

EDITORIAL

Issue no. 34 of the *Henry Sweet Society Bulletin* opened with the announcement of the death of the then chairman of the Society, Prof. R. H. Robins. Issue no. 35 contained a series of personal tributes to Bobby Robins, a great scholar and a much-loved man. One of those closest to him, and the author of one of those tributes, was Vivien Law, described on page 12 of this *Bulletin* as Bobby's 'spiritual daughter', and his successor as chair of our society. It was at the 1999 ICHoLS conference in Paris that Bobby told me of Vivien's illness. Vivien seemed to be so full of life that it was surely impossible that this could be serious? How shocking it is, two years after Bobby's death, to be announcing that Vivien, a woman only half way through a brilliant life, has also died.

Vivien appeared a private person, but the affection and respect felt for her by so many mirrors the affection and respect people felt for her 'spiritual father'. Former colleagues, former graduate students and even former undergraduate students have been only too eager to be able to contribute to the tributes contained in this volume. I asked a variety of people who had known Vivien in different ways to write about her. I hoped that we might thereby get to glimpse the essential Vivien. In fact what emerges here is a far more talented, far more profound person than any of us realised. Everyone who knew her benefited from some aspect of her knowledge and of her character, but I'm sure that few had any concept of how much more there was. The person who really knew her was of course her husband, Nick Shackleton, and it is a privilege to be able to include his own recollections amongst those of people who knew her as a scholar, as a colleague, as a teacher or as a friend.

To her family and to her many friends, the officers of the Henry Sweet Society extend their sincerest sympathy.

At the Annual General Meeting, held in conjunction with the Society's colloquium at Jesus College, Oxford in April (see report in this volume), David Cram was appointed as the new chairman of the society. David has been an active member of the Society since its foundation and has been an indefatigable officer for much of that time. His appointment is richly deserved. He is a man of great vision, and, under his leadership, the Society will undoubtedly go from strength to strength. One of David's first acts as chairman is to convene an "away day" for the committee in early June, in order to have a full and detailed discussion of the Society's future. Items on the agenda will include the *Bulletin*, future colloquia and the society library. If any members have views

on these or other matters, please communicate them to a member of the committee (names inside the front cover), so that they might be fed into discussions.

One of the main issues surrounding colloquia will be better forward planning than has been the case in the past. The 2003 colloquium will be held at Trinity College, Dublin (see announcement in this volume), but we need to plan ahead more than we have perhaps done in the past. Consequently, members are invited to let the committee know if they would like to host one of the HSS colloquia, either one of the residential meetings in 2004 and 2006 or the one-day spring meeting in 2005. Hosting a conference provides publicity in the academic community for your institution and for your department, gives you a chance to show off the glories of your home town, and is a useful thing to have on your CV!

Our library has until recently been housed at Keble College, Oxford, but regrettably the college no longer has room for these books. We are very grateful for the service that Keble, and particularly Mrs Marjory Szurko, have provided over the years. The Society is now very pleased to announce that, following negotiation, we have signed an agreement with the University of York library. The University of York boasts a very good linguistics department, and the papers of J. R. Firth and of David Abercrombie are already in its library. This will be an excellent home for the society library and for R. H. Robins's papers, and we look forward to a long and happy partnership. A full report on this exciting development will appear in the next *Bulletin*.

Since May 1999 the *Bulletin* has been issued in a pink cover. From the point of view of cataloguing and of locating specific issues it would be more helpful if the colour of the cover were to vary, as the colour of the old *Newsletter* did. As of this issue the colour of the cover will be altered annually so that the two editions for each year share the same appearance.

There were a number of printing problems with issue 37 of the *Bulletin*, the most serious of which was the failure to print the figures at the end of Bill McMahon's article on the semantics of post-medieval Lullism. Consequently this article is reproduced in full in this volume.

Andrew Linn, *Sheffield*

Vivien Law Scholar, Colleague, Teacher and Friend

Vivien Anne Law was born on 22 March 1954 in Halifax, Nova Scotia. She was clearly a single-minded and rather unusual child. She once recalled that it had been her childhood ambition to teach medieval linguistics at Oxford or Cambridge, an ambition which she of course later realised. She studied at McGill University in Montreal, from where she graduated in 1974 with first-class honours in both Classics and German, winning the Henry Chapman Gold Medal for Classics, before moving to England, via a Commonwealth Scholarship, to study for a PhD at Girton College, Cambridge, under the supervision of Michael Lapidge. Student life ended in 1977 with a research fellowship at Jesus College, and a move closer to the centre of the city which would be her home for the rest of her life. From Jesus Vivien moved to Sidney Sussex College as David Thomson Senior Research Fellow, and in 1984 she was appointed to a new post in the Cambridge Department of Linguistics, a lectureship in the history of linguistic thought. The post was very much created for Vivien. It was the only named post in the history of linguistics anywhere in the world. It is a sadness for the subject, as well as for Vivien's memory, that this post has died with her. The Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages in Cambridge has granted the vacant post to another department. With Vivien's university post came a fellowship and college lectureship at Sidney. In the late 1990s Vivien made what was for her a major career move. In 1998 she was appointed Reader in the History of Linguistic Thought after a move up the road to a fellowship at Trinity College the previous year. In 1999 she was elected Fellow of the British Academy, the highest academic distinction within the arts and humanities in Britain.

What Vivien meant to the people around her can be appreciated from the following tributes. Because *personal* tributes were solicited, they perhaps fail to reflect her eminence as a scholar. Her subject area – medieval grammars and grammarians – was a specialised one, but her reputation spread way beyond the small club of historians of medieval linguistics.¹ Her first book, *The Insular Latin Grammarians*, appeared in 1982 and was based on her doctoral work. It is testimony to the importance of this study that, to judge from COPAC, the joint catalogue of British research libraries, so many libraries hold a copy. She wrote numerous highly regarded articles and essays, and her own selection of these appeared in 1997 as *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle*

¹ An appreciation of Vivien's work will be included in the November issue of the *Bulletin*.

Ages. Vivien was not a wordy person. She was quietly spoken and a brilliantly concise writer. The monograph was not her natural genre, and she only produced one other book-length work, the brief *Wisdom, Authority and Grammar in the Seventh Century: Decoding Virgilius Maro Grammaticus* (1995). Vivien's attention to detail resulted in a significant amount of editorial work. A fuller bibliography is to appear in *Historiographia Linguistica*, and here it is sufficient to mention the John Benjamins volume, *History of Linguistic Thought in the Early Middle Ages* from 1993, and the volume of papers on *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē* from 1995, edited with Ineke Sluiter, which entered a second edition in 1998. Her care for others, and in particular her great affection for Bobby Robins, made her the natural person to edit the 1998 selection of his papers published, like the Dionysius Thrax volume, as part of the *Henry Sweet Society Studies in the History of Linguistics*.

In the following tributes we will see something of the Vivien we each knew, but everyone will learn something about this kind and talented person. Medievalist, practical linguist, flautist. Explorer, anthroposophist, roller-blader. For someone who spent all of her working life in the rather cloistered world of a Cambridge college, she was wonderfully unstuffy. She could not understand why her fellow diners at high table did not want to hear about her extraordinary exploits with the militia in Georgia, since she was always so keen to learn about what others had been doing. If one thing emerges from these tributes as a common theme it is possibly that Vivien looked out and up rather than in and down. As a girl she looked out to Britain. As a Cambridge don she looked out to the world beyond. As a linguist she looked out to the past and to more and more languages. As a person she looked out for others. The person she worried least about was Vivien Law.

ARL

Sarah Hawkins:

Colour and quicksilver. These two words sum up my first impression and abiding memory of Vivien Law. She was a passionate woman whose quiet outer demeanour only hinted at her depth and unconventionality. On first acquaintance a typical academic, even Vivien's clothes set her apart, dull-coloured but subtly unorthodox in the 80s and early 90s, and then vibrant with intricate ethnic designs and colours towards the end of her life: no ordinary Cambridge blue-stockings this. But for me and I think many others, the first thing one noticed about Vivien was her physical beauty. It was most obvious in her hair, long, wavy, shimmering gold, worn in a sort of pre-Raphaelite style that was simultaneously simple and dramatic. This alone would merely have been good to look at; it was mesmerising in combination with her regular features, almost but not quite classical, the smile too robustly alive, the skin tones too high, the blue eyes possibly too large and definitely too quizzical, and the laugh astonishingly loud and deep in one with so delicate a build. Even her speech—quiet, rapid, coming in bursts—was unusually coloured by a childhood in Canada and an adulthood in Cambridge colleges, often demanding great attention if I was to understand it all. She usually looked suitably demure, the eyes downcast and inwardly-focused, the stance quiet, reflective, the eyes just briefly flashing upwards when something particularly caught her attention. But years of sitting opposite her in male-dominated departmental meetings taught me to read a wide range of emotions from the expressions that would pass fleetingly across her face, and be gone: amusement, astonishment, anger, horror, disappointment, exasperation (sometimes there were a lot of meetings), interest, joy. Each one, often, conveyed in just a single flash of the eyes and a slight change in muscle tension. Alone with her, those same eyes could express great kindness and concern for a fellow human being, gazing directly into your being at the most unexpected times, often showing a level of empathy unusual in one so apparently inward-looking, while the accompanying smile was broad and long-lasting; the two together lit up and underlined her beauty to a remarkable degree.

Vivien's husband, Professor Sir Nick Shackleton—for in one part of her life she was Lady Shackleton, and for this she wore a borrowed hat she decorated with her own many-coloured scarves—kindly let me read the tributes he received after her death. What comes through them over and over again, is what is also true for me: her great intelligence and incisive mode of thinking, the kindness shown to individuals, her deep personal interest in and unswerving championship of students, her humour, her passionate love of the history of linguistics and of music, and her modesty. Since I am writing for the Henry Sweet Society, perhaps I can describe these qualities as the five /k/s: her

cleverness, kindness, quirkiness, quietness, and ‘ccomplishments. Academic colleagues may be rather less aware that she was deeply spiritual, an anthroposophist, and active in practical ways to make it possible to found the Cambridge Steiner school in the 1990s. I believe that her spiritual beliefs and contacts with Steiner education influenced the radical rethinking she put into her university teaching methods during her last years. I am still caught by her excitement some five or six years ago when the undergraduates took over the last session of the first year of her new teaching experiment: they used a jelly with bits in it, both in and out of the mould, to demonstrate what—and how—they had learned about the history of linguistic thought. The fact that they chose a jelly as illustration, and were enthusiastic enough to make one for the session, represented for her confirmation that melding everyday experience, emotions, and rigorous thought is a truly effective way of producing the intellectual creativity and originality we all seek to nurture in our students.

Perhaps it was our shared interests in teaching that initially drew us together, but I think it was music, as is true for many of her friends. Indeed, I can’t remember which came first, the music or the phone calls, but it was through these two things that I slowly got to know her. We both played the flute, and when I first arrived in Cambridge she invited me to play at her home, in duets with her or in larger chamber groups. Though I eventually withdrew because I felt my skills fell too far short of her own, music making with her was exciting and she never showed impatience with my performance. Those could be lonely days in Cambridge for me, and these sessions were colourful oases. They led onto meals with others of her friends, meals that still stand out in my memory for their cheerfulness, and for the vibrancy, originality and sheer interestingness of the company.

It was our phone conversations that really cemented our friendship and made me appreciate her depth. They would start with something small about work—something administrative needing attention, or checking for form’s sake that a student in her college could be helped to gain confidence through receiving extra supervisions (she always enthusiastically supported such suggestions)—and they’d ripple outwards through the pond of our mutual interests to encompass much wider things than either of us anticipated, or, usually, felt we had time for. But they kept happening, and I think we both found them not just fun, but somehow compelling. It seemed we explored everything. In time, we came to use these conversations to give feedback and shore up each other’s confidence, for we shared similar worries about being unskilled in speaking and similar frustrations when we were misinterpreted or not heard. She was a good observer and a good listener, funny, good at drawing connections, wise about people’s motivations, so these conversations, far from plunging irretrievably into angst, usually ended with laughter and optimism.

Perhaps these conversations were so special, and so important to us, because we were both interested in the way people think. Certainly it was this shared interest that made us gel as a team inside the linguistics department, for we usually found ourselves agreeing about some proposed pedagogic principle or reform to teaching, and often on a different side of the philosophical table, so to speak, from many of our colleagues. Thus what might seem superficially to be an unexpected alliance between the two members of the department whose subjects seemed to lie furthest apart, was in fact entirely natural, springing from shared interest in and beliefs about the way people think, learn, and are.

Others will write about her teaching. I heard some lectures, and found them riveting, and I think she appreciated that, though I'm merely a utilitarian phonetician, I value the history of ideas. But it was from examining with her, on a paper covering a wide range of subjects that are mainly outside both our specialisms, that I came to appreciate the full extent of her intellectual rigour. Here she was, an artsy manuscript person *par excellence* as I thought, not only organising a complicated examination procedure with the utmost economy of everyone's effort, but demonstrating perfect understanding of means, variances, probabilities and significance of differences in marks assigned by different examiners, though not really using those terms to describe them. I only fully understood what she'd achieved when I came to do the same job myself a year or two later. Characteristically, she set up a good system, involved the rest of us in it as necessary, and then hoped it would take care of itself, for, as she told me, she easily became bored once she'd made something work.

Vivien used to disappear a lot, sometimes to international conferences, but often to some remote monastery or library containing one of her manuscripts. One important place to her was Georgia, and she brought many Georgian scholars to Cambridge, as well as visiting there often. As the years went by, what probably began as an intellectual interest became part of her emotional life too, as she watched her highly cultured and educated Georgian colleagues struggle to make a meal for her from next to nothing. She cared deeply about Georgians' welfare, as individuals and as a re-emerging nation. The Georgian ambassador wrote 'Her contribution to strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding between Georgia and Britain is enormous [...] she was such a marvellous lady'. Not bad for someone whose work focused on dusty manuscripts.

It was in Georgia, too, that she had perhaps the strangest of her several adventures. During a particularly troubled time in that part of the world, she was keen to reach a remote area wherein lay the key to her current work. And perhaps she was just a bit bored with her everyday life in recent years. For she deliberately chose to take enormous risks to get there, walking beyond where public transport stopped, riding in open trucks with armed soldiers of uncertain temperament and attitude, crossing rivers whose bridges had been blown up,

and generally waving a cheery hand at fate. She returned energized, excited, hilariously funny in recounting the tale, and with her work finished as intended. No ordinary Cambridge blue-stocking indeed!

In the last few years, leading up to her diagnosis and thereafter, her Cambridge colleagues saw less of her, for she developed her teaching ideas rather away from standard academia, and during her illness I think she needed to protect herself from crowds and the rhythms and stresses of normal departmental life. This period wasn't easy for any of us, for her wishes during this time were changeable and not always clear, perhaps even to herself, as she struggled to make decisions within this complex and uncertain situation. But she continued her dedication to students to the end of the time she could work, and to my joy she came back briefly to take her place in the department, the old incisive, radiant, imaginative, quicksilver Vivien, full of ideas, before the cancer spread, and she embarked on her last illness with characteristic individuality, as represented in her beautiful and unusual funeral service.

