

## EDITORIAL

**D**uring this last year, the news of the closure of the linguistics department at Durham and proposed closure of the department at UEA have worried the linguistic community. At such a time it is perhaps even more important to bring to light what linguists have done, to try to show that linguistics is an important subject. It is important that we make people aware of how intricately connected linguistics interests are with life as human beings. Furthermore, at a time when the European Union has accepted ten new memberstates, it is even more important than before that we continue to learn about language and languages, to facilitate the connections between these countries.

The history of linguistics has certainly also had its ups and downs but we must admit that there is rather a lot of interest in this field at the moment. However, we cannot only hope that history of linguistics continues to fascinate people. Every field needs to be looked after in order to stay healthy. There are many unexplored ideas in the history of linguistics which deserve to be investigated, many discussions concerning influence, for instance, not to mention the overall question of method, which we could enter into.

This issue offers a paper on one area which to some has hardly turned history yet (computational linguistics), but which makes it clear that also the near-history is important to study. The second paper this time concerns a figure in British linguistics who has received little attention despite his obvious importance to the subject of linguistics in Britain (Guest).

I hope that all of our readers will make sure that also the coming issues will include portrayals of 'hardly' historical topics and scholars, half-forgotten scholars and many more exciting topics. I also hope that you will take your copy of the bulletin and show it to your students and let them see that there are scholars who are devoted to giving history a face.

**Therese Lindström, *Sheffield***

## **The inkstand was in the pen, and other stories.**

*The controversy between Bar-Hillel and the Cambridge Language Research Unit about language formalization and machine translation.*

In the late 1950s, the first experiments in Machine Translation (hereafter MT) gave rise to a controversy which opposed two conceptions of language and language formalization. The first one, claimed by Yehoshua Bar-Hillel, was a mathematico-logical view of language. The second one, advocated by Margaret Masterman and the Cambridge Language Research Unit, was grounded on meaning in context. This argument was focussed on the feasibility of MT, and especially the translation of sentences like *the pen was in the box / the box was in the pen*, or *the pen was in the inkstand / the inkstand was in the pen*. Two reports help tracing this controversy: Bar-Hillel's 'The present status of Automatic Translation of Language' (1959, published in 1960) and the CLRU's *Essays on and in Machine Translation* (unpublished, 1959), dedicated to Bar-Hillel in response to his report.

Yehoshua Bar-Hillel (1915-1975) and Margaret Masterman (1910-1986) were both MT pioneers. Bar-Hillel, an Israeli philosopher and logician, obtained a scholarship in 1950 to do his PhD with Rudolf Carnap (1891-1970) at the University of Chicago. In 1951, he was engaged as a full-time MT researcher (the first in the world) by MIT, where he organized the first colloquium on MT in 1952. He is the author of two reports on Machine Translation in 1952 and 1959. The second, 'The present status of Automatic Translation of Language,' published in 1960, rested on the evaluation of the first twenty MT centers all over the world. It contained serious criticisms of MT, which led to its breakdown with the publication of the report of the Automatic Language Processing Advisory Committee (ALPAC) in 1966.

As early as 1952, Bar-Hillel was very critical of the feasibility of FAHQT (Full Automatic High Quality Translation) and advocated computer-aided translation instead. In addition, he was interested in the formalization of natural languages and its validation. He was especially convinced of the necessity of building an operational syntax for Machine Translation. Thus, in his 1953 paper entitled 'A Quasi-Arithmetical Notation for Syntactic Description', he presented a method of syntactic description combining Ajdukiewicz' and Harris's works, in which a simple rule of quasi-arithmetical character is enough to compute the syntactic character of any linguistic string in its context, and provided the constituent structure of any given sentence mechanically. It should be said that Bar-Hillel's approach was very new among linguists: his operational syntax was the first categorial grammar as well as the first automatized syntactic parser. After a debate with Noam Chomsky (b. 1928) about the place of logic in the study of language and especially the notion of transformation in the journal *Language* in 1954 and 1955, Bar-Hillel finally adopted Chomsky's transformational grammar which he thought should

supplement the immediate constituent model to deal with *any* sentences, and not only simple (kernel) sentences (see Appendix II of his 1960 report).

Masterman founded the Cambridge Language Research Unit (CLRU) in 1955 to start experiments in Machine Translation in Britain. The group gathered many different and remarkable figures: Masterman was a philosopher, one of Ludwig Wittgenstein's (1889-1951) pupils, and married to Richard Bevon Braithwaite (1900-1990), professor of Moral Philosophy. R[ichard] H[ook] Richens (1919-1984) was a biologist specialising in plant genetics. There also were linguists such as Martin Kay (b. 1935) and M[ichael] A[lexander] K[irkwood] Halliday (b.1925), and computer scientists, among them Yorick Wilks (b.1939), who became one of the first researchers on Natural Language Understanding. The originality of the Cambridge Unit is that it is the only MT group, besides the Russians, to develop a method of Machine Translation using intermediary language, that is a method founded on semantic representations common to every language.<sup>1</sup> The attention given to meaning transfer in Machine Translation was very uncommon among MT pioneers who most of them, in the context of American structuralism, thought morphology and syntax, and in no way semantics, were dominant in the process of MT. This was also Bar-Hillel's view: syntactic analysis must have priority over semantics in the process of machine translation.

The controversy which opposed Bar-Hillel to the CLRU concerned the feasibility of MT, and especially the reduction of semantic ambiguities which, it must be added, is still a tricky issue for Natural Language Processing. In Appendix III of his 1960 report, Bar-Hillel's main argument against FAHQT (Full Automatic High Quality Translation) was that human translators appealed to extra-linguistic knowledge which machines cannot mobilize. To demonstrate this point, he invented the sentence *the box was in the pen*, taken from the linguistic context *Little John was looking for his toy box. Finally he found it. The box was in the pen. John was very happy.*

Assume, for simplicity's sake, that *pen* in English has only the following two meanings: (1) a certain writing utensil, (2) an enclosure where small children can play. I now claim that no existing or imaginable program will enable an electronic computer to determine that the word *pen* in the given sentence within the given context has the second of the above meanings, whereas every reader with a sufficient knowledge of English will do this 'automatically'. (Bar-Hillel 1960: 159).

To solve this ambiguity, a context, whatever it is, a paragraph or even a whole book, is of no use. Common knowledge is needed concerning the relative sizes of writing pens, toy boxes and playpens. This kind of extra-linguistic knowledge, as well as inferences, is not at the disposal of computers and no programs for the elimination of polysemy can deal with this kind of

---

<sup>1</sup> On a survey of the CLRU's works, see Léon (2000).

ambiguity.<sup>2</sup> Discussing the methods of reducing semantic ambiguity, Bar-Hillel regarded the use of the immediate linguistic environment as limited, and vehemently criticizes the CLRU method associating this method with a thesaurus: 'Notice, e.g., that the very same – fictitious! – thesaurus approach for English-to-French translation that would correctly render *pen* by 'plume' in the sentence *The pen was in the inkstand* would incorrectly render *pen* by 'plume' in the sentence *The inkstand was in the pen.*' (Bar-Hillel 1960: 162).

The CLRU members had a version of Bar-Hillel's report as early as February 1959 and they replied to Bar-Hillel's criticisms in a report *Essays on and in Machine Translation by the Cambridge Language Research Unit, dedicated to Yehoshua Bar-Hillel.*<sup>3</sup> The 'pen was in the box' issue was dealt with in Essay ML91. It should be remembered that the very survival of the MT research group was at stake in this response.

Masterman claimed that semantics was fundamental in the process of machine translation. Thus the CLRU developed several intermediary language schemes from semantic representations common to every language.<sup>4</sup> One of them was based on thesaurus organization. Following Wittgenstein's view that a language is primarily a totality of contexts, not of sentences or words, and that the logical units for studying language should not be words nor propositions but word contexts, namely word uses, Masterman wrote:

The *Use* of a word is its whole field of meaning, its total 'spread'. Its usages, or main meanings in its most frequently found contexts, together make up its *Use*. (Masterman 1954: 209)

Word meaning is thus meaning in context. And context refers to word use and also to the linguistic environment, the text, where the word occurs.

Because of its structure, based on the classification of words according to a set of contexts, Masterman chose thesaurus organization as a means of creating a new intermediary language, 'a thesauric interlingua'. At first, while pointing out its drawbacks, such as incoherence and non-systematicity, the CLRU chose Roget's *Thesaurus*.

In Essay ML91, Appendix II, Wordley presented a way of translating the two sentences *The pen was in the inkstand* / *The inkstand was in the pen* by establishing the meaning of the word *pen* with the thesaurus method. The heads of the words, *pen*, *in* and *inkstand* in Roget's *Thesaurus* are the following:

---

<sup>2</sup> Only recently have Artificial Intelligence and Natural Language Understanding taken hold of this issue. See Winograd (1972) and his SHRDLU system for dealing with cubes of different sizes.

<sup>3</sup> An earlier discussion between Bar-Hillel and the CLRU members took place in November 1958 in Washington D. C., for the sake of Bar-Hillel's evaluation.

<sup>4</sup> Some of them, such as the universal language *Nude*, conceived by Richens, was directly inspired by 17th century universal language schemes: Timothy Bright's *Characterie* (1588), Wilkins' *Essay* (1668) and probably also by Dalgarno's *Ars Signorum* (1661), see Léon (2002).

*Pen*: region, inclosure, limit, writing, book, hindrance, restraint, prison  
*In*: existence, intrinsically, completeness, component, inclusion, contents, receptacle, nearness, contiguity, interiority, centrality, investment interjacency, inclosure, concavity, direction, approach, convergence, arrival, ingress, reception, insertion, qualification, meaning, method, importance, conduct, restraint, prison  
*Inkstand*: permanence, receptacle, writing.

