

EDITORIAL

One of the courses I teach is entitled *Written and Presentation Skills for the Humanities*. It is a course for PhD students from across the Faculty of Arts and forms part of their research training programme. The rather grand name conceals a course on how to give effective conference presentations on the one hand, and how to write up work for submission to journals on the other. The subject matter is not the key thing here, although it is certainly interesting to get a taste of the research being done by students in other departments of the University. We look instead at what makes for a good presentation in the context of an academic conference or a learned journal. Issues we consider with regard to conference papers are: the clarity, the structure and organization, and the time management of the paper itself; the supporting materials used – handouts and visual aids; and personal aspects like clarity of voice, speed of delivery, the ability to inspire the audience and so on. What strikes me quite forcibly is that, while everyone can learn something about how to improve their presentation, there are certain things all the students take for granted. Nobody regards it as acceptable simply to read out a prepared script, but the majority of papers at history of linguistics conferences involve just that. Nobody regards it as acceptable to sit at a desk or stand rigidly behind a dais. The majority of papers at history of linguistics conferences involve just that. Quite subtle electronically-generated visual aids are regarded as normal and desirable, even with material which is not overtly visual in impact. We wouldn't sit behind a desk and read a script to students, supported only by a closely-typed bibliography, so why do we inflict this on colleagues? Of course conference presentations are different to lectures in a number of ways, but it seems that the next generation of colleagues isn't going to put up with antiquated methods of presentation for long.

There have been some changes amongst the officers of the Society. Rhodri Lewis has been appointed membership secretary, and Nicola McLelland replaces John Flood as treasurer.

With the retirement of John Flood from this post, a milestone in the history of the Society has been reached, for the Society has known no other treasurer in its lifetime. John has managed the Society's finances with effortless skill, juggling a number of accounts and currencies. He has also acted as membership secretary and prime mover in the *Henry Sweet Society Studies* series, in addition to his work as treasurer. Despite having all this to do, and much more besides, it is a rare occasion when a reply to an e-mail doesn't arrive within minutes of the initial e-mail being sent!

At the AGM in September all members of the Henry Sweet Society present thanked John Flood warmly for seventeen years of devoted work with our finances. The president expressed the opinion that it was hard to imagine committee meetings and AGMs without John's wise counsel and farsighted planning. The AGM elected John Flood as vice-president by general acclamation, and we wish him a happy and slightly more peaceful time in his new role.

Andrew Linn, *Sheffield*

An Introduction to the “Etymological Imagination”

Charles Wright Mills (1916–1962), an American sociologist and one of ‘the most controversial figures in American social science’ (Wallenstein 1968: 363), may be most impressively remembered for his vigorous polemic against functionalism—the social science establishment of America in the 1950s.* He not only argued for the importance of sociological method grounded in a historical interpretation, but also insisted that every sociologist make up his original theory and build models and methods based on his own ‘perspective’.

In his aphoristic essay *On Intellectual Craftsmanship* Mills presents a body of advice for future sociologists to become “ideal” scholars. This advice, composed of eight paragraphs, seems more like the sort of thing seen in a writing manual book or such like—normative or prescriptive “rules”, one of which, namely Paragraph 1, reads as follows:

(1) Be a good craftsman. Avoid any rigid set of procedures. Above all seek to develop and to use the sociological imagination. Avoid the fetishism of method and technique. Urge the rehabilitation of the unpretentious intellectual craftsman and try to become such a craftsman yourself. Let every man be his own methodologist; let every man be his own theorist: let theory and method again become part of the practice of the craft. (1959: 224)

In this “imperative” statement Mills explicitly insists that every sociologist take control of his research work and leave an imprint of his own personality on it. He should, therefore, be intellectually independent of dominant conventionalism in theories and methods of sociology. A good sociologist will ‘not hesitate, indeed seek, continually and imaginatively, to draw upon the perspectives and materials, the ideas and methods, of any and all sensible studies of man and society’ (1959: 225) and will not let his studies be taken from him

* This short essay was read at a research meeting of young professors and graduate students of English Studies—especially in historical perspective—held at Kitakyushu University (Japan) on 23 March 2001, which was followed by a discussion in English on this theme.

'by those who would close them off by weird jargon and pretensions of *expertise*' (1959: 225).

Mills does not try totally to persuade us to ignore or reject the value of conventional wisdom in politics and sociology. In fact he argues for a sociological method grounded in historical understanding, mentioning: 'Know that you inherit and are carrying on the tradition of classic social analysis' (1959: 225). Mills does emphasize, however, that we must coordinate both traditions and innovations in our minds to become a good scholar.

It is interesting to point out that Mills uses the term intellectual 'craftsman' instead of 'scientist' or 'scholar' to express what he thinks is the ideal figure for a *creator of wisdom*. In order to understand the meaning of a 'craftsman', it would be instructive to consider the following famous phrase in 'Lehrbuch' of Goethe's (1749–1832) *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*:

Der echte Schüler lernt aus dem Bekannten das Unbekannte entwickeln und nähert sich dem Meister. (The true pupil learns to develop the unknown from the known and approaches the teacher.) ([1795/96] 1891: 423)

Goethe may suggest here that a good pupil, or a promising craftsman, should follow traditions, but, at the same time, make himself creative and innovative. In other words, he should combine "head" and "hand", "knowledge" and "experience", "tradition" and "pragmatism", "theory" and "practice" in his creative activities.

An ideal craftsman, according to Goethe, should not just owe his work to his predecessors, but to his own originality as well. He is to contribute to the world to which he belongs by way of adding his innovations to things traditional. His signature must be on his work so that he may document his involvement and take pride in what he has produced, which would be described as a vocation.

In order to become an intellectual craftsman, Mills recommends that we apply 'imagination' to our research activity because it may be the only method to express our personality in our scholarly work. But what does Mills mean by 'imagination'? In his *Sociological Imagination*—the most general summary statement of Mills's overall approach and attitudes toward sociology (cf. Jary & Jary 1991: 311)—Mills gives the following definition of the 'sociological imagination':

The sociological imagination enables its possessor to understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and the external career of a variety of individuals. (1959: 5)

Mills says here—as we have seen in his *Intellectual Craftsmanship*—that sociologists must have a wide “perspective” even for detailed and specialized researches in sociological surveys. He warns sociologists not to ignore the wide range of knowledge relating to their specialized subject and to pay more attention to people as creators of society than to society itself. In this sense Mills’s suggestion reminds us of Alexander Pope’s famous words: ‘The proper study of mankind is man’.

The study of man, for which I would like to use the German term “Geisteswissenschaft”, not “anthropology”, entails a variety of fields such as language, literature, history, society, but they all have in common one purpose—the ‘recognition of human ideas’, which August Boeckh (1785–1867) put as ‘das Erkennen des vom menschlichen Geist Producirten, d.h. des Erkannten’ (the recognition of what is produced by the human mind, i.e., what is recognized) (1877:10).

My main concern in this short essay lies in the application of Mills’s perspective on the social sciences to historical English studies, especially to the study of English etymology.

As students of historical English studies, we have to reconstruct the physically unreachable world, however little we may learn from it. In this procedure “words” play the most important role as symbolic representations of a by-gone reality. Through the historical survey of the meaning of words, that is, etymological study, we can pursue the history of ideas or *das Erkennen des Erkannten*. Kurt R. Jankowsky (b. 1928) points out the significance of etymological survey as a “window” to see the reality of a bygone world:

In reconstructing with the help of Anglo-Saxon words a bygone world, we retrace the process from word to thought to idea to a particular world-view to a particular world. We, so to say, reclaim what was once the

intellectual property of the Anglo-Saxon native speaker and let him take us from his ABSTRACT thoughts to his REAL, CONCRETE social and physical environment. [...] the only window through which we SEE a world – as in our case – some fourteen hundred years away, the only avenue through which we can approach it is deciphering the words once spoken, the thoughts once thought by live people in relation to matters of small as well as very great concern to them. (2001: 274)

As long as we have written evidence, we can depend on it for etymological research. Without it, however, we can do nothing but sharpen our “etymological imagination” to reconstruct the image of men who left no written records. Then we have to learn to develop ‘aus dem Bekannten das Unbekannte’, as Goethe says.

We might clarify the point of practising our imagination in the historical study of English if we change the phrases ‘sociological imagination’ and ‘variety of individuals’, in the aforementioned quotation from Mills, into ‘etymological imagination’ and ‘variety of words’. That is to say, we are able to *understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and the external career of a variety of words by the etymological imagination*.

Regarding the effectiveness of “imagination” in the study of etymology we should turn to the comment in Eric Partridge’s (1894–1979) brilliant book, *A Charm of Words*, in which he says:

In etymology, imagination, if carefully controlled, will occasionally solve problems that phonetics cannot touch; it must, however, be imagination exercised, not in defiance of philology but within the vast horizons available to even the most formal philology; the trouble is that some people shrink from marching to the horizon, for fear (an early medieval fear) of falling over the world’s edge. (1960: 190)

The only trouble Partridge mentions here is the ‘fear’ felt by pupils or future scholars of etymology. To avoid such a fear, I will demonstrate one canon for the etymological survey presented by Prof. Karl Schneider (1912–1998) and his disciple Prof. Schoichi Watanabe (b. 1930): ‘Similar processes of root-creation are to be found in some languages between which any linguistic relationship is

excluded. It is, however, no coincidence, but it can be attributed to the universality of the human brain and sense organs’.

In this view, power and authority will be given to all willing to investigate the etymology of words that do not belong to their mother tongue. We should not fall into the trap of so-called “etymological fallacy”, but at the same time, can be confident of our “imaginative” research of a language and its world separated from us by vast distances of both time and space.

REFERENCES

- Boeckh, August 1877. *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften*. Ed. by Ernst Bratuscheck. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Jankowsky, Kurt R. 2001. On the universal power of language as expressed in Germanic poetry. In: Shoichi Watanabe et al. (eds.) *Language of the Bible; Language of the Poetry*. Tokyo: Taishukan, 256-283.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von [1795/96]1891. *Goethes Sämtliche Werke*. Vol 8. *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*. Munich: Georg Müller.
- Jary, David & Julia Jary (eds). 1991. Mills, C. Wright. In: *The Harper Collins Dictionary of Sociology*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers. 310-311.
- Mills, Charles Wright 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: OUP.
- Partridge, Eric 1960. *A Charm of Words*. Essays and Papers on Language. New York: The Macmillan Co.
- Wallenstein, Immanuel 1968. Mills, C. Wright. In: David L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 10. New York: Macmillan & Free Press, 362-364.

Hiroyuki Eto, Nagano & Osaka/Japan
etoh@georgetown.edu

The Semantics of Post-Medieval Lullism

In the medieval and post-medieval periods many people were doing componential semantics – positing theories about how simple senses could be combined to make complex ones. My views on Aristotelian componentialism are already familiar (see McMahon 1987). What I have maintained is that there is an implicit componentialist theory in medieval interpretations of the Aristotelian categories. However, what I would like to do here is to consider another approach which co-existed with Aristotelianism after 1300.

This is the Lullist approach. It is in fact strange that more attention has not been devoted to it, as many of those who are often discussed were influenced by and practised Lullism. This of course includes such writers as Wilkins, Dalgarno, Comenius, and even Athanasius Kircher. So a detailed study of the Lullist movement would be of considerable value for scholarship in 17th-century semantics.¹ My aim is not to cover the whole movement but just to treat two of the more interesting figures, leaving it to later research to connect the dots. According to Rossi (1960: ix), central themes in the traditions from Lull to Leibniz were: the discovery of a method for deciphering the divine design in nature; the construction of a language for articulating this order; and the creation of a mnemonic method for teaching the naturally revealed truth. The “art” of Ramon Llull was seen as the key to understanding the nature of things.

My purpose here will be to consider the approaches of two representatives of the post-medieval Lullist tradition. They live 100 years apart, and though both German, differed with respect to their backgrounds and orientation. They are Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim (1486-1535) and Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588-1638).

Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim (what he called himself – no one knows his real name) was from Cologne.² He is in a sense the paradigmatic “Renaissance man”. He was not an academic *per se* but occasionally held academic positions, as well as practising medicine, law and even soldiering. Like his acquaintance Erasmus, he was caught between orthodoxy and reform,

¹ One could regard Rossi (1960) as such a study, except that he focusses largely on mnemonics.

² The name ‘Agrippa’ is taken from the Roman name for Cologne. See Nauert (1965: 9).

ultimately standing with the established church. He was a practitioner of the occult, which accounts for his popularity in certain circles today; for example, one website contains an article claiming that Agrippa did not die 400 years ago, but instead became a vampire.³ Agrippa was influenced by neo-Platonism and became increasingly hostile towards the orthodox scholasticism of the universities. This attitude was fuelled by personal controversies in which Agrippa was accused of heresy (see Nauert 1965: 28, 59-62, 106-114). Llull appealed to him as a holy man who had found an unorthodox means of access to the truth, which squared with Agrippa's mystical inclinations.

Agrippa's *In artem brevem Raymundi Lulli Commentaria* (1600b) is an early work, probably written before 1520, although not published until 1533. Later he wrote his controversial and somewhat philistine *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum* (1600a), which contains some disparaging remarks about Lullism. Agrippa appears to belong to the tradition which regards Llull's art not as logic but as a better alternative. It is viewed as a comprehensive conceptual system within which virtually any subject can be treated, so it is at least implicitly encyclopedic. Agrippa further seems to think that the art is somehow systematic and rigorous. This is mystifying to the reader of today, for whom Agrippa's treatment would be unnecessarily prolix. There is much insightful material on subjects like philosophy, theology, language, and rhetoric. It is expressed in a way that is idiosyncratic to the 16th century, Agrippa not realising that that was not necessarily timeless. The Lullian method of calculating by combining members of sets of nine is employed (see McMahon 1996: 156-158), and again it is suggested that this will lead us to certain definite conclusions about relationships among concepts. However, in current parlance, Agrippa (as did Llull) mixes empirical and conceptual questions together in such a way that his "derivations" aren't really compelling.

To be more specific, let us take a look at the *Commentary*. The first part is essentially an exposition of Llull, with a few wrinkles added by Agrippa. Llull's system (Figure 1 – see McMahon 1996: 156-158) is based upon four diagrams, two of which are circles containing basic concepts, the third is a set of boxes combining the concepts, and the fourth is the calculating circle, in which three

³ http://www.fright.com/vmoon/1_12.html. There are now many websites alluding to Agrippa. Most of them appear to be concerned with magic.

concentric circles, each containing nine letters, are correlated. Agrippa treats of these and gives a standard exposition of how Llull employed the diagrams.

What he adds, however, are more circles and distinctions (Agrippa 1600b: 320-358, 449-451). He regards Llull's two main circles as sets of predicates. The A circle contains the "dignities" or attributes of God, which are said to be absolute predicates, while the T circle contains relative predicates. Agrippa also posits an S circle, whose components are nine "subjects" – God, angel, heaven, man, imaginative, sensitive, vegetative, elementative, and instrumentative. Another additional circle is the Q circle, which contains "questions and rules" – *utrum, quid, de quo*, etc. These can be found in Llull, but not on a circle (see McMahon 1996: 164). Yet another circle is the I circle, and arranged around it are the nine Aristotelian accidental categories.⁴ Since Alsted treats of this material more clearly, a more extensive discussion of it, with diagram, is reserved for later. The nine dignities, or basic properties of God, constituted the main principles of Llull's metaphysics. Agrippa (1600b: 334-335) says that three more items – essence, unity, and perfection – must be added to these, but he neglects to say how they fit in with the 9-fold divisions on the circles. After discussing the above matters, Agrippa (1600b: 364-370) then lists a number of "extraneous" terms from the fields of theology, philosophy, and medicine, which somehow figure into the articulation of concepts within the system.

The remainder of the commentary is concerned with the "multiplication and mixing" of terms, which includes the construction of propositions (such as definitions) and arguments. He discusses the rhetorical *loci* and the treatment of them. He (1600b: 399, see also McMahon 1996: 161) follows Llull in claiming that 'man is a manifesting being' is a better definition than 'man is a rational animal'. Finally, he gives examples of how we can construct a discussion on any subject whatever, focussing mainly on rhetorical aspects of presentation and argumentation. Among the examples of topics treated at length are whether the

⁴ There is yet another circle, the W circle (1600b: 450), with 18 divisions. Agrippa (1600b: 327) mentions its subject merely in passing, so one must look to Alsted (1609: 26-27) for clarification. His interpretation is that the nine subjects can be treated substantively, which yields the distinctions of circle S, or instrumentally (accidentally), as in Figure 1. Accidents, however, are divided into natural (Aristotelian) and moral ones. And to the latter moral accidents there correspond nine vices, so the W circle stands as an alternative to the I circle, i.e., when we are speaking morally rather than naturally.

Pope has a plenitude of power (1600b: 384-386), whether fasting is meritorious (1600b: 425-430), and whether the divine spirit fills the earthly sphere (1600b: 436-448).

Now, as has already been noted, the material is not as coherent and systematic as Agrippa would like us to think. To consider his commentary as a treatise in componential semantics could be regarded as a stretch, for although Lullism claims to be explicitly concerned with the combination of word-senses, it deviates from standard Scholastic intensionalism, which is what we ordinarily understand by componentialism. I shall address this point further later, but for the moment let me note that, from the standpoint of Agrippa, a Lullian artist will be someone who is more inventive than descriptive, creating senses from his previous knowledge, rather than describing the conceptual content within a given language, in this case Latin. The commentators (e.g. Poel 1997: 50 *ff.*) label Agrippa as an imaginative rather than a critical thinker, influenced mainly by neo-Platonism, the *Kabbalah*, and the humanist rhetorical tradition. Nevertheless, the *Commentary* is not anti-Scholastic in tone or content. Agrippa employs the vocabulary and conceptual apparatus of his time; hence the subjects treated (e.g. the categories) and distinctions made often sound like standard Scholasticism. Lullism is thus, in a sense, a different way of arranging such material from, for example, Thomism.

Finally, I alluded to Agrippa's critique of Lullism in the *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum* (1600a: 39-40). This work generally constitutes a fideistic swipe at secular learning. In it Agrippa (1600a: 40) articulates in his own words a standard objection to Lullism:

Hoc autem admonere vos oportet, hanc artem ad pompam ingenii et doctrinae ostentationem potius, quam ad comparandum eruditionem valere, ac longe plus habere audacie, quam efficaciae.

As noted, for example by Poel (1997: 39-40, 99-112), at the end of his life Agrippa had become disenchanted with the quest for knowledge by natural means. He saw such inquiry as replete with nitpicking and unresolvable controversy. So he became more "existential", believing that God is revealed to us through Scripture if we trust to faith and lead a virtuous life. In such a scenario Lullism becomes just another human vanity.

Our second figure, Johann Heinrich Alsted, is quite a different character, representing a later era. Whereas Agrippa appears to us as a sensitive, insecure, itinerant intellectual, one has the impression of Alsted as a stolid bourgeois burgher. Alsted spent most of his life at the Calvinist University of Herborn in Nassau. He was literally an encyclopedic thinker, producing an *Encyclopedia* of more than 2000 pages. He was thus a systematiser *par excellence*, attempting to compartmentalise all knowledge into neat pigeon holes. In the *Encyclopedia* (1630) he fits Lullism into his conceptual scheme. The treatment of it there, however, is largely a gloss on his earlier *Clavis artis Lullianae* (1609), so here I shall focus on that discussion of the subject.