She and I shared many rich times and the whole gamut of emotions. She has left me with more confidence in my ideas, a handful of coloured scarves, a purple glass bowl, twin to one she had, and many good memories, most of all of her warmth and of laughing with her over many years and many things. These things I knew she would give me. While writing this piece, I have gained an unexpected sense of privilege at having shared life with this special person.

Louis Kelly:

Vivien was a most unusual character. I have vivid memories of her on roller blades going to and fro from the Herzog August Library in Wolfenbüttel - an ideal town for this sort of transport. And yet the incongruity of this image goes some distance towards accounting for her eminence in her field. She was meticulous, and she had an excellent idea of her own abilities and failings, and above all, she was enthusiastic about what she was doing. As a scholar she was not afraid to be unorthodox, for she could often see aspects that others could not. But her unorthodoxy was firmly rooted in very sound and orthodox scholarship.

She made her reputation as an enthusiastic historian of the language theories of the early Middle Ages, the so-called Dark Ages, a label which raised her ire, and which she set out to discredit. She explored the Irish and Carolingian grammarians, who laid the foundations for those of us who worked in the later Middle Ages. Her interest in Virgilius Maro Grammaticus was in character. He was an unfathomable seventh-century grammarian, a baffling combination of scholar, practical joker and mystic, or so it seems. Yet because he was respected during the Middle Ages, Vivien set about unravelling his mysteries, and like her predecessors, finished with a series of questions, and few firm answers.

Her medieval work was set in wide academic interests, which included linguistics, applied linguistics, and a deep classical culture. She did fieldwork on Georgian, for instance, much of it in the war-zones in the south of the old Soviet Union. She was for some considerable time Chairman of the Cambridge Regional Society for the Institute of Linguists, a task she discharged with considerable panache, and which she regretfully resigned in October 2001.

She was an excellent flute-player, of professional standard. She was an easy person to play chamber-music with, at once attentive to the flow of the music round a chamber group, and demanding of her colleagues. She was also a fine principal flute in an orchestra. She had the showmanship proper to a wind soloist, coupled with an intense awareness of her duties to her fellow-principals and to those of us who were fortunate enough to play second to her.

She was learned, urbane and an extremely contented and happy person. She will be sorely missed.

Peter Matthews:

In the final month of Vivien's life, when she was in hospital and hope was virtually gone, I was trying to give lectures on 'The History of Linguistic Thought', that she would herself have given if she had been able, to the last undergraduates that she had taught. The period I had to cover was from 1500 to 1800, and I cannot think that any other experience could have brought home, with such force and emotion, how much she will be missed. I was thinking constantly of how she would have organised such lectures, of odd conversations we had had about techniques in grammar after the Renaissance, and above all of how hopelessly unequal I was to the task of substituting for her.

Her readership in Cambridge was in the History of Linguistics, and that meant all of it. When the lectureship was established in the 1980s, a committee had added some such wording as 'with special reference to the Middle Ages'; but I confess that as the then Head of Department I at once dumped on her the responsibility for teaching the whole of the subject, from fifth-century Greece to the twentieth-century United States; from early medieval Ireland to ancient India and beyond. There must be few historical papers, in any university examination, whose scope is so vast, and the average historian of ideas, let alone the average historian, would run screaming if they thought they had to cover anything like it. Teaching on a scale of that sort calls for comprehensive learning and a mastery of synthesis, which most scholars can combine, if ever, only when they are much older.

The monument to how well she did it will be her last book, on the history of western linguistics up to 1600, which her former supervisor, Michael Lapidge, has been seeing through the press. She left a copy for her students, and in reading their essays I have seen how much it helps them. But the books she published as a medievalist already show the same remarkable ability to see what is exciting in traditions that in other hands so easily seem boring. How many other perceptions her insight would have transformed, if she had lived!

She was also one of those who truly do wear immense learning lightly. I have often been corrected by her, especially when we have examined her paper together; but never without tact and patience. What she knew on many other topics, such as Georgian and Georgia, will now never be appreciated even by her nearest colleagues. Her kindness and her breadth of view will be linked in my own memory with those of Bobby Robins, whose spiritual daughter she so often seemed. How pleased he was that she was elected a Fellow of the British Academy while he was still alive! But, alas, the time the nomination reached her, in the early summer of 1999, was the time too when her cancer was first diagnosed.

MAY 2002

HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN

She learned last summer that it had returned. Nevertheless she travelled to her last conference at the end of September, and in October took up duties bravely in her faculty and college, as usual. I have a vision of her the last time I passed her in the street, sometime probably in late November, smiling as she always had done.

Nicola McLelland:

I met Vivien Law when I was a student on the Cambridge master's course (MPhil) in Linguistics in 1997-98. There was a strange subject listed as history of linguistics, which meant nothing to me, taught by someone whose description in the brochure made numerous references to medieval Latin grammarians I had never heard of and who sounded absolutely terrifying in consequence. I decided to just go to the first lecture out of politeness and then concentrate on my other subjects. But Vivien's first lecture was absolutely enthralling, and I was hooked. (I'll never forget the discovery that grammars of German were quite a new thing in the scheme of things!) At each lecture there was just a moment for us to observe which side of her head Dr Law had her hair tied on today, before we were carried away to consider the history of some of the Big Questions in linguistics, which made me see every other course on the MPhil in a new light. Vivien lectured without hesitation, never rushing, in beautifully sculpted complete sentences which it felt like sacrilege to cut down into brief notes. She always finished exactly on time, apparently having achieved precisely what she had planned for the hour. She was inspirational and immensely knowledgeable - but at the same time very approachable and encouraging, and it was only later that I realised she could be quite shy. Her teaching and supervising remains with me as the ideal I aspire to.

Christos Nifadopoulos:

My friend, blood shaking my heart
 The awful daring of a moment's
 surrender
 Which an age of prudence can never
 retract
 By this, and this only, we have existed
 Which is not to be found in our obituaries
 Or in memories draped by the beneficent
 spider
 Or under seals broken by the lean
 solicitor
 In our empty rooms

T. S. Eliot, *The Waste Land*, 402-9

Even two months after Vivien's death, it is impossible to believe that she is not with us. Call it Mediterranean superstition, but it feels that she is part of the mental and emotional processes of so many people and to such an extent, that she is still around. So, this cannot be an obituary that will account for the many academic achievements of someone absent; it is rather my account of Vivien's presence in my life and the lives of many others, in a way that I continue to witness it to this day.

My first meeting with Vivien was in 1997, in her capacity as a lecturer in the History of Linguistic Thought, the only such academic post in the country. Her lectures were inspiring not only because of the subject-matter, but also thanks to her extraordinary skill for breathing life into material which some may have found soulless at first sight. She was so successful in showing up diachronic trends, in explicating the peculiarities of each era critically – but never with historical revisionism – that she convinced many of her students to follow her example and pursue research in the field. I was only one of the many she showed the way. Her guidance was always illuminating, but never constraining. Rather than answering questions, she liked to throw them open for her research and undergraduate students alike. This was the most distinctive feature of an inquisitive mind that was driven with passion towards discovering and examining all aspects of human nature and thought. In this sense, Vivien was more than a talented academic, she was an inspired humanist, the likes of which have become rarer since the Renaissance.

Her curiosity about all things human was obvious to anyone: when she was the president of the Cambridge University Linguistics Society, I attended many dinners during which she made the speakers welcome, being generous to them with her wit and charismatic personality, but mostly honouring them with

her genuine interest. She showed the same attention to everything new, as she treasured the learning process. When I presented her with my project proposal, which involved manuscript work and fragment-spotting to discover Hellenistic trends in etymology, she made it clear to me from the start that it would be a learning experience for both of us. What she offered – apart from spirited guidance – was the excitement and the energy required to achieve the goal.

Her own independent spirit meant that she cared intensely for the intellectual independence of her students too. But her involvement with them did not stop there: their well-being was sometimes more important to her than her own. This became clear to me when, two years after our first meeting, I was asked to take care of her cherished students while she was fighting her illness. In the many discussions we had during that period, my original suspicion was confirmed that Vivien was more comfortable caring for her students than for herself. She would ask over and over again about the specifics of their progress and she would plan her return to the classroom diligently – a return which did not take place for another year. It was during that first long battle with cancer that she unexpectedly lost a dear friend and mentor, Professor R. H. Robins. This revealed a remarkable sensitivity in a woman whose strength was not diminished even by her own ordeal. She was overtaken with emotion every time she talked about him, holding great affection for the man who paved the way for linguistic historiography in Britain. She had a sense of intellectual heritage that gave her confidence in her work and a conviction that she was a vital link between her intellectual predecessors and future generations.

Her spirit shone at its brightest when faced with the gloomiest prospects. With modesty and self-deprecation, she tried to avoid making a big fuss about her illness. This attitude was reaffirmed also by her willingness to continue teaching and to maintain her students' confidence in her strength. The last time I saw her, only a couple of weeks before she left us, she put a brave face on, joked about the effects of her treatment and talked lovingly – yet again – about her students. Inspired by a verse in the *Waste Land*, she had painted in beautiful bright colours a basket of fruits and flowers – a reminder to me of all the beautiful things she offered with her presence. She bade me farewell with a beautiful broad smile.

As I sit here a photograph of her from my graduation is looking at me, and she is smiling again. I think it is important to say that she liked the idea of bringing things full circle. When I was leaving Cambridge she was there, saying that her presence was somehow appropriate – she was there in the beginning too. And because I also believe in full circles, I can say that her circle is not complete yet and will not be for sometime. And I know it.

Richard Steadman-Jones:

I heard the news of Vivien's death at the start of a semester's research leave when I was just beginning the process of revising my thesis for publication. My desk was covered with the drafts and re-drafts that I had completed as a research student under Vivien's supervision. Scattered across the margins of the work were the comments she had written over the course of the four years that we worked together and it struck me then how much of Vivien's personality showed through in those pencilled marginalia. It seemed an apt time to be reading them again.

Vivien did not waste words when criticising work. She would read for pages and pages without any comment at all and then halfway through the piece she would write a perfectly judged half-sentence making some devastatingly apposite connection that transformed the argument completely. One of my old essays has "cf. the Hebrew tradition" jotted at the end of a paragraph on page 13. Hebrew? In an army grammar of Urdu? It took me time to see what she was saying. Eventually, though, I realised that with this laconic little comment she had identified what was really interesting in the mass of material that I had collected, a thorny problem of influence and authority which I am still working through right now. Vivien had an imaginative approach to research and showed me the importance of finding these connections and exploring what they meant. But she was able to do this because of her sheer breadth of learning and the notes in the margins remind me quite how widely her interests extended.

Vivien commented too on matters of style: "You have a tendency to put too much into one sentence," she wrote over a long and convoluted discussion of something or other, "Pity the poor reader!" Of course I immediately went to the other extreme and produced reams of writing without a subordinate clause, a style that Vivien described as "leaden". I was delighted when my writing met with her approval because she herself expressed her ideas with such clarity, whether writing or speaking, in a lecture or at a conference. It was Vivien's measured enthusiasm that led me back to the study of history in the days when I might have wandered off into some other area of linguistics. There was a spontaneity about the way she spoke that I always thought was compelling and I realise now that it is no easy thing to make the material live for every new group of students you encounter. Vivien always showed consideration for the "poor reader" and this was a part of what she taught her students too.

And so back to the paper on the desk. It seems strange returning to the work I did with Vivien now that she is no longer here. More than anything, her written comments evoke the hours of talk with which she supported and guided me and I am sad that the talk is over. I hope she would have liked the work I am doing now. At any rate I am glad that I had the opportunity to study with

her and I suspect that the comments she made and the conversations we had in the four years it took me to write my dissertation will always influence what I do.

Alison Kassell:

Few lecturers could persuade a group of arts finalists that four hours a week of lectures, two of them from 4-6 p.m. on a Friday, on a subject most of us had never even known existed, formed a course that was worth pursuing. Yet any thought of abandoning the History of Linguistic Thought paper was quickly dispelled as we became enthralled with not only the subject, but also the teacher. To recall those Friday afternoons is to think of Vivien Law, in her trademark hat and quilted jacket, musing over a turning point in linguistic history one moment, then reeling off dates and names of various linguistic prodigies the next. Vivien Law not only taught us The History of Linguistics, but realised that in order to do so, she needed to teach us the history of the world, of which we knew so little. The quirkiness of her teaching methods will forever stay in our minds. Friday seminar sessions inevitably seemed to involve lots of table moving and the throwing of her beanie frog around the room, whilst also consisting of describing plants, examining old manuscripts and drawing round our hands! Vivien Law encouraged us to pursue our interests in extended essays, followed by lengthy discussions in her college room in Trinity College. It never ceased to amaze me that amongst her seemingly random collection of every book of linguistic interest under the sun, she never failed to go straight to the book of relevance (inevitably thick, bound and in ancient script), and suggest we skim read it. Our Thursday lunchtime gatherings in the Copper Kettle Café made us feel like the true intellectuals we had always sought to be. Vivien would listen as we ranted and raved, often about linguistics, frequently not, and offer the odd gem of wisdom, never patronising or intimidating, even entertaining our ideas on the title of her next book. At the time we knew that we were receiving the kind of teaching and experience we had only hoped existed at University. It is only in the light of her recent passing that we realised how truly privileged we were.

Helen Stokes:

I first met Dr Law in October 1998 at the beginning of my second year as a student at Trinity College. I had arrived at Cambridge the year before to study Modern and Medieval Languages: German, and Russian *ab initio*. As one of my first year papers I had studied An Introduction to the History of the German Language – my first real brush with linguistics - and I had enjoyed the lectures, seminars and supervisions very much. Towards the end of my first year I had heard about the possibility of changing to the relatively new linguistics degree course (or tripos as it is known in Cambridge) and had become very interested in the prospect of studying linguistics as a subject in its own right.

I arrived back in Cambridge in October 1998, determined to change tripos if possible. The first morning back in college I arranged to speak to Dr Law to find out more. I was ushered into a relatively small room, crammed with books from the ceiling to the floor in massive shelves. I remember spotting *Teach Yourself* books for many different languages, and many other different language, history and philosophy books in a variety of styles and from different points in time. It seemed to be an amazing Aladdin's cave of books to do with language. I introduced myself and explained why I was there. I was feeling slightly nervous at the prospect of studying what would be almost a completely novel subject, but Dr Law soon put me at my ease and inspired me afresh with her enthusiastic description of the courses I might take. Few people at that point had made the change to the linguistics tripos, as I soon learnt, and the small number of 'converts' were very enthusiastically received.