The intersections between the three lists yield the following results:

|                                  |                              |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>pen</i> inter <i>in</i>       | inclosure, restraint, prison |
| <i>pen</i> inter <i>inkstand</i> | writing                      |
| <i>in</i> inter <i>inkstand</i>  | receptacle                   |

From these results, it may be observed that both the ‘plume’ and the ‘enclosure’ meanings are possible for both sentences. Thanks to a bracketing procedure, the analysis into immediate constituents and subject/predicate is carried out:

((the pen) / (is (in (the inkstand))))  
 ((the inkstand) / (is (in (the pen))))

In the first sentence *pen* cannot be intersected with any other constituents in the sentence. No solution can be obtained and all the meanings of *pen* are kept. A larger context would be needed to obtain the ‘plume’ meaning of *pen*. In the second sentence, *pen* can be intersected with *in* in the same constituent bracketing. This intersection restricts the meaning of *pen* to *inclosure*, *restraint*, and *prison*. The correct meaning of *pen* is then obtained.

Actually the issue went far beyond the reduction of semantic ambiguities in the MT process. More generally, in Essay ML91, named ‘Fictitious sentences in language’ responding to Bar-Hillel’s mocking expression ‘fictitious thesaurus’ (cf. quotation 1960: 162, above), Masterman pointed out a fundamental difference of views between Bar-Hillel’s philosophy of language and the CLRU’s. She reproached Bar-Hillel for having based his argumentation against FAHQMT on a transposition of common sentences in English (*the pen was in the box*, *the pen was in the inkstand*) into ‘trick’ ones (*the box was in the pen*, *the inkstand was in the pen*), in addition to having ignored the possibility of there being a thesaurus entry for the word *in*, and the existence of a clause-bracketing program in the thesaurus procedure.

By ‘trick sentences’, Masterman referred on the one hand to sentences which were inflicted upon any MT researchers by the press at that time. Thus ‘the whiskey was good but the meat had gone bad’ was said to be the machine translation into Russian of ‘the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak’; likewise ‘the invisible man is always insane’ was said to be the machine translation into Japanese of ‘out of sight, out of mind’. On the other hand, she named them

'trick sentences' because they were provided as counter-examples by Bar-Hillel without any context. She completely disagreed with him on the issue of context, which she regarded as crucial in the determination of word meaning. She pointed out that, while he provided a context for *the box was in the pen*, that is *Little John was looking for his toy box. Finally he found it. The box was in the pen. John was very happy, he gave no context for the inkstand was in the pen.*<sup>5</sup> Without context, these trick sentences fail under a human translatability test: it can be shown that an ordinary American or English speaker fails to understand them.

Masterman provided a set of conditions which should be required of a counter-example to the possibility of FAHQMT (ML91: 5). It must come out of an actually occurrent context; it must be shown accompanied by at least a page of that naturally occurrent context; it must pass a human translatability test. Since they embody new contexts, these sentences are not 'fictitious' in ordinary language.

For Masterman, the issue of the possibility of MT depended in the end on which was right of two conflicting philosophies of language: Carnap's *Logical Syntax of Language*, supported by Bar-Hillel, or Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations*. Both views of language, however, derived indirectly from Wittgenstein; the first from his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (1922), the second from his *Philosophical Investigations* (1953).

In her view, Bar-Hillel substituted 'normal order' sentences (the trick sentences) for normal English ones. Doing this, he adopted the mathematical conception of 'normal order' used in Combinatory Logic. These are well-formed formulae – that is, meaningful sentences which are permutations, or bracketings, or re-operations, or repetitions of sentences in normal English. All such operations presuppose a view of language according to which the ordering of the total set of all sentences within such a language (within combinatory English, but not within normal English) can be defined by using calculus.

In contrast, Masterman advocated a philosophy of ordinary language where 'sentences in normal English' are 'sentences in English as English is actually spoken'. She promoted a new philosophy of language which, because it derived both from *the Tractatus* and *the Investigations*, embodied fundamental and original logico-scientific insights about language which could be tested out on computers. The philosophical insights which provoked this practical application were, first, that a language is primarily a totality of contexts, not of sentences or words, and secondly, that contexts can only be distinguished from one another by using analogy.

These insights contributed to Masterman's context-based view of language and led to the idea of a thesauric interlingua method for MT. She borrowed from Wittgenstein's *Investigations* that a concept in language is like a Gestalt figure (one can 'see' it differently by looking at it under various aspects) and that each of these 'aspects' can be represented as a context. The

---

<sup>5</sup> Here, however, the use of the preterite in this sentence could already be considered a kind of context because it inserts the sentence in a story.

different contexts of a word, undefinable and indistinguishable by normal methods, can be distinguished from one another by giving the sentence in which each occurs an analogy. Some or all of what Wittgenstein said about rules, logical grammar, notations and language games, she said, can be found even by looking at perfectly ordinary language. Among the new philosophers' insights adopted by Masterman and the CLRU, were J[ohn] L[angshaw] Austin's (1911-1960). In 'How to talk: some simple ways' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, June 1953) Austin claimed that the primary patterns of how we actually talk (and think) are simpler and more fundamental than, and different from, grammatical pattern; following Austin again ('[A] plea for excuse' Presidential address to the Aristotelian Society *Proceedings* October 1956), Masterman assumed that dictionaries could be processed to produce closed circles of semantically analogous, rather than synonymous, definitions. In other words they could be used to generate thesaurus-like headwords.

It must be added that in order to process a thesauric interlingua method of MT, formalization was needed. Contexts were formalized by using lattices which, contrary to simple trees, allow inheritance of the concept properties from multiple supertypes. Thus the different contexts of a sentence were viewed as a sub-lattice of a thesaurus. However, for the CLRU, formalization did not come first. Language has to be considered as a whole, and mathematically formalizable only as a second step, whereas for Bar-Hillel it is the opposite: language is considered as mathematically formalizable *a priori*; and it is the researcher's task to discover how natural languages can be adapted to formalization.

Let us note, as a conclusion, that in spite of their elaborated answer, the CLRU did not succeed in convincing Bar-Hillel, and they suffered, as the other MT groups, from the shortage of funds which resulted from the ALPAC report. However, until Masterman's death in 1986, they continued with diverse projects in Natural Language Processing, such as information retrieval, artificial intelligence and machine-readable dictionaries.

## REFERENCES

- Bar-Hillel, Yehoshua. 1953. 'A Quasi-Arithmetical Notation for Syntactic Description.' *Language* **29**, 47-58.
- 1954. 'Logical syntax and semantics.' *Language* **30**, 230-237.
- 1960. 'The present status of Automatic Translation of Language.' In: Franz L. Alt (ed.), *Advances in Computers*, vol.1. New York and London: Academic Press, 91-141.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1955. 'Logical Syntax and Semantics. Their linguistic relevance.' *Language* **31**, 36-45.
- Language and Machines. Computers in translation and linguistics.* 1966. A report by the Automatic Language Processing Advisory Committee (ALPAC), National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council.
- Léon, Jacqueline. 2000. 'Traduction automatique et formalisation du langage. Les tentatives du Cambridge Language Research Unit (1955-1960).' In:

- Piet Desmet, Lieve Jooke, Peter Schmitter and Pierre Swiggers (eds.). *The History of Linguistics and Grammatical Praxis*. Louvain and Paris: Peeters, 369-394.
- 2002. 'From universal languages to intermediary languages in Machine Translation: the works of the Cambridge Language Research Unit (1955-1970).' Paper presented at *ICHoLS 9, 9th International Conference on the History of Language Sciences, Sao Paulo (Brazil), August 27-30 2002*.
- Masterman, Margaret, Arthur Frederick Parker-Rhodes, Karen Sparck-Jones, Martin Kay, E. B. May, Roger M. Needham, E. W. Bastin, C. Wordley, F. H. Ellis, Robin McKinnon Wood. 1959. *Essays on and in Machine Translation by the Cambridge Language Research Unit*, dedicated to Yehoshua Bar-Hillel, June 1959. Unpublished.
- 1959a. Fictitious sentences in language. In: *Essays on and in Machine Translation by the Cambridge Language Research Unit*. ML91. Unpublished
- Winograd, Terry. 1972. *Understanding Natural Language*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1922 [1961]. *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus*, (translated by D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness) London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- . 1953 [1963]. *Philosophische Untersuchungen / Philosophical Investigations*, (translated by G.E.M. Anscombe) Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wordley, C. 1959. 'Establishing the contextual meaning of words.' In: *Essays on and in Machine Translation by the Cambridge Language Research Unit*. ML91, *Appendix II*. Unpublished.

**Jacqueline Léon, Paris**  
[jacqueline.leon@linguist.jussieu.fr](mailto:jacqueline.leon@linguist.jussieu.fr)



## **Edwin Guest: Philologist, Historian, and Founder of the Philological Society of London**

In soliciting a response to the question ‘On whose initiative was the Philological Society of London founded in 1842?’ the majority of existing members, let alone anyone in the linguistics community at large, would be hard pushed to name Edwin Guest (1800-1880) as the driving force behind the second incarnation of the Society.<sup>6</sup> In considering the role of the Philological Society in nineteenth-century British linguistics, it is all too tempting to focus on the contributions made by larger-than-life individuals such as Alexander John Ellis (1814-1890), James Augustus Henry Murray (1837-1915), and Henry Sweet (1845-1912). Indeed this is a temptation to which I have partly succumbed myself. Analysis of the contribution of linguistic giants is essential in aiding our understanding of the philological milieu of the past. However, taking into account the part played by forgotten figures such as Edwin Guest not only discourages a natural tendency to accept the essentially narrow view that concentrates on mainstream figures in nineteenth-century British linguistics, but also allows us to ‘cultivate an ability to see things from another person’s point of view’ (Law 2003: 7). Since Guest’s standing has thus far been unattested in the history of linguistics literature, this article will attempt to make partial reparation for this oversight.

