Abingdon*

Andreas Gardt

Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland.

Vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert.

Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1999.

x + 409 pp. (De-Gruyter-Studienbuch.).

ISBN 3-11-015788-8 [pb.], 3-11-015789-6 [hb.]. DM 58,00 / 118,00.

Mit diesem Buch legt Andreas Gardt, der wohl unter seinen Heidelberger germanistischen Kollegen produktivste Autor, in einem großen und auch umfassend angelegten Entwurf eine 'Geschichte der theoretischen und anwendungsorientierten Beschäftigung mit Sprache in Deutschland' (1) vor. Es liegt auf der Hand, daß ein solches Kompendium einschlägiges Interesse erwecken wird.

Gardts Bogen ist weit gespannt, expliziert er doch sein Darstellungsziel als 'die Geschichte der Auseinandersetzung mit sprachphilosophischen und allgemein sprachtheoretischen, sprachstrukturellen (grammatischen, lexikalischen etc.), sprachsoziologischen, -politischen, -ästhetischen und -pädagogischen Erscheinungen und Fragen' (1). Um diesem Ziel gerecht zu werden, bedient er sich darstellungstechnisch einer chronologischen Gliederung, indem er über die 'Sprachwissenschaft im Mittelalter' (Kap. 1, 10-44), das '16. Jahrhundert' (Kap. 2, 45-93), das '17. Jahrhundert' (Kap. 3, 94-157), über das umfangreichste Kapitel 4, das '18. Jahrhundert' (158-229) bis hin zum '19. Jahrhundert' (Kap. 5, 230-288) und dem '20. Jahrhundert' (Kap. 6, 289-355) schreitet. Eine Bibliographie der Quellen und der Forschungsliteratur, ein Namen- und ein Sachregister schließen den Band ab.

Um diese immense Menge an Daten überhaupt bearbeiten und darstellen zu können, greift Gardt auf ein Corpus an Texten zurück, das er hier nicht näher kennzeichnet, das sich aber leicht als das unter dem Arbeitstitel 'Sprachtheorie in Barock und Aufklärung. Enzyklopädisches Wörterbuch' angekündigte Publikationsprojekt wenigstens teilweise identifizieren läßt, vgl. Gardt (1996: 87 ff.). An angegebener Stelle finden sich auch mit Teilen der Einleitung nahezu wörtlich übereinstimmende Passagen, was für die Forschungskontinuität spricht.

Gardt ist sich bewußt, daß eine rein chronologische Abfolge dem gestellten Ziel nicht genügen kann. So zerlegt er jeden zeitlich (mehr oder weniger) determinierten Abschnitt in ihm relevant erscheinende *intensional*-thematische Beschreibungsgruppen, die die Relevanz der so von Gardt gesehenen Schwerpunkte für die damalige 'Sprachwissenschaft' beinhalten.

Dieses gleichsam als “methodischer Querschnitt” durch die horizontale temporale Ebene zu verstehende Verfahren ermöglicht ihm zugleich die Selektion des Dargestellten, zwingt ihn auf der anderen Seite jedoch, die zeitliche Gliederung mitunter auf eine reine Formalie hinabzustufen. Zu viele, von ihm richtig gesehene, Zwischenbezüge müssen in einem solchen Zusammenhang berücksichtigt werden. Deutlich wird dies beispielsweise an der Zerstückelung der Behandlung des Leibnizschen sprachtheoretischen Denkens in insgesamt fünf längere Abschnitte, die sich auf drei unterschiedliche Kapitel verteilen, oder anhand der größtenteils wörtlichen Wiederholungen, aus Kap. 1 im Kap. 4, oder aus Kap. 3 im Kap. 6. Gerade hier hätten verweisende Fußnoten mehr bewirkt. Der Autor hat sich aber entschieden, auf Fußnoten generell zu verzichten.

Gardts explizit-implizite “doppelte Methodik” der temporären Gliederung mit parallel selektiver Bereichsinterpretation gibt dem Leser, über das Dargestellte hinaus, auch die Möglichkeit, quasi metatheoretisch über die Darstellungskriterien des Autors zu reflektieren. Das erste Unterkap. ist ‘Frühe Reflexion über das Deutsche’ benannt, beinhaltet eine Beschreibung einer möglichen Entwicklung von Sprachbewußtsein über das Vehikel des Sprachennamens ‘deutsch’ und leitet dann zu einer Behandlung des Otfrid von Weissenburg über. Es mutet den Leser zumindest ungeschickt an, eine “sprachtheoretisch” ausgerichtete Darstellung derart zu beginnen. Das Mittelalter beginnt ja für die *heute* als deutschsprachiger Bereich verstandene Diastrie nicht im Jahre 786, zumal es sich hierbei vornehmlich um einen Volksnamen handelt und zusätzlich Gardt seine Bezugspunkte – mit Ausnahme des Otfrid (ca. 868) – im Jahre 1498 beginnen läßt. Hier zeigt sich zum einen die Orientierung an seinem Hauptarbeitsgebiet, Barock und Frühe Neuzeit, zum anderen eine m.E. nicht saubere Trennung zwischen Sprachgeschichte und Sprachwissenschaftsgeschichte. Im folgenden wird auf sprachtheoretische Grundzüge (25-44) eingegangen. Um diesen Sprung zu vollziehen, bemüht Gardt den “Umweg” über Francis Bacon, um Aristoteles’ *De interpretatione* als Beispiel für eine ‘universalistische Konzeption’ zu zitieren. Diesen sehr kurzen Abschnitt benutzt er vornehmlich zu einer Aufstellung ‘[m]it Blick auf entsprechende Ansätze späterer Jahrhunderte’ (27), um fünf ‘Kennzeichen sprachuniversalistischer Theoriebildung’ (27, auch 204) zusammenzufassen. Allerdings bleibt hierbei die Rolle des *logos* unerwähnt, genau wie der sprachphilosophisch-sprachtheoretische Gegensatz des Aristotelismus zum Platonismus und Platon selbst. Der gerade hier (40) wiederum aufgeführte Leibniz allein stand z.B. in extremer Interpretationsspannung zwischen diesen beiden Polen; von der Stoa, dem expliziten Epikureismus und den vielen anderen sprachphilosophischen Strömungen, die auf das Mittelalter zu verschiedenen Zeiten gestaltend einwirkten, einmal abgesehen. Die völlig anders wirkenden, aber relevanten Einflüsse des Augustinischen Werks bleiben unberücksichtigt. Ebenfalls prägend für “das” Mittelalter ist, daß es spätestens

seit 1178 gleichsam zwei "Aristoteles" gab, die rezipiert wurden, zum einen den durch die hellinistisch-römische Tradition bruchstückhaft erhaltenen Schriftenteil repräsentierten, zum anderen den durch die arabische Tradition über Averroes dem mittelalterlichen Europa wieder zugeführten Schriftenbereich. Die Interpretationstraditionen unterschieden sich erheblich und führten zu starken Kontroversen. Gardt zitiert lediglich kurz aus *De interpretatione*. Dieser Text gehörte zur *logica antiqua*, die neben diesem Text nur die Kategorien sowie Kommentare des Porphyrius und des Boethius umfaßte. Die Wiederentdeckung weiterer Schriften führte zur *logica vetus*. Um 1250 setzte mit William of Shyreswood, Petrus Hispanus und Lambert von Auxerre eine dritte Periode ein, gelegentlich als *logica moderna* bezeichnet. Vor dem Hintergrund, daß dies die textgeschichtliche Situation war und die gesamte "sprachtheoretische Reflexion" des Hoch- und Spätmittelalters sich in diesem Bereich abspielte, in dem die von Gardt später behandelten Modisten und Nominalisten gegenübergestellt werden, ist seine Beschränkung auf eine kleine Zitierung bedauerlich. Ein kurzer Hinweis auf Arens (1984) hätte dem Leser mehr genutzt. – Schwer nachzuvollziehen ist dem Rezensenten, warum der Universalienstreit überhaupt nicht erwähnt wird.

In seiner Darstellung der Modisten muß Gardt zwangsläufig die – nicht unerheblichen – Unterschiede zwischen den einzelnen Autoren unbeachtet lassen und konzentriert sich auf die Darstellung des Systems des Thomas von Erfurt. Hier mag man zu bedenken geben, daß, gerade vor dem mittelalterlichen Hintergrund, abweichend tradierte Meinungen über das Individuelle des Autors hinaus besondere Bedeutung hatten, ansonsten wäre der jeweilige Text nicht schriftlich vervielfältigt worden. In der Folge räumt der Autor zwar ein, daß deutsche Übersetzungen der lateinischen Termini 'sich nur ansatzweise auf neuere [gemeint wohl: moderne] Kategorien abbilden lassen' (30), jedoch verdiente die auf der nächsten Seite erfolgende Gleichsetzung von *vox + significatio = dictio*; 'dictio' = 'Lexem' [usw.: *dictio + consignificatio = 'Wortart'*] genauerer Reflexion, die Gardt in bezug auf die Unterscheidung "referentielle Bedeutung" und "grammatische Bedeutung" nur ansatzweise (30 f.) anführt. Der Nominalismus wird nur kurz im Abschnitt 'Das Nachwirken mittelalterlicher Sprachtheorie in der Neuzeit' (38-40) behandelt, mit der m. E. in ihrer Pauschalität falschen Behauptung, '[d]ie *Grammatica speculativa* der Modisten findet mit der Durchsetzung des Nominalismus ihr Ende' (38).