Dr Law became my Director of Studies and also supervised me for two papers: *Language History and Use* and her own personal subject area *The History of Linguistic Thought*. I particularly remember her supervisions and lectures on the *History of Linguistic Thought* for the breadth of knowledge that she displayed and the enthusiasm with which she taught. Supervisions went far beyond the original essay topic, as, while ensuring that we had fully grasped what the original question was asking, Dr Law would leap up constantly during the supervision to show us a particular book on a subject or perhaps an original copy of the *Grammaire générale et raisonnée* or indeed whatever text was the subject of our discussions. In our seminar sessions I can remember her asking us to come up with a way of expressing Plato's style vs that of Aristotle in a format that did not involve words. Some people drew pictures, others mimed, but the ideas that we discussed became memorable because of the unusual modes of presentation used.

Dr Law became increasingly unwell during my final year at Trinity and was no longer able to be my Director of Studies or to teach. I saw her very

MAY 2002

HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN

seldom – occasionally walking through college - and we met shortly before my finals for a last chat. I was greatly saddened to hear of her death and feel sorry that her vast knowledge of linguistics, and indeed of history and philosophy also, together with her infectious enthusiasm for the subject will be lost to future undergraduates. She made a very great impression on me as I am sure she did on many people and is much missed by us all.

Nick Shackleton:

Vivien Law was my dearest friend and companion as well as later becoming my wife, from 1978 up to her death. Although there is not a great deal I can say that bears on Vivien as a historian of linguistics, some of my memories may help to understand her gifts.

Back in 1977 Vivien heard on the radio a performance by Hans-Jurg Lange on the baroque bassoon and was captivated by the sound. Members of the Henry Sweet Society will know that she was an excellent flautist, but may well be unaware that in 1977 Vivien was also having lessons on both the oboe and the bassoon. The chance to play the baroque bassoon appeared when she met Roger Blench, who was trying to assemble a group to play the repertoire of the early 19th-century English church bands on original instruments. Having identified a potential early-bassoonist, Roger approached me to loan an instrument from my collection. My response was that while I was in principle prepared to do so, I would prefer to lend it to the person who was going to play it rather than to him. This is the route by which I met my wife-to-be. We barely met for a few months after she first took the instrument (she was reluctant to reveal how little she knew about bassoon playing!) and on 10 May 1978 when the group performed publicly (first and last time?) Vivien writes in her diary, '[...] Nick Shackleton sitting there looking faintly amused [...] non-committed proprietary air of the owner of the instruments'. By the end of the same month I start to appear in her diary simply as 'Nick'.

Many people have heard of the extraordinary number of languages that Vivien could read. One of her most remarkable talents was her ability systematically to study. The reason she could read so many languages was not unrelated to the fact that she could play flute, piccolo, baroque flute, oboe, bassoon, clarinet, basset horn (and in her last year she was learning the bass viol as a less-stressful alternative to her orchestral piccolo playing). She relished the challenge of sitting down and studying in order to learn. She always went systematically through exercises, she always revised her notes. At one point in her diary I found that she completed the Esperanto grammar and recorded 'another language within a week, not bad'. Breakfast time was too valuable to waste and she would be practising Chinese characters on scraps of paper as she ate her orange. Language after language would receive the same treatment: serious, systematic study of the grammar using both a notebook and scraps of paper, vocabulary only covered to a limited extent. In general Vivien's approach was to learn a language to a point where she could read anything with the aid of a dictionary. Exceptions were French, German and Portuguese, all of which she spoke fluently well before we first met. When we had the opportunity to travel in China together she had to study Chinese both to

read and to speak the language. Perhaps her musical abilities helped here; she tackled the challenge of learning to speak a tonal language with the same systematic approach that she generally devoted to learning to read languages, and by all accounts had an impressively good accent. Several other frequently-encountered languages (as well as Georgian) became spoken as well as read.

Of course it was not only in learning languages and musical instruments that Vivien studied systematically. She would study texts (medieval manuscripts, 19th-century tomes by German scholars...) in the same way. Again, she always took detailed notes so that there is a great number of notebooks (these will be deposited in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge) recording transcriptions, notes, comments and so on. Obviously she took these notes in order to use them (something I forgot to do once I had sat my last university examination) and they are generally legible. I always regarded Vivien as being even untidier than I am, but I was impressed to discover that her drafts and notes for each of her many publications (as well as for some that were never finished) were systematically bunched together, so that quite a lot of this will also be worth preserving at Trinity College. Like most of us, Vivien sometimes got very depressed by her inability to buckle down and finish something. It is striking how little this interfered with her reading and learning. Late in the evening after she had had a frustrating day doing nothing that she regarded as useful, I would find her crouched over the image of a microfilmed medieval manuscript projected onto an A4 sheet of paper pinned to the bookshelf, becoming herself again.

Before even we started living together I loaned Vivien an early 19th-century instruction tutor for the flute of that period, and I learned from her diary (6.6.78 '[...] How about a vol. on flute tutors?') that this is when she conceived of the idea of studying musical instrument tutors in the same manner as she studied grammars. She had hoped a few years ago to obtain a Leverhulme grant to pursue this idea, but it never came to fruition.

Vivien was not good at relaxing, and the only activity that really gave her the opportunity was walking. Unfortunately Cambridge is not the ideal starting point for a country walk; perhaps if we had lived somewhere else she would have been able to spend more of her life relaxing. I end with the story of a walk in China. For most of our visit it was arranged that, while I was visiting oceanographic institutes, she would visit groups interested in Chinese grammatical studies. In one place we visited there was no such group and Vivien was left alone in the hotel while I was taken off to work. After lunch there was time set aside for a "tourist trip" together and when asked if we had any requests Vivien mentioned a cave with carved Buddhas that she would like me to see. 'No [...]', they said, 'it does not exist' (many such caves had been destroyed during the Cultural Revolution). Vivien argued persistently, and in the end said she would show the driver the way. Our hosts found it totally

incomprehensible that she could have walked several miles, alone, to find a cave that they did not know of (and were not interested by).

Address delivered by The Rev'd Pearl Goodwin on the occasion of Vivien's funeral at St Edward's Church, Cambridge on Monday 25 February 2002:

We can look in many ways at the life of Vivien, for she was gifted with many riches. Three of these will be addressed here. First of all what one would call the outer side, in the sense that it can be written down, her achievements. Then, secondly, there is the talent or ability that made these achievements possible; and, thirdly, there is the being of Vivien herself, how she related to those gifts and creatively went beyond them. And intertwined with all of this is her biography.

As a child Vivien gave little or no trouble because she seemed to know immediately what she wanted to do, and only that took her interest. She quickly, even as a child, found her relationship to language and grammar in the form of particular children's books. She went on to a highly successful career as a scholar of language, and many people present here today will be aware of her extensive responsibilities – teacher, writer of books and articles, member of many learned groups.

But, for today, it is perhaps more fitting to look at the nature of the talent that lay behind this richness of expression. We can begin to understand it by thinking of the old use of the word “genius” – meaning an individualised spark of the divine through which can flow creative and inspired impulses. The Greeks referred to it as the “Daemon”. In Vivien, what was given to her, what she was born with, was an ability to comprehend the greater dimensions of language that made it possible for her over the years to understand about a hundred languages. This was something that she herself spoke about. To give it Biblical imagery, she was one of those rare people who could heal what the Tower of Babel brought about in the fragmentation of the Ur-language into all the separate tongues, beautiful as they are. Perhaps she was even one who could, in her modern way, hear that original language, so no existing language held too many difficulties for her. Indeed it was said of her by the Goethe scholar Douglas Miller, on reading the manuscript of her latest book, ‘this woman was present at the birth of the word’. This could only have been something like “genius” or “daemon”. It cannot be inherited, no clever combination of molecules can do this, for it is not their “job description” to do so - they can only give the right bodily basis for it to express itself.

Not only languages, but music was extremely important to Vivien, and was indeed of great personal significance in her biography, for through music she met Nick Shackleton. They married in 1986, and music continued to be one of their great common interests, along with travel, often of a most adventurous kind.

As to what went beyond talent, we can look firstly at the way Vivien related to her work. She drove herself relentlessly, perhaps even too hard in terms of her subsequent illness. And that kind of intensity is not always easy for others to either work with or live with, for she simply burned her way through – and a flame has little regard for the substance which it burns. In the realm of ideas she was a bridge-builder. She wanted to understand language in its widest possible context, and here she drew on the work of Rudolf Steiner. That work had been part of her childhood, but she chose freely to take it up again later in life. It is not easy for someone of great academic standing to involve themselves in a stream which may not have the kinds of proof that are necessarily demanded today, but that proves itself in the doing. Vivien could move seamlessly from one landscape to the other. She stood behind many initiatives that stem from the work of Steiner, e.g. the pedagogical impulse towards a Steiner school in Cambridge, and many other initiatives.

It was this side of her being that enriched her relationship to her students. People, their cares and their lives, became more and more important to her, particularly what she could give to them. She loved her students dearly, and she wanted to help them in their life-paths. Many will remember her for this.

Her relationship to her illness was nearly exemplary and tells us much about her. There is no doubt that she would have wished to go on living – she was by no means finished with either her work or the relationships dear to her. But she had no great fear of dying, and it is not difficult to imagine that the world on the other side of death would hold few difficulties for her. A great part of her never really left that world when being born into this one – it accounted for a certain childishness in her, for all her academic fastidiousness. So she could not only work out of the greater picture, but live out of the greater picture, and that greater picture always included death. Even towards the end of her illness, when speaking was hard and language became garbled, she never lost her dignity. The human being remained intact, even if the instrument could not. She will be sorely missed by all who knew her: husband, parents, brother, and colleagues. And she will be long remembered. She herself was quite sure that her work would go on.

George J. Adler (1821–1868) A Forgotten Germanist of America

In *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965), Noam Chomsky claims that Wilhelm von Humboldt's 'Introduction' to general linguistics, namely *Einleitung zum Kawi-Werk, Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluß auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts* (1836), is 'famous but rarely studied' (1965: v).^{*} Despite Chomsky's frequent references to Humboldt's linguistic views, this conclusion is not a perfectly appropriate judgment. In fact, the 'Introduction' as well as other linguistic works of Humboldt were scrutinized and evaluated with great precision by George J. Adler nearly one hundred years before the publication of *Aspects*. In his *Wilhelm von Humboldt's Linguistical [sic] Studies* (1866), apparently the first study in America of Humboldt's linguistic achievements, Adler deals with Humboldt's linguistic theory, mostly from the 'Introduction', whose interpretation and explanation are still worthy of close examination today.

In this short article I will describe Adler's life and his academic achievements based on the following two articles: 'ADLER, GEORGE J.' in the *Dictionary of American Biography* (Genzmer 1964 [1927]) and 'George J. Adler, 1821-1868' in the *German Quarterly for the American Association of Teachers of German* (Bradley 1934). Both of them present brief, but very good sketches of Adler's life history and his academic achievements.

1. The early stage of Adler's academic career

First and foremost it must be mentioned that Adler was famous during the second half of the nineteenth century as an author of a widely used German-English dictionary in the United States. As Bradley writes, Adler 'was a pioneer [of the study of German language and literature in America] and as such attracts our attention today, for, in spite of the popularity of his dictionary, little seems to have been known of his life and words' (1934: 152).

^{*} This short article is for the most part an excerpt from my Litt.D. dissertation submitted to Sophia University/Tokyo (defended on 25 January 2002), the title of which is *A Study of George J. Adler's Treatise Wilhelm von Humboldt's Linguistical Studies (1866): A New Chapter in the History of the Humboldt Reception in American Linguistics*.

Adler was a native German, born in Leipzig in 1821. When he was twelve years old, he was brought to the United States. Therefore, we could say that Adler is “more American” than Boas and “more German” than Sapir.

In the early stages of his academic career he taught German language and literature at college, though he planned a career in classical and oriental philology at first. He began to teach German to college students while he was still an undergraduate. He graduated from New York University as Valedictorian of the Class of 1844 because he was ‘generally regarded as the most scholarly and industrious [out of the class of forty-three men]’ (Bradley 1934: 152), and was appointed to be “professor” of modern languages at that institution in 1846 at the age of twenty-five. He held this position until 1854, but the title “professor” was a purely honorary one, without any salary attached.

He published excellent German textbooks. Among others, *Ollendorff's New Method of Learning to Read, Write, and Speak the German Language* (1846a) is famous for its well-organized plan and appropriate examples. This is one of the grammar series of various languages—English, French, Italian, Spanish—written after the method of Heinrich Gottfried Ollendorff (1803–1865). The ‘American edition’ of Ollendorff’s German grammar was compiled and published with Adler as ‘editor’. It followed completely Ollendorff’s new method, by which, Adler says, ‘he [Ollendorff] has made the German [*sic*], heretofore notoriously difficult to foreigners, accessible to the capacity of all, young or old, learned or unlearned’ (1846a: iv).

Adler also published a *Progressive German Reader* (1846b) which is ‘designed to be put into the hands of learners almost simultaneously with the Grammar [namely *Ollendorff's New Method of Learning to Read, Write, and Speak the German Language*]’ (1846b: vi).

2. Adler’s German-English Dictionary

However hard Adler was working on his grammar and readers of the German language, he devoted most of the time and energy of his youth to the *Dictionary of the German and English Languages*, the first German-English dictionary in the United States (cf. Bradley 1934: 153), which appeared in 1849 and was revised many times thereafter.

His name as a lexicographer is remembered not only because of the age at which he published the dictionary, but also because of the excellence of its contents. Genzmer denotes the brilliance of this dictionary as follows:

The significance of this work as a scholarly achievement can be appreciated only when one recalls that it was written in the New York of Poe’s *Literati*, by a scholar who was still in his twenties and before

Sanders and the Grimms had laid the foundation of modern German lexicography. As his basis Adler used Flügel's dictionary, but he subjected the whole book to a thorough revision, adding almost 30,000 new terms (chiefly loan words) and several hundred brief articles on synonyms. He had nothing to do with the smaller English-German volume, which was a mere reprint 'under the auspices of the publisher' of Flügel. (1964: 108)

Adler tries to 'offer to the American student of German a work which would embody all the valuable results of the most recent investigations in German lexicography' (1849: ix). He also aims at compiling a dictionary which might 'become not only a reliable guide for the practical acquisition of that language, but one which would not forsake him in the higher walks of his pursuits, to which its literary and scientific treasures would naturally invite him' (1849: ix).

This dictionary was so widespread and popular among American students of German that it was revised repeatedly after Adler's death until the first decade of the twentieth century. Besides, Adler himself compiled an abridged edition for 'the use of learners' in 1852, just three years after the publication of the first edition of the unabridged version. Although Adler's dictionary has completely disappeared from schools and bookstores in America today, it was 'without question a boon to many generations of American students of German' (Bradley 1934: 155).