### *1. Background*

Born in 1800, Edwin Guest was the only surviving son of wealthy merchant and businessman Benjamin Guest of Edgbaston, Birmingham.<sup>7</sup> Edwin’s early childhood was essentially unremarkable for the son of an affluent family in nineteenth-century Britain, at least until the death of his mother. When Edwin’s mother died, his father was forced to take on sole responsibility for his son’s welfare and education. Curiously, due to Benjamin’s apparent failure to notice that his son had reached school-leaving age, Edwin was forced to remain at King Edward VI Grammar School in Birmingham for an additional two years beyond the age at which he was expected to leave. According to his wife, Anne Guest (née Ferguson), Edwin had been reluctant to draw his father’s attention to this predicament for reasons of deference, and since his mother was no longer alive there were no family members in whom young Edwin felt able to confide.<sup>8</sup> To the twenty-first-century ear, Anne Guest’s version of events may sound incongruous. Whether or not Edwin had acquainted his wife with the

---

<sup>6</sup> An earlier society of the same name was established at London University *ca* 1830 (*cf.* section 2).

<sup>7</sup> Benjamin Guest was a descendent of the Guest family of Row Heath in King’s Norton, Worcestershire. He owned factories in Newton Street and Edgbaston in Birmingham (*cf.* Wrightson 1818).

<sup>8</sup> *Cf.* Anne’s biographical account of her husband (dated 14 April 1882) in the *Prefatory Notice of Origines Celticae* (Guest 1883, I: vii-xv).

truth of the situation is anyone's guess. Perhaps Anne knew more than she was prepared to reveal, and she recounted the tale with her husband's good reputation in mind. Shielding one's husband from disrepute, even after his death, is an act any respectable wife of a nineteenth-century English gentleman would be expected to perform without question.

In one of the most revealing passages of Anne's considered biographical account of Guest, she concedes that had her husband more purposely directed his extended study period at Edward VI, '[...] he would have taken a higher degree than he did' (Guest 1883, I: vii-viii).<sup>9</sup> Anne also notes, however, that it was precisely due to this period of non-directed reading that Guest had successfully accumulated the '[...] varied knowledge' that served him so well in later years (*ibid.*, viii). Indeed, Guest's unscheduled deferment from university did not diminish his desire to learn. During the extra two years he spent at school, Guest read voraciously in preparation for the next step in his academic career. In due course, Edwin left Birmingham and embarked upon a lifelong association with Gonville and Caius College in Cambridge, where he matriculated in 1819. He was elected a Fellow of Caius in 1824, and became Master of the College in 1853. Guest held the latter position until tendering his resignation due to ill health a few weeks prior to his death in 1880.

Like many educated gentlemen philologists of the day, whose main profession was outside academia, Guest's initial interest in philology was purely recreational. He began his professional career not as a philologist, but as a practising barrister in Lincoln's Inn, the oldest of the four Inns of Court in London.<sup>10</sup> According to ancient tradition, all trainee barristers in Britain are obliged to join one of the Inns of Court (Lincoln's Inn, the Middle Temple, the Inner Temple, or Gray's Inn). In addition to passing each of their examinations, trainees are required to dine at their chosen Inn on twenty-four occasions before they are allowed to become fully qualified barristers. Guest was first admitted to Lincoln's Inn as a student member on 24 January 1822. Six years later, subsequent to fulfilling the aforementioned requirements of Lincoln's Inn, Guest was called to the bar on 18 June 1828 (*cf.* LIL MSS.). It was not customary to belong to one Inn and reside in another, but it did happen occasionally. The annual rent accounts for the Inner Temple (1849-1853) confirm that Guest did not reside in the chambers of Lincoln's Inn. He did, in fact, take residential chambers at number 6 (and later 4) King's Bench Walk in the Inner Temple, at a rental cost of £90 annually for one pair of first-floor chambers on the south side of the staircase (*cf.* ITA).<sup>11</sup>

In view of the fact that none of his paperwork survives in Lincoln's Inn Library, the exact size and nature, or indeed success, of Guest's practice is not easy to determine. However, it seems fairly certain that Guest was not an

<sup>9</sup> Guest graduated 11<sup>th</sup> Wrangler in 1824.

<sup>10</sup> The formal records of Lincoln's Inn, which date from 1422 to the present day, are contained in its 'Black Books'. Records for the three remaining Inns date from 1501 (Middle Temple), 1505 (Inner Temple), and 1569 (Gray's Inn).

<sup>11</sup> Inexplicably, the rent accounts for 1852-53 show that Guest's annual rent was reduced to £75.

equity draftsman or conveyancer. Had he been an equity draftsman, the task of drawing up the legal documents administered in the special courts that dealt with equity law would have fallen to Guest.<sup>12</sup> Likewise, had he been a conveyancer, Guest would have drafted the legal documents associated with the transferral of property from one owner to the other. Practitioners specialising in these proceedings are usually identified in the annual *Law Lists*.<sup>13</sup> Since Guest is not documented as such it seems that, unlike many nineteenth-century barristers of a scholarly bent (Holborn 2003), he did not specialise in drafting the written proceedings in the Court of Chancery. Safe in the knowledge that Guest practised for some years as a trial lawyer on the Midland Circuit (Marshall 1890: 318), and also at the Warwick and Lincoln sessions (*Law Times* 1880: 106), we may infer that he was more of an orator than a drafter.<sup>14</sup>

Since Guest was a barrister in one of the four Inns of Court with the exclusive right of admission to the bar, we might expect his name to appear regularly in the *English Reports*.<sup>15</sup> However, his name rarely appears and when it does it tends to be in connection with cases of relatively minor importance. For example, the *English Reports* for 1834 cite Guest as having acted for the defendant in the case of *Phipson v. Harvett*, which involved a petty dispute concerning non-payment of a 9d turnpike toll (*English Reports* 1166: 149). In the same year, Guest is cited as having acted for the plaintiff in the case of *Warr v. Jolly*, which pertained to the slanderous content of a statement issued by a dissenting minister (*English Reports* 1336: 172). If these two examples can be taken as representative of the types of legal case in which Guest was involved it is not unduly difficult to appreciate his increasing dissatisfaction with the law. Although he continued to hold residential chambers at King's Bench Walk until 1853,<sup>16</sup> by the mid-1830s Guest had ceased practising law entirely to concentrate fully on his academic pursuits. An important consequence of Guest's career change, aside from being able to focus on his own academic interests, was the significant role he played in founding the second Philological Society of London in 1842, a decade or so after the original Society had disbanded.

## 2. *The Original Philological Society of London (1830?)*

In his 1965 presidential address to the Linguistic Society of America, Charles Hockett (1916-2000) identified four key dates in the history of linguistics, each of which he associated with a major theoretical breakthrough in modern

---

<sup>12</sup> Equity law was developed alongside common law to remedy some of the flaws in the legal system.

<sup>13</sup> Guest makes his first appearance in the 1831 edition of the *Law Lists*.

<sup>14</sup> Guest's considerable abilities as a public speaker are referred to in Guest (1883: xvi-xxiv).

<sup>15</sup> A large number of the major law reports published before 1865 were subsequently reprinted in 176 volumes as the *English Reports*.

<sup>16</sup> The half-yearly account for December 1853-June 1854 describes Guest's former chambers as 'Empty' (cf. ITA).

linguistics (Hockett 1965: 185).<sup>17</sup> In adding the significant work of the Danish scholar Rasmus Kristian Rask (1787-1832), and that of the German philologists Franz Bopp (1791-1867) and Jacob (Ludwig Karl) Grimm (1785-1863) to this list of dates, Lyons (1999: 292) observes that the existing Philological Society was founded between the age of the founding fathers (initiated by Rask (1818 [1814]), Bopp (1816), and Grimm (1819-37)), and that of the classical period of Indo-European comparative linguistics associated with the work of the Neogrammarians, or *Junggrammatische Richtung*, in the mid-1870s (cf. Morpurgo Davies 1978; 1998). Given that the Philological Society was established in its present form in 1842, so soon after the philological successes of Bopp and Grimm in Germany, it is not surprising that the impetus behind its founding owed much to the historical-comparative spirit evident in early nineteenth-century German scholarship.<sup>18</sup> Since the initial impact of German linguistics in Britain can be traced back to the 1820s, it is perhaps even less surprising to discover that the Society was formed from the remnants of an earlier society of the same name established at London University ca 1830.

Recent editions of *Transactions of the Philological Society (TPhS)* cite 1830 as the year during which the original Society was formed.<sup>19</sup> Notwithstanding this official endorsement, in the opening paper of the Philological Society's Sesquicentennial Symposium in 1992, R. H. Robins (1921-2000) cast an element of doubt on this date of origin. Robins maintained that the first informal meetings held by the original Society were in fact taking place as early as 1828 (Robins 1992: 2). However, as Matthews (2003) observes, had Robins managed to locate a source for the earlier date it seems quite extraordinary that he made no efforts to change the date cited in *TPhS* at any time during his forty-year period of office (Honorary Secretary 1961-1988, President 1988-1992, President Emeritus 1992-2000). Moreover, none of the archival materials I have inspected to date has shed any light on a possible source for Robins's assertion. Of course, it is entirely possible that Robins simply made a mistake.

---

<sup>17</sup> The four significant breakthroughs identified by Hockett comprise the address delivered by Sir William Jones (1746-1794) to the Asiatic Society of Calcutta on 2 February 1786 (Jones 1786; Robins 1987); the appearance of 'Eine Ausnahme der ersten Lautverschiebung' (1875) by Karl Verner (1846-1896); the posthumous publication of *Cours de linguistique générale* (1916) by Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913); and Noam Chomsky's (b. 1928) *Syntactic Structures* (1957).

<sup>18</sup> Although in practice it is difficult to distinguish nineteenth-century 'historical linguistics' from 'comparative linguistics', towards the end of the twentieth century historical linguistics and comparativism were being treated as separate fields of inquiry (cf. Collinge 1995a: 195-202, Collinge 1995b: 203-212).