Ich habe diesem ersten Kapitel insofern größeren Besprechungsraum gewährt, da anhand dieses "vorbereitenden" Abschnitts die methodischen Ausgangspunkte und die daraus erfolgte Ausführung relativ gut beschreibbar sind. Die folgenden Kapitel zeigen, daß sich der Autor in den anschließenden, zeitlichen wie inhaltlichen Bereichen sicherer fühlt. Aber auch hier gilt die oben schon angesprochene "doppelte Methodik".

Im zweiten Kapitel kommen als 'Querschnitte' die Kriterien Aufwertung der Volkssprache, frühe Grammatikschreibung des Deutschen und Martin

Luthers Übersetzungskonzeptionen zur Sprache. Hinzu tritt eine etwas überraschende Erörterung von Elias Hutterers *Öffentlich[em] Aufschreiben* (1602) ebenso wie eine kurze Behandlung der *Clavis scripturae sacrae* des Matthias Flacius Illyricus. Die ersten drei 'Schnitte' lassen sich ohne weiteres auch als selbständige Aufsätze lesen. Ihnen ist das eine Interesse des Autors gemeinsam, die Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland mit der sprachwissenschaftlichen Beschäftigung mit dem Deutschen zu verbinden, wie es (nicht nur) die Kapitelüberschriften deutlich ausdrücken: Aufwertung, Grammatikalisierung, Verdeutschung sind hier die *key terms*. Gardts Entscheidung, hier die Idee einer auch später immer wieder erscheinenden *harmonia linguarum* anhand von Hutter als relativierendes Element hinzuzusetzen, war sicherlich klug gewählt. Doch warum setzt er hier bei Hutter an, wo sich für einen solchen Überblick einflußreichere Autoren – die er teilweise in Nebensätzen erwähnt – angeboten hätten? Oder dient dieser Abschnitt nur dazu, den folgenden über Luthers Übersetzungskonzeption und pragmatischen Sprachbegriff aufzuwerten?

Im dritten Kapitel behandelt Gardt das 17. Jahrhundert. Hier verdichten sich die in den vorigen Kapiteln angedeuteten Tendenzen und führen zum ersten Mal die einzelnen argumentativen Fäden zu einem Zwirn zusammen. Der Autor behandelt die Aspekte einer Zeichentheorie (Kap. 3.1) und die der Universalsprachbemühungen (Kap. 3.5) getrennt, wobei man ersteren Abschnitt als Einleitung zum gesamten Kapitel verstehen könnte. Vor einer anderen Interpretationsfolie ließen sich diese beiden Bereiche näher zusammenrücken. Warum er die Charakterisierung eines 'ahistorischen Sprachbegriffs der Zeit' (102) wählt, hätte genauerer Erläuterung bedurft. Mag es sein, daß nun, nach dem Hochmittelalter, zum ersten Mal wieder die Kluft zwischen Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte deutlich zu Tage tritt?

Auch in anderer Hinsicht spiegelt Gardt die Thematik teilweise: Im Kap. 3.3 ('Grammatikschreibung I') und Kap. 3.4 ('Grammatikschreibung II') finden wir Schottel verzeichnet, dies überkreuzt sich im Ausschnitt mit Kap. 3.2 ('Kulturpatriotismus. Die Sprachgesellschaften des 17. Jahrhunderts') und wiederum Kap. 3.4. Ungeachtet der Überschriften, die hier als "Marksteine" eher irritieren denn orientieren, ließen sich die Kap. 3.2 bis 3.4 besser als eine Einheit lesen. Allerdings tendiert Gardts Auswahl auch hier eher in die Richtung der Betrachtung dessen, was über die deutsche Sprache gesagt, denn was sprachtheoretisch dazu gedacht wurde. Die Zitate aus Schottel lassen sich eher sprachpflegerisch denn sprachtheoretisch interpretieren, und der 'Sprachpatriotismus' zieht sich wie ein Ariadnefaden durch sämtliche Abschnitte. Hier modifiziert nun Gardt seine Rede vom 'ahistorischen Sprachbegriff' (102) zu einer 'ahistorischen Sicht der *Sprachnatur* des Deutschen' (130).

Die Behandlung der Sprachmystik am Beispiel Jakob Böhmes wird als 'metaphysischer Diskurs' betitelt. Es stellt sich die Frage, ob hier nicht

vorsichtiger von einem anti-rationalistischen Konstrukt von (u.a.) christlicher Mystik, Kabbala und Neuplatonismus zu reden wäre – was Gardt (150) auch präzise anführt. Auch verweist er in Kap. 3.5 ('Die Universalsprache als Menschheitstraum') auf die metaphysische Zielrichtung der "rationalen Entwürfe", was (wiederum) im Falle von Leibniz und im expliziten Bezug auf die *lingua rationalis* unlängst von Schepers (2000) detailliert herausgearbeitet wurde.

Auf den ersten Blick scheint das 4. Kapitel über das 18. Jahrhundert dasjenige zu sein, in dem sich die Gardtsche Konzeption in besonderem Maße konzentriert: Von einem umfangreichen Abschnitt über 'Rhetorik und Theorie der Kommunikationskultur' ausgehend betrachtet er anhand von Gottsched, Aichinger und Adelung die 'Grammatik des Deutschen', nimmt den Aspekt der rationalistischen Sprachreflexion anlässlich Leibniz wieder auf, um dann zu 'Allgemeine[r] Grammatik' überzugehen. In diesem Kapitel 4.4 durchbricht er die chronologische Anordnung radikal, indem er bei Scaliger – also im 16. Jahrhundert – ansetzt, zusätzlich Teile aus dem Kapitel 'Sprachwissenschaft im Mittelalter' dubliert, um über Sanctius, Campanella und Port-Royal mit Christoph Helwig und Johann Werner Meiner zu beschließen; das Werk des letzteren nimmt dann noch einen besonderen Abschnitt ein. Abschließend findet sich eine umfassende Darstellung über 'Sprachursprung und Sprachgeschichte'. Ob man diese beiden Topoi wie hier in dieser Form synthetisiert, oder doch vielleicht besser analytisch trennt, ist eine methodische Entscheidung. Gardts Entscheidung für eine synthetisierende Darstellung ist naheliegend. Etwas zu kurz kommen vielleicht die bis in das frühe Mittelalter zurückreichenden Traditionsstränge, deren sich der aufkommende Sprachnationalismus des 18. Jahrhunderts in diesem Zusammenhang – mit wohlgermerkt vielfach linguistikfremden Motiven – bedient. (Vgl. ausführlicher hierzu Dutz & Kaczmarek (2000).)

In auffälliger Weise tritt in Gardts Darstellungen immer wieder Leibniz auf, in diesem Kapitel nun sogar mit einem eigenen Unterkapitel 'Rationalistische Sprachreflexion in der Aufklärung: Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz'. Da Gardt – so weit ich es überblicken konnte – 'Sprachreflexion' als terminus technicus nicht näher bestimmt und auch unmittelbar mit 'Sprachdenken' (193) zu parallelisieren scheint, wäre hier Anlaß, ansatzweise über die im Titel aufgeführte Korrelation nachzudenken. Leibniz, von Hause aus Jurist, entwickelte unter anderem im Zusammenhang seiner irenischen wie naturwissenschaftlichen Interessen frühzeitig Pläne zur Errichtung einer "rationalen" Enzyklopädie des Wissens. Ausgangspunkt bei ihm war, nachdem er in einer jugendlichen Phase noch durch Lullistische Überlegungen beeinflusst war, die Entwicklung einer *Logik* der Aussagen über Sachverhalte. Zwangsläufig mußte er sich in diesem Rahmen auch mit den natürlichen Sprachen und den damals darüber geltenden Meinungen auseinandersetzen. Leibniz' Ziel war aber vornehmlich die Schaffung einer *lingua rationalis*, die

wie ein logischer Kalkül handhabbar wäre. In seinem späteren Schaffen wurde Leibniz immer deutlicher, daß durch Analyse natürlicher Sprache sein Ziel nicht erreichbar war, wenn nicht neben die logische Analyse auch die metaphysische Begründung – sein Entwurf der ‘Monadologie’ – träte. Nun wurde in der Sekundärliteratur vornehmlich auf Leibniz’ frühe Schaffenszeit zurückgegriffen, da seine philosophisch-sprachtheoretischen Äußerungen – teils in Briefwechseln, teils in unveröffentlichten Entwürfen – kaum oder nur in – allerdings umfangreichen – Exzerpten zugänglich waren. Erst seit 1999 liegt eine kritische und erstmals vollständige Edition seiner Schriften von 1677 bis zum Jahre 1690 vor (Leibniz 1999), in der der sprachlogische Teil 1343 von insgesamt 2947 Seiten umfaßt. – Die *Unvorgreiflichen Gedancken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der Teutschen Sprache* (verfaßt zwischen 1697 und 1709, postum 1717 veröffentlicht) hingegen, die Gardt in den Kontext des Kapitels einbettet und ausführlich zitiert, sind eher eine programmatische Gelegenheitsschrift mit lexikographischen und sprachkritischen Schwerpunkten, die ihre scheinbare Bedeutung erst durch die Rezeption im Sprachnationalismus des 19. Jahrhunderts erhielt. Zur Darstellung einer ‘rationalistischen Sprachreflexion’ erscheint mir dieser Text denkbar ungeeignet.