3. Adler's unwithering intellectual curiosity

Adler's devotion to work, especially to compiling the *Dictionary*, damaged his health. Adler's dictionary 'was for its author a calamity, for the unaided, unremitting drudgery of its compilation shattered his health, and he was thenceforward intermittently insane' (Genzmer 1964: 108). For Adler, the dictionary itself was 'unfortunately a calamity' (Bradley 1934: 155). Adler's health problems not only shortened his academic life, but also limited his other interests in life.

He died relatively young at the age of 47. As in the case of Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897-1941), who died at the age of 44, we could have expected many more academic contributions by Adler to the world of German linguistics and philology as well as to that of general scholarship in America, had he lived longer. In fact, he suffered from hallucinations and delusions of persecution as early as the summer of 1853, and he was taken to the Bloomingdale Asylum, where he died in 1868. An obituary of Adler was printed in the *New York Times* (25 Aug. 1868).

Even the hardship of being confined to a mental hospital did not prevent him from continuing to work and study assiduously. After his illness brought him into the shelter of an asylum in 1853, he never let his intellectual power wither and, as a result, accomplished tremendous work until the last moment of his life.

In 1854 he completed a *Handbook of German Literature* as a textbook for the study of the German language, whose plan follows, as I mentioned before, that pursued in his *Progressive German Reader* (1846b). It deals with Schiller's *Maid of Orleans*, Goethe's *Iphigenia in Tauris*, Tieck's *Puss in Boots* and the *Xenia*—the series of epigrams—of Goethe and Schiller. Judging from the works chosen here, Adler is clearly under the influence of the *Sturm und Drang* movement and German Romanticism. His interest in Humboldt's linguistic study may have had some relation to his taste in literature.

In the same year, Adler issued a private edition of *Letters of a Lunatic, or a Brief Exposition of My University Life, during the Years 1853–54*. From this book, written in the form of letters, we gain an impression of his acute interest in education and his fierce passion for his duty. In the 'Prefatory Note' he writes:

The much agitated question of University reform and of the liberty of academic instruction [...] may, however, perhaps likewise receive some additional light from the following pages, which I now submit, not from any motive of vanity, or from the expectation of self-aggrandisement or of histrionic applause; but from a sense of duty to the cause of liberal culture and of sound morality, to which I have devoted many a year of laborious effort and of earnest thought. (1854b: 3–4)

His main objective in publishing the letters of a 'lunatic' was 'to vindicate and defend my character, my professional honor and my most sacred rights as a rational man and as a public educator' (1854b: 3).

He must have had difficulty in balancing his reputation as a prominent professor of German, as well as a most distinguished Germanist in America, with the prejudiced treatment from others who regarded him as a dangerous lunatic. It is interesting to point out a few similarities between Adler and Dr. Minor, the protagonist of the *Professor and the Madman* (Winchester 1998). But, unlike Minor, Adler continued working literally until the last minutes of his life.

Even under such tense conditions, Adler's intellectual capacity did not diminish at all, but, on the contrary, expanded into various fields beyond German language and literature. In 1858 he completed a *Practical Grammar of the Latin* on the same principles as his German grammar, namely, according to

Ollendorff's methods. He also lectured on Roman literature, Arabic poetry and Goethe's *Faust*, and, furthermore, gave private lessons in Latin and German. Genzmer enumerates Adler's last three works:

A translation of Fauriel's History of Provençal Poetry (1860)
Wilhelm von Humboldt's Linguistical [sic] Studies (1866)
The Poetry of the Arabs of Spain (1867).

From the titles of these works we gain a sense of Adler's wide range of knowledge on various languages and literature and intellectual curiosity, as well as his ceaseless productive energy.

4. *Encounter with Herman Melville*

One of the highlights of Adler's life may have been his encounter with Herman Melville (1819–1891). While his health was completely shattered and he was intermittently insane, he set sail for Europe in October 1849, hoping to restore his health. On the way he met Melville. They traveled together through England and later met in Paris, and this developed into a friendship of sorts. Genzmer has the following account of their initial meeting:

In October 1849, his health temporarily restored, he sailed for Europe for a year of study and travel. On the wharf George Duyckinck introduced him to a fellow-traveler, Herman Melville. The two instantly became friends, spending the long days of the voyage in discussing philosophy, and meeting again in London and Paris. In his diary Melville affords us a pleasant glimpse of his companion and characterizes him as 'an exceedingly amiable man and a fine scholar, whose society is improving in a high degree'. (1964: 108)

Adler's friendship with Melville helped to galvanize his already established reputation and he became known in the sphere of American literature (cf. Gale 1995: 2; Weaver 1921: 285ff.; Metcalf 1953: 95ff.; Miller 1975: 176ff.; Smith 1991: 65f. 122ff., etc.). During the trip Adler 'undoubtedly stimulated Melville's intellectual interests' (Gale 1995: 3). This intellectual stimulation should be paid more attention to by Melville scholars as well as American literature students, because it may have had an influence on Melville's *Moby Dick*.

Adler's influence on Melville 'has for the most part been overlooked by Melville scholars. Yet this influence, exerted shortly before Melville began writing *Moby Dick*, may have been important in directing the course of

Melville's thought during his trip to Europe in 1849 [...] all Melville's works after 1849 are what they are partially as the result of Adler's influence' (Lee 1974: 138-141). Although both of them evidently never met face to face again, their friendship and mutual respect continued until Adler's death, when Melville attended Adler's funeral in New York (cf. Gale 1995: 3). Adler is distinctly worthy of consideration and careful study from both sides, i.e. from the history of American linguistics and from that of American literature.

REFERENCES

- Adler, George J. 1846a. *Ollendorff's New Method of Learning to Read, Write, and Speak the German Language; to Which is Added a Systematic Outline of the Different Parts of Speech, their Inflection and Use, with Full Paradigms and a Complete Table of the Irregular Verbs*. New York: Appleton.
- 1846b. *A Progressive German Reader, Adapted to the American Edition of Ollendorff's German Grammar, with Copious Notes and a Vocabulary*. New York: Appleton.
- 1849. *A Dictionary of the German and English Languages; Indicating the Accentuation of Every German Word, Containing Several Hundred German Synonyms, Together with a Classification and Alphabetical List of the Irregular Verbs, and a Dictionary of German Abbreviations*. Compiled from the Works of Hilpert, Flügel, Grieb, Heyse, and Others. New York: Appleton.
- 1854a. *Handbook of German Literature, Containing: Schiller's Maid of Orleans, Goethe's Iphigenia in Tauris, Tieck's Puss in Boots, the Xenia by Goethe and Schiller, with Critical Introductions and Explanatory Notes; to Which is Added an Appendix of Specimens of German Prose from the Middle of the Sixteenth to the Middle of the Nineteenth Centuries*. New York: Appleton.
- 1854b. *Letters of a Lunatic, or a Brief Exposition of My University Life, during the Years, 1853-54*. Printed for the Author.
- 1858. *A Practical Grammar of the Latin Language; with Perpetual Exercises in Speaking and Writing. For the Use of Schools, Colleges, and Private Learners*. Boston: Sanborn, Carter, Bazin & Co.
- 1860. *History of Provençal Poetry, by C. C. Fauriel*. New York: Derby & Jackson. (Repr., New York: Haskell House, 1966.)
- 1866. *Wilhelm von Humboldt's Linguistical Studies*. New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck.
- 1867. *The Poetry of the Arabs of Spain: Being the Substance of a Lecture Read in the Small Chapel of the University of the City of New York, on the Evening of March 28th, 1867*. New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck.

- Bradley, Lyman R. 1934. George J. Adler. In: *The German Quarterly* 7:4, 152-156.
- Chomsky, Noam 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Gale, Robert L. 1995. *Herman Melville Encyclopedia*. Westpoint: Greenwood Press.
- Genzmer, George H. 1964 [1927]. Adler, George J. In: *Dictionary of American Biography* vol. 1. New York, Scribner, 107-108.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von 1836. *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluß auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*. Berlin: F. Dümmler.
- Lee, Dwight A. 1974. *Melville and George J. Adler*. In: *American Notes & Queries* 12, 138-139.
- Metcalf, Eleanor Melville 1953. *Herman Melville. Cycle and Epicycle*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Miller, Edwin Haviland 1975. *Melville*. New York: George Braziller.
- Smith, Richard Dean 1991. *Melville's Complaint. Doctors and Medicine in the Art of Herman Melville*. New York and London: Garland Publishing.
- Weaver, Raymond 1921. *Herman Melville. Mariner and Mystic*. New York: George H. Doran.
- Winchester, Simon 1998. *The Professor and the Madman*. New York: Harper Collins.

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

Quousque Tandem Language-Teaching Reform in 19th-Century Scandinavia

1 *The language-teaching reform movement of the late 19th century*

The language-teaching reform movement of the late 19th century was an extraordinary chapter in the history of linguistics. It united an entire community of people professionally concerned with languages, in universities, academies and schools, in a way that few linguistic concerns have done before or since. And the so-called 'new philologists', men like Johan Storm (1836-1920), Henry Sweet (1845-1912) and Otto Jespersen (1860-1943) were amongst those most actively engaged. Reform was in their blood. They sought reform in spelling, reform in entire language systems, reform in the discipline of philology, and at the heart of the matter lay *phonetics*. An evangelistic zeal for phonetics went hand in hand with an evangelistic zeal for reform in language teaching methods, a reform based at least in part on the application of phonetics in the language classroom.

The linguist most usually credited with starting the movement is the German Wilhelm Viëtor (1850-1918), through his anonymous propagandistic pamphlet, *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!* (Viëtor 1882), which appeared under the pseudonym of 'Quousque Tandem', the name subsequently adopted by the Scandinavian language-teaching reform movement. Many of the contributions to the debate appeared in newly established German journals, such as *Englische Studien* and *Anglia*, and many were from schoolteachers like the Norwegians August Western (1856-1940) and Knud Brekke (b. 1855), both of whom were Storm's disciples and both of whom studied with Sweet in Oxford. Sweet devoted an entire book to the question (Sweet 1899), which goes way beyond practical issues involved in the successful teaching of foreign languages, and in which he 'endeavoured to give a comprehensive general view of the whole field of the practical study of languages' (Sweet 1899: v). Jespersen also devoted an entire book to the subject, the 1901 Danish original (*Sprogundervisning*) appearing in an English translation three years later (Jespersen 1904). Sweet and Jespersen both note the pioneering role in the movement played by Storm. Storm's concern for a reform dates back at least to 1872 - 10 years before Viëtor made his impact - and a review in the newspaper *Morgenbladet*, where he wrote that 'all these practical methods miss their mark because they are so killingly boring'. The first formal, readily available treatment of these issues from Storm's hand was in the 1879 *Engelsk Filologi*, but Storm's opinions could not even then have much of an impact on the international community as they were yet to be translated from Norwegian.

Paul Passy (1859-1940) in France was also actively involved, and, through his editorship of *Dhi Fonètik Tÿtcer* (subsequently *Le Maître Phonétique*), took the issues involved to a wider audience still. It really was an international *movement*, not just a debate, and a movement which resulted in (some) change. As Jespersen wrote:

[...] at present it may be said that the reformed method is well on the way to permanent favour, at least as far as younger teachers have anything to say in the matter. (Jespersen 1904: 2)

Reading these writers, and witnessing what happened at conferences and in the columns of newspapers and journals, we still get a sense of the urgency felt by the reformers, the 'younger teachers'. Internationally the contributions to the movement from phoneticians, scholars of the English language, foreign language teachers and educators alike were so extensive that it is not possible (or indeed necessary) to deal with them in full here. I shall just give an outline of the direction the reforms took, for the benefit of those readers unfamiliar with the issues, prior to considering the enormously vigorous Scandinavian branch. (For more detail about the movement in general, see Howatt (1984: Part III).)

Essentially the Reform Movement came about because those linguists concerned with studying modern languages synchronically, the first generation of real professors in the modern languages, at last provided an academic basis for both study and teaching. (One of the many myths of the history of linguistics is that the notion of studying language synchronically didn't occur to anyone in the 19th century, and all was diachronic until de Saussure swept away the perversity of previous generations.) Until the likes of Sweet, Storm, Jespersen, and the German Eduard Sievers (1850-1932), there had been nobody professionally qualified to judge language teaching methods and materials from an informed, linguistic point of view. When these linguists began to consider currently available methods and materials in the light of their own insights into language and into the modern languages, they were horrified. It should be stressed that there was nothing patronising about this. Many of the university folk active in the Movement, and many of those most vehement in their criticism of existing practice, had themselves worked as teachers in the schools, so they were not simply preaching from their ivory towers. Viëtor, Storm, Jespersen and Passy in their different national contexts had all worked as schoolteachers. Interestingly, those who proposed the most radical reforms were those with the most recent experience of school teaching, such as Western and to an extent Jespersen; Storm and Sweet were more cautious.

Those involved were not in full agreement on every detail of reform, but, in Howatt's words, 'the Reform Movement was founded on three basic principles':

the primacy of speech, the centrality of connected texts as the kernel of the teaching-learning process, and the absolute priority of an oral methodology in the classroom. (Howatt 1984: 171)

Sweet, as usual, states the phonetic case, 'the primacy of speech', in the strongest manner, although he held much more moderate views in other areas of proposed reform. Sweet did not work as a schoolteacher, so was perhaps more idealistic in his reliance on phonetics: '[...] all study of language must be based on phonetics' (1899: 4). There were few amongst the reformers who would disagree with this, but not all would be so categorical about the use of phonetics in the early stages of language learning. Sweet of course begins with phonetics and would never have done otherwise. Jespersen, by contrast, leaves phonetics until he is nearing the end of his *How to Teach a Foreign Language*, and then states:

I have now for many years advocated the use of phonetics – yes, even of phonetical transcription, in the teaching of foreign languages, and have to a large extent put my theories into practice both in dealing with children of all ages and with grown persons. New things always frighten people; they think with terror that here the pupils are to be burdened with an entirely new and difficult science and with a new kind of writing [...] (Jespersen 1904: 142)

Jespersen was an urbane man of the world, where Sweet was a fanatic.