<sup>19</sup> There was also an earlier British Philological Society founded in 1792 under the patronage of Thomas Collingwood of St Edmund's Hall, Oxford. The Society was based at 1 Mary Street in Fitzroy Square, and held close ties with St Marylebone Grammar School in London (SMGS). SMGS, which was also known as the Philological School (or Old Philo) until London County Council took over in the early 1900s, is said to have owed its establishment to the Philological Society of 1792 (cf. PS Archives).

Nevertheless, the fact remains that the dates cited by Robins and *TPhS* do not concur. Thus it would seem imprudent to accept either 1828 or 1830 as absolute. Since Robins's '[...] knowledge of the Society was unparalleled' (Durrell 2003), we may be inclined to accept the earlier date of origin without question. However, we cannot disregard evidence to the contrary cited by Hicks in his *Short Memoir* (1893: 10) of Thomas Hewitt Key (1799-1875), which suggests that 1830 was the year of origin. Since Key was an instrumental figure in founding both the original and existing societies, Hicks's testimony for the later date is compelling. Perhaps we ought also to note that the original Philological Society first existed, albeit without official endorsement, under the guise of the 'Society for Philological Inquiries'. Given that the latter is said to have held its meetings at London University apparently no earlier than 1830 (Bellot 1929: 88), and Key was one of its founder members,<sup>20</sup> in the absence of opposing evidence Robins's date of 1828 seems the less plausible of the two suggested. In any case, given the heightened philological activity in London in the late 1820s and early 1830s amidst the founding of London University on 1 October 1826, and the establishment in 1828 of Rosen's chair in Oriental Languages and Key's chair in Latin, determining an exact date of origin is perhaps not as important as noting that the mere existence of the Society in its various forms is indicative of the growing philological atmosphere in London at the time.

Although Robins may have cast a shadow of doubt on the founding date of the original Philological Society, we need look no further than the present Society's *Proceedings* to establish the identity of the personalities actively involved in its formation. On 11 April 1851, at a meeting of the Society (est. 1842), Thomas Hewitt Key laid on the table the manuscript minutes book of a former Philological Society that had held a series of informal meetings at London University. Key presented the MS. Book '[...] in accordance with the wishes of the Members of that Society' (*PPhS* V, 1854: 61).<sup>21</sup> The members to whom Key was referring included himself, Henry Malden (1800-1876), and George Long (1800-1879). Although Long (Professor of Greek at University College 1828-31, and Latin 1842-46) was not elected to membership of the present Philological Society until 1860 (*cf. TPhS* 1861), like Key and Malden (Professor of Greek at London University 1831-76),<sup>22</sup> he was a former fellow of Trinity College Cambridge and, after succeeding Key as Professor of Latin at UCL in 1842, Long became a colleague of both men. At this early stage, Key *et al* were primarily interested in emulating the new comparative philology but they were also concerned with pursuing the 'Philological Illustration of the Classical Writers of Greece and Rome' (*PPhS* V, 1854: 61). These aims

---

<sup>20</sup> Key formed the Society for Philological Inquiries in conjunction with Friedrich August Rosen (1805-1837) and George Long (1800-1879).

<sup>21</sup> Since the MS. Book is no longer held in the Society's archives, its whereabouts is now unknown.

<sup>22</sup> London University changed its name to University College London (UCL) on 28 November 1836.

reflected an increasing desire in early nineteenth-century Britain to combine the old philology with the new.<sup>23</sup> Identifying the year in which the original Society held the last of its informal meetings has proved even more difficult than determining its year of origin. However, there appears to be no evidence to suggest it existed in any identifiable form beyond the mid-1830s.<sup>24</sup> For the next decade or so, the Philological Society essentially lay dormant.

### 3. *The Philological Society of 1842*

By the year 1842, the original burst of German-inspired scholarship in Britain had diminished considerably. Even John Mitchell Kemble (1807-1857), an avid proponent of Grimm's work, was beginning to express tentative reservations on the absolute authority of Grimm (*cf.* Kemble 1846). Concurrent with the founding of the Philological Society in 1842, the British scholars with whom it was associated had steadily begun to carve out a philological niche of their own, no longer as self-appointed representatives of continental scholarship but as scholars in their own right. A significant number of these British scholars held close ties with both societies. Doubt surrounding the birth and demise of the original Society aside, there is no doubt as to the identity of the driving force behind its reincarnation in 1842. On recounting Guest's involvement in founding the Society of 1842, Hensleigh Wedgwood (1803-1891) recalled that, although Key and Malden had actively assisted Guest in accomplishing his objectives, the 'formation of the Society was entirely [Guest's] doing' (Guest 1883, I: x).

We have already established that Guest removed his name from the books of Lincoln's Inn in the mid-1830s, subsequent to which he pursued an interest in philological and historical inquiry. Guest's academic endeavours soon became less a recreational pursuit and more a vocation. It was during the early months of 1842, whilst in the formative stage of his researches for *Origines Celticae* (1883), that Guest first put into practice his idea of forming a society for advancing philological inquiry. In view of the fact that Key and Malden liaised closely with Guest on his philological crusade almost from the outset, it seems highly probable that the latter had some knowledge of Key and Malden's involvement with the original Society, and conceivably therefore with the Society for Philological Inquiries. Hence, it is no surprise to find the names of Key and Malden listed on the back of a printed announcement issued in London on 9 May 1842. The printed statement, which bears the signature of Edwin Guest (Secretary *pro. tem.*), was an invitation for interested parties to attend a meeting '[...] on Wednesday the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, at One o'clock P.M., at the Rooms of the Statistical Society, No. 4, St. [*sic*] Martin's Place, for the

---

<sup>23</sup> The 'modern' philology of the 1870s onwards is now often referred to as the 'new philology'. The earlier 'new philology' under discussion here now tends to be called 'classical philology'. The term *new*, therefore, is relative to the period of usage.

<sup>24</sup> Malden wrote a paper for the original Society in 1836. The paper was subsequently delivered to its successor, the Philological Society of London, in 1854 (*cf.* Malden 1854).

purpose of forming a Philological Society' (cf. *PPhS* I, 1844: 1). The reverse side of this announcement comprises a list of gentlemen, 101 in total, who had 'expressed their desire to become members of the Philological Society' (*PPhS* I, 1844: 2-3). Although the Society of 1842 was formed largely on the initiative of Guest, Key and Malden were evidently involved in drawing up the rules for the new Society. The similarity between the aims of the 1842 Society (*PPhS* I, 1844: i) and those of the original Society of the 1830s (cf. *PPhS* V, 1854: 61) is striking.

When launched, both societies had intended to combine classical and new philology. The original Society was primarily, though not solely, interested in the pursuit of comparative philology. The aims of the 1842 Society remain essentially unchanged from the previous Society's in that they propose to maintain the established tradition of investigating the 'Philological Illustration of the Classical Writers of Greece and Rome' (*PPhS* I, 1844: i). The 1842 Rules for Government also state the main objectives of the Society as being '[...] the investigation of the Structure, the Affinities, and the History of Languages' (*ibid.*). Clearly, the new Society intended from the outset to incorporate a similar but extended set of objectives to the old. The Society's intention to incorporate old and new philology may have been unusual at the time (Aarsleff 1983: 213). However, in observing the names featured both on the original list of prospective members (cf. *PPhS* I, 1844: 2-3) and the first official membership list (*PPhS* I, 25 November 1842, No. 1, 1844), and in considering the fields of inquiry with which they are most associated, it does not seem altogether unusual that the Society had in mind this dual purpose. If anything, these membership lists indicate that the stated objectives adequately and justly reflected the interests of both the old school and the new.

Subsequently, an issue of *The Athenaeum* (28 May 1842, 463) carried a notice stating that the preliminary meeting had been held as planned with Connop Thirlwall (1797-1875), Bishop of St David's, in the chair (Co-Editor of *Philological Museum* 1831-33, and President of the Philological Society 1842-69). The same issue stated that a further outcome of the meeting in May was an agreement between those present that the proposed Society, in addition to undertaking its own classical and new philological work, would endeavour to present reports '[...] upon the recent progress and present condition of the study of the Structure, Affinities, and History of Languages in other countries' (*ibid.*). Interestingly, the intention to report on philological progress elsewhere was omitted from the final version of the Rules circulated at the first official meeting on 25 November 1842. As it was, reports on philological developments in other countries were rarely read before the Society, although works undertaken by scholars on the continent deemed worthy of mention were routinely laid on the table at meetings of Council.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> For example, at a meeting held on 26 May 1843, with the Rev. William Jenkins Rees (1772-1855) in the chair, Bopp's *Über die Verwandtschaft der malayisch-polynesischen Sprachen mit den indisch-europäischen* (1841) was laid on the table (cf. *PPhS* I, 1844), and at the opening of a later meeting held on 16 January 1846 (*PPhS* II, 1846, No. 40, x) Lord

During the six-month period between the initial meeting held on 18 May 1842 and the first official meeting of Council held on 25 November in the same year, the Society's membership list had doubled in size from 101 to 203. The revised Rules for Government no longer specified an intention on the Society's part to report upon the progress of the study of languages in other countries (*PPhS I*, 1844: i-v). In any case, the number of homegrown papers presented to the Society was sufficiently high to fill the pages of its journal without the need to report explicitly on developments made elsewhere. In her contribution to the Sesquicentennial Symposium, Anna Davies observed that the Society had initially shown little interest in the contemporary tradition of comparative philology established on the continent in the early nineteenth century (Morpurgo Davies 1992). She notes that from Bopp and Grimm the British philologists had accepted '[...] the techniques but not the identification of the study of language with the comparative/historical method' (1992: 4).