Das fünfte Kapitel (‘19. Jahrhundert’, 230-288) setzt das vorhergegangene kontinuierlich fort und arbeitet, dem Titel zum Trotz, mit Rückgriffen bis hin zu Francis Bacon, John Locke und – wiederum Leibniz. Zugleich mündet der Abschnitt ‘Sprache und Denken: Wilhelm von Humboldt’ in die Behandlung von Autoren des 20. Jahrhunderts, u.a. Jost Trier und Leo Weisgerber. Ein im März 1999 stattgefundenes Symposium anlässlich des 100. Geburtstages von Weisgerber zeigte in seinen Ergebnissen, daß die Fortführung Humboldtscher Gedanken bei Weisgerber (und teilweise auch Trier) vornehmlich als legitimativ-selektiv zu bezeichnen wäre. Zur Verankerung des frühen Weisgerber in der Sprachsoziologie Alfred Vierkandts vgl. man den zusammenfassenden Bericht von Rüter (2000) mit weiterführenden Hinweisen.

Im folgenden führt dieser Abschnitt über die Sprachreflexion in der Romantik (Schlegel, Fichte, Novalis), das *Deutsche Wörterbuch* der Brüder Grimm (mit einem Rückgriff auf die lexikographische Tradition bis in das 15. Jahrhundert) und die historisch-vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft bis zur Behandlung der Junggrammatiker.

In der Konzeption des Gardtschen Buches nimmt das abschließende Kapitel 6 (‘20. Jahrhundert’, 289-355) eine vergleichbare Sonderstellung ein wie das erste Kapitel über das Mittelalter. Auch hier verfährt der Autor streng, diesmal aber auch explizit, selektiv. Insgesamt behandelt er vier Themen, Ferdinand de Saussures *Cours* (und Schulen des Strukturalismus), den Sprachnationalismus (dieser Abschnitt gleicht, mit leichten Modifikationen, Gardt 2000), die Analytische Sprachphilosophie (Ludwig Wittgenstein) und schließlich die Pragmatik (Peirce, Morris, Bühler, Traditionen der Rhetorik,

wiederum Wittgenstein, Austin, Searle und Coseriu). Dazwischen befindet sich eine Anmerkung zu Noam Chomskys *Generativer Grammatik*.

In der Behandlung Saussures sind aus historiographischer Sicht Gardts einleitende Bemerkungen (287-290) hervorzuheben: "Den" *Cours* gibt es eigentlich nicht, die Kanonisierung des von Saussure nicht autorisierten Textes ist 'ein bemerkenswertes Beispiel für die Eigendynamik von Rezeptionsverläufen' (290). Ein Saussure-Forschern selbstverständliches Faktum, das aber verdient, häufiger auch allgemein, wie in derartigen Überblicksdarstellungen, hervorgehoben zu werden. – Die eingeschobene Anmerkung zu Chomsky wird meines Erachtens dem Rahmen der vorliegenden Studie nicht gerecht. Gardt betrachtet Mißdeutungen älterer Autoren (Lullus, Port-Royal, Descartes, Leibniz, auch Thomas von Erfurt) durch Chomsky – oder doch vielleicht Ergebnisse von "Rezeptionsverläufen"? Zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in *Deutschland* wäre hier eher eine Beschreibung der Rezeption und Weiterbearbeitung von Chomskys Studien am Platze.

Der Band beschließt mit einer in Quellen und Forschungsliteratur geteilten Bibliographie, einem Namen- und einem Sachregister. Beide Teile der Bibliographie sind nützlich und bieten einen breiten Überblick. In bezug auf das Quellenverzeichnis irritiert Gardts einleitende Bemerkung: Es ist 'nicht als in jeder Hinsicht repräsentativ für die Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft zu verstehen. Aufgeführt wurden nicht alle im Text erwähnten Quellen, sondern mit wenigen Ausnahmen lediglich diejenigen, aus denen zitiert wurde' (9). In welcher Hinsicht ist das Verzeichnis repräsentativ, und in welcher nicht? *Wie* und warum bestimmen sich die Ausnahmen? Gardt folgt der germanistischen Unsitte, in den Bibliographien nur den Verlagsort und nicht den Verleger anzugeben. Warum aber kürzt er in der Forschungsliteratur auch noch die Vornamen der Autoren ab? – Die nicht wenigen Schreibfehler (auch bei Namen) sind generell nicht sinnentstellend.

Die beiden Register sind bei der Lektüre des Werks eine große Hilfe, da man mit ihnen dem Netzwerk der Gardtschen Argumentationsschwerpunkte gut folgen kann. Die thematische Subordination unter Hauptlemmata ist ebenfalls benutzerfreundlich. Naheliegender ist, daß die Einträge in beiden Registern nicht nur auf Schwerpunkte der Behandlung verweisen, sondern auch nicht selten auf Aufzählungen oder Erwähnungen in Nebensätzen.

Bislang bin ich auf Gardts einleitende Bemerkungen wenig eingegangen und möchte dies in Zusammenhang mit einer abschließenden Betrachtung tun. Das Vorliegen einer neueren *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland. Vom Mittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* macht neugierig und weckt das Interesse der Historiographen der Linguistik. Zudem reiht der Autor sich ein in die ehrenvolle Liste von Vorgängern, zum Beispiel Theodor Benfey's (1809-1881) *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und orientalischen Philologie in Deutschland seit dem Anfange des 19. Jahrhunderts mit einem Rückblick auf die früheren Zeiten* von 1869 oder Hans Arens' *Sprachwissenschaft. Der Gang*

ihrer Entwicklung von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart (1955, 21969). Die relativ ähnliche Titelformulierung dieser drei Kompendien ist auffallend. Hinzu tritt u.a. Robert H. Robins' *A Short History of Linguistics* (1967 u.ö.). Verfolgen ihre Autoren aber auch die gleichen Ziele, genauso wie die auch anderslautenden, in jüngster Zeit erschienenen Übersichten zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft (wie die *Concise History of the Language Sciences*, ed. E. F. K. Koerner, R. E. Asher 1995, das *Lexicon Grammaticorum*, ed. H. Stammerjohann 1996 oder das *Corpus représentatif des grammaires et des traditions linguistiques*, éd. B. Colombat 1998 & 2000)? Ohne Zweifel scheinen zumindest Verlagslektoren große Gesamtdarstellungen im Gegensatz zu detaillierten Spezialstudien neuerdings zu präferieren.

Gardts Studie hinterläßt einen zwiespaltigen Eindruck. Man kann den meisten Abschnitten seines Buchs die sorgfältig recherchierte und konzise Darstellung nicht absprechen. Viele historiographische Aspekte bringt er genau auf den gewünschten "Punkt", und die Technik des häufigen Querverweises erweist sich, wenn man die Darstellung als Ganzes lesen will, auch als produktiv. Die zeitweiligen Wiederholungen zeugen zwar davon, daß die Textteile ursprünglich wohl für einen anderen Zweck verfaßt sein mögen und hier neu arrangiert sind, nun liegen sie aber dem Leser leicht zugänglich in einem Kompendium vor. Sie ermöglichen zudem, durch die Lektüre hinweg auch Gardts Forschungs- und Darstellungsinteresse nachzuvollziehen oder dort, wo es nicht expliziert wurde, zu rekonstruieren. Es ist natürlich unumgänglich, in einem so breit gefächerten Bereich auch zu selektieren – wengleich Gardt einleitend (1-4) einen immensen Katalog von Parametern, die seine Studie strukturierten, aufführt. Er verweist auch zu Recht auf die große Menge an Detailstudien, die nach der Lektüre zur Vertiefung des eigenen Wissens aufgesucht werden könnten.

Auf der anderen Seite äußert sich Gardt äußerst sparsam über die Zielsetzung seiner Studie. Gegenstand ist die 'Geschichte der theoretischen und anwendungsorientierten Beschäftigung mit Sprache in Deutschland' (1), diese soll in der Darstellung 'zusammenfassend als *Sprachwissenschaft* bezeichnet werden' (ibid.). "Sprachwissenschaft" impliziert hier, Gardt zufolge, nicht die Geschichte einer einzelnen Philologie – er nennt die Germanistik – im Sinne der Beschreibung der Geschichte einer *Fachwissenschaft*. Folglich definiert er den ihm gegebenen Bereich von "Sprachwissenschaft" mittels eines Themenkatalogs und einer Textsortenbeschreibung, ohne voreilig eine Deckung beider Aufzählungen behaupten zu wollen. Damit ist der Untersuchungsbereich intensional bestimmt; zur Zielsetzung finde ich nur zwei Bemerkungen, eine ausführliche:

sprachwissenschaftliche Gegenstände [sind] in aller Regel im Schnittpunkt unterschiedlicher Diskurse angesiedelt [...]. Die Komplexität eines historischen sprachwissenschaftlichen Gegenstandes

tritt aber erst in dem Maße zutage, in dem er in den Kontext all derjenigen wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen, Autoren, Textsorten etc. gestellt wird, in deren Diskurs er konstituiert und erörtert wird. Eine Verbindung historischer und systematischer Gliederungsprinzipien kann daher wenigstens in Ansätzen versuchen, Überschneidungen und Verflechtungen der skizzierten Art aufzuzeigen (7-8)

und eine kürzere:

Die Darstellung soll dadurch wenigstens in Ansätzen auch als ein *Reader* zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland dienen können (4).