Alsted has been described as an ‘eclectic’ thinker (see Loemker 1961: 323-326). In the *Clavis* (1609: Pref. 2) his avowed purpose is to harmonise the three contemporary approaches to logic – those of Aristotle, Ramus and Lull, which he regards as compatible rather than conflicting. The *Clavis* is to some extent a commentary on Agrippa’s *Commentary*, but Alsted (1609: 22-23) maintains that Agrippa and others of his predecessors got the subject wrong; they presented it in a confused and somewhat erroneous way:

- I. *Scripta Lullii distinguantur a scriptis interpretum. Nam interpretes vel non assecuti sunt mentem autoris nostri, vel eam aenigmatis involverunt propter malevolos, vel ejus methodum immutarunt & multa de suis adjecerunt, quae artem non tam illustrant, quam obscurant.*

Alsted, then, will clarify matters by comparing the Lullian terminology with that of Aristotle and Ramus. The conception of logic which he adopts is one that includes Aristotelian demonstration as a subpart of a discipline concerned with discourse in general. This is the Ramusian notion of logic as rhetoric, in which logic becomes the *ars comparandi et tradendi scientiam*, whose operations are invention and disposition (Alsted 1609: 24, see also McMahon 1999). Logic teaches the “instruments of knowledge”, one of which is the Aristotelian syllogism (1609: 164-165). The Lullian circles enter into the picture in that they contain classes of *loci* – themes – in which are found all that pertains to demonstration (1609: 24). The circles of subjects, predicates, and questions, discussed above, are treated in more detail by Alsted, and their roles are made more clear. Alsted (1609: 116) also presents the information therein in a chart, reproduced here as Figure 2, as it is easier to read than several circles. Alsted also

discusses the boxes and rotating wheels as ways of combining terms into propositions and arguments, so as to generate virtually an infinite number of topics from a finite set of terms.

The conceptual basis of all this is orthodox Lullism, e.g., the dignities constitute the fundamental properties of reality, being infused into nature by the divinity.⁵ Agrippa's three additional absolute predicates, essence, unity, and perfection, appear diagrammatically as items L, M, N in a triangle inscribed within the A circle (Alsted 1609:28). But we do not see the combinatorial method employed to construct complex concepts from the stock of posited simples, which would be componentialism *simpliciter*. Instead there is an elaboration on the senses of the simples in the form of lists of synonyms and antonyms.⁶ The Aristotelian categories, the subdivision of which underlies traditional componentialism, appear in the overall conceptual scheme, but *de facto* they play a subsidiary role to the concepts of Figures A and T.⁷ The set of basic questions, again posited by Lull himself (see McMahon 1996: 164), are especially interesting. Although they bear resemblance to the Aristotelian categories, the correlation between them and the categories is not explicitly noted. But it is emphasised that the key to inquiry is the asking of appropriate questions (Alsted 1609: 45-46), and the nine basic "Wh-questions" are *whether, what, of what, from what cause (why), how much, of what quality, when, where, and how (by what means)*.⁸ The "rules" (1609: 48-72) associated with them are essentially labels for the kinds of answers befitting each question, respectively, *possibility, definition, matter or division, causality, quantity, quality, time, place, and instrumentality or modality*.

⁵ Although called "predicates", they also serve as subjects, as standard questions of the art include ones like "whether goodness is great" (see Alsted 1609: 106-107).

⁶ Alsted (1609: 28-38). There is also (1609: 42-43) an interesting discussion of the meanings conveyed by suffixes added to the dignity-words. In Lull (see McMahon 1996: 159-160) this had to do with the expression of the "correlatives", the properties and relationships of creatures to the divinity in which they participate. Alsted construes *bonitas, bonum, bonificare, bonificabile*, etc. as expressing different ways of thinking about a subject, such as metaphysically, physically, or morally.

⁷ As noted elsewhere (McMahon 1996: 165), the treatment of relatives (Figure T) in Lullism is of special interest because relations are a much-discussed subject in contemporary philosophy.

⁸ In Latin these are primarily Q-questions.

We thus have here a wealth of semantic material, but it is not quite what I have been looking for in the Lullist tradition. The idea of combining concepts suggests componentialism. However, like others in the tradition Alsted is not especially interested in lexical semantics but rather in combining terms into propositions and arguments (see also 1609: 127-133). The ‘multiplication’ of propositions, ‘a work of reason by which knowledge is increased’ (1609: 83) is Alsted’s primary concern, and it is that for which the circles are used. He (1609: 106) takes the fixed inner circle as that of subjects, the outer one as containing the predicates, and then one may move the middle circle to generate topics of inquiry. Although that can have the A or T terms, perhaps it is more interesting to make it a Q circle, rotating it so as to ask various questions about the relationship between an inner B, C, D, [...] and an outer B, C, D, [...]. Thus ‘from any subject infinite predicates can be brought forth from the circles’ (1609: 91). The art is also regarded as an invaluable mnemonic device for the acquisition of knowledge, the circles and tables being intended as pedagogical devices for clarifying matters and facilitating learning (see also 1609: 115-125).

On the surface then, Aristotelianism is more fruitful for inquiry into lexical semantics, as recent studies of that (e.g. Frawley 1992) appear very Aristotelian in character. As I have noted elsewhere (McMahon 1996: 163-164), regardless of whether they are metaphysical primitives, the Lullian dignities do not serve well as semantic ones, i.e., as notions of which other notions are composed. The wheels could perhaps be used componentially, if revolved around the Aristotelian categorical notions, but this is not done. Thus in order to arrive at the language schemes of later in the 17th century, one needs to modify Lullism further, most likely in an Aristotelian direction. This is to some extent what Alsted does in his *Encyclopedia* (see McMahon 1999), in which Lullism is relegated to the background, and while the overall logico-rhetorical orientation is Ramusian, the semantics is largely Aristotelian. He moves away from the Agrippine position, e.g., whereas earlier he does mention the ‘manifying’ example of definition,⁹ in the *Encyclopedia* (1630: II. 425) Alsted cites the Aristotelian “real” definition as the paradigmatic form.

⁹ Alsted (1609: 129) says:

Sic homo est cui competit hominificare. Hujusmodi enim definitiones Raymundus noster dicit esse maxime ostensivas & essentielles.

Again, Alsted's commentary on the *ars lulliana* is an improvement on the treatment of the subject by Agrippa (and by Lull himself). It is organised so as to be much more coherent; how the parts of the theory fit together is genuinely clarified. Some of the differences between Agrippa and Alsted are more amusing than serious; e.g., in contrast to some of the things which Agrippa "proved", Alsted (1609: 150-154) demonstrates that the Pope is a heretic and papism heresy. Agrippa's treatment of Lullism is inherently fuzzy, and Alsted does succeed in making it less so, but in so doing he tends to introduce another kind of obfuscation, that resulting from excessive detail. The maze of distinctions in Alsted makes it difficult for one to separate the forest from the trees. However, in conclusion, I do believe there are many valuable insights into semantics in Lullism and particularly in Alsted. But as in much medieval / post-medieval material the treasure does not exist on the surface, readily accessible. One has to dig for it.

He does not elaborate on this and later in the *Clavis* (1609: 145-149) discusses the Aristotelian sense of definition as if it were the standard. This would square with a treatment of the types of argument (1609: 170-172) which differentiates verbal and real questions. The point here is that if Alsted understood the difference between empirical and conceptual issues, upon reflection he would see that "man is a manifesting animal" is a vacuous conceptual claim.

FIGURE 1

NOVEMBER 2001

HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN

REFERENCES

- Agrippa von Nettesheim, Heinrich Cornelius. 1600a. De incertitudine & vanitate scientiarum atque artium declamatio invectiva. *Opera*, Vol. II. Lyon: per Beringos Fratres, 1-314. Repr. 1970. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- 1600b. In artem brevem Raymundi Lullii commentaria. *Opera*, Vol. II. Lyon: per Beringos Fratres, 319-451.
- Alsted, Johann Heinrich. 1609. *Clavis artis Lullianae. et verae logices duos in libellos tributa*. Strassburg: Lazarus Zetznerus. Repr. 1983. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- 1630. *Encyclopediæ*. 7 vols. Herbornae Nassoviorum: pub. not given. Repr. 1989 with an introduction by Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann and a bibliography by Jörg Jungmayr. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Frawley, William. 1992. *Linguistic Semantics*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Loemker, Leroy E. 1961. Leibniz and the Herborn Encyclopedists. In: *Journal of the History of Ideas XXII*, 323-338.
- McMahon, William E. 1987. Aristotelian Categorical Theory Viewed as a Theory of Componential Semantics. In: Hans Aarsleff, Louis G. Kelly, and Hans-Josef Niederehe (eds), *Papers in the History of Linguistics: Proceedings of the Third International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences. Princeton. 19-23 August 1984*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 53-64. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences. 38].
- 1996. The Semantics of Ramon Llull. In: Ignacio Angelelli and Maria Cerezo (eds), *Studies on the History of Logic. Proceedings of the III. Symposium on the History of Logic*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 155-171. [Vol. 8 of Perspectives in Analytical Philosophy].
- 1999. The Semantics of Johann Alsted. In: David Cram, Andrew Linn & Elke Nowak (eds), *History of Linguistics 1996. Volume 2: From Classical to Contemporary Linguistics. Selected Papers from the Seventh International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHoLS VII). Oxford. 12-17 September 1996*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 123-130. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences. 94].

- Nauert, Jr., Charles G. 1965. *Agrippa and the Crisis of Renaissance Thought*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. [Vol. LV of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences].
- Poel, Marc van der. 1997. *Cornelius Agrippa, the Humanist Theologian and his Declamations*. Leiden: Brill. [Vol. LXXVII of Brill's Studies in Intellectual History].
- Risse, Wilhelm. 1964. *Die Logik der Neuzeit*, Vol. I, 1500-1640. Stuttgart / Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann.
- Rossi, Paolo. 1960. *Clavis Universalis, Arti Mnemoniche e Logica Combinatoria da Lullo a Leibniz*. Milan/Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi. (Trans. by Stephen Clucas – see review in this volume.)

William E. McMahon, Akron, Ohio
mcmahon@uakron.edu

Richard Chenevix Trench – more than just a populariser

Rummaging about in second-hand bookshops has its pleasures. Such shops, and academic libraries, are rather poignant sources of enjoyment. The many books one sees are mainly the fruits of untold labours by forgotten scholars, some unjustly neglected, and others less so. It is always a slightly painful pleasure to come across forgotten works of value, such as those of Richard Chenevix Trench (1807-1886), as I did in a second-hand bookshop in Edinburgh some years ago. J. R. Hulbert (1955: 39) tells us that finding Trench's works in such shops used to be quite a common event.

Trench is little known today, but was a prominent clergyman and philologist of the Victorian period. His biographer, Bromley, calls him a 'minor Victorian', whose writings 'were not destined for immortality' (1959: v). That view may be a little harsh. Trench deserves to be remembered and better known. In fact, his name and work are recorded appropriately. He had interests also in poetry, occultism and Spanish literature (on which he published). He was the author of many collections of sermons and poems,¹⁰ and was one of the first to stimulate close linguistic study of the gospels. He also wrote a study of synonyms in the New Testament. This work involved the painstaking philological study of the New Testament texts with a view to their better understanding. His *Glossary of Synonyms of the New Testament* was a fruit of those labours, and it remains useful. In his practical life, he helped to bring Christianity and charitable relief to the poor of London, defended (unsuccessfully) the establishment of the Irish church and later worked to maintain the unity of the disestablished Church of Ireland, was an active member of the Philological Society of London, played a significant role in promoting (what became) the *Oxford English Dictionary* (originally, of course, the *New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*), and

¹⁰ Two of Trench's poems are included in the *Oxford Book of Victorian Verse* (ed. A. Quiller-Couch, 1913, nos. 133 and 134, p. 149). His poems also appear in *The Oxford Book of Christian Verse*, *The Cambridge Book of Lesser Poets*, and *Palgrave's Treasury of Sacred Song*. The poems show a private man of deep personal feeling. His life certainly contained its share of suffering. He lost two sons who died on service in India, for example.

published two books, which popularised the study of the English Language. *On the Study of Words* (1851) and *English Past and Present* (1857) were probably the earliest works to present English etymology and the history of English in a way which was at once both scholarly and systematic, and readily accessible to an educated public. Less well known nowadays is his *Select Glossary of English Words Used Formerly in Senses Different from their Present* (1859), although it went through seven editions in his lifetime. His work came at a time of rising interest in historical linguistics and the history of English.

Trench was born in Dublin in 1807 into a prominent family. His father was a barrister and his eldest brother became a major-general. One of his sons also rose to prominence in the army in India. Trench's family moved to Bursledon, Hampshire, and he was educated at Twyford School, Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A (1829), M.A. (1833) and B.D. (1840). He was awarded an Hon. D.D. by Cambridge University in 1856 (automatically on accession to the Deanery of Westminster). He was ordained in 1835 and held various appointments in the church (including one as curate to "soapy" Samuel Wilberforce, with whom Trench was closely associated) at Curdridge and Itchenstoke (Hants.) before being appointed Professor of Divinity at King's College, London (1846-58). He then became Dean of Westminster, in succession to Wilberforce, (1856-63), and later Archbishop of Dublin (1863-84), in succession to the fine scholar and logician, Richard Whately, and died in 1886. Obituaries appeared in *The Times* (29.3.1886) and *The Guardian* (31.3.1886). His life was recorded in J. Bromley's excellent study, *The Man of Ten Talents – a Portrait of Richard Chenevix Trench* (1959). (Concise information can be found in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (contributor J. Bayne, 1898) and F. Cross (ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1974: 1392.)

Trench and the OED

Trench's work in stimulating the great undertaking which became the *Oxford English Dictionary* has been recorded several times; by *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (15th ed. *Macropaedia*, vol. 6, p. 883), Potter (1950: 118), Hulbert (1972: 39, 45-46), and Asher (1994, vol. 5: 2894). According to *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Potter, and Asher's *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, Trench must be given credit for the suggestion which led to the great dictionary.

In the 1850s there was discussion in the Philological Society of the existing dictionaries (particularly those of Johnson and Richardson) and the current needs. According to MacMahon, writing in *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, 'The philologist and clergyman, Richard Chenevix Trench (1807-86), persuaded the [philological] society that what was required was not a supplement, but an entirely new dictionary' (p. 2894). Trench achieved this by delivering two papers to the society in the summer of 1857, eventually published as *On Some Deficiencies of our English Dictionaries* (1857), in which he laid out the requirements and scope of a proposed new dictionary. As Hulbert (1972: 45) says, Trench 'expounded the main desiderata of a dictionary', i.e. to give the history of words in the language, the date of their first introduction, whether the words were present in Old English, the development of each meaning, the latest date for obsolete words, dated quotations, as well as the usual information on spelling, pronunciation, current meaning and etymology. It can be seen that these ideas have been incorporated into successive editions of the *OED*, although of course they have been refined, developed and implemented in the light of experience by lexicographers. Only very recently, with the advent of computer corpora, have lexicographical methods changed significantly away from the basic principles laid down by Trench. It has to be said, however, that Hulbert gives the credit for the initial suggestion to F. J. Furnivall rather than to Trench. He says that the action taken by the society was 'apparently as a result of a suggestion made by F. J. Furnivall [the second editor of the *OED*] to Dean Trench in May' (p. 38) and that suggestion resulted in Trench's papers. However that may be, it is clear that Trench and Furnivall were both important instigators of the great enterprise and Hulbert (pp. 45-6) goes on to say, 'the paper prepared by Dean Trench was one of the earliest moves leading to the decision on the scope and policies of that monumental work' and was a 'first step in dictionary making'. Trench's *On Some Deficiencies of Our English Dictionaries* is linked to his *Select Glossary of English Words Used Formerly in Senses Different from their Present*. Both books present extensive examples of the sort of information required in dictionaries. Trench deliberately used material which had *not* yet been proposed for the Dictionary project. The *Glossary* 'proposes to state in a popular manner and for the general reader the changes of meaning which so many [...] words have undergone' (p. v). Its basic principles are similar to those underlying his proposals for dictionaries. In fact, the two works were written close together and it is clear that Trench was deeply concerned with lexicology at the time. He

emphasises (pp. viii – xi) the application of general laws of meaning change and the study of a wide range of early authors as well as the use of clear, illustrative examples drawn from authentic texts. As is usual with Trench, he aims to link meaning and semantic change to the history of manners, historical events and moral values.

The main deficiencies in dictionaries, listed with copious examples, in his papers to the Philological Society are (p.3):

1. Obsolete words are incompletely registered [...]
2. Families or groups of words are often imperfect, some members of a family inserted, while other are omitted.
3. Much earlier examples of the employment of words oftentimes exist than any which are cited; indicating that they were introduced at an earlier date into the language [...]
4. Important meanings and uses of words are passed over; sometimes the later alone given, while the earlier [...] are unnoticed.
5. Comparatively little attention is paid to the distinguishing of synonymous words.
6. Many passages in our literature are passed by, which might be usefully adduced in illustration [...]
7. [...] our dictionaries err in redundancy as well as in defect, in the too much as well as the too little [...]

It is clear that Trench was calling for a more systematic and comprehensive form of dictionary on historical principles with clear illustrative references and greater attention to precise and distinctive definitions. He clearly wanted the grammatical functions of words and their cognates to be systematically presented. He did not, however, discuss the kind of phonetic information which we now expect to find. His work includes a discussion of the criteria for the admission of words to the dictionary. While he is in favour of comprehensiveness, an objective 'inventory of the language' (p. 5), and wishes to include all obsolete words (p. 12), he prefers to exclude dialectal words (p.14), unless they have become more general. While the former criterion gives too much weight to literary sources and leads, in principle, to the admission of any foreign word which might have crept into an English text, the latter is too restrictive. On the whole, however, Trench's papers constitute a sensible and

viable set of principles and a major contribution in the history of lexicography. The editors of the *OED*, of course, developed great expertise of their own and modified Trench's approach, but he certainly pointed the way.

Trench's On the Study of Words

There is no question, however, that Trench's two popularising books were of great importance in the development of English Language studies and in kindling interest in them. They came a little before the first edition of Max Müller's popularising lectures, *The Science of Language* (1860), and at a time when the great progress in historical and comparative linguistics were just becoming known to the public. (Apart from Max Müller's work, those developments were known to a much wider public through the Religious Tract Society, whose cheaply available (and anonymously written) *Origin and Progress of Language*, 1848, contains very clear references to the work done in Germany by Bopp, Adelung, the Humboldts, Pott, Grimm and others, pp. 115-148). Trench's two main philological works were clearly well received (review in *Fraser's Magazine*, December 1851), went through many editions over more than fifty years, and were eventually reprinted in the Everyman's Library (1927). The *Study of Words* had reached its 27th edition by 1886, *English Past and Present* its 19th by 1884, and the less well-known *Select Glossary* its 7th by 1890. There seem to have been few sources or models for Trench to work with (other than Horne Tooke's *Diversions of Purley*) and there were no serious competitors to his works, in the popular field, until those of Pearsall-Smith and Weekley (and later Wrenn, Potter, Brook and others) or, in the more academic field, until those of Skeat and Wyld. Potter (1950: 118) calls them 'attractive little books', which indeed they are. Pearsall-Smith (1912: 253) writes, 'with the exception of Archbishop Trench's little book, *On the Study of Words*, new edition 1904, little has been written in English on the connection between language and thought and history'. Hulbert (1955: 39) writes that Trench's books are 'perhaps the earliest of a long line of popular expositions of the fascinating history of our language and of selected English words. These books may not have had any worthy competitors for a long time'.

Trench's works show him to have been a capable linguist and a good scholar. His style is clear, if somewhat elevated and, perhaps, too dry for the

modern taste. His work has the virtues of Victorian scholarship. His ideas are well organised, although the moral and religious orientation of a significant portion of the work must be seen in the context of the thinking of the day and the light of the fact that Trench was a clergyman. *Fraser's Magazine* accused him of confusing philology with the pulpit and the accusation is repeated in Bromley (1959: 230). Clearly, chapters such as 'On the Morality in Words' and arguments for Original Sin drawn from instances of change of meaning do not stand up today. However, one should not be distracted from the overall usefulness and well-written content of the books. Furthermore, in Trench's defence, *On the Study of Words* was originally a set of lectures for intending or serving teachers at the Winchester Diocesan College. Nevertheless, Trench was certainly a populariser and his work was not true etymology, although he was clearly a very capable linguist. His work was almost entirely concerned with vocabulary only and paid little attention to phonetic change.