It is true that following its inception in 1842, and for the first two decades at least, the Society was more concerned with classical philology, etymology, investigation of the various forms and dialects of English, and non Indo-European ethnographical philology than it was in the development or explicit emulation of continental philology. However, the continental tradition remained firmly ensconced in the background of the Society's dealings throughout much of the nineteenth century. Davies accurately observes that the Society had demonstrated a desire to maintain links with German philology (1992: 3). This is especially true of the early years. Both Bopp and Grimm can be counted amongst the elite list of German scholars elected to honorary membership status (*cf. PPhS I*, No. 3 & No. 5, 1844).<sup>26</sup> However, less obvious links can be found upon close inspection of the papers read to the Society during its formative years. Many papers, particularly those concerned with establishing genetic relationships between the Indo-European languages, make specific reference to work undertaken by Rask, Bopp, or Grimm. Although these references frequently appear in support of the continental scholars' findings (e.g. Key 1846), the minority view is increasingly voiced at variance with them (e.g. Key 1863; Guest *cf.* section 4).

There is some truth in Aarsleff's statement that the 'Philological Society did not create a Forum for the new philology in England [...]', but perhaps there is less truth in his assertion that '[...] the most striking fact about the Society's work during the first twenty years is the virtual absence of non-English, Germanic philology' (1983: 221). In taking only a passing glance at the titles of papers read to the Society during the first twenty years, one might

---

Francis Egerton (1800-1857) presented Bopp's *A Comparative Grammar of the Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German and Slavonic Languages* (London 1845, transl. by the Orientalist and Diplomat Lieutenant Edward Backhouse Eastwick (1814-1883)).

<sup>26</sup> *Cf. PPhS I*, No. 3 (27 January 1843) for the announcement that letters had been received from Grimm and Bopp '[...] expressing the interest they felt in the Society', and *cf. PPhS I*, No. 5 for the meeting (24 February 1843) at which Grimm and Bopp were proposed for election.



easily be left with the impression that the members had all but abandoned an interest in the continental tradition, particularly with respect to the 'non-English' Indo-European (IE) languages. Nevertheless, numerous attempts were made to establish relationships between English and cognate forms in various other IE languages; an endeavour which is by definition a trait associated with comparative scholarship on the continent. However, whilst the initial momentum behind the founding of the Philological Society owed a debt to the comparative-historical background of the day it would seem that the health of the Society, in the beginning at least, was not as reliant upon the progress of continental philology as had initially been anticipated.

#### *4. Guest and the Philological Society*

In view of the fact that the formation of the 1842 Society was the brainchild of Guest, it seems only fitting that he should have presented one of its first papers. Accordingly, at an early meeting of the Society held on 9 December 1842, Guest delivered the first paper of many which successfully combined his two favourite topics of Roman-British history and philology ('On certain Welsh Names of Places preserved in English Compounds' (Guest 1844a)). The paper comprises a discussion of the names with which the Welsh race of Worcestershire was identified by the Romans and Anglo-Saxons. Although unremarkable in content, the paper indicates that for Guest philology and history are inextricably linked. By the time he founded the Society, in addition to making known his interest in the Welsh language, Guest was sufficiently well acquainted with Old English (OE) to make it the central theme in the majority of papers he was to read during his period of office (1842-53).

Kemble and Benjamin Thorpe (1782-1870) have been credited with leading the advancement of English philology in the 1830s (Aarsleff 1983: 212). Philologists of note educated both Kemble and Thorpe whereas Guest was entirely self-taught in the art of Anglo-Saxon scholarship. Kemble worked with Grimm in Göttingen for a year (1831), and Thorpe studied under Rask in Copenhagen for four years (1826-1830). Guest on the other hand had trained himself to read OE whilst examining unedited manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon poetry in preparation for his first book *English Rhythms* (1838). Kemble was a notorious spokesperson for the new philology, having spawned the impassioned debate between the scholars who were for and against the new philology in the 1830s (*cf.* Dickins 1939; Aarsleff 1983), and such was Thorpe's reputation that he was awarded a civil list pension in 1835. Guest must have seemed like a neophyte in comparison. Although Guest was never a contender for philological personality of the year, we ought at least to acknowledge the fact that many of Kemble and Thorpe's contemporaries equally respected Guest. Numerous colleagues sought the advice of Guest, and he was frequently sent OE manuscripts to examine (*cf.* Freeman papers; Osborn MS.). Whether or not his humble educational background was at the root of Guest's relative anonymity, the truth is that he never hungered for the level of recognition bestowed upon Kemble and Thorpe.

Intriguingly, Kemble held a regard for Guest that was not wholly reciprocated. Following a lengthy discussion with Guest at the fifth annual meeting of the Archaeological Institute (held at Salisbury in 1849), Kemble confessed to being envious of Guest's extensive knowledge of Welsh literature and the Welsh language. 'In other things', declared Kemble, 'I am not the least afraid of him; but there he beats me' (Guest 1883: xx-xxi). Guest did not hold his rival in such high esteem. He suspected Kemble of 'borrowing' ideas from Grimm, a practice of which Guest sorely disapproved. In one of his letters to Edward Freeman, Guest writes that he does not hold with the popular view on the etymology of *hlaford*, also adopted by Freeman, and insists that 'Kemble borrowed [the names of English topography] from Grimm' (Freeman papers: Ref. FAI/285/b).

Although Guest was known for being reticent to share his views when party to a heated philological debate, at least until he was certain of the views he held, his position on German philology was formed early in his philological career. Guest's reluctance to use contemporary terminology of German origin in his second Philological Society paper provides the first of many clues to suggest he is no more an enthusiast of the German philologists than he is of Kemble. Guest consistently uses the term 'Old English' to refer to the Middle English period and 'Anglo-Saxon' to refer to what is now commonly known as Old English (Guest 1844c). This he does even though the history of the language has by this time been divided into the three main periods *alt-* 'old' (OE), *mittel-* 'middle' (ME), and *neu-* 'new' or 'modern' (MnE) by the German philologists (Burrow and Turville-Petre 1996: 3). By the year 1877, Henry Sweet notes, in the sixth annual presidential address to the Philological Society, that the term 'Old English' is now generally preferred over 'Anglo-Saxon' by the majority of scholars, not just by himself and Professor March in England but also by Professor Zupitza in Germany (*TPhS 1877-78-79*, Vol. 17, 1879: 3). Unperturbed by these recent developments, Guest persists in using the established terminology to differentiate between the various stages of the English language throughout his lifetime.

Guest wittingly disregards German philology but he has a particular problem with Grimm, and he frequently expresses disapproval of Grimm's analyses of the English language and of his methods of comparison. Guest denounces Grimm's analysis of *hers* as a regular genitive of *her* (*Deutsche Grammatik*, I, 788) as 'quite untenable', on the basis that *hers* is in fact a 'double inflexion' (Guest 1844b, 10 March 1843, 69). Guest later protests that Grimm's 'imperfect acquaintance' with certain English idioms has led him '[...] into a serious error, which English writers have too hastily accepted' (Guest 1846a, 28 February 1845). Guest condemns Grimm further at a meeting on 28 November 1845 in a paper entitled 'On the Anomalous Verbs of the English Language' (Guest 1846b). The purpose of the paper is not to attack Grimm but to investigate the class of verbs divided by the Dutch scholar

Lambert ten Kate (1674-1731),<sup>27</sup> in contrast to those outlined by the Oxford scholar George Hickes (1642-1715).<sup>28</sup> However, before proceeding with his paper, Guest is careful to point out that ten Kate's analysis of Germanic verbs was subsequently 'adopted by the continental philologists' (*ibid.*). In much the same way as Guest is keen to ensure Kemble is not credited with having originated work that has already been carried out, he is always on hand to make sure the work of the German philologists is not needlessly glorified.

In comparing the present and past tenses of the verb *to come* in ME (1846b), Guest notes that the second person singular of the present tense occasionally takes *-st* instead of a 'vowel inflexion', as in *comst* 'come' and *herest* 'hear' (as does the second person singular of the indicative *herdest*, although the *-est* ending is gradually lost). Since the *-st* formation depends on laws that vary and are 'both obscure and difficult to investigate', no deductions can be drawn from the laws already proposed by philologists on the continent. As far as Guest is concerned, these 'laws' do not offer any formal proof compelling enough for him to espouse (*ibid.*). Aside from his reluctance to accept these laws without question, Guest is unimpressed that Grimm's name has been assigned to the laws first observed by Rask. Aggrievedly, Guest remarks that the laws now commonly ascribed to Grimm used to be called 'the laws of Rask' (Guest 1883 I: 345). Guest's main objective was to *further* philological inquiry rather than simply to repeat work already completed by others. This purpose is clear from Guest's response to William Whewell's (1794-1866) account of the defunct Cambridge Etymological Society (27 June 1851, *PPhS* V, 1854: 133). Guest comments on the importance of keeping a record of previous societies formed with the same or a similar set of objectives in mind, lest work already undertaken be repeated. Without such records, argues Guest, '[...] the history of English scholarship could hardly be considered as complete' (*ibid.*). To his credit, Guest saw little point in addressing questions that had already been sufficiently investigated, irrespective of whether the investigations had been carried out elsewhere or on his own doorstep.

Guest does not confine his criticisms to scholars of whom he disapproves. He has a disregard for inept editors and transcribers of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts which is almost equal to his growing dislike of Grimm. He repeatedly reproaches editors and contemporary scribes for the way they pare down the vernacular. 'Even [John] Milton's English has been corrected!' declares Guest in 'On the Ellipsis of the Verb in English Syntax' (Guest 1846c: 9). Although Guest did not give credit where he felt it was not due, he was not averse to giving himself the occasional pat on the back. In the 1830s, Guest

---

<sup>27</sup> Lambert ten Kate discovered that the stem vowels of the strong verbs in Germanic languages follow regular patterns of deviation (1710).