'The centrality of connected texts as the kernel of the teaching-learning process, and the absolute priority of an oral methodology in the classroom' meant for the reformers a move away from the despised *readers* of the previous generation. Storm was possibly the most outspoken of all the reformers on the subject of textbooks based on the study of meaningless constructed bits of language. Sweet had his stock absurd sentence - 'the philosopher pulled the lower jaw of the hen' - supposedly found in such a book. Storm's examples, whether genuine or invented, are even more amusing:

Have you seen my pen-knife? No, but I have seen my old aunt's green umbrella. The Dutchman has more flies than the Frenchman, and so on in *omnia saecula saeculorum*. (Storm 1887b: 170)

Storm rightly enquires, 'where in all the world do sensible people speak such a language?' He vents his spleen in the preface to his first book of French dialogues, from which I've just quoted, and for which his writings on teaching reform were a sort of extended commercial:

The methods hitherto employed have all proved inadequate for the purpose [...] The ordinary primers, text-books and books of exercises, with their disconnected and often difficult sentences, are dull and tedious, and give no facility in the use of the language. (Storm 1892: VII)

Storm felt very strongly about this, and it wasn't just a general complaint. He goes on to more specific criticisms, describing the language teaching method of Franz Ahn (1796-1865) and Heinrich Gottfried Ollendorff (1803-1865) (see Howatt (1984: 138-145) for a description) as 'exceedingly unpractical', 'often erroneous', 'ill arranged and so overloaded with unnecessary details and with incorrect, stilted and uncommon expressions' (Storm 1892: VIII-IX). His polemic seems exaggerated perhaps, but methods like Ahn's and Ollendorff's and any number of imitators were readily available, entered many editions and were clearly very popular with the general public. They gave their users the impression of learning a foreign language, but, as Storm remarks, when those users actually tried to employ their new-found language skills with native speakers, they were completely lost. The language they learnt was artificial, not spoken by any native speaker anywhere. It was not the living language, 'just a bad selection of literary language' (p. 170).

Sweet agrees with the 'continental reformers in condemning the practice of exercise-writing and the use of a priori methods such as Ahn's', but he 'refuse[s] to join them in their condemnation of translation and use of grammars' (Sweet 1899: VII), as in fact does Storm. So, while there was disagreement over the detail, as to how much reform was required and how radical that reform should be vis-à-vis the use of phonetics and the rejection of existing methods and materials, none of this extensive group of scholars, teachers and educators was in any doubt that 'der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren'.

2 *Quousque Tandem*

On Thursday 12 August 1886, Lektor A. Drake from Nyköping in Sweden gave a talk at the third Scandinavian philologists' meeting, held in Stockholm, with the title: 'How can a practically and psychologically significant system of and methodology for language teaching be achieved in our schools?'. There was so much interest in the issue that it was decided to postpone the subsequent

discussion until the following morning, Friday 13th, inauspiciously enough. Passy, Western, and the Swedish phonetician, Johan August Lundell (1851-1940), all took part in that discussion. Further debate was needed, and so an extra session was arranged for some 50 delegates, with Lundell in the chair. This time Jespersen, the Swedish dialectologist and general linguist Adolf Noreen (1854-1925), and Storm, amongst others, also contributed. The chief outcome of these meetings was the foundation of the *Quousque Tandem* movement (*QT*), and a letter was sent out inviting like-minded people to join. The letter, dated September 1886, signed by Jespersen, Lundell and Western and printed in parallel Danish and Swedish versions, contained the invitation:

in connection with the discussion of language teaching methodology, which took place at the third meeting of Scandinavian philologists in Stockholm this year, we the undersigned take the liberty of inviting male and female colleagues to join the society

QUOUSQUE TANDEM

Scandinavian Society for Improved Language Teaching

During the following period a number of articles appeared, setting out the programme adopted by the 'Quousquists' and explaining to school teachers why a reform of language teaching along these lines was desirable. The four lines along which reform was proposed by *QT* are set out in the letter and reiterated in Jespersen (1886):

1. It is not the written language which is taken as the foundation for teaching, but the real, living spoken language. In those languages whose orthography differs significantly from the pronunciation, we therefore begin with texts in an appropriate phonetic script.
2. From the very start teaching is based on connected texts, not disconnected sentences.
3. Grammar teaching is wedded to reading to the extent that the pupil, with the help of the teacher, is guided into gradually working out the laws of the language from the reading. Only later should a systematic textbook be used for revision purposes.
4. Translation both from the first language into the foreign language and *vice versa* is limited, and replaced partly by written and spoken reproduction and free production in the foreign language in conjunction with what is being read, partly by more cursory reading.

A radical reform in teaching methods and materials was inevitably going to meet with a negative response from conservative teachers of the older generation. The three founders of *QT* were all young and idealistic (Jespersen was 26 in 1886, Lundell 35 and Western 36), and this cannot have helped their cause amongst older traditionalists. In fact Storm, although in many respects on the same wavelength as *QT*, found the attitude of the individuals involved repellent (he regarded them as arrogant). As expected, there were some rapid counter-attacks, dealt with by Western in his 1888 article in *Vor Ungdom*. He dealt with the first two 'opponents', C. Michelsen and J. Vising, quite summarily, displaying some of the arrogance of which Storm and others accused him. However, the third opponent was Storm (in Storm (1887b)), and responding to the great man was, for Western, a much more sensitive problem. Storm was the pioneer here, and he was Western's mentor. How should he deal with an attack on the movement from this quarter?

Far from regarding Prof. Storm as our opponent, we regard him as our greatest ally, despite the fact that disagreement about the means to the end is still apparently so great that it has hindered a closer alliance. We have welcomed his contributions to the discussion as the most significant yet to have been made, and we are even grateful for the statements which go against us, as they have partly contributed to a clarification of our own views, and partly shown that there are points on which our own statements require greater clarification. (Western 1888: 53)

The fact that Western changes from a superior tone in discussing Michelsen's and Vising's objections to one of humility in dealing with Storm's indicates the status Storm had in this particular milieu. Western concludes his mollification of Storm with an exhortation for the great man to join, nay lead, the movement of which, in Western's view, he was the rightful leader:

So if I could contribute to Prof. Storm's adopting his own child and taking on its continued upbringing and, where necessary, discipline, then not only would my goal with these lines have been achieved, but I would regard it as the best job of work I have yet done. (Western 1888: 58)

A newsletter (*Revy*) was started in 1888 as an offprint of the Swedish journal, *Verdandi*. It was not a particularly ambitious publication and was, according to the opening letter 'to the readers', produced on a tight budget. Its aim, in the words of the same letter, was 'to enter into more regular contact as much with our members as with the pedagogically interested general public than has been possible up to now' (p. 1). It contained brief reports and reviews

and ran until June 1891, appearing in 15 rather irregular issues and covering a total of 120 octavo pages. It provided, amongst other things, a list of members. Issue no. 3 listed 169 members, and new members were added at a steady rate, if in declining quantities – there were 32 new members in October 1889 and only 10 in June 1891. It appears to have been a reasonably flourishing society, compared with similar special-interest societies, and the majority of members came, as one would expect, from the Scandinavian countries: Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. A number of well-known names appeared on the list of members – Vilhelm Thomsen (1842-1927), Adolf Noreen, and the Swedish phonetician, Hugo Pipping (1864-1944) for example – and there was a handful of members from outside Scandinavia, notably Passy and Hermann Klinghardt (1847-1926), the latter possibly the most active contributor to the European movement for teaching reform. Perhaps the most noteworthy cluster of members was the group of three ‘Æresmedlemmer’ [honorary members] placed at the top of the list: Storm, Sweet and Viëtor.

The *Revy* fizzled out in 1891, and the movement seems to have been little more than an idealistic experiment, soldiering on for another five years until 1896. This is not to say that it had no impact. There is no evidence as to how many members left between 1888 and 1891, but it can be assumed that there were around 200 members for much of that period, teachers who to some extent subscribed to the movement’s reform programme and who would have carried on teaching in its spirit after the movement faded. Klinghardt adopted a thorough-going *QT* teaching programme in Reichenbach in Germany and was visited by a number of Swedish teachers (see Brate 1891).¹ According to Brate, Klinghardt had notable success in teaching English using this method:

I had the opportunity to receive a testimonial outside school as to what fine results Dr Klinghardt’s teaching achieved. A pupil had for some time been absent from school on account of a contagious illness in his family. He returned to the town while I was there and visited Dr Klinghardt in his home, before rejoining the school. On that occasion Dr Klinghardt spoke with him in English about his work and absence and all manner of other things, for which he was not in the least bit prepared, and the boy not only understood everything Dr Klinghardt said, but also replied to his questions in English without faltering or stammering. This pupil was in the third year of English at the time. (Brate 1891: 74)

Whatever else, as Western began his defence of the movement by saying:

¹ For more detail on Klinghardt’s experiment, see Howatt (1984: 173-175).

If the Quousque Tandem society has achieved nothing else, it has at least quickened tempers and generated some discussion. It has hopefully made it clear to many that the excellence of our current teaching method is not beyond doubt. And that is something. If the young society dies, it can't be said that it was silenced to death, and hopefully it won't be spoken or written to death either. (Western 1888: 40)

REFERENCES

- Brate, Erik 1891. Ett besök hos d:r Klinghardt. *Quousque Tandem Revy* 10, 73-74.
- Howatt, A. P. R. 1984. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jespersen, Otto 1886. Den ny sprogundervisnings program. In: *Vor ungdom*, 353-381.
- 1901. *Sprogundervisning*. København: Schubothe.
- 1904. *How to Teach a Foreign Language*. Translated from the Danish original by Sophia Yhlen-Olsen Bertelsen M.A. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Quousque Tandem* [=Wilhelm Viëtor] 1882. *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren! Ein Beitrag zur Überbürdungsfrage*. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger. [English trans. = 'Appendix' to Howatt (1984).].
- Storm, Johan 1872. Review of Petersen, Peter 1872, *Fuldstændigt Kursus i fire Sprog (Norsk, Tydsk, Engelsk, Fransk). Første Hefie*. Drammen. In: *Morgenbladet*, 29 August 1872, 11 November 1872.
- 1879. *Engelsk Filologi. Anvisning til et videnskabeligt Studium af det engelske Sprog for Studerende, Lærere og Viderekomne. I: Det levende Sprog*. Kristiania: Alb. Cammermeyer (Det mallingske Bogtrykkeri).
- 1887a. *Franske Taleøvelser. En systematisk Fremstilling af det franske Talesprog gennem Samtaler af det daglige Liv, ordnede efter Grammatiken. Mellemtrin*. Kjøbenhavn: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag (F. Hegel & Søn). Græbes Bogtrykkeri.
- 1887b. Om en forbedret undervisning i levende sprog. In: *Universitets- og skole-annaler. Ny række* 2, 161-198, 305-351.
- 1892. *French Dialogues: A Systematic Introduction to the Grammar and Idiom of Spoken French by Joh. Storm L. L. D., Professor of Romance and English Philology in the University of Christiania. Intermediate Course. Authorised English Edition by Geo. Macdonald, M. A., Balliol College, Oxford*. London and New York: Macmillan and Co.
- Sweet, Henry 1899. *The Practical Study of Languages: A Guide for Teachers and Learners*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.

Western, August 1888. Mere om den nye sprogundervisning. In: *Vor ungdom*,
40-70.

Andrew R. Linn, *Sheffield*

A.R.Linn@Sheffield.ac.uk

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 Lull 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 lived 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, 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

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).

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). Lull 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 Lull'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 Lull) 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 Lull, with a few wrinkles added by Agrippa. Lull'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 concentric circles, each containing nine letters, are correlated. Agrippa treats of these and gives a standard exposition of how Lull employed the diagrams.

What he adds, however, are more circles and distinctions (Agrippa 1600b: 320-358, 449-451). He regards Lull'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

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.

“questions and rules” – *utrum, quid, de quo*, etc. These can be found in Lull, 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 Lull’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 Lull 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 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.

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.

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 auctoris nostri, vel eam aenigmatis involverunt propter malevolos, vel ejus methodum immutarunt & multa de suis adjecerunt, quae artem non tam illustrent, 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

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.

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*.

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.

⁸ In Latin these are primarily Q-questions.

⁹ Alsted (1609: 129) says:

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

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.

I. Tabula generalis adumbrans Alphabetum artis, & singulos circulos

CLAVIS ARTIS LULLIANAE									
Circulus									
Subjectorum	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. S. Substantiarum	B DEUS	C Angelus	D Caelum	E Homo	F Imagi- natio	G Senti- entia	H Vega- tura	I Elemen- tatio	K Intra- mentia
2. I. Accidentium	Quantitas	Qualitas	Relatio	Actio	Passio	Habitus	Situs	Tempus	Locus
3. W. Ac- cidentium	Instita	Prudentia	Fortitudo	Tempe- rantia	Fides	Spes	Caritas	Potentia	Pietas
Moralium Virtutum	Avaritia	Gula	Luxuria	Superbia	Acedia	Invidia	Ira	Mendacium	Incon- stantia
4. Predicatorum	Bontas	Magniti- co	Aceritas, Duratio	Potestas	Sapientia	Voluntas	Virtus	Veritas	Gloria
Respectorum T.	Differen- tia	Concor- dantia	Contrarietas	Principium	Medium	Finis	Materia	Aequalitas	Minoritas
5. Questionum, seu regularum Q.	Utrum	Quid	De quo	Quare	Quantum	Qualis	Quando	Ubi	Quomodo, cum quo

FIGURE 2

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. *Encyclopaedia*. 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.

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

The 19th Annual Colloquium of the Henry Sweet Society

Jesus College, Oxford
13 April 2002

Conference Report

The nineteenth annual colloquium of the society was held on Saturday 13 April in the pleasant surroundings of Jesus College, Oxford. It was attended by about 27 participants from across Britain and Europe.

Proceedings were inevitably tinged with immense sadness as we remembered Vivien Law and moving tributes were paid by Werner Hüllen, Anneli Luhtala and Louis Kelly during the AGM, who all, in talking about the many aspects of Vivien's life, conveyed the sense of great loss, but also great pleasure in having known Vivien, which was, I'm sure, felt by all.

As this was the first colloquium I have attended, I can offer no comparison with previous years, but can say how inspiring and enjoyable I found the whole day and how refreshing it was to meet others working in the history of linguistics in such a friendly atmosphere.

The six papers given ranged in temporal focus from the middle ages to the twentieth century and geographically from the very local interest of Joan Leopold's paper discussing Max Müller's role in the first appointment in anthropology in Oxford, across Europe to finish in America with Camiel Haman's consideration of the part played by Chomsky in linguistic historiography. In between we were treated to two papers on 17th-century thought, as Jaap Maat convincingly argued that, despite the similarities in the work of Dalgarno and Leibniz, they differed fundamentally in their view of "logical form", and David Cram enlightened us on the writings of John Wilkins and George Fox on Babel and Pentecost, as well as entertaining us with his recording of 'holy gibberish'. These were balanced by the more pedagogically focused papers of Andrew Linn, who traced the history of the Scandinavian 'Quousque Tandem' movement and its part in 19th-century language teaching reform, and John Walmsley's fascinating paper on language use in grammar teaching during the later middle ages in England. It was only a shame that time did not allow for a fuller discussion following this paper. Overall the papers complemented each other well and were never less than thought provoking.

MAY 2002

HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN

The success of the day was, of course, in no small part due to its organiser, David Cram, who not only assembled a stimulating set of papers, but also arranged for us to spend the day in aesthetic and culinary comfort, and he deserves our thanks.