The influence of Trench's works, however, can be seen in several ways. First, the ideas of his two main works have been taken over by a whole series of important academic popularisers and those writing for a more serious academic purpose. The main ideas of the *Study of Words* and *English Past and Present* are found in, and are familiar from, the works of Weekley, Pearsall-Smith, Potter, Wrenn, Brook, Ullmann and (to a lesser extent) the more recent standard works by Barber (1993) and by Fennell (2001), where many of Trench's examples have become standard, e.g. in the classification of Middle English borrowings. Weekley (1928), Pearsall-Smith (1912) and Potter (1950) all mention Trench's work. Trench's views on the differentiation of synonyms were quoted and discussed as late as 1933 by W. A. Russell (p. 158). Secondly, the structure of *English Past and Present* is repeated in many expositions of the history of English. Thirdly, and rather surprisingly, Trench's materials and the information in his books were incorporated into proposals for the reform of English teaching in secondary schools around the turn of the century by Richard Wilson. As mentioned before, *The Study of Words* was first directed to teachers and its final chapter explicitly discusses ways of incorporating the study of the vocabulary into the school curriculum. Finally, Trench's ideas and etymological explanations

passed into educated discourse and influenced the mode of public debate. This is clear, for example, from references in Ruskin.¹¹

While many of the linguistic ideas contained in the *Study of Words* are expressed in connection with religious messages and moral conclusions (which are clearly related to the content of the Religious Society tract, *On the Origin and Progress of Language*, 1848),¹² the work is a clear expression of many ideas which later became commonplaces. Furthermore, it illustrates processes of linguistic change which have been repeated in later expositions and provides examples which have subsequently become standard.

The *Study of Words* invites the reader to consider the great amount of information which words provide. Trench says, 'often [...] in words contemplated singly, there are boundless stores of moral and historic truth, and no less of passion and imagination laid up – that from these lessons of infinite worth may be derived [...]' (p.1) and later 'to study a people's language will be to study them' (p. 59). Here are two of the major trends of much (popular) English Language study of this historical sort. There are concerns with words to the exclusion of other aspects of the language and the use of language study for what Hjelmslev (1953: 7) called 'transcendental' purposes, i.e. the use of linguistic information as a tool for non-linguistic understanding. Trench was not concerned with the *immanent* structure of the language and was one of many to divert readers' attention away from it. The first chapter is constructed around the following themes:

The poetry in words. Here Trench illustrates the metaphorical basis of words using now well-known examples such as *dilapidated* (p. 6) and expressing the 'deep analogy of things natural and things spiritual' (p. 5). This is a theme which has often been taken up and is well explained in, for example, Ullmann (1962: 212 ff.).

¹¹ Ruskin's diaries record that he 'walked' and 'dined' with an unidentified Mr. Trench in November 1857. It is quite possible that the gentleman in question was R. C. Trench, given the latter's literary interests (Ruskin 1958).

¹² One should also remember that the content was originally a series of lectures to the trainees at the Diocesan College, Winchester.

The morality in words. Using examples such as *tribulation* (from *tribulatio*, 'threshing') and *divert* (and the idea of turning away from ourselves), Trench continues the theme of the development of abstract ideas from concrete metaphors (the 'deepening and elevating of words' (p. 9)). Other examples he gives are *knight*, *humility*, *apostle* and *paradise* (p. 37). Trench goes on to illustrate the opposite process by which words come to designate less favourable realities than they once did. An example he gives is *lewd*, which has come to mean 'sinful, pornographic' via 'unlearned' from 'lay' (p. 13). The examples *knave*, *villain*, *boor*, *conceit*, and *officious* (p. 29 ff.) have become standard examples of this process of change. Narrowing of meaning is illustrated by *passion* (p. 43) and shifts along the scale of **approbation-disapprobation** by now standard examples such as *silly*, *simple* and *happy* (p. 51-3). *Pars pro toto* is exemplified by *hand* (p. 54) to mean 'labourer' and euphemism by *love-child* (p. 55). Again, all of these linguistic processes are amply discussed in much the same ways in many subsequent works.

The fossil history in words. Here Trench draws attention to the association of words with history and connects the history of the language with the history of its speakers. He takes the example of the register and meaning shift of *frank* connecting it with the Franks (p. 13). Again this has become a well-worn example and the method is one which is familiar from Weekley's *Romance of Words*, Bradley's *Making of English*, Jespersen's *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, and Potter's *Our Language*. There are still echoes of it in Barber's excellent *The English Language: a Historical Introduction* and Fennell's very useful *A History of English*.

In Trench's work and that of the other writers named, we can see the same presuppositions, many of which have passed into the lay person's understanding of language. There is the concentration on words to the exclusion of other components of languages. There is the antiquarian 'fossil-hunting' involved in the discussion of selected words. There are the ideas of true or 'proper' (i.e. etymological) meanings, which are, or (prescriptively) should be, significant to the user, and of words as either 'native' or 'non-native' / 'foreign'. The idea of there being 'foreign elements' in the language extends well beyond recent borrowings to all words of non-Germanic (non Old English) origin. This is a uniquely historical viewpoint and, of course, knows nothing of a unified hybrid

language, of the social stratification of languages, or of code-switching and mixing. It is a viewpoint which associates English with 'Anglo-Saxon' and the anglo-saxon tribes in a way that has political, nationalistic and (to modern ears) perhaps racist overtones. Those are views which have persisted down the years and are repeated in Weekley's *English Language* and Pearsall-Smith's book of the same name (see also Weekley's *Romance of Words*, 1912, and Pearsall-Smith's *Words and Idioms*, 1925). Both Weekley and Pearsall-Smith associate words of anglo-saxon origin with 'native English' and all borrowings with 'foreign elements' (Weekley 1928: 59 ff. and Pearsall-Smith 1912: 30 ff.). Similar views are found in Max Müller's (almost contemporary) lectures with which Trench was no doubt familiar. As Max Müller says:

[...] languages are never mixed. [...] to the student of language English is Teutonic and nothing but Teutonic. Though every record were burned, [...] the English language, as spoken by any ploughboy, would reveal its own history, if analysed according to the rules of comparative grammar. (1871: 84)

Furthermore, Trench personifies English and other languages as somehow living entities with an independent existence, whose words can be 'ennobled' or 'degraded' in changes of register. He discusses the 'usefulness' of new words and the issues of good and bad 'taste' in word creation and whether words are 'needed' (p. 136). From such ideas arise the themes of 'progress and decay' (Jespersen, e.g. 1922: 319 ff.) and 'profit and loss' (Bradley 1904: 74 ff.) in English and those ideas and the value judgements associated with them have continued to bedevil discussions of English to the present day (see, e.g., Gowers (1954: 30–119), and further discussion in Potter, (1950: 10 & 125)).

Subsequent chapters develop the themes of the first chapter. They concern: the Morality in Words (ch. 2); the History in Words (ch. 3); the Rise of New Words (ch. 4); the Destruction of Words (ch. 5); and the Schoolmaster's Use of Words (ch. 6). Those chapters make clear the etymological processes mentioned above and the sources of the English vocabulary. In chapter 3 Trench takes up the ways in which word origins and borrowings reflect historical events and processes. He further illustrates the pathways of the cultural transmission of words. In doing those things, he introduces themes and examples which have become commonplaces in popular discussions of English vocabulary (again

compare Pearsall-Smith (1912), chapters 6-8 on 'Language and History'). For example, Trench discusses the themes of the differentiation of near synonyms of Romance and Germanic origin (p. 70); the distinction of words of Germanic origin as familiar or core vocabulary from those of Romance origin for more formal or elevated use (p. 72); the discussion of the origins of words (p. 75 *ff.*); and the types of change of meaning (p. 97 *ff.*). Now well-worn examples are introduced concerning the names of household or everyday terms from Old English, *water, sun, moon, house, cow, sheep*, etc. – as opposed to names of luxury goods and animal products, as well as words for royalty, or aristocracy and power, of Romance origin – *beef, mutton, robe, castle, duke, court*, etc. This sort of (perfectly valid) analysis by semantic field (with very similar examples) is still found today in Fennell's book (2001: 106 *ff.*).

Trench also classifies words by theme in ways which have been followed since. Thus, we find vocabulary items listed which originate with the schoolmen (p. 83) – *real, entity, quality*, etc. – or from religious or political groups (and he notes the distinction between names deliberately adopted and those imposed from outside – p. 85 *ff.*) – *quaker, roundhead, methodist, tory*, etc. – or from place names (p. 88 *ff.*) – *muslin, bayonet, cambric, damask*. That leads him on to discuss both false etymologies (p. 91 *ff.*) and words of interesting origin (e.g. the names of days of the week (p. 98) and *lumber* from *lombard* p. 93), and those which reflect old views or philosophies (*humour, saturnine, jovial*, etc. p. 95 *ff.*). Finally in this chapter he briefly discusses change of meaning up to the time of writing.

The writing skips from example to example within the overall categories, but the general principles are clearly observable and they are those which have often been followed since, frequently with the same examples. These are popular and interesting ways of looking at words. They do have some unfortunate consequences, however. We have noted already the concentration on words. In this and subsequent chapters, we see the 'fossil-hunting', rather antiquarian approach to languages, which Saussure criticised for the failure to see languages as systems (1916: 18 *ff.*) and Hjelmslev (1953: 7) attacked as viewing languages as so many *membra dissecta*. Chapter 4 (p. 136) raises questions of the 'need for', or 'usefulness' of, words which have entered the language. That has been a distracting theme of popular discussion down to the works of Gowers (1954), Partridge (1965), and the letters column of *The Times*.

On the other hand, chapter 4 introduces important ideas about the development of vocabulary. In particular, Trench emphasises the importance of identifying the first use of words and, where possible, the first written source (p. 101). Those were, of course, central ideas for the development of the *OED*. He discusses the names of places and countries (p. 107 ff.); the vocabulary items from christian Latin (104 ff. examples: *saviour*, *incarnation*, *trinity*, etc.); the neologisms of major writers (107 ff.); the effect of new philosophical and scientific thought (114 ff.); the new vocabulary from poetry (p. 116); cultural change and borrowing to reflect new realities such as in animal naming (p. 117 ff.); the new words proceeding from historical events (p. 130 ff.) and goes on to consider folk etymology (p. 139), uncertainty in etymology (p. 142) and the gradual spread of new words throughout the population (p. 145). Those are all significant themes in the understanding of the history of the lexicon, first explicitly and systematically introduced and explained in English by Trench and followed by many others. In these matters, Trench is a clear precursor of Bréal, whose *Essai de Sémantique* did not appear until 1897.

Chapter 5 deals with the 'Distinction of Words'. As we have seen, Trench was interested in 'synonyms' (including near synonyms or words simply of related meanings) and their differentiation for the proper understanding of New Testament Greek and for the understanding of English. The differentiation of synonyms is a common activity of popularising historians of English. There can be confusion in such discussions because of the lack of any clear theory of meaning. Trench, of course, had no such theory, but the outline of an approach can be discerned. He was well aware of what we would now call semantic fields, as we have seen, and he appears to treat meanings as classes of conventionally denoted referents distinguished within such a field. He says, 'what, after all, is a word but the enclosure of a certain district, larger or smaller, from the great outfield of thought or fact [...]?' (p. 148). He pointed out the correlations between the sources of words with their meaning variation, and what we would now call register. Thus, he discusses the specialisation in meaning and relative formality of words of Romance origin with the homelier feel and wider application of Germanic near-synonyms in now well-known examples such as *love/charity*, *shepherd/pastor*, *feeling/sentiment*, *kingdom/realm*, *heal/cure*, *soften/mollify*, etc. (pp. 156-7). The related noun-adjective correlations such as *star/stellar*, *year/annual* – are also discussed in this context (p. 157). One can see from the examples that the idea of 'synonym' is too broad, but the observations

are fundamentally correct and have been repeated many times since. One of the most interesting examples of the correlation of differing sources with varying register and usage is the list *trick, device, finesse, artifice, stratagem* from Old English, Italian, French, Latin and Greek respectively (p. 150).

The final chapter of the *Study of Words*, 'The Schoolmaster's Use of Words', is, as noted, devoted to the potential for word study in the curriculum. That is partly because Trench's original audience was made up of practising or intending teachers, but also because of a clear pedagogical interest of his own. Trench suggested that word study could be both of interest to pupils and the teaching integrated with other areas of the curriculum.

He wished to make the English class more interesting by pointing out to pupils the etymological connections of words, e.g. *smith/smite, guile/guilt* (p.189), the origins of common words, *cockle, field* (p. 204), the explanation of curious or puzzling words in the contemporary language, *the quick and the dead, canon/cannon* etc. (pp. 193-4), the threads of polysemous words, *post, stock* (pp. 191-2) and differences of historical origin in e.g. *ear of corn / ear on the head* (p. 196).

Trench suggested various areas of the curriculum where a study of words might be fruitful. In particular, he noted that a better understanding of other languages could be had by comparing English with Latin (or French). He added areas such as nature study through animal or plant names, history and geography through place names (pp. 207-8) and, of course, religious instruction (p. 214).

A final interesting discussion in the last chapter of the *Study of Words* is that devoted to the proposal for spelling reform (p. 184 ff.). It is noteworthy that Trench rejects the idea of a phonetic script for very much the same reasons as scholars have put forward ever since; namely that the gains would be greatly outweighed by the losses in visual differentiation, association of cognate words, and that pronunciation is in any case constantly shifting. As he remarks, 'a word exists as truly for the eye as for the ear' (p.184).

Influence of the Study of Words

Trench's book was well known, widely read, and the only one in its field. It, no doubt, had an effect on the reading public. One example is Ruskin (who may well have met Trench – see above). Although he does not refer to Trench by name, the

following passage from 'Of King's Treasuries' (first published in 1865) seems to be directly influenced by Trench:

Now, in order to deal with words rightly, this is the habit you must form. Nearly every word in your language has been first a word of some other language – of Saxon, German, French, Latin or Greek (not to speak of Eastern or primitive dialects). And many words have been all these: - that is to say, have been Greek first, Latin next, and English last undergoing a certain change of sense and use on the lips of each nation; but retaining a deep, vital meaning, which all good scholars feel in employing them[...]. (1905: 34)

More than fifty years after the first publication of the *Study of Words*, others, such as Richard Wilson, *Lingua Materna* (1908), tried to put Trench's ideas on the incorporation of word study into the curriculum into practice as part of a proposed reform of English teaching in schools. Wilson's book, which is a sensible contribution and worthy of at least a short chapter in the history of education in itself, makes several explicit references to Trench's work (p. 27, pp. 32-33, p. 36 and p. 168). Wilson takes up the suggestions made by Trench for word study to be integrated into the curriculum and puts forward the following:

[...] reading Trench's *Study of Words* along with Skeat's *Dictionary*, or a course of lessons based on these two works is suggested for the second year of upper secondary, i.e. age 14-15 or so [...]. (1908: 168)

(It must be remembered that Wilson had in mind (mainly) linguistically sophisticated public schoolboys of a much higher general level of reading than the average pupil of today.) It may be that Nesfield (1898) had similar ideas in mind, and was also perhaps influenced by Trench, in the word study parts of his (occasionally derided, but actually useful and informative) *English Grammar* (e.g. p. 445 ff).¹³

¹³ One might wonder whether Stuart Chase's *Tyranny of Words* is an echo of Trench's remark (*Study of Words*, p. 180): 'Ask then words what they mean [...] that you may deliver yourselves [...] from the tyranny of words [...]'. There is no explicit reference to Trench by Chase, but the book is in the spirit of (some of) Trench's ideas.

If *The Study of Words* introduced many of the themes taken up subsequently in the study of the history of English vocabulary and established patterns for their discussion, *English Past and Present* set a pattern for the systematic (popular) exposition of the history of English. *English Past and Present* is also a word-based study, which takes up and develops many of the themes of the earlier book with an abundance of additional examples. It introduces also, however, a systematic periodisation of English and places borrowings in the context both of history and of the period of borrowing. Furthermore, it shows, in a number of respects, an advance in thinking over the earlier work.

English Past and Present

English Past and Present is the written text of a series of eight lectures given at King's College School, London. The work was greatly updated in later editions to take account of work done by Max Müller and the German comparativists, such as Schleicher. Lecture 1 raises the awareness of the diverse origins of English vocabulary, gives an overview of the sources of borrowing into English, and suggests reasons for philological study. A principal reason stated is 'the present is only intelligible in the light of the past', so we need 'a knowledge of historic evolutions and the disturbing forces which have made themselves felt therein' (p. 7). Here Trench is adopting the historical approach to explanation, which was the dominant, if not exclusive, mode of scientific explanation of the day. It is one of the examples of Trench being typical of his period.

Lectures 2, 3 and 4 are concerned with borrowing into English from different sources, and the semantic fields concerned, from the Norman conquest to his time of writing. Little attention is given to Scandinavian influences on English, but there is extensive study of borrowing from French at different periods, Latin (directly and via French, p. 98 *ff.*), Greek, and other languages, especially the languages of European culture, Italian, Trench's beloved Spanish, and German (for scientific vocabulary, 118 *ff.*).

Lectures 5 and 6 look at 'diminutions of the English Language'. Here Trench is principally concerned with vocabulary losses at different periods, including the decline of 'anglo-saxon' word formation in the face of borrowing, but he also outlines some grammatical changes. By those, he means the loss of

inflections (e.g. compared with Latin, p. 208), which he classes as part of linguistic decay. He tells us that by the end of the Middle Ages, '[...] the grammar [...] had [...] become a ruin' (p. 59). He had not come to see the progressive reorganising of English grammar through analytic means. For him, 'it is the essential character of a living language to be in flux and flow, to be gaining and losing' (p. 169). Such a state is part of 'that great struggle for survival, which is going on here, as in every other domain of life' (p. 173). Trench has caught here the prevailing Darwinian mood, which was to pervade historical linguistic studies for a long time to come (and is a little surprising in one so closely associated with Wilberforce, who had famously, and disastrously, attempted to discredit the theory of evolution by natural selection).¹⁴

Lectures 7 and 8 look at changes of meaning and spelling issues respectively. Lecture 7 develops themes of the earlier *Study of Words* and provides more examples of narrowing and expansion of meaning, and changes of register, while lecture 8 gives a fuller discussion of the problems of English spelling, its relationship to etymology, and rehearses the arguments against the adoption of "phonetic" spelling for English.

Many of the themes of *English Past and Present* are those of the earlier work, as we have seen. They include also the recognition of 'doublets' (a later term, p. 21), judgements of 'good' and 'bad' borrowing and loss (e.g. p. 193), the classification of borrowings by source language and semantic fields at many points in the work, synonyms (p. 76 ff.), and register differences (p. 188 ff.). However, there is much in the work that is an improvement over the earlier text. There is less sermonising. There is more reference, in later editions such as that of 1868, to the academic work of the period (especially to Marsh's *Origin and History of the English Language*). While much linguistic change is still regarded as 'decay' (p. 59 ff.), there is more attention to grammar (which Trench equates largely with inflectional morphology, as was typical of his period, p. 147, p. 208) and to phonetic change (p. 115, p. 289). Apart from the useful periodisation of borrowings, there is more recognition that the result of borrowing has been a hybridisation of English, a 'blending' (p. 59 ff.) of Anglo-Saxon and French, a 'naturalization' of words (p. 105). Finally, there are interesting earlier speculations on the process of linguistic divergence (p. 49).

¹⁴ In later editions, e.g. 1868, there are explicit references to the works of Lyell and Darwin, (fns p. 10, p. 56).

Concluding Remarks

Trench always provides us with copious examples of the processes discussed. Those examples are sometimes surprising because his 19th-century views may be different from our current observations. As I have remarked elsewhere (Rastall 1995: 134 *ff.*), the comments of earlier, reliable linguists shed light on linguistic change. For example, Trench lists certain words with the suffixes *-some* and *-ard* as 'nearly or quite disappeared' or 'extinct' (pp. 182-3). They include *toothsome*, *winsom(e)*, *lissom(e)*, *fearsome*, *dullard*. Clearly, they have made a come-back. Again, Trench's observation that the 'genitive "s"' form is 'daily narrowing' in the face of the *of* construction (p. 230) may be compared with the recent resurgence of the form (*England's capital*, *the theory's advocates*, etc.). Trench considers that, at his time, *the hypocrite's hope* would have been rephrased as *the hope of the hypocrite*, etc.