<sup>28</sup> Hickes wrote the first exposition in Britain of the structure of Old English, Gothic, Old Frisian, and Old Icelandic (1689). However, unlike ten Kate he did not make any formal comparisons between the languages or try to explain correspondences between the verb forms.

had argued that *wist* was not the preterite of the verb *wiss(e)*, as had been supposed, but the preterite of the verb *wit*. He claimed that *wiss(e)* was an adverb answering to the Germanic *gewiss* (Guest 1838: 430).<sup>29</sup> Over forty years later, Guest noted with pride that the ‘intrusive verb’ was gradually disappearing from the dictionaries and glossaries of Old English (Guest 1883: 353). However, he strongly objected to the fact that neither the editors nor the transcribers had bothered to thank him for ridding OE texts of such imprecision (*ibid.*)

The conviction that he was right once his mind had been settled was a character trait Guest shared with many gentlemen scholars of the day. It was precisely this level of determination that led Guest to organise the first meeting of the Society in 1842. Often when a venture of this sort is on its feet, the initial excitement fades away and the humdrum business of the daily routine takes over. Perhaps it was this *laissez-faire* attitude of the London scholars which, in some measure at least, led to the dissolution of the original Society in the 1830s.<sup>30</sup> The fact that Guest was able to keep up the momentum, when the initial commotion surrounding the 1842 Society had dwindled, is a credit to his tenacity. Guest had been a leading light in the Philological Society from its inception until the time he resigned the secretaryship on 27 May 1853. Throughout volumes I-VI of the *Proceedings* (1844-54), Guest’s name appears on the list of papers read at meetings more frequently than that of any other member. In addition to performing his secretarial duties, Guest managed to produce twenty-two papers during his eleven-year period of office.

Aside from the numerous contributions he made to the Society’s journal, Guest was an active participant in the discussions that followed the reading of any paper, and he was always ready to step into the breach when any member failed to produce his designated piece (Guest 1883: x). Guest’s ability to deliver an informed talk at short notice was recorded at a meeting held on 23 April 1847 (*PPhS* III, 1848, No. 58, 1). The Rev. Richard Garnett (1789-1850) in the chair announced that the evening’s paper had not been received ‘owing to the sudden illness of its author’. Guest swiftly volunteered to read the latter portion of a paper he had read at a previous meeting on 26 February 1847 (‘On the Elements of Language; their arrangement and their accidents’ (*cf.* Guest 1848a; 1848b; 1850)). There had not been sufficient time to engage in a lively discussion of the points he had raised on the earlier occasion. Consequently, Guest was most anxious to finish his paper.

In 1852, the same year Guest was nominated and elected Master of Gonville and Caius College, he became an honorary member of the Society of Antiquaries (SA). Given his interest in Roman-British history, Guest’s election to membership of the SA is entirely explicable. The rising generation of Saxonists in 1830s England, which was predominantly led by Kemble and

---

<sup>29</sup> The OE forms *wiss(e)* and *wist(e)* both appear in OE manuscripts as the preterite singular of *witan* ‘know’; *wit* regularly appears as the dual pronoun ‘we two’.

<sup>30</sup> Perhaps UCL’s financial problems, which eventually led to a number of resignations, also played a part in the Society’s dissolution (*cf.* Bellot 1929).

Thorpe, effectively represented the new continental scholarship. The older generation of Anglo-Saxon scholars, many of whom belonged to the SA, epitomized the time-honoured tradition of Anglo-Saxon scholarship that had developed throughout the previous three centuries. Although Guest was only forty-two years of age when he seized upon the initiative to form the Philological Society, in respect of his combined interest in philology and British history, he was very much a gentleman of the old school of philology rather than the new. Guest had never been an advocate of continental philology, and the historical approach of the SA corresponded to the old Saxonist establishment in many respects. In addition to satisfying his historical appetite in the 1850s and beyond, Guest revelled in fostering his archaeological interests. He was renowned for having delivered several outstanding talks on the history of Britain at meetings of the Archaeological Institute, notably 'The four great Boundary Dykes of Cambridgeshire, and the probable date of their construction', which he delivered at a meeting held at the Senate House in Cambridge on 5 July 1854 (Guest 1857).

It is noteworthy that the year in which Guest was admitted Doctor of Civil Law (D.C.L.) *ad eundem* at Oxford (7 June 1853) (*cf.* Foster 1887/1888), he was to read his final paper as Secretary of the Philological Society (Guest 1854a). Guest presented the paper at a meeting on 25 February 1853, a few months prior to his resignation from office in May. There were no fanfares announcing his impending departure, perhaps because no one knew this was to be Guest's final paper as Secretary, least of all Guest himself. In keeping with his notoriously composed character, Guest left his secretarial role behind with the minimum of fuss. Although he grazed in the Vice-Presidents' pasture until his death in 1880, there is no evidence to suggest that Guest had any say in the day-to-day running of the Society's affairs.<sup>31</sup> He may have stepped down from his secretarial duties owing to the demands on his time as Master of Caius (he was also Vice-Chancellor of the University 1854-55). Guest himself admitted that he had been '[...] driven from pillar to post – what with College meetings, [and] College and other examinations' (Freeman papers, Ref. FAI/7/285a). Perhaps his deepening interest in British history and archaeology had also diverted his attention. Regardless of the reasons for Guest's departure, the Philological Society continued to thrive in his absence under the joint secretaryship (1853-62) of Key and Frederick James Furnivall (1825-1910), and under the sole secretaryship of Furnivall (1862-1910).<sup>32</sup>

### 5. *Origines Celticae* (1883)

Evidently, Guest was kept busy by the formal duties he had to perform not only as Master of Caius but also in his role as a Justice of the Peace for Oxford (*cf.* Guest 1852) and Cambridge (*cf.* Guest 1854b), and by the various scholarly

---

<sup>31</sup> Guest is cited as a contributor to the Society's *New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* in Murray (1884: v).

<sup>32</sup> Key was Honorary Secretary from 1853 to 1862. Furnivall held the position from 1853 to 1910.

gatherings he chose to attend. Even so, in later years he began writing what was to become his pet project. The resulting two-volume work *Origines Celticae* (1883), edited by W. Stubbs (Regius Professor of History at Oxford) and the Rev. C. Deedes, was published both posthumously and incomplete. Guest had fully intended the work to be a complete history of Britain. His aim was to trace the first inhabitants of the island and chart the progress of subsequent populations from prehistoric times to the present day. Guest had hoped to accomplish this Herculean task via careful study of archaeological remains, geographical names and ancient monuments, and in the development of his own philological speculations. Although *Origines* is not a philological work as such, the detailed chapter on early language and letter changes (Vol. I, Ch. XI: 334) testifies that Guest had maintained a healthy interest in English philology.

In reflective mood, Guest recalls his own philological past and in doing so refers to the work of the German philologists. Guest has not changed his opinion on Grimm's account of letter changes at this point and, although in his earlier Philological Society papers the disregard he felt for Grimm was implicit, the views expressed in *Origines* (Vol. I) can leave the reader in no doubt as to his position. In quoting a passage from Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik* (1822 I: 584), Guest admits that Grimm's comparative analyses of the Greek, Gothic, and Old High German sound changes create 'a pretty formula'. Somewhat acerbically, however, he adds that as soon as the selected languages do not 'furnish us with the necessary letter changes' the selection is automatically widened by like-minded philologists, who then find 'representative languages whenever they find it convenient'. On the basis of such reasoning, argues Guest, 'there is no 'law' we may not establish' (1883, Vol. I: 345).

Guest also attacks Grimm for the omissions in his description of the sound changes in the Germanic (Gmc) series of obstruents (*cf.* Fig. 1); pointing out that the said 'law' does not account for the apparent exception to the rule concerning the medial *t*. The exception to which Guest refers is where the expected change from Proto-Indo-European (PIE) voiceless stop > Gmc voiceless fricative sometimes becomes Gmc voiced stop or voiced fricative (e.g. PIE \**bhrātēr* 'brother' > Gothic *brōþar*, medial \**t* > /θ/; but PIE \**pātēr* 'father' > Gothic *fadar*, medial /*t*/ > voiced /d/). However, Guest fails to take account of the most recent developments in linguistic science. He is apparently unaware of Verner's Law (1875), which states that the voiceless alveolar plosive [t] becomes voiced alveolar plosive [d] medially in Gmc words if it occurs between voiced segments and if it immediately precedes the original stressed syllable, but not if it follows it. Thus, since the stress was originally placed on the second syllable in PIE \**pātēr*, the voiceless dental fricative in Grimm's Law [θ] becomes voiced [ð] in Verner's Law, and subsequently the voiced alveolar stop [d] in the OE form *faeder*.

**(Fig. 1) Grimm's Law**

(a) voiceless stop > voiceless fricative

**PIE \*p t k > Gmc /f θ x/**

(b) voiced stop > voiceless stop

**PIE \*b d g > Gmc /p t k/**

(c) voiced aspirated stop > voiced stop

**PIE \*bh, dh, gh > Gmc /b d g/**

(McMahon 1994: 23)

In respect of the laws attributed to Grimm, the confusion for Guest partly derives from his failure to distinguish between sound change and orthographic change. He observes that the 'dental aspirate' has two sounds, one a 'whisper' and one a 'vocal sound' (both terms were originally coined by Guest in the 1840s; the term 'whisper' was adopted by many others including Henry Sweet).<sup>33</sup> Guest also notes that Grimm's formula does not account for the differences between the two sounds in the orthographic conventions exhibited in OE manuscripts (Guest 1883, Vol. I: 346). He maintains that OE manuscripts do not use the symbols *þ* 'thorn' or *ð* 'eth' (or *ðæt* as the Anglo-Saxons often referred to it) with any consistency, and that Grimm ought to have considered this fact. It is true that scribes of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts do not employ these symbols consistently, but this is partly because the distinctions appeared to be less significant in OE (Mitchell and Robinson 1992: 13). It would seem inadvisable, therefore, to base any hypotheses of sound change on inconsistent orthographic evidence alone.