Penny Sarginson, Cambridge
pjs31@cam.ac.uk

**The 19th Annual Colloquium of the
Henry Sweet Society**

**Jesus College, Oxford
13 April 2002**

Abstracts of Papers

Max Müller and the First Appointment in Anthropology at Oxford

Joan Leopold (London & Los Angeles)

It has usually been assumed (or put forward for University political reasons) that Edward Tylor's appointment to the first university position in "Anthropology" in the English-speaking world was due to the "call" given to him by Lt.-Gen. August Henry (Lane Fox) Pitt Rivers when he gave his collection of anthropological objects (the Pitt Rivers Museum) to the University of Oxford in 1883.

The story is – naturally – much more complicated than this. As part of our biography of Edward Tylor (to appear), we have looked at this issue, and concluded that a large part of the impetus for Tylor personally to come to Oxford must have come from Friedrich Max Müller, the professor of comparative philology at Oxford, and one of the most important reviewers of Tylor's first anthropological work *Researches into the Early History of Mankind...* in 1865 in *The Times*.

This paper will focus on the period 1880-84 in its discussion of Max Müller's involvement in why Tylor came to Oxford.

Dalgarno and Leibniz on the Particles

Jaap Maat (Amsterdam)

Comparing the linguistic work of George Dalgarno (c. 1620-1687) and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716), one is struck by various parallels. Both men were engaged in constructing an artificial language, both explicitly drawing on the logical tradition. More specifically, they both postulated the

existence of a logical form underlying expressions of ordinary, non-artificial languages, and they both sought to make the artificial language capable of expressing this logical form in a more satisfactory way. In doing so, both Dalgarno and Leibniz focussed on the analysis of linguistic particles, being convinced that these contain the key to the structure of language and to the structure of thought. Apart from these systematic similarities, we know that Leibniz studied Dalgarno's work very carefully, and that he made use of it in preparing the implementation of his own scheme. The paper argues that in spite of all this, Dalgarno's approach differs crucially from Leibniz's in that they had different views of what has here been termed 'logical form'.

The Language Ecology in England c. 1000 to 1500 AD

John Walmsley (Bielefeld)

The theme of this paper is the changing role of the vernacular in England between about A.D. 1000 and 1500. The key event in this period was of course the Norman Conquest, which had both immediate and long-term effects on the development of English morphology and syntax, orthography and pronunciation, and, of course, the lexicon. Although Aelfric had provided a vernacular grammatical terminology for the description of Latin before the Conquest, in the course of the changes set in train by the Conquest this tradition died out, and for almost four hundred years there is no evidence for the use of an English vernacular grammatical terminology. Then, in the space of just a few decades we see didactic practice changing, and from about 1390 AD a vernacular tradition of grammatical metalanguage is established which continues down to the present day.² The question is, what precipitated this sudden change to teaching grammar in the vernacular within such a short space of time?

The idea of a language ecology seems to have gone out of focus during the last few years. Previous attempts to deal with the question, such as those by Bernd (1972), Chambers (1932), Fisher (1977), have almost exclusively been undertaken from the viewpoint of a single language, such as English, French, or Latin. I shall argue that in order to understand the changes which took place during this period, we need to consider the language ecology as a whole. This means looking at the different functions language was used for in medieval society, and the changing relations between the languages used to execute these functions.

The Scandinavian *Quousque Tandem* movement

Andrew Linn (Sheffield)

The late nineteenth-century Reform Movement is unique in language teaching history. For a period of about twenty years, not only did many of the leading phoneticians of the time co-operate towards a shared educational aim, but they also succeeded in attracting teachers and others in the field to the same common purpose. (Howatt 1984: 169)

The Norwegian Johan Storm (1836-1920) was agitating for language-teaching reform as early as 1872, ten years before the linguist usually credited with starting the Reform Movement, Vilhelm Viëtor (1850-1918), using the pseudonym *Quousque Tandem*, published his propagandistic pamphlet, *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!*. It was in Scandinavia that the Reform Movement found perhaps its most vigorous manifestation, but Howatt merely notes, tantalisingly, that “a Quousque Tandem Society was formed in Scandinavia, borrowing the famous but now discarded pseudonym” (p. 170).

After a brief general introduction to the Reform Movement, and to Storm’s part in it, I will go on to present the ideas and activities of the society set up in 1886 during the Third Scandinavian Philologists’ Meeting, held in Stockholm. Its midwives were Otto Jespersen (1860-1943), Johan August Lundell (1851-1940) and August Western (1856-1940), and it had three Honorary Members, three figureheads: Sweet, Viëtor and Storm. It was a bright light which burned out quite quickly, but it did have its successes and a lasting impact.

Linguistic Eschatology: Babel, Pentecost and Babylon in Seventeenth-Century Thought

David Cram (Oxford)

Speculation about the nature of language was, in the seventeenth century, positioned within an eschatological framework of first and last things. On the one hand, the Biblical story of the confusion of tongues at Babel informed any account of the present-day diversity of human languages and defined the constraints on our understanding of the Adamic language spoken in Paradise and its possible reconstruction in the form of a philosophical language. On the

other hand there is in the Christian tradition a typological “reverse parallel” between the confusion of tongues at Babel and the subsequent unification of tongues at Pentecost

But considerations about “first things” appear to loom much larger in the seventeenth-century debate about language than do considerations about “last things”, and the purposes of the present paper is to enquire as to why there should be this lopsided asymmetry. After all, universal language schemes were just one aspect of a larger teleologically-driven programme for the reform and perfecting of human knowledge and human society, and the mid-seventeenth century was a period when millennial expectations were particularly intense.

The paper is in three sections. The first deals with the treatment of Babel in John Wilkins, and argues that the trajectory of his argumentation about language change moves from supernatural origin to natural causes. The second section looks at interpretations of the gift of tongues in contemporary Bible commentaries, which, counter to modern readings, present the phenomenon as *xenolalia* rather than *glossolalia*. The third section looks at the attitudes towards language of one of the more eschatologically inclined non-conformist thinkers, George Fox. Fox’s linguistic eschatology, based more strongly on the Apocalypse than the account of Pentecost, makes him as fundamentally hostile to language engineering as he is to university learning. But it will be suggested that however alien his eschatology to that of Wilkins, if the “trajectory” of his thought – from the word of creation to the divine inner word – is considered in parallel, the counterpart to universal language schemes turns out to be not Pentecostal ‘holy gibberish’ but Quaker silence.

Chomsky’s Revenge on Descartes

Camiel Hamans (Brussels)

From 1967 on Noam Chomsky worked at a study, which resulted in his well known ‘Remarks on Nominalization’ (1970). In this paper he developed a theory which opposed the so-called school of Generative Semanticists and which caused a long, intensive and particularly vehement discussion with people he had co-operated with till shortly before. The dispute, called one of the ‘linguistic wars’ by Randy Harris (1993), was ‘notable not simply because it became so bitter, but also because it [...] represented what had clearly been the most serious organised challenge to Chomsky’s views to date’ (Huck and Goldsmith 1995). According to Pieter Seuren (1998), who devotes more than 30 pages to this episode, it was a bitter and personal conflict. On the other hand Noam Chomsky himself considers this rebellion as rather unimportant. It was a

disagreement between two generations of students, 'many of them not my students' (Chomsky in Barsky 1997).

In the mid sixties Noam Chomsky got involved in another dispute. In 1962 he presented himself as a historiographer for the first time at the 9th International Congress of Linguists, organised by the linguistic departments of Harvard and MIT. This research resulted in *Cartesian Linguistics* (1966), a book, which was not welcomed warmly by the whole linguistic community. Especially specialists in the history of linguistics criticised it seriously. One name among the criticisers is most notable, that of Robin T. Lakoff, who could be considered as associated with the group of generative semanticists. Another remarkable reviewer was Peter H. Salus, who presented his views at the Regional Meetings of the Chicago Linguistic Society of 1969 and 1971. At these conferences, especially the first one, the generative semanticists were very successful, as James McCawley (1995) remembered.

In my paper I shall show how this negative response to *Cartesian Linguistics* influenced Chomsky's attitude towards the new theory of generative semantics. He thought himself challenged or even threatened by the adverse criticisms of his scholarly standards. He must have felt attacked in his recently acquired authority by the reviewers of his historiographical studies. That is why the dispute with the school of generative semantics became so personal and bitter. It is also why Noam Chomsky never came back to the field of the history of linguistics or even responded his critics.

**‘Silent Language: Characters, Notes and Symbols in the
Early Modern Period’**

**Birkbeck College, University of London
12 – 13 April 2002**

It would take a conflicting conference of the greatest interest – or the promise of it – to prevent one from attending an HSS Colloquium with a programme such as that for the Oxford meeting on April 13, the more so if (like me) you happened to reside within the institution in which it was to take place. So it was that, with no little anticipation, I travelled down the M40 motorway to London to attend a conference entitled ‘Silent Languages’ at Birkbeck College, organised by Stephen Clucas and Patricia Brewerton. Papers to be given included ‘Bacon’s universal language’, ‘The meaning of early modern notation’, Bulwer’s ‘Natural language of the hand’, ‘Timothy Bright’s Characterie’, and ‘Lullist notation’. The conference was to be avowedly and self-consciously interdisciplinary, which cannot have hindered its organisers in their successful efforts to secure it financial assistance from the British Academy.

Some early disappointment was caused by the sight of the amended programme. Rather than discussing his ‘universal language’, Alan Stewart altered his talk to ‘Bacon’s biform alphabet’ on the stated grounds that he found this more interesting, and Thomas Leinkauf abandoned Lullist notation for a discussion of ‘Early modern textbook illustrations’ (both papers, it transpired, were stimulating and to the – redefined – point). Patricia Brewerton and Sue Wiseman talked, as advertised, on Timothy Bright and John Bulwer respectively, while Stephen Clucas provided a wide-ranging summary of different aspects of notation from Trithemius to Leibniz via Viète, Dee, Warner, Oughtred, Harriot and the ‘universal language movement’. Thomas Ernst was judicious and admirably transparent in his unpicking of Trithemius’s *Steganographia*, Judith Field was trenchant in her discussion of the growth of algebra, Michael Bath looked at the history of emblems as conveyors of meaning (Elizabeth I, aided as ever by Francis Walsingham, beheaded a Duke of Norfolk on the strength of an embroidered emblem he had been sent by Mary, Queen of Scots), and Martin Ham spoke plausibly about the role of numbers within Renaissance musical symbolism. In addition, papers were given on the role of signs in mapping early modern London, on sixteenth-

century Christian interpretations of Cabalist tradition and on the location of Dee's monad.

However, the conference was marred by the fact that its contributors seldom addressed the question of what a language was, let alone what a silent or universal one might be. An unwillingness, or inability, to discriminate between cryptographic, universal and real character projects was matched by a lack of attention to the implications of a purely written system of linguistic communication. Similarly, most speakers paid little attention to the obvious gaps between neo-Platonic pseudo-hieroglyphics and an artificial character based on the Aristotelian common notions of humankind, and accordingly fell headlong into them. If it is true that historians of linguistics occasionally pay too little heed to the historical contexts of the works that interest them, then it is certainly the case that the intellectual historians who spoke at this conference had (collectively, but by no means in every instance) an insufficient understanding of the linguistic world they set out to explore, and that they thus failed to do it justice. Although this conference was founded on ambitions that were admirably vaulting, there is little doubt that it came to overleap itself.

Rhodri Lewis, *Oxford*

Rhodri.lewis@jesus.ox.ac.uk

Koerner, E. F. K. / Hans-Josef Niederehe (eds.)

History of Linguistics in Spain II.

Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001.

[Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III - Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, Volume 100].

xxii + 463 pp. ISBN 90 272 4589 4 (Eur.); 158811 075 3 (US). €110 / US\$99.

The history of linguistics in Spain is an important field in which not many monographs exist. The editors have compiled a collection of articles which have appeared in *Historiographia Linguistica* in recent years, thus providing a good representation of scholarly research devoted to the history of Spanish linguistics. The first volume of *The History of Linguistics in Spain*, published by A. Quilis and H.-J. Niederehe in 1986 as No. 34 in the *Studies in the History of the Language Sciences*, reprinted the texts of all contributions to *Historiographia Linguistica* in 1984 without making any changes. This time the editors opted for inclusion of the majority of articles that had appeared in volume XXIV (1997) and some papers which go back to earlier issues of the journal, which have been updated considerably. They invited María Dolores Martínez Gavilán and Manuel Brea Claramonte to submit previously unpublished studies in order to round off the volume.

Hans-Josef Niederehe's 'Introduction to Linguistics in the Hispanic World' begins with Antiquity (Seneca, Quintilian) and focusses on some major persons, such as Alfonso X el Sabio and Nebrija. He regrets the lack of articles on medieval thought and relates theoretical reflection to Alfonso; on the other hand he considers Nebrija more related to grammatical work. It was Nebrija who introduced the study of languages in Spain and presented the Italian model as an innovation in the Renaissance.

For the study of language in the 16th and 17th centuries, he cites some important names, mentioning, for example, the significance of Sanctius. The history continues with some topical subjects of Enlightenment linguistics which are arranged under lexicography, grammaticography, rationalist grammar, comparative linguistics and history of language, and finally descriptive grammar. This does not permit following up the real impact of the major texts of the 18th century. For example, Gregorio Mayans y Siscar and his *Ortígenes de la lengua española* (1737) are difficult to understand, as is Bernardo Aldrede's *Del origen y principio de la lengua castellana* (1606), which is in a historical tradition of language study said to have been absent in the French Enlightenment. The 19th and 20th centuries and the history of linguistics in

Latin America are only briefly mentioned. We find this book to be a monumental history limited to several important personalities and topics, while the history of linguistics in Spain would need more subtle categorisation.

The first part of the volume is dedicated to the Renaissance and the Golden Age. It begins with an important article written by W. Keith Percival on Nebrija's syntactic theory in its historical setting. Nebrija modelled his Latin grammar closely on grammars current in Italy in the 15th century. His grammatical doctrine represents not a revival of ancient models but a continuation of a development which had begun in the early centuries of the second millennium. Therefore Percival recommends focussing attention on the extent to which Nebrija and other humanist grammarians built their grammatical doctrine, especially their syntactic procedures, on medieval foundations. This perspective seems at variance with the common notion which sees the Renaissance humanists rejecting medieval modes of thought.

In her paper on evolution in Nebrija's dictionaries (1492-1512), Carmen Codofner studies Nebrija's sources and the process by which the progressive amplification of lemmata took place. Miguel Ángel Esparza Torres and Vicente Calvo Fernández argue in their paper that the so-called *Grammaticae proverbiandi* constitute the immediate precursor of Nebrija's undertaking, since they contain didactic postulates which he developed further. This kind of medieval grammar uses commentaries and notes in Romance languages. They led Nebrija to a contrastive grammar of Latin and Castilian and the creation of a grammatical terminology for the vernacular. Nebrija holds that by making use of the contrastive method it is possible to study two languages such as Latin and Castilian. He had coined the notion of "unity in diversity" concerning his grammatical work, therefore, his *Grammatica Castellana* must not be considered as separate from the rest of Nebrija's scholarly production.