Trench's biographer, Bromley, while acknowledging Trench's contributions to New Testament philology, concludes that 'Trench's greatest services to Philology were rendered through his membership of the Philological Society, and in particular through his ardent championship of the scheme for the production of a new and comprehensive English dictionary' (p. 237). He feels that, 'we could hardly describe Trench as a comparative philologist in the scientific sense [...] He was a popularizer, using the medium which in those days was most effective and successful; the educational lecture addressed to a general audience' (p. 229). Those conclusions are reasonable, but do not do justice to Trench's work in the history of English and his role in promoting interest in it. Certainly, Trench gave impetus to the dictionary project and was a populariser, but he was also a fine scholar, whose work has been imitated and built on to this day. His approaches to the development of English vocabulary and classification of the processes in it have been often repeated. His examples have become the commonplaces of many who are unaware of his name.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asher, R. E. (ed.) 1994. *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Volume 5. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Barber, C. 1993. *The English Language: A Historical Introduction*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bradley, H. 1904. *The Making of English*. London: MacMillan.
- Bromley, J. 1959. *The Man of Ten Talents – a Portrait of Richard Chenevix Trench*. London: SPCK.
- Brook, G. L. 1958. *A History of the English Language*. London: Deutsch.
- Chase, S. 1937. *The Tyranny of Words*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.
- Cross, F. (ed.) 1974. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Oxford: OUP.
- Bayne, R. 1899. Richard Chenevix Trench. In: *Dictionary of National Biography* 1:viii, 191-4. [Now online].
- Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 1975. 15th ed., *Macropaedia*, volume 6. London, Chicago etc.: Benton.
- Fennell, B. 2001. *A History of English*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fraser's Magazine*, London, **December 1851**.
- Gowers, Sir E. 1954. *Complete Plain Words*. London: HMSO.
- Hjelmlev, L. 1953. *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Home-Tooke, J. 1829. *Diversions of Purley*. 2nd ed. London: J. Johnson
- Hulbert, J. R. 1955. *Dictionaries: British and American*. London: Deutsch.
- Jespersen, O. 1922. *Language*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- 1943. *Growth and Structure of the English Language*. 9th ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Marsh, G. P. 1862. *History and Origin of the English Language*. London: Methuen
- Müller, F. Max. 1871. *Lectures on the Science of Language*. 6th ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co. [1st ed. 1860].
- Nesfield, J. C. 1898. *English Grammar - Past and Present*. London: MacMillan.
- Palgrave, F. T 1889. *Treasury of Sacred Song*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Partridge, E. 1965. *Usage and Abusage*. 8th ed. London: Hamilton.
- Pearsall-Smith, L. 1912. *The English Language*. London: Butterworth.
- 1925. *Words and Idioms*. London: Constable.

- Potter, S. 1950. *Our Language*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Quiller-Couch, A. 1913. *Oxford Book of Victorian Verse*. Oxford: OUP.
- Rastall, P. 1995. *A Functional View of English Grammar*. Lampeter and Lewiston : Mellen Press.
- Religious Tract Society. 1848. *Origin and Progress of Language*. London.
- Richardson, C. L. 1836-1837. *A New Dictionary of the English Language*. London: Pickering.
- Ruskin, J. 1905. "Of King's Treasures". In: *Sesame and Lilies*. London: Allen. [First published 1865].
- 1958. *Diaries of John Ruskin*. Vol. 2. Edited by J. Evans and J. Whitehouse. Oxford: OUP.
- Russell, W. A. 1933. *The Development of the Art of Language in Latin and English*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Saussure, F. de 1916. *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris and Geneva: Payot.
- Skeat, W. 1887. *Principles of English Etymology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1888. *Concise Dictionary of Middle English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1895. *Primer of English Etymology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Trench, R.C. 1851. *On the Study of Words*. London: Parker.
- 1854. *Synonyms of the New Testament*. London: Parker.
- 1855. *English Past and Present*. London: Parker.
- 1859. *A Select Glossary of English Words used formerly in Senses Different from their Present*. London: Parker.
- 1860. *On Some Deficiencies of our English Dictionaries*. London: Parker.
- Ullmann, S. 1962. *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wilson, R. 1908. *Lingua Materna*. London: Arnold.
- Weekley, E. 1912. *The Romance of Words*. London: Murray.
- 1928. *The English Language*. London: Benn.
- Wrenn, C.L. 1949. *The English Language*. London: Methuen.
- Wyld, H.C. 1927. *A Short History of English*. London: Murray.

Paul Rastall, Portsmouth
paul.rastall@port.ac.uk

**THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL COLLOQUIUM OF THE
HENRY SWEET SOCIETY
MUNICH, 2001**

Abstracts of Papers

***The first English Grammarian: The influence of Ælfric's Latin Grammar on
his Writings in English***

Mark Atherton (Oxford, markdatherton@hotmail.com)

The paper examines the links between Ælfric's religious writings and his *Grammar*.

Ælfric, monk of Cernel in Dorset until 1005 and thereafter Abbot of Eynsham, was one of the most prolific writers of the late Anglo-Saxon period. His *Grammar* was intended for the intermediate student of Latin and fits well into the Insular tradition of basic Latin grammars written for speakers of languages such as Old English, who had far greater difficulties acquiring the basics of the language than did their Romance-speaking counterparts (Law 1982). The difference was that Ælfric was the first scholar to produce a Latin grammar written in English. The *Grammar*, edited by Zupitza (1880, 1966), has been studied for its linguistic terminology, and it has been shown that standard Old English already had a basic metalanguage of grammatical terms, to which Ælfric added his own (Williams 1958, Gneuss 1990). More recently, Ælfric's unedited source, an epitome of Priscian, has been identified and studied (Law 1997). A few links have also been established between the *Grammar* and his other works, particularly in his use of etymologies (Hill 1988).

Ælfric's writings in Old English - mostly in the form of homilies, saints' lives and pastoral letters - are a systematically planned and organised body of religious teaching which was copied, read and studied for the next 150 years, despite the many cultural changes of the Anglo-Norman period. In short, he

became the great teacher of the late Anglo-Saxon world, thus following in the footsteps of his own teacher Æthelwold, the main force behind the tenth-century Benedictine reform movement that had swept through England during the reign of Edgar (959-75). Ælfric's pedagogical skills were refined during the writing of his two series of Catholic Homilies in the 990s, a period when the reign of Edgar's son Æthelred the Unready (i.e. 'the Ill-Advised') was increasingly marred by Viking attacks and the disastrous mistakes of his political advisers. The pedagogical skills thus gained are everywhere apparent in his *Grammar*, particularly in his clarity of explanation, his use of familiar subject matter, along with his humorous light touches and addresses to the audience. Linked to this, however, is a more serious sense of urgency, partly based on an ever-present but never explicitly stated disapproval of the present reign - as compared to the time of peace under the strong rule of Edgar, who is mentioned occasionally alongside the name of Bishop Æthelwold. (The political criticism becomes clearer in the *Lives of the Saints*, which he wrote after the *Grammar* was completed.) The urgency has also a theological motivation, a millennial angst and fear of error, to which his writings will provide an antidote; the many deep meanings of the difficult Latin texts will then be revealed, since 'grammar is the key that unlocks the meaning of books'.

REFERENCES

- Julius Zupitza (ed.), *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, 2nd edn with Preface by Helmut Gneuss (Berlin: Weidmann, 1880, 1966).
- E. R. Williams, 'Ælfric's grammatical terminology', *Publications of the Modern Languages Association* 73 (1958), 453-62.
- Helmut Gneuss, 'The study of language in Anglo-Saxon England', *Bulletin of the John Ryland University Library of Manchester* 72 (1990), 3-32.
- Viven Law, *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages* (London: Longman, 1997).
- Joyce Hill, 'Ælfric's Use of Etymologies', *Anglo-Saxon England* 17 (1988), 35-44).

John Marbeck's Concordance to the English Bible (1550)**David Cram (Oxford, david.cram@jesus.ox.ac.uk)**

The tradition of English lexicography is often said to originate in the early seventeenth century, Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall* (1608) being identified as the first English-English dictionary. But running parallel to the dictionary tradition proper is an English concordance tradition (where the meaning of 'dark' elements in biblical texts are elucidated by cross reference to 'light' ones) which by the seventeenth century was already well established (Cram 1994). The first concordance to the whole English Bible, by John Marbeck, was published in 1550, and soon thereafter shorter concordances were authorized for binding with all English Bibles (Herry's *Tables Alphabeticall*, 1578). The present paper will first examine the circumstances surrounding the composition of Marbeck's work, including the set-back of its being burnt in manuscript when Marbeck was sentenced to death for possessing heretical writings in 1643. It then proceeds to analyse the structure of the work, along with Marbeck's prefatorial discussion, in order to reconstruct the way in which it was used by readers to elucidate word-meaning, and thus to point up connections with the dictionary tradition.

Learning and Teaching English at Higher Girls' Schools in Germany during the last third of the 19th Century**Sabine Doff (Munich, sabine.doff@anglistik.uni-muenchen.de)**

Wir sagen beim Unterrichte gern voraus, was wir sagen wollen, und ehe wirs sagen; wogegen die Weiber ohne diese Erschwerung gradezu zur Sache schreiten: wir präludieren, die Weiber spielen gleich das Textlied, wir fangen mit der Grammatik Sprachen an, die Weiber mit Sprechen. (Hippel, *Nachlaß über weibliche Bildung*, 1801)

This paper gives an overview of the distinctive female way of teaching and learning modern languages in Germany in the last third of the nineteenth century. During this period the teaching of modern foreign languages, that is to

say French and English, became a main element of girls' higher education which was slowly becoming institutionalised in the form of higher girls' schools. In order to understand the design of the secondary school system for girls in the 19th century, it is crucial to also consider the prevalent theories on gender, in so far as these theories defined what women could and should learn. Another important feature in this context is the development of the German feminist movement which also took place during the second half of the nineteenth century.

However, in this paper my central question is: (1) whether a female tradition of teaching modern foreign languages existed; (2) what it looked like; and (3) to what extent it influenced the concept of teaching English as a foreign language at higher schools for both sexes. The analysis tries to establish if this influence meant an innovation and if it was documented in official guidelines, for example curricula, of higher girls' schools, which were of course written by men. In this context the role of the *Neusprachliche Reformbewegung*, the reform movement initiated by male teachers of modern languages in Germany around 1880, has to be investigated as well.

We furthermore take a closer look at the quality of modern language teaching at public and private higher girls' schools from 1870 onwards, as this was very frequently doubted by male critics. These critics were often teachers themselves, who had usually gone through the German *Gymnasium*, the grammar schools for boys, where Latin and Greek were taught. These classical languages were considered to be the backbone of higher education in Germany for a long time. Finally, I try and show some constant factors in the history of teaching foreign languages in Germany which might help us to understand the dominance of women in the field of language teaching in the 19th, 20th and 21st century.

C. T. Onions (1873–1965) and Japan

Hiroyuki Eto (Osaka/Nagano, etoh@georgetown.edu)

C[harles] T[albut] Onions may be remembered primarily as one of the most distinguished lexicographers in the history of English philology—especially as one of the four editors of the *NED* (1884–1928) and as the editor and reviser of *A*

Shakespeare Glossary (1911), *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (1933), *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* (1966), etc.

Compared with his outstanding work of editing and revising such great dictionaries, many of his other contributions, even if not totally forgotten, seem hardly evaluated as appropriately as they should be. Among them we can name his *Advanced English Syntax Based on the Principles and Requirements of the Grammatical Society* (1904), to which we must pay more attention in order to re-evaluate its status in the developmental history of English philology. This grammar is particularly important for scholars of the English language and linguistics in Japan since it has had—and still has—an enormous impact on English language education in Japan.

In this presentation I investigate the influence (or rather, the traces of this influence) of Onions's Grammar on today's most standard and prevailing English grammar books for Japanese high school students, and consider the reasons for this influence from a historical viewpoint. In particular, I compare Onions's *Advanced English Syntax* and the *Outline of English Syntax* (1917, 1971) by Itsuki Hosoe (1884–1947), one of the eminent Japanese English Grammarians, with special reference to *Five Forms of the Predicate* or *Five Sentence Patterns* and the concept of *Equivalents* and verify Hosoe's dependence on Onions's *Syntax*. This comparison shows both the extent of Onions's influence and the results it has produced in English grammar writing in Japan.

The London Branch of the Allgemeiner Deutscher Sprachverein

John L. Flood (London, jlf@zetnet.co.uk)

The *Allgemeiner Deutscher Sprachverein* (ADS), founded at Braunschweig in 1885, was a grass-roots organisation open to all who were devoted to the promotion and protection of the German language. It operated essentially through its network of branches, of which by 1910 there were 324 with more than thirty thousand members. By the late 1920s total membership exceeded forty thousand. There were seventeen branches outside Germany: in other European countries, in

the USA, in German colonies in Africa, and elsewhere. The London branch, founded in 1898 though not officially inaugurated until 1899, was one of the largest, with more than 600 members in 1913.

As far as is known, the records of the London branch do not survive; its history has to be reconstructed from sparse information given in a brief article by T. J. Leonhardt (1913) and scattered, laconic references in the *Zeitschrift des Allgemeinen Deutschen Sprachvereins*, *Londoner Zeitung Hermann*, and the *Londoner General-Anzeiger*. On this basis, the paper attempts an analysis of the social composition of the membership and outlines the range of the branch's activities, focusing especially on the language-related ones. Particular attention is given to the careers, linguistic interests and publications of four prominent members: the founder, Prof. Dr. Aloys Weiß, a fervent advocate of linguistic purism, who was president of the branch throughout its existence; Friedrich G. Zimmermann, author of *German for Military Students* (London 1911, 2nd edn 1913) and of an *Easy Handbook of German for Soldiers: containing the chief grammatical rules, conversational phrases, essays on military and technical subjects, and a handy vocabulary* (London 1915); Adolf George Haltenhoff, who published *A New German-English Dictionary (in roman type). An up-to-date compilation containing some 36,000 German words with English equivalents in general and technical use, including the most recent terms employed in arts, science (mathematics, chemistry, physics, geology, botany, physiology, political economy, etc.) commerce, engineering, architecture, agriculture, music, the army, navy etc. with numerous Latin scientific names and chemical formulæ, the principal tenses of verbs and numerous idioms* (London, n.d.); and finally Walter Rippmann who, influenced by Wilhelm Viëtor and as an associate of Daniel Jones, played an important role as a popularizer of phonetics in Britain before he turned his attention to reform of English spelling through his involvement with the Simplified Spelling Society.

The London Branch of the ADS was a thriving organisation until 1913, but with the outbreak of the First World War it fell victim to the vitriolic anti-German climate of the time. The many British members will have resigned, and the German members chose to lie low.

For a fuller account see: John L. Flood 2001. The London Branch of the Allgemeiner Deutscher Sprachverein. In: *'Proper Words in Proper Places': Studies in Lexicology and Lexicography in Honour of William Jervis Jones*.

Edited by Máire C. Davies, John L. Flood and David N. Yeandle. Stuttgart: Heinz, 230-53. [Stuttgarter Arbeiten zur Germanistik 400]

***Languages for Special Purposes in Antiquity:
The Example of Seneca's Philosophical Writings as Metalinguistic Documents***
Thorsten Fögen (Exeter, T.Foegen@exeter.ac.uk)

Modern studies on languages for special purposes ("Fachsprachen") from the field of general linguistics tend to neglect a very important aspect, namely that the theoretical discussion about the features of technical texts and technical languages goes back to Antiquity.

The first part of this contribution underlines the importance of the fact that Greek and Latin amply fulfill the communicative needs of their speakers; the varieties of both languages were differentiated by the ancients on a diatopic, diastratic and diaphasic level, and this entailed the existence of linguistic elements for the description of highly complex subject matters. Metalinguistic reflections of ancient writers include remarks on the characteristics and functions of languages for special purposes and of technical texts. Style and the degree of linguistic technicality were adjusted to the intended readership of the treatises. Very often, the importance of clarity and brevity is emphasised as compositional principles. Apart from these more pragmatic aspects it is the occurrence of numerous technical terms which was described by the ancients as the most conspicuous trait of instructive literature in all disciplines.

In the second part of the paper Seneca the Younger's (1st c. A.D.) philosophical writings are singled out to supplement the preceding more theoretical considerations with some practical examples. Like other writers, he acknowledges the fact that no specialist area, including philosophy, can do without the use of technical terms. Everyday language is said to apply certain words in a different way from their use in a philosophical framework. Apart from these lexical aspects Seneca has some intriguing remarks on the pragmatic side of philosophical style and language. Stylistic simplicity is supposed to

guarantee a high degree of intelligibility for both the oral and written communication of philosophical ideas.

Particular attention is given by Seneca to the translation of Greek terms into Latin. While in some cases a Latin equivalent is easily at hand, there is often not one single term, but a number of Latin words which have been used instead of the Greek original. Seneca further demonstrates that a strict formal (i.e. morphological) correspondence is not always necessary, as long as the significance of a Greek term is aptly rendered into Latin. If a Greek word had already been sufficiently integrated into the lexical system of Latin and its usage, its translation was superfluous.

There are, however, many instances where Seneca holds the rendering of a Greek term into Latin as either impossible or at least unsatisfactory. He thinks that some Latin one-to-one translations do not resemble the Greek original closely enough and cause semantic ambiguity; therefore it is better, he argues, either to keep the Greek term or to circumscribe its meaning by more than a single Latin word. The reason for all these problems is, according to him, the lexical poverty of his native tongue which does not provide enough equivalents for Greek words. But he locates the deficits of Latin even on the morpho-syntactic level: to render the Greek participle *το ον* by the relative clause *quod est* is seen as a solution that falls short of the original.

Le principe d'adjacence et la controverse des constituants discontinus dans les grammaires catégorielles

Béatrice Godart-Wendling

(Paris, beatrice.godart-wendling@linguist.jussieu.fr)

Jusque dans les années 80, les différents modèles catégoriels s'avèrent incapables de proposer un traitement adéquat des constituants discontinus. La raison de cet échec provient du fait que les grammaires catégorielles sont régies par un principe d'adjacence qui pose que 'the rules may only apply to entities which are linguistically realized and adjacent' (Steedman 1985). L'impossibilité de montrer la bonne-formation syntaxique de la phrase 'He looked it up' conduisit ainsi Y.

Bar-Hillel (1953: 82) à rejeter définitivement dans les années soixante la perspective catégorielle et à vanter l'intérêt de la notion de transformation chomskienne qui permettait d'analyser sans difficulté ce type de construction. Plus généralement, l'abandon du paradigme catégoriel — qui caractérise la période 1960-1980 — s'explique en grande partie par son échec à ne pouvoir proposer de solution syntaxique satisfaisante des constituants discontinus. On constate de plus que le renouveau théorique que connut la perspective catégorielle à partir de 1985 s'explique par la réflexion qui porta sur le traitement de ces éléments discontinus. Comparant les problèmes posés par la discontinuité dans des langues comme l'allemand, l'anglais, le hollandais, etc., les tenants des grammaires catégorielles proposent non seulement des solutions qui unifient le traitement de faits syntaxiques contenant des discontinus de nature très diverse (les phrases comprenant des éléments topicalisés 'Apples, he likes', des pronoms relatifs 'A cake which I can believe that she will eat', des verbes à l'infinitif 'wil proberen te lezen', ...), mais usent également des résultats obtenus pour montrer leur pertinence dans l'analyse de constructions syntaxiques qui, telle que la coordination, semblaient pourtant nécessiter l'intervention de règles grammaticales différentes. Or, curieusement, cette nouvelle possibilité d'analyser les éléments discontinus dans le cadre catégoriel ne provient pas du rejet du principe d'adjacence car celui-ci demeure un des principes de base de ce type d'approche.

Dans cette communication, nous tenterons, dans un premier temps, de mettre en évidence les raisons ayant conduit à chercher une résolution des constituants discontinus qui ne reposerait pas sur l'abandon du principe d'adjacence. Nous étudierons alors dans un second temps la spécificité des règles syntaxiques qui furent ajoutées à la théorie catégorielle afin de la rendre apte à gérer conjointement les phénomènes de discontinuité et le principe d'adjacence. Cette étude nous permettra alors de montrer que la résolution d'un problème empirique — apparemment très local comme la discontinuité — eut en fait pour conséquence de questionner toute la théorie en l'obligeant à préciser ou à changer les liens qu'elle avait établis entre le lexique, la syntaxe et la sémantique.