Ohne Zweifel führt die von mir oben schon angesprochene "doppelte Methodik" von zeitlicher Gliederung und thematisch-systematischer Betrachtung aus der Krux der Vollständigkeit der Darstellung heraus. Gardt kann Schwerpunkte setzen und sie miteinander verbinden. Nur muß in diesem Zusammenhang Kritik bei der Umsetzung geübt werden. Die "Querschnitte" sind selektiv, die jeweilige Selektion wird aber für einen jeweiligen zeitlichen Abschnitt nicht diskutiert. Bei weitem gelingt es nicht, den Katalog von Themenbeschreibungen und Textsorten abzuarbeiten. Dies überrascht auch nicht – doch eine differenziertere Reflexion in der Einleitung hätte den Leser besser vorbereitet. Liest man die Studie kontinuierlich, so fällt auf, daß Gardt nicht sauber trennt zwischen den sprachwissenschaftlichen Beschäftigungen in Deutschland und der Behandlung vornehmlich des Deutschen (selten anderer [National-]Sprachen) innerhalb seiner Betrachtungsfeldes. Abschnitte wie die 'Frühe Reflexion über das Deutsche' stehen in befremdlichen Gegensatz zur darauf folgenden Betrachtung der sprachtheoretischen Grundzüge. Aber auch in anderen Abschnitten rückt die Behandlung der deutschen Sprache (Nationalsprache, Sprachpatriotismus, Lexikographie, Grammatikschreibung) vor die der Betrachtung von Sprache in Deutschland – was der Titel ja eigentlich verspricht. Es entsteht der Eindruck, als gäbe es – wohlgemerkt jenseits einer Fachgeschichte – keine wissenschaftliche Beschäftigung mit anderen Sprachen in Deutschland. Natürlich erwähnt Gardt das Sanskrit und die indoeuropäische Sprachenfamilie – doch wo bleiben die schon im 17. Jahrhundert einsetzenden Schilderungen und Grammatikschreibungen nicht-europäischer Sprachen? Die ausführliche Behandlung der Sprachpflege und Sprachkritik hätte eine – ganz im Sinne des Autors – überschneidende und verflechtende Fortsetzung z.B. in Richtung auf Mauthner und Nietzsche verdient. Sprachpädagogik fremder Sprachen wird lediglich in bezug auf die *linguae sacrae* und im Bereich des 16. Jahrhunderts, mit Deutsch als Zielsprache, behandelt, die reichhaltige Literatur der Sprachpädagogik zum Englischen und Französischen in Deutschland (!) im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert

bleibt unerwähnt. Der wichtige Einfluß der französischen Sprachphilosophie auf die deutsche findet nur ansatzweise in bezug auf Gottsched Erwähnung, der Einfluß der französischen *idéologues* um Destutt auf u.a. Humboldt und Herder wäre im Kapitel 'Sprache und Denken' zu erwarten gewesen, leider habe ich keinen Hinweis finden können. Statt dessen wird Leibniz' sicherlich indirekt vorhandener Einfluß auf das Humboldtsche Denken überbetont, und B. Schlieben-Lange, die sich um die Aufarbeitung der Rezeption der idéologischen Schule sehr verdient gemacht hat, wird lediglich im Bereich der Sprachpragmatik erwähnt. – Es geht aber nun nicht darum, Gardt irgendwelche Lücken vorzuwerfen. Vielmehr sollen diese Beispiele zeigen, daß über die salvatorischen Bemerkungen in der Einleitung hinausgehend viel engere (damit auch präzisere) Grenzen gezogen werden, als es die intentionalen Kataloge erwarten lassen.

Etwas irritierend ist unter methodologischem Gesichtspunkt, daß Gardt sich mehrfach Formulierungen wie 'Réflexionen über Sprache', 'Denken über Sprache' bedient, ohne diese Begrifflichkeit zu präzisieren. Daß damit kein kontemplatives Räsionieren gemeint ist, zeigt sich deutlich in der Behandlung Jakob Böhmes. Man mag einwenden, daß in jeder Darstellung irgendwann eine Grenze der terminologischen Definiiertheit gezogen werden muß. Die häufige Verwendung der Termini oszilliert jedoch parallel zur Betonung von Sprachwissenschaft als Gegenstand, so daß sich diese Frage schlicht aufdrängt.

Abschließend sollen zwei Bemerkungen festgehalten werden: An der Qualität der Gardtschen Arbeit kann kein grundsätzlicher Zweifel geäußert werden. Man mag es sogar als einen Vorteil empfinden, wenn eine solche Studie zu entsprechenden Nachfragen anregt. In diesem Sinne, und auch im Sinne der teilweise konzisen Materialsammlung, ist das Buch nur zu begrüßen. Auf der anderen Seite kann nicht überzeugen, daß dieses Buch als "Reader" für Studenten verwendet werden könne (wie es z.B. N. McLelland (2001) in ihrer Rezension generell vermutet). Dazu sind die Äußerungen Gardts zu sehr von seinem (manchmal nur implizit ermittelbaren) Forschungsinteresse geprägt. Im Gegensatz zu Arens, der noch 1955 optimistisch-positivistisch von einer 'Sichtbarmachung der Grundauffassung von der Sprache' sprechen konnte, bringt Gardt seine eigenen Bewertungen explizit ein. Im gleichen Maße treten abweichende Interpretationen aber auch in den Hintergrund – vielleicht auch eine Form der *analogia fidei* wie bei Flacius?

In einem anderen Sinne könnte man Gardts Buch als eine Sammlung seiner eigenen Studien zur Historiographie der Linguistik zwischen dem 16. und 19. Jahrhundert auffassen und hielte ein informatives Kompendium in den Händen. Nur wäre der Autor dann besser beraten gewesen, die etwas unharmonisch beigefügten Kapitel über Sprachwissenschaft im Mittelalter und über das 20. Jahrhundert beiseite zu lassen. Das erste Kapitel kann nicht überzeugen, da es seinem betitelten Anspruch nicht gerecht wird, das letzte Kapitel beinhaltet zu offensichtlich separate Studien. Aspekte beider Kapitel

hätten sich ohne Probleme und bei vielleicht besserer Lesbarkeit in die anderen Abschnitte eingliedern lassen.

Trotz dieses etwas "gespaltenen" Eindrucks ist Gardts *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland* ein Buch, dem man viele Leser wünschen mag – und genauso viele reflektierende, den Gardtschen Ansatz ggf. fortführende oder kommentierende Studien.

REFERENCES

- Arens, Hans 1984. *Aristotle's Theory of Language and its Tradition. Texts from 500 to 1750. Selection, Translation and Commentary*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Dutz, Klaus D. & Ludger Kaczmarek 2000. Vorstellungen über den Ursprung von Sprachen im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert. In: Sylvain Auroux [et al.] (eds.), *History of the Language Sciences*. Vol. 1. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1071-1081.
- Gardt, Andreas 1996. »Sprachtheorie in Barock und Aufklärung. Enzyklopädisches Wörterbuch«. Zum Stand eines lexikographischen Projekts. In: Klaus D. Dutz & Hans-J. Niederehe (eds), *Theorie und Rekonstruktion. Trierer Studien zur Linguistik*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 87-100.
- Gardt, Andreas 2000. Sprachnationalismus zwischen 1850 und 1945. In: Gardt (ed.), *Nation und Sprache. Die Diskussion ihres Verhältnisses in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 247-271.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm 1999. *Philosophische Schriften*. Ed. by d. Leibniz-Forschungsstelle der Universität Münster. Fourth volume. 1677-June 1690. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- McLelland, Nicola (2001). Tausend Jahre deutsche Sprachreflexion, Sprachphilosophie und Sprachwissenschaft. [Review of the present book]. In: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*. 11,1 (2001).
- Rüter, Angelika 2000. Re-Interpretation der Interpretation. Ein Bericht. In: Klaus D. Dutz (ed.), *Interpretation und Re-Interpretation. Aus Anlaß des 100. Geburtstages von Johann Leo Weisgerber (1899-1985)*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 11-20.
- Schepers, Heinrich 2000. Die Polaritäten des Einen und des Vielen im Begriff der Monade. In: Antonio Lamarra & Roberto Palaia (eds), *Unità e molteplicità nel pensiero filosofico e scientifico di Leibniz*. Firenze: Olschki, 171-184.

Klaus D. Dutz, Münster
dutz.nodus@t-online.de

Engler, Balz, and Renate Haas (eds.)

European English Studies:

Contributions towards the History of a Discipline

s.l.: Published for The European Society for the Study of English by The English Association, 2000.

ii + 388 pp. ISBN 0 900232 23. [Available from the ESSE treasurer, www.mshs.univ.poitiers.fr/esse/esse.htm]

In order to be expressed, ideas need institutions in space and time which define and elaborate them through research, and which spread them through teaching. As a rule these are universities. Looking at those in Europe, we find that all of them have departments for English Studies which deal with the language, the various literatures and the general culture. Their programmes can be read as indicative of what they have in common in most of the European countries and of where they differ. Under the auspices of ESSE (European Society for the Study of English) the two editors undertook to collect national reports on the history and the present state of English Studies on the Continent. We find (in this order) surveys on Portugal, Spain, Italy; France, the Netherlands; Norway, Denmark; Austria, Poland, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia; Serbia, Romania, and Bulgaria. That Belgium, Sweden, and Finland are missing is probably accidental. However, it creates some regrettable gaps (concerning Belgium with its complex linguistic constitution, and Finland whose particular language situation might have provided some special facets). The introduction and the appended essay on 'Englishness and English Studies' by the one (Swiss) editor make up for the missing Swiss survey. At the same time it gives the equally missing British survey some kind of justification, because here English Studies have their own conditions since they pertain to the national tongue, whereas in all other cases they pertain to a foreign one. The, likewise appended, essay on English Studies in Germany after the 1848 revolution by the other (German) editor is certainly meant to replace the German survey. It does so by taking up a little discussed historiographical topic, showing that the German outlook into the world is of no small interest for its own political development. However, I realise that there are relevant studies outside the present book (e.g. Haenicke 1979, Finkenstaedt 1983). Finally, a personal report on the birth and growth of ESSE is given and 'Parameters and Patterns of Development' are tentatively distilled out of the foregoing essays. (For a paper on Vilém Fried, see below.) The two editors certainly deserve our thanks for putting this vast material together.