In his article on Nebrija and the grammars of Spanish of the 16th and 17th centuries, José Luis Girón Alconchel studies the framework of Spanish linguistics of the Renaissance and the evolution of grammar with reference to Latin grammar and teaching Spanish as a foreign language. Nebrija dominated Spanish grammar writing of the 16th century; in his Castilian grammar, the author stresses its capacity to be a grammar for foreigners and the value of this document for the history of Spanish. In the 17th century, the work of Sanctius initiates a rationalism which favours pedagogical methodology and linguistic rationalism. The author also gives a survey of 17th-century grammatical work.

The Italian connection in Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de la lengua* (1535) is the subject of Angelo Mazzocco's contribution. He reassesses the *Dialogo*'s connection with the Italian Renaissance by demonstrating that Valdés predated the rich Italian literature on language and the concept of rebirth. Some of the innovations of the *Dialogo* may be seen as provocative: Valdés is able to provide an assessment of the birth and growth of the Castilian vernacular that is

more historically accurate than the Italians' evaluation of their idiom. Though wrong in his belief that classical Greek was an important substratum of Latin in the Iberian peninsula, Valdés nevertheless formulates a theory on the role and decoding of the linguistic substrata.

Juan M. Lope Blanch considers the *Osservazioni della Lingua Castigliana* by Giovanni Miranda (1566) to be the best pedagogical grammar of Spanish of its time. Since it served as a model to French, English and German grammarians, it was important well beyond Italy. It was essentially a practical teaching work, but one finds some theoretical observations on parts of speech as well as on certain peculiarities of Castilian grammar and usage. The *Grammatica Audax* by Juan Caramuel y Lobkowitz, in contrast, is an approach to grammar that looks for the universal bases underlying the general mechanisms of language, independent of their occurrence in any particular language. It can be seen as anticipating generative grammar in its use of certain explanatory mechanisms. The paper written by María Dolores Martínez Gavilán is intended to contribute to a deeper understanding of the work by considering it against the background of its own time, in which the encyclopaedic ideal and the unitary concept of knowledge were the main focus.

The second part, devoted to the 18th century, begins with a paper in which Brigitte Lépinette analyses six French grammars published in Spain in the first half of the 18th century. After describing their treatment of phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax, the changes that took place in French pedagogical grammar are emphasised. The approach became more specifically contrastive. Hans-Josef Niederehe studies the position of Spanish grammatography between tradition and reorientation. He describes a tradition of monolingual grammars which reflect contemporary European grammatical discussions, and he shows how the *Gramática de la lengua castellana* of the Spanish Royal Academy develops a logical approach to grammatical description even further. The influence of the Port-Royal grammar nevertheless seems to be a more complicated matter. The importance of Sanctius's *Minerva* for the Port-Royal grammarians, which is incontestable, would need further discussion. The grammar of San Pedro was certainly inspired by French Rationalism, not by the *Grammaire Générale* but by the new methods of language teaching (*el nuevo método de Port-Royal*, p. 186) developed by Lancelot.

María José Martínez Alcalde focusses on the period that follows the works of Gonzalo Correas and ends with the publication of the grammar of the Spanish Royal Academy (1640-177), the "pre-academic" period. There have been many interesting proposals of solutions to grammatical problems in the work of this period. Two different approaches, the ones of San Pedro to which the introduction of innovations is attributed, and the one of Martínez Gayoso, a less interesting traditional approach, are studied in their mutual influence. The

classification of the so-called indefinite articles has been discussed earlier and in a clearer manner by Martínez Gayoso. However, it is in a later pre-academic grammar by Salvador Puig (1770) where one finds the most exhaustive treatment of the subject.

Margarita Lliteras studies the role of empirical facts in the development of Spanish grammaticography. Renaissance grammarians did not derive the authority of their texts from the language of the literary canon, but from the transfer of the rules of Latin grammar into Spanish. During the 18th century, descriptivism resulted in an increase in the importance of syntax, and Enlightenment grammars appeared based on a literary corpus of a previous (non-contemporary) period. Spanish descriptive grammars did not appear until the several editions (1831-1847) of Vicente Salvá, which achieved a high degree of specialisation in grammar, considered a sign of advancement. The discussion of the universal character of the French language in 18th-century French grammars for Spaniards and French-Spanish dictionaries published before 1815 is the subject of Manuel Bruña Cuevas's contribution. He argues that the enthusiasm expressed by authors about the superiority of French over all other languages varies depending on nationality and place of publication.

The third part, dedicated to the 19th and 20th centuries, consists of six articles. Manuel Breva-Claramonte considers data collection and data analysis in Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro as laying the foundation for modern linguistic typology. Using information from exiled Jesuits, Hervás had compiled data from 350 languages, and he wanted to undertake a descriptive study of their *artificio*, their pronunciation, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary for the purpose of cataloguing, setting up family groups, and revising the history of nations. Emilio Ridruejo argues that the earliest and most important of the works responsible for the introduction of French grammatical philosophy in Spain is the *Principios de gramática general* (1835) by José Gómez Hermosilla. The application of his theory to descriptive grammars required adapting both the theory and the description to achieve a reasonable balance between universal and language-specific aspects. Grammars influenced by Hermosilla show innovations which produced a deictic interpretation of articles, possessives and demonstratives and will affect the theory of verb tenses, as well as the definitions of prepositions and conjunctions and the classification of sentences. One of these grammars, the *Nueva gramática de la lengua castellana* (1839) is studied by Marina Maquieira. She analyses the structure of Noboa's work and aims to show how it constitutes a unified text combining different aspects, of which the most striking is syntax.

Linguistic studies of Galician are the subject of Mauro Fernandez's article. Since the tradition of writing in that language had been interrupted

towards the end of the 15th century, its later discovery required certain decisions on what the model for "good Galician" would be. A close examination of prefaces and introductions to grammars and other relevant texts shows a clear preference for the Galician spoken by the people, in all its diversity.

Joaquín Mesa deals with the work of the Spanish polygraph Eduardo Benot and strives to explain Benot's choice of concepts (system, sign, illocutionary function) from a modern functional and pragmatic perspective. The similarity between Benot and modern language philosophers like Grice, the author maintains, is not merely one of terminology, but of the quite similar treatment of ideas.

The only article on historical linguistics is contributed by José del Valle and deals with Ramón Menéndez Pidal's theoretical approach to the history of language. The author claims that the Spanish philologist's accomplishment did not occur in a social vacuum. Menéndez Pidal lived in a period in which the construction of the Spanish nation was threatened by centrifugal forces (e.g. the articulation of Basque, Catalan and Galician nationalisms) that challenged Spain's unitary political and cultural identity. In this socio-political landscape, Menéndez Pidal uses the neogrammarian model of convergence and the developed integrative reworking of the phonetic law, converting it into a means by which to perceive the unity underlying dialectal variation.

The fourth part, dedicated to Hispano-America, consists of only three contributions. Barry L. Velleman asserts that Domingo Faustino Sarmiento desired a different language for America, noting that linguistic change was a symptom of cultural advancement. The writings surveyed are principally those of the period 1841-1843, when Sarmiento was involved in polemics, promoted in part by the controversy of whether or not to break with Spanish models. Enrique Obediente and Francesco d'Introno analyse two aspects of Andrés Bello's grammatical thought, its relation to the British empiricists and its similarity with generative grammar. From the empiricists Bello derives the idea that there is no innate universal grammar with rules present in all languages. From this he also deduces his concept of language as an independent system of arbitrary and conventional signs. The author argues that, in his grammatical analysis, Bello uses concepts that are reminiscent of generative grammar, for example the notion of an underlying proposition comparable to that of deep structure. But he concludes that the major difference to Chomsky consists in Bello's assuming language to be learned through a symbolic system.

The final paper by María Ángeles Álvarez Martínez discusses Rudolf Lenz and his contribution to grammar and lexicography. He was responsible for

the spreading of the teachings of the German school of philology in South America, which was analogous and simultaneous to the work carried out by Menéndez Pidal in Spain.

The volume contains the addresses of all contributors, an index of biographical names as well as an index of subjects and terms. There are detailed English summaries of all the contributions written in Spanish or French, and Spanish summaries of the papers written in English. Unfortunately, there are some misprints in the articles as well in the English abstracts.

Of course, the volume does not achieve a homogeneous picture of the history of linguistics in Spain. While some major representatives are treated extensively, others are lacking. In some cases, authors present conflicting opinions on important questions, for example the influence of Rationalism in Spain. While some contributions give a very useful analysis on the basis of text studies, some authors do not substantiate their conclusions or statements by including discussions of particular works. Some authors try to explain the linguistic theories using ideological and social-political conditions, others discuss them without such implications. Some authors use parallels to modern thought, the majority prefer historical explanation and describing historical background. But the volume is worth reading even for non-specialists on linguistics in Spain. It shows the importance of authors who have been neglected in the European historiography of linguistics and whose ideas are fruitful and suggestive.

Gerda Hassler, Potsdam
hassler@rz.uni-potsdam.de

Nils Langer***Linguistic Purism in Action. How auxiliary 'tun' was stigmatized in Early New High German***

Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter, 2001.

[*Studia Linguistica Germanica*, 30]. xii + 312 pp. ISBN 3-11-017024-8.

Sentences like *Die Katze tut die Maus gleich fressen, Tust du mir jetzt helfen?, Ich tät' dir schon helfen, wenn ich Zeit hätte*, though frequently encountered, especially in speech, are generally rejected by handbooks on modern German grammar on the grounds that the insertion of *tun* is superfluous: standard German demands *Die Katze frißt die Maus gleich, Hilfst du mir jetzt?, Ich würde dir schon helfen, wenn ich Zeit hätte*, etc. In this excellent study, Nils Langer investigates the origin of the stigmatization of periphrastic *tun* by grammarians.

The study comprises two main parts. The first examines the distribution of auxiliary *tun* and its cognates in the West Germanic languages: Frisian, Early and Modern Dutch, Early and Modern English, Low German, Old, Middle and Early New High German, and modern German dialects. In English, of course, *do* has become a marker for negation, questions and emphasis. In Dutch, on the other hand, periphrastic *doen*, in so far as it occurs (e.g. *Hij doet de hele dag stofzuigen* rather than *Hij zuigt de hele dag stof* 'he spends the whole day Hoovering'), is stigmatized, being associated with less well-educated and younger people (especially children). As far as German is concerned, Langer shows that whereas the old causative use of *tun*, as in OHG *Ih tuon ivvuih uesan manno fiscara* 'I will make you fishers of men' (Matthew 4, 19), gradually died out in the later Middle Ages (as indeed it did in English), the periphrastic use emerged in the first half of the fourteenth century, spreading to all dialect areas. The pattern of functions of *tun* in modern German dialects, which Langer surveys on the basis of the available dialect grammars and dictionaries (with all their shortcomings), is shown to be complex: 'It occurs most prominently in subjunctives, but other uses, as a support or catalyst to shift the focus pattern of the clause or to realise certain aspectual interpretation[s], have been attested and appear to be very common' (p. 57). In contrast with the dialects, however, the modern standard language restricts *tun*-periphrasis to constructions like *Essen tue ich schon immer am Liebsten* (V-topicalization), other usages being stigmatized as colloquial or regional. To determine how the contrast between the polyfunctionality of periphrastic *tun* in Early New High

German (ENHG) and in the modern dialects and the restricted usage in the modern standard language developed, Langer has analysed what may be fairly considered a statistically valid corpus of 127 ENHG texts selected from the Heidelberg corpus of ca. 1000 texts, compiled by Oskar Reichmann to serve as the basis for the *Frühneuhochdeutsches Wörterbuch* (Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter, in progress). The sample covers four centuries (14th–17th), six large dialect areas (here called Northern German; West and East Central German; West, North and East Upper German), and seven text types (didactic, legal, literary, devotional, scientific, theological, chronicle). Langer shows that the claims made in most of the earlier secondary literature, that the *tun*-periphrasis is largely characteristic of southern German dialects, common in literary texts but particularly rare in other text types, and was declining by the seventeenth century, are simply not borne out by his analysis. The primary data from the corpus is set out in full in an appendix on pp. 225–262, but in the body of the book Langer limits himself to discussion of selected examples to test whether those functions of *tun* postulated by the secondary literature – tense (past, present), mood (subjunctive, imperative), focus (emphasis, theme–rheme) and aspect (durativity, habituality) – can actually be verified. Overall it is shown that analysis of ENHG usage in fact sheds no light on the reasons why *tun*-periphrasis came to be considered ungrammatical in modern standard German.

Consequently, the second part of the study looks for another explanation. The thesis is that the reason for the stigmatization of *tun* has to be sought in the prescriptive comments made by Early Modern grammarians. In order to set the scene for the discussion of this topic, Langer reviews the development and current state of thinking regarding the emergence of Standard German – students will find this succinct account (pp. 99–107) of what is acknowledged to be a very complex topic extremely helpful. He then shows, with illuminating quotations, that there has hitherto been no agreement among scholars on the question of the degree of influence exerted by grammarians in shaping the standard: while some have denied it, others have accepted that grammarians played some role in this. Langer reviews the debate in the Early Modern period among grammarians about what constituted “correct” German (this is another section, pp. 107–123, that our students will find most helpful, not least for its clarity). Before looking at what the grammarians actually had to say about periphrastic *tun* specifically, he draws attention to two other constructions with a long history, which are now also stigmatized as “ungrammatical”: multiple negation, and the double perfect (e.g. *ich habe gegessen gehabt*, rather than *ich habe gegessen* ‘I have eaten’, ‘I ate’) and asks whether all three come to be stigmatized in the same way and whether there is any evidence that such stigmatization results from the prescriptive comments of grammarians. To this end he now analyses a corpus of 139 grammatical works, dating from 1531

(Fabian Frangk's *Cantzley vnd Titel büchlein*) to 1849 (Heyse's *Handwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*). The investigation shows that whereas the early grammarians recognised double negatives as emphasizing or strengthening the negative force, their mid-eighteenth-century successors condemned the construction on the basis of a rationalist objection to superfluous elements and semantic redundancy. As for the double perfect, though it is early (1574) recognised as being a south German regionalism and is said to be 'best avoided' already in 1681, it is only in the mid-eighteenth century, with Gottsched and Aichinger, that rationalist thinking rejects it as semantically redundant. Finally, with regard to *tun*-periphrasis, it appears that the stigmatization develops in stages: although the first negative comment occurs very early (1550 with Erasmus Alberus), it is from 1640 onwards that arbiters of poetry such as Philipp von Zesen and, a little later, men like Andreas Tscherning and Kaspar Stieler, who declare it to be undesirable, the final denigration of the construction being achieved through later grammarians like Johann Bödiker, Gottsched, Aichinger and Adelung. Langer remarks (p. 216) that stigmatization of these constructions is virtually confined to theoretical texts, which raises the question of how the recommendations of the theoretical linguists were actually transmitted to the writers of practical language manuals. One avenue, as I have myself suggested,¹ is to examine how far German printers' manuals took note of eighteenth-century grammarians and, further, to investigate the extent to which their recommendations, thus transmitted, were actually implemented in printing-house practice. Such handbooks arguably had a formative role to play in the publishing industry and hence potentially had a wide impact on literacy generally. Langer himself touches upon 'the use of prescriptive grammars by editors in publishing houses and writers of books' (p. 223) as something still to be explored, as well as the use of grammars in schools and recommendations in grammars designed for the use of foreigners.