*The Idéologues in Spain and Germany:
Transfer or Conceptual Transformation?*

Gerda Haßler (Potsdam, hassler@rz.uni-potsdam.de)

In this paper I discuss a methodological question in relation to a concrete example: the French intellectuals, scientists, philosophers and physicians called *idéologues* and their impact on other European countries. The *idéologues* formed a rather homogeneous group by the end of the eighteenth century. They continued the enlightenment ideas and engaged in the reconstruction of the French educational system. In this context, they produced elementary and fundamental texts and held the opinion that the acquisition of knowledge by a pupil presents similarities with the intellectual development of mankind.

For the study of their influence abroad, I have chosen two opposite examples: Spain, where the influence of the *idéologues* is obvious and even led to the self-definition of some intellectuals as Spanish *ideólogos*, and Germany, where some traces of the *idéologues* can be found in a generally hostile climate. The methodological question I study with this example is whether a conceptual history of linguistics can legitimately suppose mere transfer of concepts developed in one place to another where these concepts might be needed or regarded as useful, or, if we have to suppose a transformation of these concepts depending on the conditions of reception, the theoretical mainstreams met in the new area, and the questions researchers are interested in. The examples show that it may be necessary to take into account series of texts to recognize the dynamic character of the history of linguistics which cannot be seen from the horizon of just one researcher's work. In many cases it is in the text of minor authors which have not been considered within a monumental history of linguistics that we learn something about the reasons and the processes which can be observed in their results. Doing historiographical research of this kind we understand that linguistic terminology did not spring up from nowhere and that exchange between national traditions is not simply a transfer of concepts as one might consider transfer of artifacts in the history of arts. Metalinguistic concepts are prepared in historical contexts and after being fixed, they continue being propagated in texts. Studies of text series show whether an idea or argumentation which is known from a famous reference text, is current at the epoch of its appearance or whether the reference text was rather marginal and its later influence has to be attributed to other conditions of reception. Finally the

consideration of text series will help to discern relations between different national traditions and ways of communication between schools and research programs.

Divine Rocks: On Ferdinand de Saussure's Metrics

Niels Helsloot (Amsterdam, niels@nielshelsloot.nl)

In 1906, shortly before Saussure started the courses in general linguistics which would make him famous after his death, he wrote a poem which has not been noticed up to now. The poem's content can be connected to Saussure's research of saturnian metric, which took place at the same time, and on which not much is known either. This metrical research has been mentioned only few times as the onset to the research of anagrams, which occupied Saussure at the time of his courses in general linguistics. In fact, however, it was research in its own right. Like the poem, the metrical research shows a preference of expressions of Greek culture, which may be contrasted to historical linguistic interest in Germanic culture. My aim is to give a somewhat more coherent picture of Saussure's projects than implied by the received contradiction between his general linguistics and his historical 'sins of his youth' and philological 'abberations'. This can be done by including the theoretical context of his research, which is more clear in the case of his metrics than of his studies of anagrams. Saussure is methodologically testing preconceived rational schemes that may apply to the saturnian verses. Such schemes are hypotheses (by others or by himself) which cannot be judged without recourse to historical textual and cultural material. He therefore combines a comparative linguistic approach to several philological theories: Saussure attempts to incorporate as many viewpoints as possible, and to compare their overall results. This approach implies a methodological framework of empirically testing rational schemes on the basis of historical data. There is no reason why anagrams would be less qualified for testing than the traditional metre, which itself was rather difficult to test. Like linguistic hypotheses in general.

Explaining Synonyms: the Way from Wilkins to Roget
Werner Hüllen (Düsseldorf, werner.huellen@uni-essen.de)

Between 1662 (Wilkins) and 1852 (Roget) the theoretical underpinning of onomasiological (topical) lexicography changed drastically. One reason for this is the all-pervading influence of Lockean philosophy. It worked to the effect that words were no longer seen as names tagged to either objects in reality or to concepts (notions) existing in the mind, but rather as signs of ideas which, though originating in the senses, are a product of that mind, in particular where simple ideas are turned into complex ones. This accounts for the fact that, in the overall tendency, Wilkins's *Tables* are a *Sachwörterbuch*, whereas Roget's *Thesaurus* is a *Begriffswörterbuch*. Another reason is the discussion of synonyms after Abbé Girard (1718). John Trusler (1767), Hester Lynch Piozzi (1794), William Taylor jr. (1813), and George Crabbe (1837) wrote books which are either translations and adaptations of Girard or follow his way of treating synonyms closely. In Dr Johnson's dictionary, two methods of the explanation of word-meanings are combined, the one by defining synonyms and the other by contextualisation (quotations). William Perry (1805) compiled the first, virtually complete, dictionary of the English language in rows of synonyms. He did this by pruning Dr Johnson's book from all definitions and quotations. This prepares Roget's *Thesaurus*. Moreover, by the concept of 'radical synonyms' Perry introduced modern lexicological ideas, among them what could be called the network-image as a constitutive principle of lexis.

The Secret Character of John Wilkins

Michael M. Isermann (Heidelberg, M.Isermann@urz.uni-heidelberg.de)

Linguistic historians have known John Wilkins (1614-1672) for mainly two publications: his early manual on secret communication (*Mercury: or the Secret and Swift Messenger*, 1641) and especially for the monumental proportions of his attempt at a universal and scientific writing system (*An Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language*, 1668). While *Mercury* had been the result of Wilkins's profound interest in methods of concealing information, the aims and ideals of the *Essay* could not have been more different. It was specifically designed to make public the information that was then considered the private possession of a few privileged people (true scientific knowledge) or a few privileged nations (true religious knowledge). And yet, the universal character is not, or at least essentially not, what Wilkins says it is. Superficially, the universal character can still be classified as the modern and rational alternative to the rather obscure universal language ideas that originated from the occultist camp of the *prisca theologia*. Under the surface, however, Wilkins chose to make his character possess all the characteristic features that the original and universal language was believed to have in the occult tradition. Abounding with secret and occult information on the signatures and source of all things and signs, it appears to deconstruct its rational superstructure and to restore the neoplatonic ideal of a mathematical *harmonia mundi*.

From at least one point of view, the apparent conflict between the private or secret and the public or manifest in Wilkins vanishes: As an expert cryptographer, he knew that the more public the hiding place, the safer the secret would be. And could there be a place more public than a language or even a universal language? This is roughly what Wilkins must have had in mind when he decided to hide a magnificent riddle in a magnificent book. I do not pretend to have solved it completely, but I think I can present a few interesting results.

The Stylistic Similarities in Magnus quae uox?, a Carolingian Parsing Grammar, and the Commentary on Donatus's Ars minor by Remigius of Auxerre

Jee Yeon Jang (Cambridge, jyj20@cam.ac.uk)

Magnus quae uox? is a Carolingian parsing grammar, composed in the tenth (or eleventh century) for classroom use. It deals with topics in Donatus's *Ars maior* and *Ars minor* and aims at a higher level of instruction of Latin by means of the comments embedded in the parsing method. For its source, Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* and the commentaries on Donatus by the Scotti Peregrini and Remigius of Auxerre are used. The use of *Remigius minor* in the chapters on the parts of speech in *Magnus quae uox?* is very striking. *Remigius minor* is different in style from the other commentaries used by the author of *Magnus quae uox?* in that it retains the question-and-answer form of Donatus's *Ars minor*. This classroom-like way of presentation would have appealed to the author of *Magnus quae uox?* who was constructing his grammar in questions and answers. Thus we find the questions and the answers in *Remigius minor* are frequently quoted verbatim in *Magnus quae uox?*. Another stylistic feature shared by *Remigius minor* and *Magnus quae uox?* is the shortening of Donatus's lemmata for the comments. The later parts of Donatus's lemmata are in most cases shortened into 'etc.' or 'et reliqua'. This phenomenon does not appear in the commentaries on Donatus's two *Artes* by the Scotti Peregrini.

Whether these stylistic features of *Remigius minor* influenced other Carolingian parsing grammars is difficult to tell at this stage. This question could be answered only when we have more parsing grammars edited and studied.

Migration and Transformation of German Linguistic Ideas in the 19th Century distilled by O. O. Potebnia – Part I: Eastward Route.

Nadia Kerecuk (London, nadia.kerecuk@virgin.net)

German linguistic thought and German thinking on language travelled eastwards as soon as the first contacts were established with the centres of scholarship in Central and Eastern Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries. In most of the cases, the migration of intellectual traditions including linguistic thought is

accompanied by the transformation of these thoughts. This paper examines some of the main German influences along with influences that came through the German tradition on the works of O. Potebnia (1835-1891).

Firstly, an overview of Potebnia as a critical historian of ideas will be offered. Specific focus will be on his critique of the theories of language in the works of Becker, Schleicher and von Humboldt as presented in his 1862 *Thought and Language* (see annotated translation of *Thought and Language* by N. Kerecuk (forthcoming 2001/2)). Secondly, the paper will briefly illustrate how Potebnia chooses von Humboldt as a point of departure for the development of his own theory of language. (See some of these ideas discussed in (i) Kerecuk, N. (2000) 'Consciousness in Potebnia's *Theory of Language*' in *HEL*, t.xxii, fasc. 2, 81-96 (8th ICHoLS paper, 1999 University of Paris); and also (ii) Kerecuk, N. (forthcoming 2001) 'Perception, Child Language Acquisition and Conscious Thought in O. O. Potebnia's *Theory of Language*' - Colloquium of the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas - University of Edinburgh; and (iii) Kerecuk, N. (forthcoming 2002) 'Language and Consciousness in Potebnia's theory of language', paper presented at NAAHoLS, Washington DC, 2001.) In addition to that, a brief summary of his use of some of the ideas in the works of Steinthal, the Grimm brothers, Lazarus, Lotze, Waitz, Müller, Bopp, Heyse, Curtius, Paul, Pott, Böthingk, Benfey, Brugmann, Schwartz among others will follow. Potebnia also refers both to the philosophical and intellectual ideas in Leibniz, Kant, Herbart and Herder as well as Göethe, Schiller, Heine and Schelling, Rüdiger, Lessing, Lebrecht. Some examples will be offered.

This migration resulted in influences that encompass not only linguistics but also other sciences that have an interest in language. The conclusion will offer an argument that there is both an overt and covert interaction between the parties involved in the process of migration of ideas. A future paper will be necessary to show how some of these ideas were transformed and re-routed westwards and, thus, represent an evolution of those original ideas.

A bibliography of the works of the German authors used by Potebnia in his main works will be provided.

***'Phrases, which Use has Consecrated':
Progress towards the Lemmatization of English Headphrases in General
Lexicography before the Eighteenth Century***
Gabriele Knappe (Bamberg, gabriele.knappe@split.uni-bamberg.de)

Before common words became a standard feature in English monolingual lexicography, starting with John Kersey in 1702, bilingual and multilingual dictionaries were the current types of English general – in the sense of non-specialized – dictionaries. One feature of them is that beside single headwords they include headphrases, that is, sequences of English words in the first position of the entries or sub-entries. These may be free syntagms or habitually fixed (= phraseological) units such as *to give somebody a hand* 'to help somebody'.

In this paper I look at the lexicographical treatment of these headphrases, including their potential phraseological status and their formal features, but particularly their placing and ordering, in samples taken from important bilingual dictionaries with English in the first position. The English - Latin tradition is surveyed by a comparison of Richard Huloet's *Abececlarium Anglico-Latinum* of 1552 with John Higgins's revision of Huloet published in 1572 and the first part of Elisha Coles's *Dictionary, English-Latin, and Latin-English* of 1677. Vernacular dictionaries are represented by Henry Hexham's *Copious English and Netherduytch Dictionarie* of 1647, Willem Sewel's *New Dictionary English and Dutch* (1691), and Guy Miège's *Great French Dictionary* of 1687-1688, who introduced innovations in the handling of headphrases. All the lexicographers looked at in this paper recognized the need to deal with phrasal material. Their reason for doing so might be most clearly expressed in the Preface to Abel Boyer's *Royal Dictionary* of 1699: 'I [...] content my self to comprehend in this Volume most of those Phrases, which Use, the sovereign Umpire of Languages has as it were consecrated, and which are as essential Parts of a Speech, as the very Words of which they are composed'.

While standard bilingual lexicography thus always paid attention to headphrases and sometimes developed 'phraseological awareness', it can be shown that some of the greatest achievements in the lexicographical treatment of phraseological units and their lemmatization occurred when lexicography was married to a teaching manual in the sixteenth century (John Palsgrave's *Lesclarcissement de la langue françoise* of 1530) and, above all, to a universal

language project in the seventeenth century, namely John Wilkins and William Lloyd's monolingual *Alphabetical Dictionary* of 1668.

*Artificial Memory Schemes and Artificial Language in C17th England:
The Case of John Beale*

Rhodri Lewis (rhodri.lewis@jesus.ox.ac.uk)

An introduction to the life of John Beale (1608-83), a Herefordshire gentleman and active member of the Hartlib correspondence circle with wide-ranging interests. One of these was his interest in mnemonics. Having corresponded with Hartlib about the plans for optimising one's memory found in classical rhetoric, Beale received from Hartlib various bits of information about those who had already concerned themselves with artificial memory (including Cyprian Kinner). However, the most important of these was a series of parchments containing the artificial memory scheme of one Caleb Morley. Beale then proceeded to develop these in the light of his own thoughts, being particularly drawn to the notion of a mnemonical character, which he saw as closely related to the development of a universal, real, character. The development was carried out in correspondence with such figures as Robert Boyle, John Pell, John Worthington and William Brereton, though he was also in correspondence with George Dalgarno in the early stages of his work on a universal language. Beale's eventual proposals were submitted to the Royal Society in 1663, and other than the intrinsic interest - which has hitherto been overlooked by all scholars of the period - they throw aspects of John Wilkins's *Essay* (1668) into somewhat sharper relief.

James Harris's Conception of the Origin of Language

Masataka Miyawaki (Yokohama, miyawaki@isc.senshu-u.ac.jp)

In the mid-eighteenth century the subject of universal grammar began to merge with the question of the origin of language, as is seen, for example, in Britain, in Joseph Priestley's *Course of Lectures on the Theory of Language, and Universal Grammar* (1762), Lord Monboddo's *Of the Origin and Progress of Language* (1773-92), and James Beattie's *Theory of Language* (1788; first published in 1783 as one of his *Dissertations Moral and Critical*). They discussed the origin and development of grammatical categories like parts of speech in parallel with the development of the human mind. In other words, universal grammar and the origin of language were conceived as two facets of the same question of the philosophy of mind. However, James Harris's (1709-80) *Hermes* (1751), a representative treatise on universal grammar in 18th-century Britain, has never been discussed in relation to the contemporary debate on the problem of the origin of language. The reason for the absence of Harris in the literature concerning this debate seems to be quite simple; nowhere in *Hermes* does Harris directly address the question of the origin of language.

However, there are scattered through *Hermes* and his other writings a number of statements which clearly indicate his interest in the 'causes' or origins of things in general and of language in particular. The aim of this paper is to reconstruct Harris's conception of the origin of language on the basis of such statements. First, I shall show that his interest in the origins of things in general is linked to his commitment to ancient philosophy, and propose to invoke Aristotle's doctrine of the 'four causes' as the framework in which we are to reconstruct his conception of the origin of language. Secondly, within this framework I shall examine what he thinks the 'efficient cause' of language is, and try to demonstrate that his thinking comprises two dimensions. Finally, I shall indicate that one of these dimensions points towards the theory of language origin as it was later developed by the German philosophers, Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835).

Harris recognises two phases in the origin of language: (i) humans are innately or 'naturally' furnished with the faculty of language as the copy of the 'Ideal Form' of language in the divine mind; and (ii) exercising this faculty, they invented individual languages 'by convention'. In other words, we can identify

two dimensions in Harris's conception of the origin of language. On the one hand, he makes an issue of the origin of 'language-in-itself', or language in the sense of the language faculty (*langage*), and, on the other hand, he considers the origin of individual languages (*langues*). As for the origin of the faculty of language, he believes that it is innate in the human mind as the copy of the archetypal 'Form' of language pre-existing in the mind of God. As regards the origin of individual languages, he holds that human communities invented their respective languages by convention. According to this conception, humans must be innately equipped with the faculty of inventing language before they can actually invent individual languages.

In terms of the history of opinions concerning the origin of language, Harris looks backward in that he considers that humans instituted individual languages by convention; this idea goes back to the conventionalist position in Antiquity by way of the Middle Ages. On the other hand, he looks forward to the extent that he ascribes the immediate origin of language to the innate equipment of the human mind which distinguishes mankind from the other animals. In this regard, his conception of language origin adumbrates some of the ideas fully developed later by Herder and Humboldt.

Feral Children and the Origin-of-Language Debate in the Eighteenth Century
Cordula Neis (Potsdam, Cordula.Neis@t-online.de)

The Enlightenment debate on the origin of language was characterized by an interdisciplinary approach which aimed mainly at the reconstruction of the faculties of human beings. Much attention was therefore devoted to the question of the essence of Man in contrast to other parts of the "great chain of being". Man being endowed with the faculty of language, he seemed to be allowed to claim a position of absolute supremacy - a conception fostered by Descartes and Buffon. However, leading theoreticians of French sensationalism opposed this conception of Man: Condillac and La Mettrie argued that there was only a gradual difference between humans and beasts endowing the latter with the capacity of pre-intellectual reactions. By far the most influential author in the

discussion of natural faculties of Man was undoubtedly Rousseau who integrated his conception of the origin of language in his vision of a state of nature, but he could not cope with the difficult question of the anteriority of language and society, thus entangling himself in a vicious circle.

Rousseau's vision of society and language, exposed by his *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (1755) had a strong impact on the discussion of the origin of language in the second half of the eighteenth century. This holds true especially for the prize essay contest organized by the Berlin Academy in 1769. Generally, this contest is associated with the name of its prominent winner, Johann Gottfried von Herder, who for a long time was supposed to have given the only valid solution to the question. In contrast, the remaining 30 essays of his competitors were treated with disdain until the 1970s. This paper is chiefly concerned with the forgotten essays of these anonymous participants and the most important works of reference which influenced this text series. Among the most prominent works of reference we cite treatises by Linnaeus, Oluf Borch, La Mettrie, Monboddo and de la Condamine. The idea that *feral children* can provide an appropriate mould for the reconstruction of the scanty origins of language must needs be seen in the light of an influential hypothetical experiment: the *experiment of Psammetichos* quoted by Herodotus in his *Five Books of History*. Given the strong belief of eighteenth-century scholars that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny, children raised in isolation and thus deprived from a normal language-acquisition process seemed to represent a quite reliable model for the reconstruction of the genesis of language, the moment of the genesis of language also being in itself a state of poverty and deprivation. Indeed, the model of *feral children* appears as a *topos* both in the Berlin text series and in the texts of reference.

It was in particular the case of the *puella campanica*, a wild girl discovered in the forests of Champagne in 1731, which caused a sensation. This wild girl fascinated eighteenth-century scholars, some of whom even claimed to have known her personally. Thus, the reports of the case given by de la Condamine and Monboddo gain a maximum of topicality and make the *puella campanica* appear as an almost tangible representative of a creature oscillating between the realm of beasts and the world of Mankind, a creature oscillating between fact and fiction.