The rise of English Studies on the Continent means that the language, literature, and culture of its most north-westerly (isolated) state grew into the dominant topic of philological studies here. This process is embedded within wider political developments which are different depending on the nations involved (between Britain and Portugal, e.g., good, but between Britain and Spain bad, between Britain and Germany before World War I good, but afterwards bad, etc.). These developments also led to English becoming the world language inside and outside Europe, thus giving English Studies a somewhat universal aspect. Notwithstanding some preceding initiatives, the main period for all these activities is the 19th century when, after the overthrow of the *ancien régime* and of Napoleon, the Continental universities were reshaped, and the 20th century when, after World War I, newly founded states organized their national university systems. For those states which came under Soviet influence after 1945, this means that 1989 is another important *caesura* for and sometimes the beginning of a national university life.

Besides literary criticism, the main academic framework in which the rise of English Studies took place was the development of Indo-European, i.e. comparative, philology. Many English departments started as branches of seminars of Germanic Philology. In many European countries this created a rivalry between German and English as preferred foreign languages. It was finally settled by the well-known political circumstances. The predominance of French as the diplomatic and cultural *lingua franca* in Europe waned after World War I and, indirectly, supported the rise of English.

One of the recurring statements in the surveys is that the need to train English teachers for secondary schools stimulated the growth of English Studies more than anything else, in particular more than the spread of ideas. This was so in the twenties, in the fifties and again in the seventies of the twentieth century. The present-day interests are mirrored by the whole undertaking itself. British Council-maintained English lecturers and teachers have apparently been of great influence - a fact which well deserves a study of its own. But in spite of the urgency of practical needs, there are hardly any deliberations on how foreign (English) language teachers should be trained professionally at universities. On the contrary, sometimes the introduction of courses relevant for teacher training is looked upon as a threat to the seriousness of academic studies. Though dependent on a wide-spread and advanced knowledge of the language, the representatives of English Studies seem to have been generally reluctant to train their own successors, and obviously they still are. To this extent, the book is quite honest.

A volume consisting of twenty contributions by almost as many authors has its obvious problems. They need no comment. The editors certainly did their best to smoothe them out. In many papers, questions of academic administration (course design, grades, examinations, professorships, etc.) are in the foreground. Of course, they dominate the daily worries of academics much

more than they should, and to this extent the book is again honest. But in as many papers this makes the development of cultural ideas almost disappear in the background, which is the more regrettable because, in view of the present-day position of English in the world, this development is of much wider importance than that of a national culture. After reading this book, I am not sure whether the representatives of English Studies have actually realised the privileged position which they are in. Noteworthy exceptions to this are the summarizing and commenting contributions by the two editors and the papers on Poland, Romania, France, and Italy.

As an appendix to the main body of the book, we find an essay on the life and work of Vilém Fried, the Czech-born Jewish scholar who was forced to emigrate twice from his homeland, taught in Britain and finally in Germany, where he had to fight unduly for his citizenship. He came from the Prague linguistic circle which he propagated in Europe when there was not one professor of English left in (then) Czechoslovakia. The paper shows what a person-orientated history of Cultural Studies in Europe could achieve. These Studies abound with great names: Karl Brunner, Otto Jespersen, Emile Legouis, Leon Levitchi, Karl Luick, Vilém Mathesius, Mario Praz, Margret Schlauch, Eduard Sievers, Johan Storm, Henry Sweet, Wilhelm Viëtor, and many others. A systematic collection of biographical studies on them could valuably complement these 'contributions to the history of a discipline'. Perhaps ESSE can initiate another project for its own sake?

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

Radchenko, O. A.

Language and Creation of World:

Linguistic Philosophy of Neohumboldtianism

Moscow: Metatext, 1997.

538 pp. ISBN 5-89672-003-3. [2 volumes, published in Russian]

Sometimes you do catch yourself thinking that diversity of languages in the world is very inconvenient. At least sometimes you wish you knew more than just a necessary set of English, German and French to be aware of new worthy worldwide additions to your area of study. One such contribution to the field of history and philosophy of language is a book by the Russian linguist and historian, Oleg Radchenko, *Language and Creation of World: Linguistic Philosophy of Neohumboldtianism*, published in Moscow in 1997. It is definitely worth studying one more language to become acquainted with this book because it fills a gap, apparent not only in Russian, but in western linguistics in general. Trying to summarise the results of 20th-century linguistic studies, the author looks into the less frequently discussed but no less important topic: the development of pre- and postwar German philosophy of language. In particular, the author is interested in a trend that emerged in Germany in the 1920s and was aimed at reviving interest in W. von Humboldt's spiritual heritage along with developing its own principles of describing and explaining language phenomena.

Why has the book attracted our attention? Prior to the book's appearance, this important period of German linguistic history had never received full coverage in modern literature. Maybe such lack of interest was still an echo of World War II and demonstrated an instinctive denial to look into cultural aspects of German life and science of the period (it might be especially true with regard to Russia's war tragedy) - or the reason might just be the absence of a scholar who could meet the challenge of interweaving historical, linguistic and philosophical concepts into a detailed narrative body of a book responding to the needs of those who feel a certain lack of data in this field. Both reasons might be true, but there is no need to mention them any more - here is the book that offers sufficient variety, depth and novelty in describing the topic.

And the topic itself seems to be quite complicated and challenging to any linguist or philosopher. The term *Neuhumboldtianismus* is quite new. The author coined it to denote the above mentioned trend. This term means that the primary goal of its founders was to re-attract attention to Humboldt's idea of

language as a unique world creation power for this language community - or, in the author's words, to begin the Renaissance of Humboldt's ideas. *Neuhumboldtianismus* believed that the best way to pursue this goal would be to develop a new description of the German language; a description that would be based not only on visible words and rules, but on some characteristic features of the process of communities creating a picture of the world via language means. Such a (for that period) non-standard approach stimulated new research in philosophy of language, linguistic historiography, history and theory of linguistic terminology, and in other related fields. More than that, the author claims this trend to shape functional grammar as a separate descriptive study not only in Russian and German linguistics, but also in eastern linguistics, especially that of Japan and South Korea.

Following this brief introduction, the book is logically separated into three large parts, each consisting of a few chapters. It's hard to resist the temptation to retell the whole book, but the limited space in a short review forces us to let the reader navigate this sea of knowledge himself. On the other hand, no sailor can go without a compass; that is why we still need to give a brief indication of the contents.

The first part of the book deals with pure history. Here the author shows the beginning of the trend and concentrates the reader's attention on the life and work of Johann Leo Weisgerber (1899-1984), the founder of *Neuhumboldtianismus*. His biography serves as a background for outlining the general situation in German linguistics. This provides a necessary reason for turning the discussion into a sequence of interrelated minor topics. The second part of the book is devoted to discussion of these topics.

First comes philosophy of language. The author aims at restoring the neohumboldtian process of developing an integrated concept of a language as a unique cognitive medium, a language community's power of world creation. This concept, as the author puts it, defines *Neuhumboldtianismus* as a certain way of interpreting Humboldt's ideas. The whole system of subjects took part in shaping this concept. The subjects include language as world intermediary, language fragments of world cognition (*Zugriffe*), acts of autonomous language creativity (*Ausgriffe*), the problem of expressing the world through a word (*Worten der Welt*), three types of language philosophy, and, at last, language world creation (*sprachliche Weltgestaltung*). Then the author turns to neohumboldtian understanding of language psychology. In this respect he shows how they understood the problem of language reality reflection in the common mind and what they considered to be a part of language in the everyday life of a community. Such practical issues as the phenomenon of child language, sign language, and other diverse cases of language performance are also included in the frames of discussion. Finally, in the third part of the book the author focuses on the neohumboldtian sociology of language. The author shows that Weisgerber differentiated this field of science from linguistic

sociology. In fact, Weisgerber thought it to be wider and to include not only the theory of structuring human language behaviour, but also such global issues as language imperialism, linguistic minorities, and the individual right to speak a mother tongue.

Why does the book have such a narrative structure? The author stresses it as most important. It is this logical construction – from philosophy and psychology of language to sociology of language – that helps to build an integrated picture of the whole complex neohumboldtian linguistic theory. Making such a picture from a mosaic of different data was the prime goal of the author, and the goal was achieved.

However, the author's own voice was not by any means lost in the bulky volumes of somebody else's theories. The writer tries to find a balance between universal and ethnic in the neohumboldtian concept of language and actually succeeds in that. He suggests and defines three categories, which seem to be more philosophical than linguistic, but which, he says, are essential in any language system description: *universalialia*, *unicalia*, and *idiouniversalialia*.

The first category, *universalialia*, expresses the philosophical nature of the neohumboldtian concept of language and implies that the concept contains such universal notions as laws of native language and language community, all attributes of language as the main means of symbolic cognition for the given language community; it also compresses all the forms of non-linguistic thought, i.e., art, mathematics, or music, which are not very much influenced by a language.

Unicalia can be rarely seen in the frames of neohumboldtian theory, the author tells us. The reason is that even each individual act of speech can not be considered quite unique; it reflects and brings into reality the whole language potential of a given language community. This category can rather be found in those categorial resources of a language, which make it different from other languages; but again, these resources are not very large for the reason that all languages possess common typological characteristics.