Although the stigmatization of periphrastic *tun*, multiple negation and the double perfect may have proceeded differently in detail, overall Langer has neatly demonstrated the influence of early prescriptive grammarians and their importance for the development of standard modern German. But as he notes: the 'effectiveness of prescriptive grammarians cannot be seen as a simple yes / no development: instead, a complex number of factors were involved' (p. 222).

This book, which began life as a University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne Ph.D. thesis, supervised by Dr Jonathan West, is one of which the author can be justifiably proud. It is a distinguished piece of research making a valuable contribution to the study of the role of prescriptive grammars. It is lucidly

¹ John L. Flood 1996, 'Gottsched, Adelung, and contemporary German printer's manuals.' In: Vivien Law and Werner Hüllen (eds), *Linguists and their Diversions. A Festschrift for R. H. Robins on His 75th Birthday*. (The Henry Sweet Society Studies in the History of Linguistics, 3.). Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 189-209.

written and, considering the range of sources covered, admirably concise. There is a comprehensive bibliography. A few minor misprints have been noted. All that is lacking is an index of names.

John L. Flood, *London*
John.Flood@sas.ac.uk

Wilkins, John

An Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language
[facsimile of 1668 edition]

Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 2002.

454 (+184) pp. ISBN 1 85506 941 5. £195.

Wilkins hoped that the 1668 publication of his *Essay towards a real character and a philosophical language* (with an appended dictionary compiled by William Lloyd) would serve to stimulate interest in artificial language planning, both in general circles and amongst the cognoscenti of the Royal Society and Church, so that an improved version of his scheme would finally come to be the international language of science, religion, learning and commerce. However, although his work was elaborately produced in folio, with the typographical efforts to make it easy on the eye matched only by the worldly ones to ensure it met the demands of its intended readers (that it cost 16 shillings, significantly on the pricey side of thrift, gives us some idea as to their identity), the *Essay's* publication history mirrors its linguistic fate. John Ray translated an expanded but unpublished Latin version of it (lost at some point after the mid-eighteenth century in Royal Society archives), excerpts appeared in Wilkins's collected works, but no reissue of the work happened until 1968, when Robin Alston's Scolar Press published its facsimile edition.

It is thus satisfying to note that, although the Scolar Press has long since gone the way of most small independent publishing houses, another facsimile edition of the *Essay* has been published rather sooner than 300 years after the last. The twentieth-century revival of interest in the history of linguistics in general and in Wilkins and the English artificial language movement in particular – in which members of the Henry Sweet Society have played such a large part – must be seen as the principal reason for this, but much credit indubitably attaches to Thoemmes for having the imagination and confidence to publish such a work. All scholars of linguistic thought in the seventeenth century must be grateful for their enterprise, especially at a time when the Scolar edition is virtually impossible to come by and when original editions not already in libraries retail from about three to four thousand pounds. £195 may not be cheap, but it is a good deal more affordable than this. In addition, Thoemmes have published many original and now long out of print works from the history of ideas, in either facsimile or reprinted form, a goodly number of which might interest HSS members: Bacon (Roger and Francis), Boyle, Horne

Tooke, Shaftesbury, Descartes, Locke, Monboddo and Murray, to name but several.

Better yet is Thoemmes's commitment to the printed page at a time when new technologies for the transmission of written information are widely seen, with all the usual promise of the new, to be easier and more economically viable than what had gone before. And it is not hard to see that there is something in this: we may worry about the reliability of information posted on the internet or encoded within a CD-rom, but as anyone who had any sort of dealings with publishers will know, just because something appears in print with one's name alongside it, it is no marker of either fixity or authenticity (the corrections in the paperback editions of works published by any reputable university press often make for diverting reading). Print itself was a cutting-edge technological medium at one stage, with authors committing their works to it concerned that the printer or his press would usurp them, or their intentions, or both. Of course, our distrust of this form of communication technology has been mitigated in time, and the same will almost certainly happen with the new media. However, Wilkins's work was not designed to be published electronically, but was a lavish folio book replete with diagrams, fold-out tables, page after page of an Aristotelian classification of noetic reality and a dictionary in which the presence or provenance of any English (or artificial) word could be quickly checked. None of this is immediately clear or conveniently accessible in electronic form: compare for example the facsimile available on the excellent Early English Books Online – <http://www.wlib.umi.com/eebo/search/basic>. Similar points could be made about any published books, but particularly those from eras different to our own; they are artefacts in their own right, whose medium (as with anything written exclusively for, say, the internet) has a decisive impact on the way their message is, and is designed to be, received. The effort of houses such as the Thoemmes Press in reproducing these works, if we seek to propagate the serious study of texts and their contexts, cannot thus be praised or supported enough.

As for this edition of the *Essay* itself, it is everything one could hope for, although I suspect it is fractionally smaller than the original folio. This seems, simply, to be a case of Thoemmes increasing their margins by decreasing those of the book – nothing excessively deleterious in that. Modern printing and imaging technology has if anything enhanced the quality of the print, which other than imparting a cleaner look to the text than one is perhaps used to, bears tangible fruit in that it makes Wilkins's references a good deal easier to read. Moreover, a good deal of time has been expended on the correct reproduction of the fold-out sheets, something it must have been tempting to shelve on grounds of cost alone.

MAY 2002

HENRY SWEET SOCIETY BULLETIN

Although enough on its own, this book has more than itself to recommend it; those HSS members interested in Wilkins and his milieu, however marginally, should buy it.

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

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(to 3 May 2002)

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

Dr David Cram
Jesus College
Oxford OX1 3DW

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

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

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

ETO, Hiroyuki

A Study of George J. Adler's Treatise Wilhelm von Humboldt's Linguistic Studies (1886): A New Chapter in the History of the Humboldt Reception in American Linguistics. [D.Litt. dissertation; Sophia University, Tokyo, 2001]. xi + 245 pp.

KATE, Lambert ten

Aenleiding tot de kennis van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche sprake (1723). Facsimile edition, with an introduction by Jan Noordegraaf and Marijke van der Wal. Alphen a/d Rijn: Canaletto/Repro Holland BV, 2001. 34 + 84 + 10 pp. ISBN 90 6469 766 3. Dfl 250,- / €115,00.

KATE, Lambert ten

Gemeenschap Tussen de Gothische Spraake En de Nederduytsche. Fotomechanische herdruck van het editie 1710. Facsimile edition, with an introduction by Igor van de Bilt and Jan

Noordegraaf. (Cahiers voor Taalkunde 19). Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU Amsterdam / Münster: Nodus, 2002. 1-34, 1-84. ISBN 3 89323 525 6.

PERIODICALS

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft. 11:2 (2001) and 12:1 (2002). ISSN 0939-2815.

Historiografia da Lingüística Brasileira. Boletim VI, 2001. Em Homenagem a Ataliba Teixeira de Castilho, por ocasião do seu 65^o aniversário. Universidade de São Paulo: Grupo de Estudos em Historiografia da Lingüística Brasileira.

Comenius. Bulletin de la Société canadienne d'études coméniennes / Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Comenian Studies. 9: double issue 1/2 (December 2001).

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

CRAM, David [with Gwenllian M. Awbery]
 "Francis Willughby's Catalogue of Welsh Words (1662)."
Cylchgrawn Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru / National Library of Wales Journal, 32.1 (2001), 1-55.

ISERMANN, Michael M.
 "Das Wilkins-Paradox und die neuplatonische Metaphysik der zwei Sprachen."
Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 12.1 (2002), 1-25.

KALTZ, Barbara
 "Zur Entwicklung der Wortbildungstheorie in der deutschen Grammatikographie 1750-1800."
Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 12.1 (2002), 27-47.

KNOBLOCH, Clemens
 "'Willige Vollstrecker?' oder: Geschichtsschreibung als Waffe und Werkzeug"
Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 11.2 (2001), 277-285.

KUHLMANN, Julia
 "'Sprachforum' (1955-1960). Zukunftweisendes oder nur kurzlebiges Projekt der

angewandten Sprachwissenschaft?"

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 12.1 (2002), 109-140.

LINN, Andrew Robert

"Professor Storm's Diary. Historical Fact – Historiographical Fiction."

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 11.2 (2001), 193-219.

McLELLAND, Nicola

"Schottelius, Language, Nature and Art: Buildings and Banyans"

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 12.1 (2002), 65-92.

NOORDEGRAF, Jan

"Amsterdamse kringen. Taalkunde en theologie rond 1700."

In *'Teeckenrijcke Woorden' voor Henk Duits: Opstellen over Literatuur, Toneel, Kunst en Religie, meest uit de zestiende en zeventiende Eeuw*, edited by Fred de Bree, Marijke Spies & Roel Zemel. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU Amsterdam / Münster: Nodus., (2002), pp.235-51.

NOORDEGRAF, Jan

"Historical linguistics in the Low Countries: Lambert ten Kate."

In *History of the Language Sciences/ Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften/ Histoire des Sciences du Langage*, edited by Sylvain Auroux, Konrad Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe & Kees Versteegh. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. Vol. 2 (2000), pp. 1115-1124.

NOORDEGRAF, Jan

"The man who knew too much: J.M. Hoogvliet as a teacher and theoretician of language."

In *Reflections on Language and Language Learning: In Honour of Arthur van Essen*, edited by Marcel Bax and Jan-Wouter Zwart. Amsterdam: Benjamins (2001 [2002]), pp.21-33.

SCHMITTER, Peter

"Das schriftliche Denkmal. Humboldts erweiterte Konzeption von Sprachwissenschaft als 'Prüfung' literarischer Texte".

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 11.2 (2001), 221-238 .

SCHMITTER, Peter

"Für eine 'gerechte' Sprache: Zu den feministischen Bemühungen um eine Reform des Deutschen".

Dogehak / Koreanische Zeitschrift für Deutsche Sprachwissenschaft 3 (2001), 5-34.

SCHMITTER, Peter

"The establishment of linguistics in Greece."

In *History of the Language Sciences/ Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften/ Histoire des Sciences du Langage*, edited by Sylvain Auroux, Konrad Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe & Kees Versteegh. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. Vol. 1 (2000), pp.345-366.

TANI, Ilaria

"Il problema della somiglianza nell' 'origine del linguaggio' – Sulzer, Tetens, Herder."

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 11.2 (2001), 239-276.

van der WAL, Marijke J.

"Lambert ten Kate and Eighteenth-Century Dutch Linguistics."

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 12.1 (2002), 49-63.

VARANI, Giovanna

"Der junge Leibniz und die *interpretatio*."

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft 12.1 (2002), 93-107.

VONK, Frank

"Karl Bühler's child psychology."

In *Reflections on Language and Language Learning: In Honour of Arthur van Essen*, edited by Marcel Bax and Jan-Wouter Zwart. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins. 47-60.

Organizers:

Nils Langer (nils.langer@bris.ac.uk)

Winifred Davies (wvd@aber.ac.uk)

Maria Barbara Lange (m.b.lange@bris.ac.uk)

**35th Conference of the Societas Linguistica Europea
Potsdam, 22–25 July 2002
“Rethinking Language and Mind”**

Information about this conference can be found in English, French, German and Spanish at the conference website:

http://www.uni-potsdam.de/u/dekanat_philfak1/sle/default.htm

**MA in Historical Language Studies
(Research Track), University of Sheffield**

The Department of English Language and Linguistics at the University of Sheffield has launched a new **MA in Historical Language Studies**, a course involving the history of linguistics, to begin in September 2002. It is intended for students who have successfully completed a first degree involving a significant component of Linguistics or English Language, and who are considering research in the History of Linguistics, Historical Linguistics, the History of English, or the areas of convergence between these subdisciplines. It involves a substantial research-training component, in which students will learn a range of subject-specific and generic research skills in preparation for study at PhD level. Although geared closely to those who are at least considering the PhD path, this MA in Historical Language Studies can function as a stand-alone qualification for those who simply want to investigate historical language issues in more detail than is typically possible at undergraduate level.

In the first semester the focus is on the subject areas which make up historical language study, and all students will take two from: **1) Issues in the History of Linguistics; 2) Issues in Historical Linguistics; and 3) Issues in the History of English.** In addition there will be two research-training modules in the first semester: **Research Support** and **Research Methods for Historical Language Studies.** The **Research Support** module will continue into the second semester as students begin work in earnest on their dissertations. In the second semester students will also choose one of three

subject-specific research skills modules, designed to support the dissertation research: 1) **Manuscript and Early Printed Material**; 2) **Corpora in Historical Language Studies**; or 3) **Interdisciplinary Historical Language Study**.

Further information is available as appropriate from the course director, Dr Andrew Linn, or from the graduate admissions secretary, Mrs Jackie Elkington, both at the Department of English Language and Linguistics, University of Sheffield, GB - Sheffield S10 2TN.

Treasurer's Interim Report 2001-02

Subscriptions

In considering the figures for subscription income it should be remembered that this is spread over three accounts: some payments are received in the Sterling account, some in the Dutch Euros account, and some in a US dollar account. Overall, subscription income has been maintained at roughly the same level as in preceding years. We are grateful to a number of members who have shown their commitment to the financial health of the Society by paying subscriptions for several years in advance.

A note on payments in Euros - jubilation at the introduction of the Euro and the simplifications it would bring to cross-border payments has proved to be premature, as this still incurs heavy bank charges, and cheques not drawn on a Dutch bank will not be processed, *even if* they are in Euros. Some members tried to circumvent that this year by sending me cash in the post. Unfortunately, however, it is very difficult indeed for me to bank money which reaches me in Ireland, since our accounts are in Britain and the Netherlands, and all banking is done by post. Members should also note that old-style Eurocheques are no longer accepted. Some members have suggested accepting payments by credit card, but the costs are prohibitive for a society of this size (€19 per month, plus a €127 joining fee), and such a scheme would involve significant additional administrative effort.

Sterling account

Subscription income totalled £1662, to which might be added most of the £30 received in donations since this sum is largely made up of receipts of subscriptions paid in November at old rates by members who have still not amended their standing orders.

The balance also includes the sums of £296.38 and £53.68 transferred respectively from a German account and a third British account, now closed.