Theodor Arnold and his Grammar**Hans Sauer** (Munich, Hans.Sauer@anglistik.uni-muenchen.de)

Theodor Arnold was born in Annaberg (Saxony) in 1683, and he must have died in 1763 or earlier. He studied theology in Halle and was connected with pietistic circles, but he made his living as a freelance language teacher and translator in Leipzig. His main field was English, although he never had a chance to go to England. Nevertheless, his grammar was one of the most successful early German grammars of English, if not the most successful. It was used for well over a hundred years: The first edition was published in Hanover in 1718; the 15th edition was published in 1829 (revised by Fahrenkrüger), and there seems to have been an edition printed in Philadelphia as late as 1848. The 2nd edition (Leipzig, 1736) was a much shortened version of the 1st edition, and Arnold also changed the title (a long, baroque title, as usual at the time): 1st ed. *A New English Grammar [...]*; 2nd ed. *Grammatica Anglicana Concentrata [...]* A careful comparison of the different editions still has to be done. In the 2nd edition, the grammar has five main sections: (1) pronunciation; (2) accent; (3) parts of speech and inflectional morphology (called etymology); (4) syntax (mainly congruence, not syntax in our modern sense); (5) orthography. Arnold used a wide range of sources. Typical features of Arnold's grammar, which he shares with many early grammars, are: (1) Dependence on Latin: Just as in Latin, Arnold posits six cases for the English noun; etc. (2) Dependence on the written language: For example, the description of the pronunciation always starts from the letters of the alphabet. An articulatory description of sounds is not yet available to Arnold. (3) Dependence on authorities, e.g. at the beginning of his section on the word-classes, Arnold lists the same eight parts of speech as Dionysius Thrax did – a distinction between noun and adjective is only made later. (4) Conservative description of English: Often Arnold's description does not reflect current English: e.g., he still gives *thou* – *thee* as the normal form of the personal pronoun 2nd person singular, and 'Read you? Oder do you read?' are given as equivalent alternatives for forming questions. He does mention, however, 'he is a friend of mine', the postposition of prepositions, etc. (5) Problems with contrastive aspects (English-German): As far as pronunciation is

concerned, Arnold sees the problem with the <th>, but cannot really solve it. As to morphology, he lists categories which do not exist in German, but does not really explain their function, e.g. he hardly explains the difference between the simple form and the expanded form of the verb (*I read – I am reading*), nor the difference between the past (imperfectum) and the present (perfectum). Nevertheless, Arnold's grammar should not be judged too harshly from our present point of view: in many of the features mentioned, he is not that different from his contemporaries.

Ps.-Herodian, *Perì Soloikismoû kai Barbarismoû*: An unnoticed term denoting the moods of the verb, a lost explanation of the subjunctive and the *súndesmoi epizeuktikoi*

Markus Stegbauer (Munich, markus.stegbauer@campus.lmu.de)

The analysis of the ps.-herodianic *Perì Soloikismoû kai Barbarismoû* shows that the lost central section of an original treatise dealing with three linguistic vices (*soloikismós, barbarismós, akurología*) has been replaced by material of various provenance. The original parts have preserved rather old grammatical doctrine, as is shown not only by various instances of Stoic terminology, but also by two distinctive features which can be traced back to the first century B. C.: a) the distinction of nine parts of speech; b) the denomination of the verbal moods as *eidē*, which Cicero and Varro translate by *genera*. In the chapter on solecisms concerning verbal moods, the subjunctive is denominated by the term *epizeuktikón*, mentioned as being unusual by the rather late Choeroboscus. This term was followed by an explanation, of which only the last sentence is extant: *taúta gàr protassómena poiei tēn epizeuxin*. This fragment has never been considered in order to reconstruct the ancient theory of the subjunctive. However, it allows us to rebuild the wording of the explanation: 'The *epizeuktikón* is named after the epizeuctic conjunctions (*tà epizeuktikà mória*). For these have initial position and establish the connection'. This confirms Skrzeczka's opinion that, by contrast with Choeroboscus's account, the subjunctive was named *epizeuktikón* after the epizeuctic conjunctions. But which connection is meant by

Ps.-Herodian? In my opinion one has to reconsider the view that the epizeuctic conjunctions were originally so called because of their construction with the subjunctive mood (Schenkeveld). Although this view seems to be held by a number of grammarians, I prefer to date the discovery of the first epizeuctic conjunction *eán* (according to M. Baratin by the Stoic Poseidonius) prior to that of the subjunctive, and to explain its name as the result of the need to find a denomination similar to but not identical with the ones applied by the Stoics to the conjunctions *ei* (*sunaptikós súndesmos* [connective conjunction]) and *epei* (*parasunaptikós súndesmos* [subconnective conjunction]), which connect clauses and indicate the succession (*akolouthía*) of protasis and apodosis. In coining the term Aristotle was followed, who uses the verb *epizeugnúnai* in the sense of ‘to impose a word as a yoke upon two words or phrases’. The epizeuctic conjunction is thus named after its function to establish the connection between two clauses. Later on, it was noticed that the epizeuctic conjunction *eán* is followed by a specific form of the verb, which was then called *epizeuktikón*. (At present, I am working on a doctoral thesis about ancient theories of the subjunctive mood.)

The Terminology of late Middle English Grammatical Description

John Walmsley (Bielefeld, John.Walmsley@uni-Bielefeld.de)

Thoughts about language, and their encoding *in* language, occupy an important place in early modern western European culture. Language played a significant role in the theological debates of the time, and it also had a practical aspect in that grammar - and its learning - provided the essential foundation for all subsequent academic study. Its metalanguage - the language of linguistic description - is, through the nature of its Latin sources, intimately connected with contemporary systems in other parts of Europe.

At the same time, this language, and the grammatical systems it encodes, has significant historical implications. The application of categories derived from the description of Greek and Latin to the description of other languages has been sharply condemned (e.g. ‘the description of a language must not be carried out using the descriptive framework originally devised for the study of some other

language [...]’ - Crystal 1971: 70). But explanations differ as to why earlier grammarians chose this path. Chomsky believes or believed that it was ‘the goal of traditional “universal grammar” [...] to give a substantive general account of these [grammatical – J.W.] categories, thus fixing a universal “vocabulary” for the generative grammars of all languages [...]’ (Chomsky 1964: 941, fn. 8). For Michael, on the other hand, the history of the definition of grammatical categories seems to be one of almost unremitting incompetence (‘often the reader is uncertain (because the writer is) how far the terms refer to things and to material relations; how far to words and grammatical relations [...]’ (Michael 1970: 481). However, study of the treatment of grammar in the late Middle English grammatical texts shows a different picture.

The relevant texts cover a relatively well-defined period and constitute a relatively self-contained corpus. From them, we can build up a detailed picture of what the grammatical systems, which every educated person would have possessed, looked like when the first description of English grammar to be published in English appeared (Bullokar 1586). At the same time, the texts also exhibit systematic historical development, so that “the systems” at the end of this period are not necessarily the same as they were at the beginning.

Major themes which emerge from this study are:

- Is it sensible to speak of a common European vernacular linguistic system based mainly on Donatus and Priscian?
- What did the system of grammatical description look like at the point of its first accepted application to the description of English (Bullokar 1586)?
- How accurate are the views put forward by Chomsky (1964) or e.g. Crystal (1971) concerning the underlying motivation for applying grammatical categories derived from Latin and Greek to the description of English?

Jean-Antoine Caravolas

Histoire de la didactique des langues au siècle des Lumières.

Précis et anthologie thématique.

Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal / Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2000.

[Giessener Beiträge zur Fremdsprachendidaktik].

xv+544+5 (Table des matières) pp.

ISBN 2-7606-1779-3 (PUM), 3-8233-5311-X (NARR). CAD 39,95 / DM 96,-.

This is the second part (of three planned ones) of the author's comprehensive treatment of the history of foreign language teaching in Europe and North America between 1450 and today, in all the major languages and countries of the two continents. The first part was reviewed by Douglas A. Kibbee and extensively discussed by myself in the *Bulletin* (30, 1998: 24-26, 26-35). It appeared in two separate volumes, entitled [1] *La didactique des langues. Précis d'histoire I. 1450-1700* and [2] *La didactique des langues. Anthologie I. À l'ombre de Quintilien*. The first of these two volumes contained the analytical descriptions of the many manuals for language teaching of the era, the second quotations of varying length from these manuals ordered according to pertinent themes. Given today's automatized method of cataloguing, it is to be hoped that librarians and readers realize the present publication is the second part to the first one published in 1994, in spite of the different titles. In the table of contents, the former *Précis I* is now called 'Première partie: Précis historique' and the former *Anthologie I* 'Deuxième partie: Anthologie thématique II'. Binding two volumes into one certainly has its advantages for booksellers and librarians, but readers will probably regret losing the possibility of putting the two volumes side by side in order to read the analytical and descriptive articles of the *précis* and the extracts from the original works in the *anthologie* in comparison with each other.

In his short introduction, the author explains his aim 'de présenter une image globale de l'état de la pédagogie des langues au xviii^e siècle et non pas d'écrire une histoire exhaustive de la discipline'. The book is to be 'un instrument de consultation pratique et fiable' (xi, xii). Both these statements have to be kept in mind. *Précis* and *anthologie* in this second part are organized in the same way as in the first, as is the principle of devoting each chapter to one country or geographical region. Only the chapter on the Jesuits as a teaching agency in its own right deviates from this line, in the first as well as in the second part of the whole work. In the book now under review, this approach

leads to eleven chapters, devoted (in this sequence) to Great Britain; France; Germany; Belgium and the Netherlands; Italy, Spain and Portugal; the lands of Austria (*les états de l'Autriche*); the Balkan states; Poland, Scandinavia and Russia, the Jesuits; Canada; and the United States. Each chapter is divided into sections on (i) a historical overview, (ii) the general situation of the country concerning education, (iii) the teaching of old languages, and (iv) the teaching of modern languages. Where feasible, there are further sub-divisions into various countries, authors, places, or schools of importance, etc., and regularly (under iv) into various modern languages. The divisions of the anthology are exactly the same as in the first part, with a correction of *thème 2: Enseigner une langue étrangère* which had been given there erroneously as *langue maternelle*.

Taken as a whole, the book can be called a detailed commented stocklist of manuals for teaching foreign languages, ancient and modern. To them belong textbooks proper and grammars, but not dictionaries outside such textbooks. In my review of 1998, I expressed, first of all, my full admiration of the great dimensions of the whole undertaking whose unbelievable masses of preparatory work have been shouldered here by one man. The bibliography of the new volume lists 322 historical authors with some 480 works. Together with the sources of part one (let alone those of the announced part three) this is the reading load of a whole team of researchers. I repeat my unqualified admiration of this achievement.

In my review of 1998, I also expressed my doubts concerning two points. First, I thought it unwise to organize the material according to (political) countries. I shall not repeat this criticism here, because in the 18th century the national lines of development are indeed much more clearly discernible than in the previous ones, though I am not fully convinced of the usefulness of this approach even here. After all, countries like Germany, Belgium, Poland, etc. were so different in the 18th century from what they are now that at least a discussion of the problems of this division was to be expected. The problem is that the areal delimitations of mother-tongues, which stand in the background of language teaching and determine its process to a large extent, do not in many cases coincide with the delimitations of countries.

My second critical point was whether the present-day conception of language teaching didactics (*didactique*, *Fremdsprachendidaktik*) was a good guide for the characterization and evaluation of historical sources. I shall not repeat this criticism here, either, but I still hold it valid. The tasks which serve as rubrics of the groups of texts compiled in the anthology (e.g. *La correction des fautes*, *Apprendre à lire / écrire / parler / prononcer*) are so obviously taken from today's concepts and educational conditions that we may infer from their writings what our forebears said about our modern problems (frequently nothing), but are not guided to understand them in their own grapplings with the problems of language teaching. In short, this modern perspective creates the risk of anachronism without discussing the positive aspects which anachronism

may indeed have in historiography. I do not ignore the introductory parts to each chapter which draw frameworks of historical facts in general culture and in education in order to give the didactic books their proper historical perspective. For a closer inspection, I choose chapters I and III, on Great Britain and Germany respectively. They can be taken as representing all the chapters of the book.

The historical overview concerning Great Britain starts with a surprising statement: 'On a dit que le xviii^e siècle était français. C'est vrai pour la culture. Pour la reste, il est anglais'. The *aperçu* lists the names of literary and philosophical authors, excluding however John Locke whose influence on thinking about language was certainly very great. The general overview concerning education speaks of the differences between conformist and non-conformist institutions, the slow development of general ('English') schools, and the fact that among the authors we now find some women. (Indeed, it was also the time of Mary Elstob (1683-1756) who was not a schoolteacher or author of a manual but the first female antiquarian scholar in the country.) Concerning Latin, the general deterioration of studies in Europe is deplored. The old issues about language teaching are still in the air: Latin is either learned by grammatical rules, to be formulated in Latin or in English, or by practice. Practice is either provided by construction, by reading and/or by translation. These alternatives are discussed in six manuals by Thomas Watt (1704¹), Richard Johnson (1706), Thomas Ruddiman (1714), John Clarke (1720), Jenkin Thomas Philipps (1723), and John Coleridge (1772). Each author is given between a half and two pages of text. The authorities to choose between were John Lily's grammar whose influence, originating in the preceding century, was felt to be tyrannical, Locke's postulate of teaching Latin as if it was a living language, and the grammatical ideas of Port Royal. The grammar-orientated authors (Johnson, Ruddiman, Clarke) outnumber the practice-orientated ones slightly (Watt, Philipps). Coleridge is rather eccentric outside the two groups.

The reports on teaching French, Italian, Spanish, German, and Portuguese (in this sequence) are introduced by a section on teaching English as the mother-tongue. It lists various grammars between 1693 (Josph Aickin) and 1762 (Robert Lowth), but it can naturally not say anything about the great themes that dominated English grammaticography at that time: the departure from Latin, the definition of word-classes, the functions of prepositions as case markers or as adverbials, the coincidence of universal and specific (national) grammars, the importance of norms, etc. Its function is merely to show that there was no principal difference in the opinions about teaching a natural (first) and a foreign (second) language, as we assume it to be the case today.

¹ Years behind names indicate the earliest publications of the relevant author mentioned by Caravolas.

There was an immense production of manuals for the teaching of French at the time, mostly written by native speakers. Caravolas reviews seven of them: Abel Boyer (1694), Jenkin Thomas Phillips (1723), J. E. Tandon (1735), François Cheneau (1716), Louis Chambaud (1750), Jean-Baptist Perrin (1768), and Abbé Lecoutz de Lévizac (1799). More authors of manuals, of which quite a few went through several editions, are mentioned in an introductory part. All these books contain ways of presenting the foreign language as known from the previous century, like grammar, vocabulary, conversation, correspondence. Caravolas regards it '[l]a plus grande nouveauté' (21) that, in the 18th century, authors also pay attention to pronunciation (for which a simple phonetic transcription is found) and practical exercises.

Each author is given between a half and two and a half pages of text. This leaves room for only short epitomes ordered around well-known categories. Boyer 'insiste sur l'usage mais commence l'enseignement par les règles de grammaire, continue par la lecture de textes connus dans la langue maternelle [...] et de documents originaux jugés faciles [...]' (23). Philipps "utilisait la même méthode pour enseigner les langues anciennes et les langues vivantes [...]" (25). Chambaud 'favorise l'approche mixte et l'enseignement bilingue' (28). More statements of this sort could be quoted.

There are two manuals for Italian (Ferdinando Bottarelli, 1711, and Cesare Mussolini, 1800) described and some mentioned only by name. All of them favour 'la méthode pratique (la conversation)' (34). For Spanish, six authors and their works are given, but each with only a few lines of explanatory text. Johann James Bachmair's grammar (1751) is the only textbook on German. One final paragraph mentions an anonymous book on Portuguese (1707) and a grammar (1767) plus a dictionary (1773) of that language by Antonio Vieyra.

Chapter I on teaching languages in Great Britain shows the guidelines according to which the topic is treated in the other chapters. Chapter III on teaching languages in Germany shows that Caravolas added special aspects to the ones mentioned, depending on the circumstances in this country. This is again typical for the whole book. In the general overview of the German scene, the repercussions of the particularization into many states and the division into Protestantism and Catholicism are mentioned. To a certain extent, it coincides with progression and tradition, with attention to living languages and to Latin, with practice-orientated and grammar-orientated methods, and with the two leading states Prussia and Bavaria. The former developed intellectual movements like "reform of pedagogy" (*Reformpädagogik*), pietism (*Pietismus*), and neo-humanism (*Neuhumanismus*), centred in Halle and Dessau and represented by such outstanding names as August Hermann Francke, Johann Bernhard Basedow, Joachim Heinrich Campe, Johann Mathias Gessner, Hermann August Wolf, Johann Gottfried Herder, and Emanuel Kant, of which many made important contributions to Germany's intellectual life by far

transcending the needs and possibilities of language teaching. Generally speaking, *Reformpädagogik* and *Pietismus* took sides with a more utilitarian approach, whereas *Neuhumanismus* favoured the idea of cultural and aesthetic *Bildung*. This sketch does not give more historical facts than can be read in any other book, but *in loco* it serves as a grid for giving the following texts an adequate order. Authors of manuals for teaching French are divided into those representing *[l]a méthode inductive* (Jean-Charles Thibault de la Veaux, 1784), *[l]'approche grammaticale* (among others Eléazar de Mauvillon, 1754; Johann Georg Kleine, 1775; and Christian Luckenbein, 1752), *[l]'approche mixte (éclectique)* (Mathias Cramer, 1696, and Hilmar Curas, 1739), *[l]'approche néo-humaniste* (Johann Mathias Gessner, 1756, and Friedrich Gedike, 1755), *[l]a méthode de lecture* (Charles de Villers, 1899), *[l]'approche philanthropiste* (Basedow, 1770, and Wolke, 1787), and *[l]a méthode grammaire-traduction* (Johann Valentin Meidinger, 1783). This means that, to a certain extent, the strictly chronological order is here given up in favour of an order according to pedagogic and didactic ideas. In the following sections on English, Italian, Spanish, and Russian manuals, Caravolas, however, returns to the former principle of presentation.

These sketches of two chapters show what Caravolas means when he calls his book 'un instrument de consultation pratique et fiable, des références concises, impartiales et aussi complètes que possible [...]' and 'une image globale de l'état de la pédagogie des langue au xviii^e siècle [...]' (xi, xii). It can serve these needs excellently. It might also well become the stepping stone for more, for 'une histoire exhaustive de la discipline' (xii) which the author, honest and realistic in his ambitions, did not plan to write. In the future, no historiographical study of language teaching from Quintilian to the Enlightenment can go without mentioning and referring to it.

The two anthologies provide all scholars with a plethora of samples of texts, even if regularly dissected into small pieces (sometimes only one sentence). They will provide material for topical discussions in seminars. They will also initiate further historiographical studies. But, alas, all the texts have been translated into French, although Jean-Antoine Caravolas is excellently versed in many languages himself. Is it expedient or wise to confront readers who look for information about the history of foreign language teaching in many major European (Western) languages, even at the beginning of their careers, only with one, most probably their own, idiom?

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

Thorsten Fögen

Patrii sermonis egestas.

Einstellungen lateinischer Autoren zu ihrer Muttersprache

Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2000.

279 pp. ISBN 3-598-77699-3. DM 158,00.

The main concern of linguistics is to reflect on languages and language use. In today's linguistics, strict rules have to be observed concerning the formation of terminology, the definition of structures, descriptive accuracy, generalizations, etc. This is why linguistics is a task for seminars and academic lectures with their self-reflexive style of expertise. Such statements are, of course, commonplace.

But almost everybody who speaks and writes with some care also reflects on his or her language outside the institutions mentioned. The same happens with people who are engaged in translation. This means that there is also a layman's linguistics (seen from our present-day attitude), a kind of pre-theoretical but general awareness of linguistic properties and the applicability of rules. We find it in eras previous to the foundation of contemporary linguistics proper (which we may attribute to Saussure) and also contemporary with it. It concerns almost everybody speaking or writing for the public, but in particular people like philosophers, historians, orators, etc. who cannot be called laymen in their own fields. Their deliberations on language and languages are often insightful and profound, even if outside the methodological subtleties regarded today as necessary by professional linguists. We might call these people linguistic laymen on a high intellectual level. One of their frequently treated topics is evaluative language comparison.

It is difficult to find an adequate locus in the system of linguistic sub-disciplines for this kind of pre-theoretical study. More than others, sociolinguistics seems to be the proper slot because here non-experts' thoughts on language and the habits of language use are dealt with. If found in the past, they can contribute immensely to our knowledge of the history of any language, not so much as formal systems of structures, as grammarians establish them, but as *faits mentals et sociaux*. It is in this context that Thorsten Fögen's book on *Patrii sermonis egestas* should be read. It deals with problems which we would nowadays call "sociolinguistic" as found in the works of classical authors.

At some point in their histories, languages like English, French, or German outgrew their state of being a bundle of dialects and developed into a

national idiom. The reasons and the conditions for this process were different in each case, but invariably tied to a growth of national self-awareness and even pride. Previous to this threshold, authors usually deplored the poverty and lack of exactness of their national idioms, as compared to Latin; subsequent to it they usually stressed its communicative efficiency, beauty, independence, etc. Thorsten Fögen shows us that the Romans, too, had their feelings of inferiority and deplored the poverty of Latin as compared to the richness of Greek.