The most interesting category, the category, which, in the author's opinion, can be found on the border between universal and typical, is *idiouniversalialia*. The category is of striking importance, because its existence gives readers the right to treat language performance as something in-between objective and subjective. This implies that on the one hand any Indo-European language has syntactic and word building models, lexical fields and notional spheres for parts of speech, but on the other hand they are expressed in a unique way in every language. Forms of language reality take a certain shape in every community, depending on its cultural tradition. The fact of a native language discovery in the process of forming a language community can also be named among *idiouniversalialia*. In general the author concludes that the notion of a native language in neohumboldtian theory is nothing other than a philosophical category of *idiouniversalialia* if understood as a global process of

mental re-creation of the world by the unique means of a language. This conclusion is not at all surprising after the author's thorough analysis of facts and data along with powerful argumentation; however, it provides a fair opportunity for discussion and criticism.

In general, though it may seem strange, the complexity of the discussed topics does not prevent the book being very well crafted and quite readable. The text is not at all oversimplified in describing any of the theoretical or philosophical issues, but the author manages to stay clear enough to be accessible to the targeted audience from students of philology to mature scholars, who no doubt are familiar with the subject. And what's more pleasing, the author manages to remain free from any political bias, which might be expected in describing the situation in linguistic studies in a country with political and social life controlled by Nazis (or National Socialists). Weisgerber's ideas were so heavily criticised and speculated about after World War II, not only in Russia, but also in Germany itself, that it was definitely hard to find out what was going on behind the political scene. But the author is primarily a historian and his problematic is linguistics and philosophy - so the reader will find facts and conclusions only; no charges, no speculations. The book reflects a vast amount of research, both in published documents and in archives, personal files of the war period, personal letters, and reminiscences of friends and relatives. This hard work results in many rare and previously unpublished photographs adding flavour to detailed historical narrative. And as any real work of science and art, this book opens plenty of perspectives for its readers, encouraging them to use neohumboldtian ideas in further linguistic, historical and philosophical research, or in practical descriptive study of the German language.

Natalia Sciarini-Guryanova, *Guilford CT, USA*
gnv_1999@yahoo.com

Vistdal, Oskar

Georg Sauerwein – europear og døl.

Bergen: Norsk Bokreidingslag, 2000.

573 pp. ISBN 82-7834-015-3. NoK 298.

Georg Julius Justus Sauerwein (1831-1904) was an extraordinary figure. He devoted his life to the geographical margins of Europe, to minority languages and to politically disadvantaged peoples, yet he kept company with intellectuals, aristocrats and even royalty. He preferred to live in a rural Norwegian valley, but he was a central figure in movements for world peace. Sauerwein's linguistic activities were many and various, but his fame in his own lifetime rested principally on his reputation as a language genius, capable of mastering new and difficult languages and language varieties with consummate ease. His linguistic abilities were subject to exaggeration, not least by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1846-1929) who wrote that Sauerwein knew around 200 languages (147). According to Vistdal's reckoning, Sauerwein worked with at least 75 languages and actually used 50 (149). One of the greatest practical linguists of the day, and one of the most sceptical of men, Johan Storm (1836-1920), met Sauerwein and was able to investigate the Sauerwein phenomenon for himself. Storm's opinion can probably be relied upon to be free from hyperbole, so it is worth quoting what Storm wrote in a letter to his good friend, Vilhelm Thomsen (1842-1927), after meeting Sauerwein:

Now I will explain to you why I have been so much occupied. A polyglot has come to town, who from a practical point-of-view is nearly as good as you, whilst from the scientific point-of-view is completely inferior to you, namely Dr Sauerwein from Hanover. I don't know whether you've heard him spoken of; I must confess my ignorance. As well as the Germanic and Romance languages, he knows the Slavonic languages very well, he speaks Welsh with ease – he's lived in Wales for two years – and Hungarian too. He is very much at home in Turkish – he's written a Turkish dictionary – and Persian as well – he's written a Persian ode to the Shah, of which he provided me with a copy. If you should want to see it, I'll send you a copy. He has studied Tamil [...]. The remarkable thing about him is that he has studied Malagasy, and in great detail at that; he has revised the Bible translation, but never spoken with a native. I went with him to see our young Madagascan, to whose

great joy he addressed in his own language. [...] He expresses himself with ease in Dano-Norwegian after a six-week sojourn, during which he has studied the Hardanger dialect in particular. He naturally makes many mistakes, but finds expressions for his thoughts without difficulty. In the languages in which I can judge him, his pronunciation is good, but not excellent. I must say that he is completely free from conceitedness and humbug [...] Like most Mezzofantis (except you and Rask) he has not produced any real linguistic work, as far as I have been able to discover. (Letter of 20.9.1874)

Sauerwein would live for another thirty years and achieve a lot more, so Storm's account does not reflect the full extent of his linguistic capabilities. Nonetheless it is probably as close to an objective account of Sauerwein's skills as we will get, since he was a sensation, and his freak-show abilities provoked a rich mythology.

The only serious job Sauerwein had was as an employee of the British Bible Society, for which he worked between 1857 and 1896. His post was permanent from 1870, and he acted as Bible-translator and consultant for translations into a variety of languages, notably into Turkic, Caucasian, Slavonic and African languages. The only full translation he undertook himself was into the Berber language, Kabyle, in preparation for which the Bible Society sent him to Algeria. He was very well travelled, and a table on pages 572 and 573 shows all the places he lived in the course of his active life.

In so far as the adult Sauerwein had a base, it was north Gudbrandsdal in east-central Norway, in and around Dovre and Dombås (*døl* of the book's title literally means 'valley dweller'). Vistdal devotes more attention to the Norwegian side of Sauerwein's life than to the others, but this is to be expected since the book was written in a Norwegian context. Sauerwein became utterly absorbed into life in Gudbrandsdalen. He wore the local costume and, while he was, as always, viewed by many as an eccentric outsider, he was a popular member of the community. His manner and appearance tended to attract attention, and he suffered abuse here as in other places. On balance though Sauerwein was happier in Gudbrandsdalen than he was anywhere else. He was given a particularly hard time by his fellow citizens in Kristiania. He regarded his experiences in the capital city as untypical of the real Norway, and in fact treated Norway as a 'mental and physical retreat' (247), as a place where people were dealt with fairly, by contrast with the fate of ethnic and linguistic minorities in his homeland. Sauerwein of course mastered the local dialect, and wrote using his own written norm for the dialect. He also used Dano-Norwegian (the variety which would later become Bokmål), but was more at home in the dialect. In 1885 he published a 159-page collection of verse in the dialect of north Gudbrandsdal, entitled *Frie Viso ifraa Viggul'n sungje i Nørdre-Gudbrandsdalsk Dølamaal*. It was dedicated to Ivar Aasen ('Nestor among

Norwegian linguists') and comprised Romantic verses on the nature, language and popular life of Dovre. *Frie Viso* was on the whole well received as an attempt to represent Norwegian folk language, but detractors were quick to point out the academic German style which sometimes underpinned the popular Norwegian forms.

Sauerwein was a 'europæar' as much as he was a 'døl'. His first significant activity on the European front was in support of the Wends or the Sorbs, the Slavic people of Lausitz in the eastern part of Germany near the Polish border, who were trying to maintain their identity in the face of German aggression. Sauerwein had grown up in a vigorously protestant home and he always had a strong religious / moral sense. As a student he had been unable to decide whether to study theology in order to become a missionary, or whether to study medicine in order to be able to carry out good works in the East. In the event he didn't complete either of these courses of study, and so began a life of dreams and schemes, of whimsical obsessions, a much more interesting life than he would have had if he had followed a more conventional path. Sauerwein learnt both High Sorbian and Low Sorbian and wrote poetry in Low Sorbian which is still known today, and which helped to strengthen the cultural identity of the Sorbian people. He also produced language-political writings.

He was active in support of another ethnic and linguistic minority suffering repeated attempts at Germanisation, namely the Prussian Lithuanians. Vistdal recounts that national identity and the development of the native language in support of national identity had not been discussed very much before Sauerwein became a driving force here in the 1880s. Here too he wrote poems and political pamphlets, encouraging Prussian Lithuanians to develop their own culture in the face of German attempts to wipe it out, and in 1886 he set out a programme for a Lithuanian cultural movement, rooted in his National-Romantic philosophy (196). Such a movement must, Sauerwein argued, be based on the language. Lithuanian was as a queen among languages and was as ancient as Sanskrit. Unfortunately Sauerwein's Romantic programme was opposed by a more practical, realist programme propounded by a group of younger activists, and the pioneering Sauerwein was soon seen as the spokesman for an earlier, outdated political philosophy. Sauerwein stood as an Independent Lithuanian candidate in the local Prussian elections of 1879, 1881 and 1898. He stood unwillingly to begin with, as he was not a political person, but was persuaded to do so on account of all he had done for the Lithuanians and their cause. Vistdal reports that 'Sauerwein never got into parliament, and he didn't manage to soften the hard-handed Germanisation [which] conversely sharpened towards the turn of the century' (210). His work did, however, attract attention in his homeland, as well it might, and he suffered widespread attacks in the German media. In the end his work for the Lithuanians and for their culture was a crushing disappointment for Sauerwein. In 1903 he looked back on it and wrote:

I offered myself for a nation on its way to ruin [...] a people who I nevertheless wanted to fire up. This people trod me under foot because I wanted to rouse them. (216)

Sauerwein is certainly interesting to historians of linguistics. The man was, as a Mezzofanti, a linguistic phenomenon himself. The historiography of linguistics has tended to focus on institutions, on schools and universities and those who have worked and studied in them. But beyond the walls of such places are those who have 'lived' language, those who have come at language and languages in ways unencumbered by the needs and expectations of the education system. Two Scandinavian linguists who were able to follow their linguistic passions without the burden of academia, but who have found a place in historiography, are Rasmus Rask (1787-1832) and Ivar Aasen (1813-1896). There must be others like Sauerwein who the history of linguistics is a bit too snobbish to welcome in. What Aasen and Sauerwein did was *much* more important than what many of the canonical figures in the history of linguistics achieved. Aasen and Sauerwein influenced entire nations through their linguistic work.

Sauerwein's work on and in Lithuanian, Norwegian and Sorbian has been valued by scholars and ordinary people alike and has received quite a lot of attention, because of its cultural and political importance as much as its linguistic importance. However, Vistdal states (55) that most of his writings, published and unpublished, are in German, English or French, but these writings have simply not been researched and are not even properly catalogued. Vistdal has made a very positive start with his book, but he has focussed on the minority languages Sauerwein was involved with. So Sauerwein awaits more research, and what fascinating work that will be, linguistically, politically, culturally and from the human angle, for whoever takes it on. It may be of particular interest to *Bulletin* readers to learn that his work for the British Bible Society is one of the areas still awaiting a detailed study.

Vistdal's book is an impressive achievement. Sauerwein wrote vast amounts in many different languages, and this material is scattered around the world. It takes a person of Sauerwein-like dedication and linguistic ability to launch out into this tide of material. Vistdal is described on the dust-cover as a 'former lecturer in Finnish, Icelandic and German', and, to judge from the bibliography, his first publication on Sauerwein appeared in 1981, so a great deal of time, energy and know-how has gone into this book. It is written in Nynorsk and is a model of how that language can be used in academic writing. Nynorsk writers are often self-consciously naïve or folksy, which is frustrating in genres that call for a different register. Vistdal's style is powerful, and he employs a much fuller and richer vocabulary than is sometimes found in Nynorsk texts. Content aside, this book is a joy to read from the purely

mechanical point-of-view. It is beautifully produced and there are lots of relevant and attractive pictures, which help break up the substantial text. The publisher, Norsk Bokreidingslag, is virtually unknown outside Norway. It specialises in books written in Nynorsk, and particularly those that employ a rather conservative, traditional variety of that language. Its books are always of the highest quality, and Norsk Bokreidingslag is currently publishing Ivar Aasen's papers in a series of volumes, edited by Jarle Bondevik, Oddvar Nes and Terje Aarset, which is a great service to the community of Norwegian linguists. Conservative Nynorsk is rather inaccessible to readers who have not themselves studied it, but *Georg Sauerwein – europear og døl* does have a 14-page German summary which is very helpful. The bibliography, organised by year of publication rather than alphabetically by author, is rather less helpful. Those who cannot read the text can perhaps sing the songs which are reproduced with accompaniments at the end of the book.

Andrew R. Linn, *Sheffield*
A.R.Linn@Sheffield.ac.uk

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(to 27 April 2001)

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

Dr David Cram
Jesus College
Oxford OX1 3DW

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

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

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

COBLIN, W. South, & LEVI, Joseph A.
Francisco Varo's Grammar of the Mandarin Language (1702). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 93]. liii + 282 pp. ISBN 90-272-4581-9.

DIETRICH Wolf & Ulrich HOINKES (eds.)
Romanistica se movet Festgabe für Horst Geckeler zu seinem 65. Geburtstag.
Münster: Nodus, 2000. 215 pp., DM 84. ISBN 3-89323-287-7.

DUTZ, Klaus D. (ed.)
Individuation, Symphonia pánta, Harmonia, Emanation. Festgabe für Heinrich Schepers zu seinem 75. Geburtstag.
Münster: Nodus, 2000. 270 pp. DM 108. ISBN 3-89323-285-0.

ETO, Hiroyuki

A Study of the Distinctive Features of Edward Mätzner's Englische Grammatik and a Re-evaluation of its Place in the Development of English Philology.

MA Dissertation, Sophia University, 1995. ix + 255 pp.

ETO, Hiroyuki

Philologie vs. Sprachwissenschaft: Historiographie einer Begriffsbestimmung im Rahmen der Wissenschaftsgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts.

Doctoral Dissertation: Georgetown University, 1999. xii + 283 pp. UMI number: 9986289.

GENSINI, Stefano

"De linguis in universum". On Leibniz's Ideas on Languages. Five Essays.

Münster: Nodus, 2000. 174 pp., DM 59. ISBN 3-89323-282-6.

HINRICHS, Jan Paul

The C.H. van Schooneveld Collection in Leiden University Library.

Leiden: Leiden University Library, 2001. viii + 240 pp. ISBN 90-74204-10-4.

LUHTALA, Anneli

On the Origin of Syntactical Description in Stoic Logic.

Münster: Nodus, 2000. 214 pp. DM 108. ISBN 3-89323-457-8.

MATTHEWS, Peter

A Short History of Structural Linguistics.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 163 pp. ISBN 0-521-62367-7 (hardback); ISBN 0-521-62367-8 (paperback).

SALGADO, Benigno Fernández

Os Rudimentos da Lingüística Galega: Un estudio de textos lingüísticos galegos de principios do século XX (1913-1936).

Universidade de Santiago de Compostella, 2000. 352 pp. ISBN 84-8121-859-6.

JOURNALS

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft. 10:2 (2000). ISSN 0939-2815.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft. 11:1 (2001). ISSN 0939-2815.

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

FORMIGARI, Lia

“L’Éloge de l’Abbé de Condillac; Ou: du matérialisme dans les théories du langage.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 10.2 (2001), 241-252.

FUCILE, Maria

“Linguaggio ordinario e strumentalità linguistica in J. L. Austin.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 11.1 (2001), 69-88.

HABLER, Gerda

“Origine, histoire, évolution. L’actualité d’une histoire notionnelle des sciences du langage.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 11.1 (2001), 117-138.

HELSLOOT, Niels

“Nietzsche’s Tone. A Philologist’s Answer to the Rise of Linguistics.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 11.1 (2001), 89-116.

HÜLTENSCHMIDT, Erika

“La chaire de grammaire comparée à la Sorbonne (1852-1864), occupée par un philhellène: Charles Benoît Hase.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 11.1 (2001), 49-68.

KLEIN, Wolf Peter

“Christliche Kabbala und Linguistik orientalischer Sprachen. Das Beispiel von Guillaume Postel (1510-1581).” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 11.1 (2001), 1-26.

SCHMITTER, Peter

“Zur Rolle der Semantik in Humboldts linguistischem Forschungsprogramm.” In Kirsten Adamzik & Helen Christen (eds.) *Sprachkontakt, Sprachvergleich, Sprachvariation: Festschrift für Gottfried Kolde zum 65. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 307-323.

STORARI, Gian Pietro

“Language and the Limits of Logic in the Thought of Thomas Reid.” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 11.1 (2001), 27-48.

MAY 2001

HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN

TRABANT, Jürgen

“Geist und Kultur in der Sprachwissenschaft. Zur Erinnerung an Karl Vossler (1872-1949).” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 10.2 (2000), 253-270.

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

3-5 September 2001

The 18th Annual Colloquium of the Henry Sweet Society will be held from Monday 3 September to Wednesday 5 September 2001 at the University of Munich, Germany (LMU = Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität). The University of Munich dates back to the 15th century and is today one of the largest German universities. It has, among others, a faculty of languages and literatures with 6790 students, 59 professors and 211 lecturers, and several of its other faculties also deal with languages and linguistics.

Munich is the capital of Bavaria. It is easy to reach by car, train and plane. Munich has many sights to offer - churches, castles, museums etc., from the Middle Ages to the present day - and the Bavarian lakes and mountains are fairly close. There is also a rich cultural life. It is suggested that participants travel to Munich on **Saturday 1 September** in order to benefit from cheaper flights, and for the Sunday we are planning a trip to the historic city of Augsburg, which was founded by the Romans, and has important Medieval and Renaissance buildings.

The sessions will be held at the university, which is within walking distance from the city centre, and also easy to reach by underground and bus. Delegates will be accommodated (at reasonable prices) in one of the numerous hotels near the university or the city centre. Meals can be taken in the university cafeteria or in one of the many restaurants around the university.

Bookings may still be made and a booking form for those who have not yet registered is included with this Bulletin. All enquiries should be sent to the conference organiser:

Prof. Dr. Hans Sauer
Institut für Englische Philologie
Universität München
Schellingstr. 3.
D-80799 München (Munich)
Germany

Tel. (0049)-89-2180-3270 or 3933

MAY 2001

HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN

Fax (0049)-89-2180-3932

e-mail: hans.sauer@anglistik.uni-muenchen.de

For payment of the conference fee, it is best to send a Eurocheque to Prof. Sauer (DM 30.00 for members, DM 75.00 for non-members). Those attending the conference may also pay on arrival, or transfer the money to the following account:

Account number: 84449105, BLZ 700 202 70, Hypovereinsbank (Gauting). In the latter case please ensure that you cover the bank charges as well.

Provisional Programme

Saturday 1 September

16.00 – 19.00 Registration

19.00 ‘Conference Warming’

Sunday 2 September

Excursion to Augsburg

Monday 3 September

9.00 – 9.15 Opening Session

9.15 – 10.20 Panel discussion:
Teaching the history of linguistics
(Vivien Law, John Walmsley et al.)