He deals with Lucretius, Cicero, Quintilian, and Aulus Gellius. Moreover, he gives short remarks concerning Augustine, Jerome, and Boethius. In the writings of all these authors, comparisons between Greek and Latin are largely confined to lexical aspects in the context of what would today be called language for special purposes, mostly with reference to translatability. Cicero was the only author who assertively contradicted the otherwise wide-spread opinion of the poverty (*paupertas*, *egestas*, *inopia*, *angustia*) of Latin and maintained its superiority over Greek, together with the famous Roman virtues, for the purpose of philosophical discourse. His statements concerned his fellow-authors, but also served the advancement of his own work. He developed the elaborate style of the special language of philosophy together with that of oratory (rhetoric) and historiography.

Lucretius was the first to speak of *egestas* in a way which established a long-lasting stereotype. He stressed the necessity of *claritas* and *perspicuitas*, as they are to be found in Epicurus. Occasionally it is difficult to differentiate in Lucretius's writings between serious criticism of the Latin language and rather stereotypical expressions of modesty.

Quintilian stressed the lexical subtlety and aesthetic value of the Attic dialect and advised Roman orators how to achieve these effects in their own oratory. More than the other authors he also saw the necessity for syntactic refinement. He gave guidelines for translation and the acceptance of Greek words. His overall criterion for style was communicative adequacy, i.e. gearing one's linguistic means to the conditions of when, where, to whom, and on what a speech was going to be made.

Aulus Gellius, finally, regarded Greek as the pre-eminent language of drama and of what was then called the sciences, but he attributed the shortcomings of Latin not to the language itself but to the inability of translators and writers.

Thorsten Fögen presents his sources with carefully chosen quotations underpinned with elaborate footnotes to editions, secondary studies, etc. (On average, almost half of each page is covered with these notes.) Their adequacy, correctness, and exhaustiveness can only be judged by an expert classical scholar (which the present reviewer is not, although I have no doubts whatsoever). It is interesting, almost exciting, to read the many footnotes on what the author calls *moderne Linguistik*, because they show the numerous cross-references between classical philology and present-day translation theory,

sociolinguistics, contact linguistics, structural linguistics with reference to the so-called dia-systems, etc. Sometimes, the label “modern” is too generously given to publications which are about forty years old. Sometimes doubts may be raised as to whether they are happily chosen, e.g. concerning metaphors (p. 93) or contrastive linguistics (p. 151). But, in general, this wealth of references shows how modern classical studies on language and how classical modern studies are. There is an important lesson to be learnt here. Matching ancient authors with new ideas might also be a way of stimulating a general interest in the Classics whose ignorance among the younger generation is so often regretted.

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

Paolo Rossi

Logic and the Art of Memory: the Quest for a Universal Language.

Trans. by Stephen Clucas.

London: Athlone, 2000. 333 pp. ISBN 0 485 11468 2 HB. £50.

It would not be hyperbolic to call Paolo Rossi's *Clavis universalis* a genuinely seminal text in the study of the history of ideas as pursued in the last quarter of the twentieth century. An English translation of this work, originally published in Italian in 1960, has been long-awaited, not least by this reviewer. However, having now read it in Stephen Clucas's English translation, this mixture of expectation and admiration seems to me to be an at least slightly shameful set of sentiments; were the English reader to command erudition anything like as deep as that of Rossi, then no such translation would be necessary at all.

Logic and the Art of Memory can be divided into two interrelated sections of four chapters each, the first section providing the context in which the subjects of the second are situated and considered. In the first four chapters it is made clear that the notion of the Renaissance is not a helpful one when examining the art of memory: the tradition is shown to stretch continuously from Aristotle to Aquinas (via Rome and the early Church Fathers) and from there to the long fifteenth century and beyond. Of course, no tradition covering such a wide temporal span could be uniform, and Rossi usefully delineates three principal aspects to it. These are: i) the Ciceronian-Quintilian approach (concerned with the essentially technical retention and organisation of material by places and images, the better to reproduce it in oratorical performance); ii) the Aristotelian approach, including the works of Aquinas, Albertus Magnus and Averroes (also concerned with the development of memory by use of places and images, but most particularly with the speculative ordering of these – which is to say that they were designed to reflect the relationship between the 'sensitive and the intellective soul'); iii) approaches directly connected to the *Ars magna* of Ramon Lull (a product of Lull's aim to unite logic and metaphysics, developing what Rossi deems 'an organic and unitary corpus of knowledge and a systematic classification of reality' through his art's basis in the combination of simple, irreducible notions. The mnemonic technique developed to aid the acquisition of this knowledge was also combinatorial, based on an *alphabetaria revolutio* rather than the traditional *loci*, and was seen as a constitutive part of the Lullian process, the key which would allow entry into the truths his art revealed.) Rossi suggests that at some point in the mid-

sixteenth century, there was a 'confluence' of these three aspects and that it is here that one should look for the genesis of the universalising tendencies of the seventeenth century, and in particular for the origins of the universal-philosophical language movement. Some of the authors presented as exemplary of this 'confluence' include Bernardo de Lavinheta (whose work was later edited by Alsted), Giovanni Battista della Porta, Johannes Spangenbergius, and (in a nod of both acknowledgement and censure to Frances Yates, whose *The Art of Memory* elevates him above all others in the sixteenth-century mnemonic firmament) Giordano Bruno.

The four latter chapters are devoted to tracing the influence of this tradition, post-'confluence', in works frequently described as existing within what has come to be considered as the nascent scientific milieu. The scientific avant-gardists through whom this influence was mediated to the later seventeenth century is presented by Rossi as consisting of Ramus, Bacon, Descartes, Alsted and Comenius, all of whom are suggested to be familiar with the art of memory in general and with Lull's influence or works in particular, and all of whom attempt to utilise them in the service of their own ideas (be they logical, encyclopaedic or didactic). The final two chapters locate the English universal language movement (in particular that of John Wilkins's *Essay*) and the universal character of Leibniz in this context, and examine their relationship with and dependency upon the mnemonic tradition that stretched before them. In addition to this, ten appendices provide mnemonic manuscripts and printed texts that would not otherwise be readily available to the reader, ranging from Lull's *Liber ad memoriam confirmandum* to D'Alembert's entry on "caractère" in the *Encyclopédie*.

The scope of *Logic and the Art of Memory* is thus broad, and in tracing the continuities between works developed as a part of the new science in the seventeenth century and traditions from the sixteenth century, the medieval period and before, it delivers a salutary lesson in writing the history of ideas (the history of linguistics is emphatically not to be considered *sui generis* in this regard). Clucas's introduction and the two prefaces by Rossi all make the explicit point that the reconstruction of what Rossi calls the 'vital historical context' of any work is essential to understanding its true significance. In particular Rossi views his work as a corrective to the tendency to address a 'generic and mysterious entity called Platonism [...] stretching behind the works of major and minor writers of the [nascent scientific] period', without ever really bothering to investigate what this might have meant for the writers of the time or investigating what role it might have played in their work. Rossi, on the other hand, sets out to demonstrate how:

An instrument designed with practical rhetorical purposes in mind becomes (after the encounter with the Lullist tradition) a search for a 'code' which would allow one to penetrate into the innermost secrets of reality, and to

infinitely extend man's potential.

Or, as Clucas paraphrases the argument of *Logic and the Art of Memory*, the universalising movement that gave rise to works such as Wilkins's *Essay* can only be comprehended:

within the context of a tradition which fused the mediaeval notion of the *ars artium* ... [with] mnemotechnics, emblematics, cryptology, the cabala and other symbolic modes of communication.

And while this is certainly contextualising and could never be accused of representing a pattern of study which examines historical texts merely as an exercise in 'confirming the truth of the present' (giving the lie to those in thrall to Kuhn, at least), it is here that *Logic and the art of memory* begins to seem to me to be problematic. For while it is certainly verifiable that all those influences mentioned by Clucas are significant to the development of, in particular, the universal languages that are the subtitle of this work, his list is not in fact comprehensive. Not even nearly so. Even a moment's reflection testifies to the role played by other factors in the history of the universal language movement. Think about, say, language teaching, Aristotelian logic, the decline of Latin and the rise of vernacular languages, radical religion, the demands of the "new science" (familiar with traditions such as the art of memory, yes, but *not* the product of them), the thirty years' war or the rise of print culture. One could, and should, go on. Rossi does not, and though he devotes some space to the "mathematical" underpinning of language projection, he proceeds to marginalise and misunderstand material not germane to his case. There may be sound rhetorical reasons for so doing in that the book seeks to emphasise the importance of a hitherto under-explored avenue in intellectual history, but the imputation of polemicism is hardly an accolade in scholarly works of this sort.

An unfortunate corollary of these (rhetorical?) elisions is the tendency throughout *Logic and the Art of Memory* simultaneously to over-egg and under-cook the pudding with regard to those subjects and authors it does consider. The reader is consistently directed from particular examples towards implied conclusions by means that are never clearly formulated, and one cannot escape the thought that this is a result of the fact that either the conclusions or the means of reaching them might not stand much scrutiny in a brighter light. While Rossi's treatment of Ramus would have benefited greatly from a reading of Walter Ong's *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue*, published in 1958, two years before the original *Clavis*, his discussions of Descartes and Bacon (particularly that of Bacon), are sure-footed and genuinely broaden the reader's appreciation of their work. However, his treatment of the universal language movement in England is weak, and demonstrates the shortcomings

found elsewhere in the book writ large. This chapter suggests that the universal language movement in England (always presented as a uniform rather than variegated movement) was the result of three basic sources, viz. Baconianism, the scientific revolution and the influence of Comenius; in each of these cases his approach and analysis is seriously flawed.

Leaving aside the fact that it is hardly possible to speak of the scientific revolution in England without reference to Bacon, these categorisations are problematic. Though the presentation of Bacon's linguistic thought is acute and sensitive to the fact that Bacon was not opposed to natural language *per se*, but to the abuses of language that he considered to be an obstacle to the comprehension of reality, the only attempt to show how he came to influence the universal language movement is inadequate, and even misleading. The evidence of this is a paragraph which lists, in this order, some reflections on prose style and language in general from John Webster's *Academiarum examen* (date given as 1653 by Rossi, actually published in 1654), Robert Boyle's *Considerations* (date given as 1651, actually published in 1661), Joshua Childrey's *Britannia baconica* (date given as 1660 in the text and as 1669 in the note, actually published in 1661), Thomas Sprat's *History of the Royal Society* (1667), and George Thompson's *Μισοκυμιας ελεγχος* (1671). Even extending Rossi and his translator the benefit of the doubt and assuming that the publication dates of these works are only typographical errors (which nevertheless should have been picked up by some editor), this paragraph fails to show anything other than his familiarity with a wide range of sources from the period. All the authors cited show a vague Baconian preference for things over words, and an affection for a plain unadorned prose style, but that is it. On this evidence, Rossi seems to think that being opposed to the Ciceronian prose style is coterminous with support for the construction of a real character or universal language simply because Bacon writes about both subjects. None of the authors cited (with the partial exception of Boyle who supported the schemes of both Lodwick and Dalgarno) had anything concrete to do with the development of a real character or universal language, either. Moreover, the chronological and social spread of the authors is so wide as to render any attempt to impose some historical meaning upon them a pointless task. For example, Robert Boyle and John Webster were authors writing for such different audiences and with such different intentions – writing in such different contexts – that to use them collectively as an attempt to prove anything but the most bland generalisation requires a complete suspension of discrimination. Similarly, what do Webster and George Thomson have in common that tells us anything about the influence of Bacon on English language projection? The former was a Puritan zealot writing against the perceived errors of the English university system at the height of the Interregnum, whereas the latter was attempting to defend the Royal Society from Henry Stubbe's accusation of irreligiosity at a time when English language projection had already passed its apotheosis. This paragraph

may seem a particularly gratuitous instance, but it is not untypical of Rossi's approach throughout the book (it serves him better when dealing with a large corpus of work by an individual author): he piles up examples drawn from far and wide and then forces them (without ever sticking his head over the parapet and making the point explicitly) into conclusions that come at the cost of these works retaining any of their actual significance.

In his preface Rossi deprecates historians' tendency to 'hunt for "examples"' without bothering to examine the works from which they are drawn or what their authors were doing in writing them, but this is exactly the method he chooses to fall back on here, and it is certainly to be deprecated in its turn. Indeed, his carelessness with *facts* (whatever historical *truths* he may be highlighting) does seem to suggest that the events he details are just a convenient peg to hang his theories on, and are of no intrinsic value in themselves. There is a fine example of this in the next section of this chapter, concerned with describing (rather cursorily) the role of 'Linguistic symbols and mathematical symbols' in 'fostering' the development of language projection in England. This concentrates principally on the 'mathematical simplicity' that characterised the newly developed specious arithmetic (sc. what we now call algebra), and in this Rossi presents considerations of Thomas Sprat, Thomas Hobbes, Seth Ward and William Petty. The section on Hobbes (p.151) is worth quoting at some length:

The [mathematical] tendency was even more explicit [than in Sprat's *History*] amongst those thinkers who were directly influenced by Thomas Hobbes, who [...] saw language as a kind of 'calculus'. The views of Seth Ward are typical in this regard.

Of course, it is always good to see Hobbes being considered as a part of seventeenth-century intellectual life rather than as the lonely old volcano of Chatsworth, but this is taking things a little too far. Rossi goes on to quote from Ward's *Vindiciae academiæ* (1654), noting the similarity between Ward's 'simple notions' and the mathematical ideas of Hobbes. Can he really have read *Vindiciae academiæ*, let alone others of Ward's works, or even Hobbes's fullest working out of his linguistic ideas in *Leviathan*? To clarify: Ward was one of Hobbes's most energetic adversaries, both theologically and mathematically. His principal mathematical influence was William Oughtred. He first criticised Hobbes in his *Philosophicall essay* (1652), while *Vindiciae Academiæ* itself contains a preface (written by Wilkins) which makes abusive remarks about Hobbes, and concludes with an appendix devoted to attacking Hobbes's views on the university curriculum. Furthermore, in 1656 Ward wrote a full-scale attack on *Leviathan* entitled *In Thomæ Hobbii philosophiam exercitatio epistolica*. Hobbes even developed a less than flattering sobriquet for Ward: *Vindex*. To be sure, Ward was typical, but only in

his opposition to Hobbes, who was not at all smiled upon in the circles that came together to form the Royal Society, and never became a Fellow of the Royal Society himself; bearing this in mind, the comparison offered of Hobbes with Sprat's *History* is also of little worth. While it is true to say that Hobbes's and Ward's mathematical positions do share common characteristics, to infer any sort of interpenetration between their ideas on this basis alone is mistaken. While Ward's ideas are not dissimilar to those of Hobbes, the surviving documentary evidence puts any question of 'direct [or indirect] influence' beyond reasonable doubt. Rossi's complacency regarding the examples he chooses reaches such a pitch that he actually manages to ignore one of the highest-profile conflicts of this age.

This, *mutatis mutandis*, repeats itself in the remainder of the chapter, concerned with: i) the influence of the Comenian groups upon the English movement; ii) the exegesis of Wilkins's *Essay* and Dalgarno's *Ars* (which are taken to be more or less analogous); iii) some reflections upon the 'mnemonic function of universal languages'. There is much to be said about all of these, but most of it is beyond the scope of this review. To deal with the Comenian section first, it must be said that this is by far the weakest part of the book. Drawing extensively on the work of Benjamin De Mott, Rossi claims that Comenius's trip to England in 1641 was the catalyst of English language projection. Comenius's ideas, with preoccupations that were every bit as religious as they were linguistic, were then disseminated by Samuel Hartlib in manuscript form (eventually published as *Via lucis* in 1668), which in turn fed the imagination of the English universal language movement that resulted in Wilkins's *Essay* and the Royal Society's support for linguistic advancement. Vivian Salmon has comprehensively demolished this particular historical edifice (though her 'Language planning in seventeenth-century England' is not included in the bibliographies found in both the translator's and Rossi's prefatory remarks), so this review need not do so again, other than to add that it is unfortunate for Rossi to have tied the religious dimension of English language planning so closely to the idea of Comenius he has gleaned from De Mott. The religious dimension is clear enough in its own right, as one of the examples adduced by Rossi makes plain. William Bedell, described by Rossi puzzlingly as 'one of the major supporters of irenicism and Lutheran-Calvinist reconciliation in England' (he was certainly irenically inclined, but was Anglican Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland, killed in the Irish rebellion of 1642), was interested in advancing a universal character for religious reasons and engaged one John Johnson to do so on his behalf. Rossi advances this as being on account of Bedell's 'intense interest in the work of Comenius (and the English Comenians) [...] [and] was motivated (at least in part) by [...] [their religious] conviction'. Other than that it would be a mistake to label the Hartlib correspondence group unreservedly "Comenian", the unfortunate thing about this is that Bedell was dead before Comenius was supposed to have left his

manuscript *Via lucis* with Hartlib in June 1642 (he was killed in January 1642), and even more pertinently, Hartlib was in correspondence from late 1638 about the Johnson-Bedell plan for a universal character, something which comfortably predates the visit of Comenius. Whatever the religious sources of the universal language movement, they certainly predate the pansophism of Comenius to which English language planners may or may not have been exposed in the years after his arrival in England in 1641. It would not be entirely fair to beat Rossi with a stick made from the scholarship which appeared in the years after *Clavis Universalis* appeared in 1960, but he certainly should have been more rigorous in his examination of De Mott's claims; in any case, his work on the Comenian influence is now obsolete.

The exegesis of the fully realised philosophical-universal language schemes of Dalgarno and Wilkins is somewhat meandering, not really sure what its destination might be or where it has come from. The reader is told that the structure of these works is 'almost identical to those [...] [of] sixteenth-century encyclopaedias and treatises which [...] dealt with the logical-encyclopaedic themes of Lullism'. And that is more or less that, except that Rossi also emphasises that 'the mnemonic function [of Wilkins's *Essay*] [...] was closely related to the classification of minerals, plants and animals', and points to the prominence that the mnemonic function of universal language had, referred to approvingly in such terms by the likes of Kinner, Lodwick, Dalgarno and John Beale. In much the same way as the *Essay* is described as being 'almost identical' (which is to say, again, 'a bit like') the encyclopaedic tradition, it is now noted that the universal language movement, in being concerned with mnemonic function, is a bit like the art of memory. True enough, certainly, but this hardly amounts to any sort of proof, particularly as (if I have understood the aim of the book correctly), its central thesis is to outline how the art of memory came to be subsumed into the universalising movement of the seventeenth century, eventually peering 'into the innermost secrets of reality, and [...] infinitely extend[ing] man's potential'. Though there certainly is a demonstrable link between the mnemonic tradition and the language projectors active in England (and elsewhere) in the seventeenth century, Rossi signally fails to find it – principally as a result of the vagueness he displays with regard to facts, inferences and the description of the ideas he discusses.

Indeed, this use of the "almost" formulation and its analogues permeates *Logic and the Art of Memory*. When faced by a choice between a nebulous generalisation and something that can be verified (or falsified), Rossi invariably opts for the former. To choose a random example, Ciceronian mnemonic texts of the fifteenth century are 'almost exclusively technical', and when giving a direct quotation from *Leviathan* (on p. 28) he even goes as far as to note its 'Hobbesian' qualities. What does he expect to find in Hobbes's *magnum opus*? It is only Hobbesian in the same sense that a book is bookish or science is

scientific, but his desire to manufacture sources that are as broadly applicable as they are malleable overcomes this blatantly obvious fact. His discussions of, say, Lull's influence are marred by the same imprecision: refusing to differentiate between someone who was a follower of Lull, those familiar with his works and those whose works exhibit characteristics similar to those of Lull, only on very few occasions does he produce a link that is actually verifiable (again, demonstrable proof of Lull's influence does exist). One device he constantly has recourse to, and which helps him to avoid framing his claims with more exactitude, is the block quotation. While these can be a useful way in which to familiarise the reader with the pattern of an author's style and pattern of thought, they can also be used to obscure as much as they reveal; they are certainly not an end in themselves, or an argument in themselves, at least within the context of a work such as this. When intricate examples and evidence are required to keep the narrative force of his history moving forwards, Rossi often prefers to give the reader a chunk of primary text and exclaim (*sotto voce*), 'Look! Don't you see?'. *Logic and the Art of Memory* would certainly have been strengthened had Rossi eschewed his all too allusive style.