10.20 – 10.40 Coffee/tea break

10.40 – 11.20 Thorsten Fögen,
Ancient authors on languages for special purposes

11.20 – 12.00 Christos Nifadopoulos,
*Reconstructing an ancient theory of etymology:
Herodian’s Peri pathôn*

12.00 – 14.00 Lunch (Cafeteria)

14.00 – 14.40 Jee Yeon Jang,
*Magnus quae vox and Remigius’s In artem Donati
minorem*

14.40 – 15.20 Mark Atherton,
*The influence of Ælfric’s Latin grammar on his writings in
English*

15.20 – 15.40 Coffee/tea break

15.40 – 16.20 David Cram,
John Marbeck’s concordance to the English Bible (1550)

16.20 – 17.00 Jana Privřatská,
*Czech as a mother tongue in the linguistic thought of
Comenius*

(17.00 Committee meeting)

19.00 Reception

Tuesday 4 September

- 9.00 – 9.40 Rhodri Lewis,
Artificial memory schemes and artificial language in seventeenth century England: the case of John Beale
- 9.40 – 10.20 Cordula Neis,
Feral children and the origin-of-language debate in the eighteenth century
- 10.20 – 10.40 Coffee/tea break
- 10.40 – 11.20 Cristina Altman,
Organizing American Babel: or the importance of being a mother tongue
- 11.20 – 12.00 Gabriele Knappe,
“Phrases, which Use has consecrated”: Progress towards the lemmatization of English headphrases in general lexicography before the eighteenth century
- 12.00 – 14.00 Lunch (Atzinger)
- 14.00 – 14.40 Michael Isermann,
More on John Wilkins's secret character
- 14.40 – 15.20 Werner Hüllen,
Explaining synonyms: the way from Wilkins to Roget
- 15.20 – 15.40 Coffee/tea break
- 15.40 – 16.20 Gerda Haßler,
The Ideologists in Spain and Germany: transfer or conceptual transformation?
- 16.20 – 17.00 John E. Joseph,
Sign, brain and 'inner speech' in late 19th-century French psychology of language
- 17.15 – 18.45 Annual General Meeting
- 20.00 Conference Dinner

Wednesday 5 September

- 9.00 – 9.40 Serhii Vakulenko,
Alexander Potebnia's criticism of Max Müller's conception of myth as a disease of language
- 9.40 – 10.20 Nadia Kerecuk, *Migration and transformation of German linguistic ideas in the 19th century distilled by O. O. Potebnia – Part I: eastward route*
- 10.20 – 10.40 Coffee/tea break
- 10.40 – 11.20 Hiroyuki Eto,
C. T. Onions (1873-1965) and Japan
- 11.20 – 12.00 Niels Helsloot,
Divine rocks: on Ferdinand de Saussure's metrics
- 12.00 – 14.00 lunch
- 14.00 – 14.40 Saskia Daalder,
The 1937 Round Table conference on linguistic oppositions
- 14.40 – 15.20 Béatrice Godart-Wendling,
Le principe d'adjacence et la controverse des constituants discontinus dans les grammaires catégorielles
- 15.20 – 15.40 Coffee/tea break
- 15.40 – 16.20 Masataka Miyawaki,
James Harris's conception of the origin of language
- 16.20 – 17.00 Hans Sauer,
Theodor Arnold and his Grammar
- 17.00 Close of conference

ASSOCIAÇÃO DE LINGÜÍSTICA E FILOLOGIA DA
AMÉRICA LATINA
RESEARCH COMMITTEE IN LINGUISTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY
PLAN OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE DURING THE 13TH ALFAL
CONGRESS

UNIVERSIDADE DE COSTA RICA
18 - 23 FEBRUARY 2002

Theme: *Latin American Linguistic Research Traditions: Diversity and Universality*

Subject of Discussion

The task of establishing the historical record of Latin American linguistic traditions is not an obvious one. It seems to require, first of all, a definition of what we understand by 'Latin American' linguistic practices and thinking before talking of a Latin American tradition in the study of languages. Any approach to Latin American kinds of linguistic thinking before the 19th century has to consider the particular nature of the colonization process which was carried out by the European 'conqueror', and the complex linguistic panorama they had to confront. After the 19th century, one has to take account of the movements toward independence of these colonies, the creation of national states, and the adoption of a European language as their official national language.

On the one hand, where the study of the 'exotic' languages is concerned, the considerable linguistic diversity in Latin America played an important role in the enlargement of our 'empirical' linguistic knowledge. The colonial expansion and the christianization of the various peoples living in these vast territories were the main causes for the practice of collecting and registering the linguistic data, not only in travel reports and narratives of all kinds, but, more importantly, in grammars being written and vocabularies compiled by the various groups of Catholic missionaries.

On the other hand, other aspects of Latin American language study bear on matters of theoretical linguistic reflection and may contribute to a better understanding of some important features of the Western grammatical tradition. One such interest implies the study of non-documented languages in the elaboration of a universal grammar; another may involve the study of linguistic

typology. Finally, the development of a national linguistic tradition in the treatment of the indigenous people and their native languages would be of importance for study.

Objective

The central purpose of the Historiography of Linguistics Committee is the investigation of the essential tension between the (empirical) perception of linguistic diversity and its (universal) modes of representation, in the Latin American context.

General methodology

For this to be accomplished, it is planned to pursue some of the following avenues: a) a characterization of the sources according to their modes of metalinguistic description; b) a characterization of the sources according to their modes of representation such as the concepts of 'letter', 'word', 'parts of speech', 'sentence' and 'text'; and other descriptive categories (case? tense? modality?); c) explication of the methodological (and possibly philosophical) assumptions underlying these practices; d) evaluation of the 'failures' and the 'successes' correlated with these practices from the descriptive and linguistic-pedagogical viewpoints; e) evaluation of the impact of these grammars on the emergence of a new linguistic culture, on a more empirical basis, in conflict with the long-standing tradition of classical studies; f) evaluation of the impact of the empirical data gathered by linguists on the study of universal grammar.

Schedule

The workshop will meet Monday to Friday, 2p.m.-5p.m, except on Thursday 21 February, when the general assembly of ALFAL will take place. The detailed program of the workshop will be announced in due course.

Committee

Beatriz Gárza Cuáron (Universidad del Mexico)
Cristina Altman (Universidade de São Paulo)
Daniel Labonia (Universidad de Buenos Ayres)
Marta Lujan (University of Texas, Austin)
Maria Carlota Rosa (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro)
Mercedes Hackerott (Universidade de São Paulo)
Neusa Bastos (Pontificia Universidade Católica de São Paulo)
Wulf Oesterreicher (Universidade de Munique)
Otto Swartjes (Universidade de Oslo)
Rebeca Barriga Villanueva (Universidad del México)

Contact addresses:

Cristina Altman
Departamento de Linguística
Universidade de São Paulo
Av. Prof. Dr. Luciano Gualberto 403
05508-900 São Paulo - SP - B R A S I L

altman@usp.br

or:

altman@netcomp.com.br

The Paul Salmon - Pieter Verburg Memorial Fund

The Henry Sweet Society has received two generous donations in memory of the late Paul Salmon and the late Pieter Verburg. Pieter Verburg was the author of a seminal work on the history of linguistic ideas, published in Dutch in 1952 and translated into English by Paul Salmon and published in 1998.

Once again, in 2001, the Society intends to award two annual bursaries of £100 (one hundred pounds Sterling) each to members of the Society who wish to attend and present a paper at one of the Society's colloquia but whose financial circumstances make this difficult. Preference may be given to younger scholars.

Applicants must be paid-up members of the Society before applications are made. Applicants should submit the following:

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

Applications should be sent to the Treasurer:

Prof. John L. Flood

University of London Institute of Germanic Studies

29 Russell Square

London WC1B 5DP

to reach him NOT LATER THAN 30 JUNE 2001.

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

Subscriptions for 2001

Members who have not already paid their subscriptions for 2001 are reminded that subscriptions are now due.

The current rates are set out below.

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

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

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

For members in The Netherlands:

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

ORDINARY MEMBERS: NLG 46,00

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

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

Members in Europe are asked to note that since the beginning of 2001 British banks have withdrawn from the Eurocheque system. EUROCHEQUES CAN, THEREFORE, NO LONGER BE ACCEPTED IN PAYMENT. Arrangements can be made for members in Germany to pay their subscriptions into a German bank account; please contact the Treasurer for details (jlf@zetnet.co.uk)

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

Members in the USA and others paying in US dollars should send their subscriptions to:

Professor Joseph L. Subbiondo
President, California Institute of Integral Studies
1453 Mission Street
San Francisco
CA 94103
U.S.A.

(E-mail: josephs@ciis.edu)

The following rates apply:

ORDINARY MEMBERS: US\$ 30.00

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

Note to members in countries outside the European Union and the USA:

To avoid disproportionate bank charges, overseas members are recommended, wherever possible, to pay for three years in advance. Alternatively, banknotes (Sterling, Deutsche Mark, or US Dollars only please!) may be sent at sender's risk.

Members paying by cheque or Sterling draft should send their payment, which should be made payable to THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY, direct to the Honorary Treasurer:

Professor J. L Flood

University of London Institute of Germanic Studies

29 Russell Square

London WC1B 5DP

The Henry Sweet Society Studies in the History of Linguistics

Volume 6

Hedwig Gwosdek

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

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

Volume 7

Anneli Luhtala

On the Origin of Syntactical Description in Stoic Logic.

214 pp. ISBN 3-89323-457-8. Normal retail price DEM 108,-

Members may obtain copies at the special members' price direct from the publisher:

Nodus Publikationen

Postfach 5725

D-48031 Münster

Germany

Fax [+49] 251 66 16 92

e-mail: dutz.nodus@t-online.de

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

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