The block quotations also lead one towards another unnecessary shortcoming of *Logic and the Art of Memory*. Sensibly, Rossi translates all primary materials from their original Latin, German, Italian or French, which aids smoothness of reading for the reader without specialist knowledge of these languages. These translations (be they the work of Rossi himself, or that of Clucas) are generally exemplary models of both clarity and accuracy. Of course, in order to check this one must turn to the original sources, which are faithfully reproduced in the notes, and which in turn contain more than simple textual or bibliographical information. However, for some unaccountable reason these have been placed at the end of the book, making checking the original text or consulting them for any sort of reason a very laborious task indeed. In this age of computer publishing, when it is no longer punitively expensive to arrange the apparatus at the bottom of the page, there seems to me to be no reason at all to hinder the progress of the reader in this supremely frustrating way.

Ultimately then, frustration is the only response to *Logic and the Art of Memory*. As it stands, it is still a very useful book, drawing attention to an often neglected but central tenet of intellectual history, and covering a wide range of sources from a huge temporal span. It has also been ably translated by Clucas, and is not at all difficult to read. But it could have been so much more, and to have been so would only have had to adhere to the principles laid down in its admirable preface. On the macro-level, Rossi is correct in the conclusions he draws and the influences he identifies, but in so doing he is so careless with the details that constitute the micro-level that he brings the validity of his broader conclusions – and of his professed method – into question. Which is

unfortunate indeed. The Irish poet William Butler Yeats gave a powerful speech to the Irish senate (of which he was a member) in 1927, in which he warned of the dangers inherent in Fascism and the need to oppose it at every opportunity. Throughout this speech, he referred to Mussolini as Missolonghi, the site of Byron's death when taking part in the Greek insurgency of 1824. On this later being pointed out to him by a fellow senator, he adopted his most vatic expression and responded 'does it [...] really [...] matter?'. Your response to this question will probably condition your appreciation of Rossi's work. For my part, I happen to think it does.

Rhodri Lewis, *Oxford*
rhodri.lewis@jesus.ox.ac.uk

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(to 30 October 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

CRAM, David & MAAT, Jaap

George Dalgarno on Universal Language: The Art of Signs (1661), The Deaf and Dumb Man's Tutor (1680), and the Unpublished Papers.

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. xi + 456 pp, + fold-out table, £65.00.

ISBN: 0-19-823732-4.

LUCAS, Peter J. (ed)

Caedmonis monachi Paraphrasis poetica: genesios ac praecipuarum sacrae paginae historiarum / abhinc annos M.LXX Anglo-saxonice conscripta & nunc primum edita [à Francisco Junio]; edited by Peter J. Lucas.

[Early Studies in Germanic Philology 3] Amsterdam: Rodopi. xlix + 206 [+ 28] pp. ISBN 90-420-0343-X.

MATTHEWS, Peter H.

A Short History of Structural Linguistics.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. ix + 163 pp. ISBN: 0-521-62367-7 (hardback), 0-521-62568-8 (paperback).

ROSSI, Paolo

Logic and the Art of Memory: The Quest for a Universal Language, trans. Stephen Clucas.
London: Athlone Press, 2000. xxviii + 333 pp., £50. ISBN 0-485-11468-2.

VERWER, A.

Letterkonstige, dichtkonstige en redekonstige schetse van de Nederduitsche tale. Uitgegeven door Igor van de Bilt en Jan Noordegraaf.
[Cahiers voor Taalkunde, deel 18]. Amsterdam/Münster, 2001. xxxii + 94 pp., 125 blz. NLG 25,00. ISBN 90-72365- 64-X; ISBN 3-89323-524-5.

PERIODICALS

Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek. XIX/2000, –i. V
ISSN • 0922-7865; ISBN • 3-89323-440-3

ARTICLES

de GROOT, Henk

“The publications of the ‘Maatschappij tot Nut van ’t Algemeen’ in Japan.”
Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek 19 (2000), 143-171.

FEITSMA, A.

“Het Reisplan van Joast Halbertsma.”
Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek 19 (2000), 173-209.

HÜLLEN, Werner,

“Characterisation and evaluation of languages in the Renaissance and in the Early Modern Period.” In Martin Haspelmath et al (eds) *Language Typology and Language, An International Handbook*. [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication, 20]. (Berlin: de Gruyter 2001). vol. 1, 234-249.

HÜLLEN, Werner,

“Reflections on language in the Renaissance.” In Martin Haspelmath et al (eds) *Language Typology and Language, An International Handbook*. [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication, 20]. (Berlin: de Gruyter 2001). vol. 1, 210-222.

LÉON, Jacqueline

"Traduction automatique et formalisation du langage. Les tentatives du Cambridge Language Research Unit (1955-1960)." *Orbis* 19 (2000), 173-209.

NOORDGEGRAAF, Jan

(2000) Review of: Anne Dykstra & Rolf Bremmer (eds) *In skiednis fan'e Fryske taalkunde* (Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy, 1999); *It Beaken, Tydskrift fan de Fryske Akademy*, 62:3, 227-231.

VAN DE BILT, Igor

"Adriaan Kluit (1735-1807) en de spelling van het Nederlands." *Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 19 (2000), 95-142.

WALMSLEY, John [with Jens DÖPKE]

"The proper treatment of derivation in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar." In Bernard Reitz & Sigrid Rieuwerts (eds) *Anglistentag, 1999, Mainz*. (Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag 2000). 103-119.

WALMSLEY, John

"The 'entente cordiale grammaticale', 1885-1915." In Bernard Colombat & Marie Savellie, eds. *Métalangage et Terminologie Linguistique: Actes du Colloque International de Grenoble, 14-16 Mai 1998*. (Leuven: Peters 2001; = *Orbis / Supplementa*, 17). 499-512.

GRAMMARS OF THE PEOPLE 1700-1900

Joan Beal and Carol Percy have received funding for this project under the Association of Commonwealth Universities / British Academy International Collaboration Scheme.

The aim of this project is to consider how the standardisation and codification of English in the later modern period both marginalised and was manipulated by, authors who were in some way outside the mainstream of 'polite' British society: those who were working-class, female, provincial, colonial or dissenters. Previous studies of English grammars in this period (Leonard 1929, Crowley 1989, 1991) have emphasised the role of grammars in catering for the social aspirations of the bourgeois, maintaining the political status quo and uniting the British nation and Empire under the banner of a uniform standard. Crowley, whilst acknowledging that 'it is from the edges of the dominant culture that [Buchanan and Sheridan] arrive with their prescriptions for "proper English"', goes on to assert that this is not surprising, as the marginalized will be those who most aspire to acceptance in polite society (1991: 73). This project aims to challenge such a monolithic view of approaches to language study in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, demonstrating that there were other, more radical approaches and agendas.

Authors such as Thomas Spence and William Cobbett, far from aspiring to climb up the social hierarchy, saw grammar as a means to subvert it. Cobbett viewed 'the proper use of language' as a weapon of empowerment, enabling the user 'to assert with effect the rights and liberties of his country'. According to Cobbett (1823: 4), 'tyranny has no enemy so formidable as the pen', a view expressed earlier by Spence, who described an ideal society in which 'as they could now learn as much in a Month, as formerly in a Year, the very poorest soon acquired such Notions of Justice, and Equity, and of the Rights of Mankind, as rendered unsupportable, every species of Oppression' (1782: 40).

Spence and Cobbett were self-taught men who wrote for what Spence termed 'the laborious part of the people', belying Leonard's claim that the 'Doctrine of Correctness' was devised by and for the rising middle-classes. This project will also examine the motivation of female grammarians and teachers such as Ann Fisher and Ellin Devis, 'provincial' authors such as Buchanan and Sheridan, 'colonials' such as Webster and Franklin and dissenters such as Priestley, with a view to demonstrating that each of these categories, whilst marginalised by mainstream society, viewed language as a means of empowerment.

The project will also address the question of the status of English outside England, and the relationship between 'colonial' and 'provincial' varieties in terms of their status. In this respect, the position of Scots and Scottish English will be of particular interest. We shall demonstrate that, contrary to the received view that 'scotticisms' were universally condemned in

this period, there were several authors who advocated Scottish English as superior to that of London. Tobias Smollett, for instance, creates the character of Lieutenant Lismahago to present a pro-Scots view in *Humphrey Clinker*, claiming that the English Language is spoken 'with more propriety at Edinburgh than in London'.

The project will not be confined to the study of grammars, but will encompass radical and resistant approaches to the study and description of English, including reflections on English contained in grammars of other languages. An example of this would be the remarks made by the radical Scot James Gilchrist in his descriptions of Urdu, in which the encounter with the non-European 'other' is seen as shedding light on the European 'self'.

The main objective of this project is to produce a publication, which will constitute the proceedings of a symposium to be held at the University of Sheffield in July 2003.

If you are interested in taking part, please contact Joan (j.c.beal@shef.ac.uk) or Carol (cpercy@chass.utoronto.ca).

other correspondence should be mailed to the following postal or e-mail addresses:

Professor Kjell-Åke Forsgren
Umeå universitet
Institutionen för moderna språk/tyska
SE-901 87 Umeå (Sweden)
kjell-ake.forsgren@tyska.umu.se
Tel.: +46-(0)90-786 67 60

**First International Conference on Missionary Linguistics
University of Oslo
13-16 March 2003**

After the discovery of the New World, the Europeans began to establish their hegemony in a new continent. European expansion, colonisation and christianisation of a large number and variety of Amerindian tribes was accompanied by the study and recording of the native languages of the Americas. In the same period, Christian missionary activities escalated in Asia, especially the Far East, and in Russia, and a little later in Africa. In the early 19th century, the Pacific became a new “America” for missionary linguistics. This congress aims to outline the state of research done in the field. The subjects are to some extent limited in time (focusing primarily on the period 1492-1850), but not in space. This conference, organised by Profs Even Hovdhaugen and Otto Zwartjes, aims particularly at inter-relating grammars written in different languages (Latin, Spanish, Portuguese, English, French, Dutch, etc.), by missionaries of different orders (Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, etc.), and in different continents. We wish to ‘globalise’ the discipline, crossing national and linguistic frontiers in order to create new views and to open new horizons. See <http://www.hf.uio.no/kri/mlc> for more information.

The Revised Constitution of the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas

1. The name of the Society shall be the *Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas*.

2. The aims of the Society shall be to promote and encourage the study of the history of all branches of linguistic thought, theoretical and applied, and including non-European traditions. Fields of interest shall include the history both of major subject areas such as ethnolinguistics, and also of more specialized topics, such as writing systems, literacy, rhetoric, and the application of linguistic ideas within technical and professional fields, such as medicine.

3. Membership of the Society shall be open to all persons engaged in scholarly study or research appropriate to the Society's aims.

4. The officers of the Society shall be:

A President (with representative functions)

Up to four Vice-Presidents

Chairman of the Executive Committee

Secretary of the Executive Committee

Publications Secretary

Editor of the *Bulletin*

Reviews Editor

Treasurer

5. There shall not be less than four and not more than ten ordinary members of the Executive Committee.

6. The officers of the Society, together with the ordinary members of the Executive Committee, shall have power to co-opt additional members with specific responsibilities (such as librarian, second editor of the *Bulletin*, assistant secretary, representative in the USA). Furthermore, they shall have power to co-opt officers and ordinary members of the Executive Committee if posts have fallen vacant.

7. Terms of office shall be:

President: six years

Vice-Presidents: without limit while they remain members of the Society

Executive Committee officers: three years, with eligibility for re-election

Ordinary members of the Executive Committee: three years, with eligibility for re-election

Co-opted officers: three years, with eligibility for re-confirmation

8. Elections:

(a) The officers shall be elected by the Executive Committee from amongst its members

(b) The members of the Executive Committee shall be elected by the membership of the Society, as assembled in the Annual General Meeting. Nominations shall be made in writing to the Secretary of the Executive Committee, at least fifteen days before the Annual General Meeting, or by oral proposal to the meeting by the Chairman of the Executive Committee.

9. Applications for membership:

(a) Applications for membership should be made to the Secretary, accompanied by a brief statement of interests and qualifications, and of existing contacts, if any, with the Society.

(b) Undergraduate students, and graduate students of not more than five years' standing from their admission as graduate students shall be eligible for associate membership of the Society.

(c) The officers of the Society shall be empowered to admit applicants to membership, seeking advice from the full Committee at their discretion.

10. The Annual General Meeting shall normally be held in conjunction with a colloquium, a lecture, or a seminar. Invitations to the Annual General Meeting, including a draft of the agenda and, if pertinent, the text of an amendment of this constitution, must reach the members fifteen days previous to the meeting. During the meeting, the Treasurer shall present the Society's accounts, and the Executive Committee shall recommend, and the membership of the Society as assembled in the Annual General Meeting shall approve, the annual subscription to be paid on 1 January each year.

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

4 September 2001

The Annual General Meeting of the Henry Sweet Society was held at 5.15 pm on 4 September 2001 at the Internationales Begegnungszentrum, Amalienstrasse 38, Munich. It took place during the Annual Colloquium organised by Professor Hans Sauer and his colleagues from the Department of English, University of Munich. The meeting was chaired by the President of the Society, Professor Werner Hüllen.

1 Apologies for absence were received from Vivien Law, Louis Kelly, Vivian Salmon, John Joseph and Nicola McLelland.

2 Constitution The President proposed a new Constitution, with various amendments of the earlier document in order to bring theory into line with practice on the day-to-day running of the Society. Members present at the AGM scrutinised the new document, and David Cram observed that there was nothing controversial about the amended clauses. The new Constitution was agreed unanimously by the meeting; the full text is printed in this issue of the Bulletin.

3 Committee membership Following the amended Constitution, the President proposed that the members re-elect Anders Ahlqvist and Jan Noordegraaf as members of the Committee and Mark Atherton as Secretary. He also proposed the new election of Nicola McLelland as Treasurer and of Rhodri Lewis as Membership Secretary. The members at the AGM agreed unanimously to these elections and re-elections. Since John Flood was retiring as Treasurer, Dr Jana Privratska proposed that he be elected as a Vice-President of the Society; this was seconded by David Cram, and all agreed warmly to the proposal.

4 Library report The Secretary reported on the discussion by the Committee of the Society's recent negotiations with the University of York regarding the removal of the HSS collection (now at Keble College, Oxford) and the R. H. Robins bequest collection (now at Luton University). These two HSS collections would then be housed at a new location at the Humanities Research Library that is presently being built next to the Morrell Library at York. Most of the proposals by the York librarian, Elizabeth Heaps, had been received favourably by the Committee. At present, matters stand as follows:

- (1) The HSS Secretary would sign - on behalf of the Society - a statement of ownership.
- (2) The terms of deposit of the collection would be 'permanent loan'.
- (3) The committee would negotiate with York to ensure that off-prints should all be catalogued.
- (4) The Society would reserve the right to send new books to the collection as appropriate.
- (5) The collection would be covered by the insurance scheme of the library of the University of York.
- (6) Access to the collection would be granted to all *bona fide* researchers, with consultation only in the library; books would not be borrowable.
- (7) The Library at York would be responsible for the day-to-day management of the collection and for its use, if appropriate, in exhibitions.

In response to the report, Professor Hans Sauer and others expressed concern about whether the collections would be kept separate. Others reiterated the need to catalogue not only books but also off-prints. [Secretary's note: such cataloguing will of course take time; it is likely also to require special funding applications from the University of York, to which the Society would offer moral support and such contributions as are available, for instance from donations to the Society.]

5 Treasurer's report The retiring Treasurer, Professor John Flood, reported on the good financial condition of the Society, with approximately £12700 in credit (as compared to the debt of £600 which the Society had when it was first founded). He spoke of the usefulness of the Society's other bank account in the Netherlands, which allowed much more efficient collection of subscriptions from Dutch and other Continental members, as well as facilitating other transactions. As far as expenditure was concerned, the *Bulletin* had been cheaper this year because the previous year's costs included the printing of the Index. The Paul Salmon/Peter Verburg fund was seeing good use; this year a bursary had been given to Thorsten Fögen towards the cost of his travel to Munich to give a paper at the Colloquium. Professor Flood ended his report by emphasising that the hand-over of Treasurer's duties to Nicola McLelland would proceed gradually, allowing him to advise her on all necessary details. The President thanked John Flood warmly for his eighteen-year service as Treasurer; the Society owed him a great deal for his far-sighted planning and wise counsel.

6 Colloquia The Secretary reported that since ICHOLs is taking place next year (29 August-1 September 2002 in Sao Paolo), the Society will not be hosting a large-scale conference. Instead, a short one-day Colloquium is being planned for the period around Easter, at Jesus College, Oxford. The subsequent Annual

Colloquium will take place in September 2003; the venue is yet to be confirmed.

7 Publications John Flood reported on the seven volumes published in the HSS History of Linguistics series (all were on display at the Colloquium bookstore). No new project has been definitely confirmed at present. If anybody has further proposals for volumes in the series, the Society would be pleased to receive them.

8 Bulletin David Cram informed the meeting that the editors of the *Bulletin* are very open to the submission of reviews, news and short articles. To a question from Thorsten Fögen about research in progress, he replied that information of this kind would also be very welcome.

9 Publicity The Society has now renewed the office of Membership Secretary, and - in general - it is keen to extend its membership. John Flood raised the question as to why it should be that not a single library in Germany subscribed to the journal; Werner Hüllen pointed out that these institutions cannot be members of the Society; John Walmsley spoke of the need to make provision in the *Bulletin* for institutional subscriptions.

10 Closing remarks The President thanked everyone who had done work for the Society that year, and particularly expressed gratitude to Hans Sauer and his colleagues for organising an enjoyable and profitable Colloquium.

In Memoriam Ramsey Rutherford (1934-2001)

In January 2001 the Society lost one of its longest serving members.

Ramsey William Rutherford died of heart disease, suddenly, on 12 January 2001 at his home in Co. Durham, England. Ramsey Rutherford was born on 3 November 1934 in Consett and attended the local primary and secondary schools. In 1957 he graduated with honours in English Language and Literature from King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, a Department headed at the time by Professor Barbara Strang, but still part of the University of Durham.

For the next eight years, Ramsey worked alternately as a teacher and journalist, taking in a Postgraduate Certificate in Education at the University of Leicester along the way. His interest in and growing experience with language led him to apply for the course in Applied Linguistics at the University of Edinburgh, where he studied under S. Pit Corder and his staff from 1965-67, supporting himself by working at nights and in the vacations as sub-editor for the *Scottish Daily Mail*. In 1967 he was appointed Director of the Child Language Survey as part of the Nuffield / Schools Council Modern Languages Project in York for five years, during which he completed his work for his Edinburgh M.Litt.

When the research project in York came to an end in 1972, he was appointed to a post at the recently formed languages centre (*Sprachenzentrum*) in Bielefeld, and he remained a member of the faculty until his retirement in November 1999.

Ramsey published in the fields of language testing (for Robert B. Pinsent), foreign-language teaching methodology, and the language of fifteen-year old children – the latter being an area of particular interest. Since language acquisition is assumed to be more or less complete by the onset of puberty, few studies have been carried out on the language of teenage children in comparison to the vast number devoted to language acquisition in the earlier years.

Through his work Ramsey got to know a number of the most prominent figures in Applied Linguistics personally. His wide reading and his interest in travel and foreign cultures, linguistics and language and languages generally, brought him into contact with many more. On the principle that we are all more or less human, he was always ready to open a conversation with any lost-looking human being he came across, from Bill Gates downwards. This meant that he had met personally a number of world-famous linguists whose names are now known to us, alas, only as the authors of famous books.

In the Society he provided useful cross-links with modern linguistics (through his membership of the LAGB), and with Old English studies (through the TOEBI). Anxious never to let a debate flag, Ramsey will be remembered by participants at the Edinburgh conference for his vigorous personal contributions, based on wide knowledge and experience. It is a tragedy that he

NOVEMBER 2001

HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN

was not permitted to enjoy much more than a year of his well-deserved retirement.