Had he been aware of Verner's Law (1875), Guest would doubtless have noticed that a number of Verner's alternations are preserved in OE, such as the accent-shifted preterite plural and past participle of vocalic verbs (Quirk and Wrenn 1957: 127). A case in point is (class III strong verb) *weorðan* 'become' (preterite 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular *wearþ*, 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural *wurdon*, and past participle *geworden*), in which the stress was originally placed on the second syllable. This example shows that, unless affected by analogy, the preterite indicative and subjunctive (and the past participle) in cases where the original stress was placed after the affected consonant, demonstrate the change [θ>ð>d] outlined in Verner's Law. When Guest was in the throes of writing his swansong, he had not been actively involved with the Philological Society for almost thirty years. He had always taken great pleasure from reading widely and keeping abreast of developments in philology. However, during the last thirty years of his life, Guest's historical interests appear to have overshadowed his awareness of contemporary issues to such an extent that he failed to monitor the most recent linguistic developments, or at least to recognise their

---

<sup>33</sup> In 1868, Sweet described the voiceless consonants as 'breathed' (cf. Sweet 1869). Later he described a narrowing of the glottis without vibration as 'whisper', a narrowing of the whole glottis as 'weak whisper', and the closed glottis as 'strong whisper' (Sweet 1908, 19-21).

importance. In the midst of writing *Origines*, Guest was forced to resign his position as Master of Caius through ill health. He died a few weeks later on 23 November 1880.

Following his death, Guest's colleagues best remembered him for the 'combination of laborious study' and 'brilliant conjecture' with which he undertook his philological and historical works on the English language (Guest 1883, I: xxv). He was even favourably compared to the 'genius' of his greatest adversary, John Mitchell Kemble (*ibid.*, xix). Admittedly, Guest's name is not recorded in the Philological Society annals alongside nineteenth-century linguistic greats such as Ellis, Sweet, and Murray. Nonetheless, it is worth remembering that without his initiative the Society would not exist in its present form, if indeed it would exist at all. A few weeks after Guest's death, at a meeting held on Friday 3 December 1880, the President (Ellis) confirmed that the 'early success of the Society' was attributable solely to Guest's hard work (*cf.* Monthly Abstract of Proceedings, *TPhS 1880-81*, Vol. 18, 1881, 41). The Society continues to prosper in more or less the same format outlined by Guest over 160 years ago and, although he may not reasonably be credited with first having the idea to form such a society, he can certainly be documented as having successfully established what is now the oldest and most enduring learned linguistics society in Britain. Edwin Guest is no longer remembered for elucidating '[...] many obscure points in the history of the English and cognate tongues' (Guest 1883, I: xvii); but at the very least he ought to be remembered for the significant role he played in establishing the sound principles upon which the Philological Society conducted its business then, and conducts its business now.

## REFERENCES

- Aarsleff, H. 1983 [1967]. *The Study of Language in England 1780-1860*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Athenaeum, The*. 1842. 28 May 1842. London.
- Bellot, H. H. 1929. *University College, London, 1826-1926*. London: University of London Press.
- Bopp, F. 1816. *Über das Conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache in Vergleichung mit jenem der griechischen, lateinischen, persischen und germanischen Sprache* [English version 1820]. Frankfurt: Andreäische Buchhandlung.
- . 1841. *Über die Verwandtschaft der malayisch – polynesischen Sprachen mit den indisch – europäischen*. Berlin: Dümmler.
- . 1845 (transl.) *A Comparative Grammar of the Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German and Slavonic Languages* (translated by Edward Backhouse Eastwick). London: Madden and Malcolm.
- Burrow, J. A., and T. Turville-Petre 1996. *A Book of Middle English*. Second edition. Oxford and Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.



- Collinge, N. E. 1995a. 'History of Comparative Linguistics'. In: Koerner and Asher (eds) 1995, 195-202.
- . 1995b. 'History of Historical Linguistics'. In: Koerner and Asher (eds) 1995, 203-212.
- Dickins, B. 1939. 'John Mitchell Kemble and Old English Scholarship.' In: *Proceedings of the British Academy 1939*, 51-84. London: Humphrey Milford for the Oxford University Press.
- Durrell, M. 2003. Correspondence from Professor Martin Durrell to the author (9.i.2003).
- English Reports*. 1834. Edinburgh: W. Green & Son; London: Stevens & Sons.
- Foster, J. 1887/1888. *Alumni Oxonienses 1715-1886* (2 Vols). Oxford: Parker [Guest is entered in Vol. 2 (1888: 575)].
- Freeman papers. A series of letters (9 in total) from Edwin Guest to Edward A. Freeman [composed during Guest's periods of residence at Caius Lodge in Cambridge and Sandford Park in Oxfordshire. The letters are currently held in the John Rydlands Library, University of Manchester (Ref. Freeman papers, NRA 25956 Freeman)].
- Guest, E. 1838. *A History of English Rhythms* (2 Volumes). London: William Pickering.
- . 1844a. 'On certain Welsh Names of Places preserved in English Compounds.' *PPhS I* (1844): 9-12.
- . 1844b. 'On certain Inflexions of the Old-English Adjective.' *PPhS I* (1844), No. 6: 65.
- . 1844c. 'On English Pronouns Indeterminate.' *PPhS I* (1844), No. 6: 151.
- . 1846a. 'On the Use of the Collective Noun in English Syntax.' *PPhS II* (1846), No. 30: H.
- . 1846b. 'On the Anomalous Verbs of the English Language.' *PPhS II* (1846), No. 38: S/149.
- . 1846c. 'On the Ellipsis of the Verb in English Syntax.' *PPhS II* (1846), No. 26: 6.
- . 1848a. 'On the Elements of Language; their arrangement and their accidents.' *PPhS III* (1848): 31, 71.
- . 1848b. 'On the Elements of Language; their arrangement and their accidents (the Labials).' *PPhS III* (1848): 165, 187.
- . 1850. 'On the Elements of Language; their arrangement and their accidents.' *PPhS IV* (1850): 239, 261.
- . 1852. Sworn in as a JP for Oxford (Ref. C202/241/6) [Documents held in the National Archives at Kew].
- . 1854a. 'On the Etymology of the word *Stone-henge*.' *PPhS VI* (1854), No. 130: 31-35.
- . 1854b. Sworn in as a JP for Cambridge (Ref. C202/244/1) [Documents held in the National Archives at Kew].
- . 1857. 'The four great Boundary Dykes of Cambridgeshire, and the probable date of their construction.' *Journal of the Archeological Institute*. June 1857, London

- . 1883. *Origines Celticae (a fragment); and other contributions to the history of Britain.* (2 Volumes). London: Macmillan & Co.
- Grimm, J. 1819-37. *Deutsche Grammatik* (Vol. I: 1819/1922; Vol. II: 1826; Vol. III: 1831; Vol. IV: 1837). Göttingen: Dieterich. (Rev. by Scherer W. et al 1870-98 Bertelsmann, Berlin).
- Hickes, G. 1689. *Institutiones Grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae, et Moeso-Gothicae.* Oxoniae: E. Theatro Sheldoniano.
- Hicks, J. P. 1893. *T. Hewitt Key. A Short Memoir.* London [for private circulation only].
- Hockett, C. F. 1965. 'Sound Change.' *Language* 41, 185-204.
- Holborn, G. 2003. Correspondence from Guy Holborn (Lincoln's Inn Librarian) to the author (9.x.2003).
- ITA. Inner Temple Archives. Annual Rent Accounts for 1849, 1850, 1851, 1852, and 1853 (Reference CHA/10/6-7).
- Jones, W. 1786. 'On the Hindus. Third Anniversary Discourse to the Asiatic Society.' Repr. in Lehmann, W. F. (ed.) 1967. *A Reader in Nineteenth Century Historical Indo-European Linguistics.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indian University Press.
- Kemble, J. M. 1846. 'On the North-Anglian Dialect.' *PPhS* II (1846): 119, 131.
- Key, T. H. 1846. 'On the English Verb *do* and the Latin *da-re*, and on the Formation of the English Weak Perfects.' *PPhS* II (1846): 50.
- . 1863. 'The Sanskrit Language, as the basis of linguistic science, and the labours of the German school in that field – are they not overvalued?' *TPhS* 1862-63. Vol. 8. 1863, 113-169. Berlin: A. Asher & Co.
- Koerner, E. F. K., and R. E. Asher (eds) 1995. *Concise History of the Language Sciences: From the Sumerians to the Cognitivists.* Oxford: Pergamon.
- Law, V. 2003. *The History of Linguistics in Europe: From Plato to 1600.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Law Lists.* 1831. London: Stevens & Sons.
- Law Times.* 1880, Vol. 70. London: Office of the Law Times [continued as *New Law Journal*].
- LIL MSS. Manuscript papers housed at Lincoln's Inn Library, London.
- Lyons, J. 1999. 'Diachrony and synchrony in twentieth century lexical semantics: old wine in new bottles?' *TPhS* 97: 2. Oxford and Boston: Blackwell, 287-329.
- Malden, H. 1854. 'On pragmatized legends in history.' *TPhS* 1854, 217-28.
- Marshall, E. H. 1890. 'Edwin Guest.' In: Stephen, L., and S. Lee (eds) 1890. *The Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. XXIII Gray-Haughton. London: Smith ET AL, 318-19.
- Matthews, P. 2003. Letter from Professor Peter Matthews to the author (13.viii.2003).
- McMahon, A. M. S. 1994. *Understanding Language Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, B., and F. C. Robinson 1992. *A Guide to Old English.* Fifth edition. Oxford and Massachusetts: Blackwell.

- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1978. 'Analogy, Segmentation and the Early Neogrammarians.' *TPhS* 1978. *The Neogrammarians Commemorative Volume*, 36-60. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 1992. 'German Influence on British Linguistics in the nineteenth century (also 'The Reaction of British Scholarship to German Scholarship in the Nineteenth Century').' Unpublished paper delivered at the Sesquicentennial Symposium of the Philological Society on 14 November 1992 [the handout from this talk is in the possession of Dr Keith Brown].
- . 1998. *History of Linguistics IV: Nineteenth-Century Linguistics* (ed. Lepschy, G.). London and New York: Longman.
- Murray, J. A. H. (ed.) 1884. *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles, founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Osborn Manuscript 27, folders 26 and 27. Letters from Edwin Guest to Henry Le Keux. [Held in *The James Marshall and Marie-Louise Osborn Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University*].
- PPhS* = *Proceedings of the Philological Society*
- PPhS* 1842-43 and 1843-44, Vol. I. 1844. London: Richard and John E. Taylor.
- PPhS* 1844-45 and 1845-46, Vol. II. 1846. London: Richard and John E. Taylor.
- PPhS* 1846-47 and 1847-48, Vol. III. 1848. London: Richard and John E. Taylor.
- PPhS* 1848-49 and 1849-50, Vol. IV. 1970. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- PPhS* 1850-51 and 1851-52, Vol. V. 1854. London: George Bell.
- PPhS* 1852-53, Vol. VI. 1854. London: George Bell.
- PS Archives. Letter addressed to Professor Martin Durrell (10 March 2000), and redirected to Professor R. H. Robins (16 March 2000), from Roy Mansell (former Headmaster of SMGS) [held in the archives of the Philological Society].
- Quirk, R., and C. L. Wrenn 1957. *An Old English Grammar*. Second edition. London: Routledge.
- Rask, R. K. 1818 [1814]. *Undersøgelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandiske sprogs oprindelse*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Robins, R. H. 1987. 'The Life and Work of Sir William Jones.' *TPhS* 85 (1987): 1-23.
- . 1992. 'The London School of Linguistics and the Philological Society.' Unpublished paper. Opening talk at the Sesquicentennial Symposium of the Philological Society, delivered on the evening of Friday 13 November 1992 [typescript in the possession of Professor Peter Matthews].
- de Saussure, F. 1916. *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Payot.
- Sweet, H. 1869. The history of the "th" in English. *TPhS* 1868-69, 13 (1869): 272-288.

- . 1908. *The Sounds of English: an introduction to phonetics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- ten Kate, L. 1710. *Gemeenschap tussen de Gottische en de Nederduytsche (The Relationship between the Gothic and the Dutch Languages)*.  
*TPhS* = *Transactions of the Philological Society*  
*TPhS* 1854. **1** (1854). London: George Bell.  
*TPhS* 1860-61. **7** (1861). Berlin: A. Asher & Co.  
*TPhS* 1862-63. **8** (1863). Berlin: A. Asher & Co.  
*TPhS* 1868-9. **13** (1869). London and Berlin: A. Asher & Co.  
*TPhS* 1877-8-9. **17** (1879). London and Strasburg: Trübner & Co.  
*TPhS* 1880-81. **18** (1881). London and Strasburg: Trübner & Co. [Part III of *TPhS* for 1880-81 was not published until April 1883].
- Verner, K. 1875 [1876]. 'Eine Ausnahme der ersten Lautverschiebung.' *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* **23**:2, 97-130 [transl. and ed. version 'An exception to Grimm's Law' in Baldi, P., and R. N. Werth (eds) 1978. *Readings in Historical Phonology*. University Park Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 32-63].
- Wrightson, R. 1818. *Wrightson's Triennial Directory for 1818* [Birmingham 1818]. Copyright Gen UKI (UK & Ireland Genealogy). File reprinted in 1969 by Frank Graham, 6 Queen's Terrace, Newcastle upon Tyne.

**Fiona Carolyn Marshall**, *Sheffield*  
[f.c.marshall@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:f.c.marshall@sheffield.ac.uk)

**The Henry Sweet Society  
for the History of Linguistic Ideas**

**Annual Colloquium**

**Jesus College, Oxford  
13<sup>th</sup> –16<sup>th</sup> September, 2004**

*Programme*

**MONDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2004**

14.00 ONWARDS: ARRIVAL AND REGISTRATION

14.00 COFFEE

*Plenary Session*

16.45 Welcome and opening of Colloquium

17.00 L.G. Kelly (Darwin College, Cambridge) *The Puritan Apothecaries:  
Translation and Education*

17.45 Peter Gilliver (Associate Editor, Oxford English Dictionary) *The  
Genesis of the Philological Society's New English Dictionary*

19.00 DINNER

20.00 RECEPTION

**TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER**

*Plenary Session*

9.00 Marjorie Perlman Lorch (Birkbeck College, London)

*Bilingualism and Memory: Early Nineteenth-Century Ideas about the  
Significance of Polyglot Aphasia*

9.45 Kevin Mendousse (University of Auckland) *Ockham's Razor in the  
Hands of Roman Jakobson: An Episode in Distinctive Feature Theory*

10.30 COFFEE

*Session A*

- 11.00 Christophe Bresoli (Munich) *Histoire des idées de la dialectologie romane: le rôle crucial de L'Atlas Linguistique Roumain de Pop et Petrovici*
- 11.30 Elena Simonato (University of Lausanne) *The 'Energetical Linguistics' of D.N. Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij*
- 12.00 Ekaterina Velmezova (Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow – University of Lausanne, Switzerland) *Against the Arbitrariness of the Linguistic Sign: Soviet Linguistics in 1920-1930*

*Session B*

- 11.00 Pascale Hummel (Paris) *'Le diable et sa grand-mère': discours psychiatrique et tradition philologique à l'aube du XXe siècle*
- 11.30 Paula Hellal and Marjorie Lorch (Birkbeck College, London) *Barlow's 1877 Case of Acquired Childhood Aphasia and its Significance for Neurolinguistic Theory*
- 12.00 Els Elffers (University of Amsterdam) *(Anti-)Psychologism in Linguistics*

13.00 LUNCH

*Session A*

- 14.00 Casper C. de Jonge (Leiden University / Christ Church, Oxford) *Dionysius of Halicarnassus as a Historian of Linguistics: The History of the Theory of the 'Parts of Speech' in De compositione verborum 2*
- 14.30 John Walmsley (Bielefeld) *The English Patient: Grammar in Twentieth-Century England and Wales*
- 15.00 Richard Steadman-Jones (University of Sheffield) *The History of Linguistics in an Interdisciplinary Curriculum*

*Session B*

- 14.00 Stijn Verleyen (Fund for Scientific Research - Flanders) *Synchronic Theory and Diachronic Phonology in Generative Historical Linguistics*
- 14.30 Sam Hardy (University of South Carolina) *What Was Old Is New Again: The rehabilitation of Whorf's Linguistic Relativity Principle*
- 15.00 Jacqueline Léon (CNRS, Université Paris 7) *Claimed and Unclaimed Sources of Corpus Linguistics: Meaning in Context, Statistical Linguistics, Empirical Methods in Machine Translation in the 1950s*

15.30 COFFEE

*Session A*

- 16.00 Frank Vonk (Doetinchem) *Reflections on Law and Language in Nineteenth-Century Habsburg. What Did Mauthner Learn from Merkel?*
- 16.30 Jean-Marie Fournier (Université de la Sorbonne-Nouvelle, Paris III) *La conception de l'aspect verbal chez Michel de Neuville*

- 17.00 Irina Ivanova (Lausanne / Saint-Petersburg) *The Experimental Phonetics of Abbé Rousselot as a Starting Point of Modern Linguistics*

*Session B*

- 16.00 Andreas Musolf (University of Durham) *Ignes fatui or apt similitudes? — The Apparent Denunciation of “Metaphor” by Thomas Hobbes*
- 16.30 Masataka Miyawaki (Senshu University, Kanagawa, Japan) *Case and Tense in English Grammar 1586-1801*
- 17.00 Valérie Raby (Université de Reims) *De quelques emplois des ‘termes de supplément’ dans la Grammaire Générale française*

[17.45 Meeting of the Executive Committee]

19.00 DINNER

- 20.00 Panel Discussion: *On Teaching the History of Linguistics*  
Organisation and chair: Andrew Linn.

**WEDNESDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER**

*Plenary Session*

- 9.00 Saskia Daalder (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) *Who Initiated the First International Congress of Linguists (1928)?*
- 9.45 Fiona Marshall (University of Sheffield) *Thomas Hewitt Key and the Philological Society of London: A New Period of Influence*

10.30 COFFEE

*Session A*

- 11.00 Christiane Schlaps (Göttingen) *Noun vs. verb: From the History of a Controversy*
- 11.30 Konrad Koerner (Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Typologie und Universalienforschung (ZAS) Berlin) *Pour une historiographie engagée; Or What’s Wrong with the History of Linguistics*
- 12.00 Matejka Grgič (Faculty of Pedagogy, Cankarjeva 5, Slovenia) *The Theory of Names in Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages*

*Session B*

- 11.00 Frans Wilhelm (University of Nijmegen) *The Introduction of the Grammar-Translation Method in Dutch Foreign Language Teaching: Sources and Success*
- 11.30 Gijsbert J. Rutten (University of Nijmegen) *Usage and Reason: Enemies, or Partners in Crime?*
- 12.00 Jan Noordegraaf (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) *Dutch Nineteenth-Century Linguistics and the Rise of Afrikaans as a Standard Language*

13.00 LUNCH

14.00 OUTING: 'OXFORD UNSEEN'

Visits on foot to lesser-known museums or Sehenswürdigkeiten (multiple-choice). A portfolio of information will be available, and selected outings will be accompanied. (You may perhaps have seen the Bodley and the Dodo, but have you seen the Bate Collection of Musical Instruments?)

*Session A*

- 16.00 Luiza Palanciuc (Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris) *Linguistique bourgeoise / versus / linguistique soviétique: crises, discontinuités, changements de paradigme (domaine roumain)*
- 16.30 Nadia Kerecuk (London) *The Role of Nineteenth-Century Eastern European Linguistics in the History of Ideas in Language Sciences*
- 17.00 Tinatin Bolkvadze (Tbilisi I State University, Georgia) *Language Future of Mankind: Monolingual or Multilingual*

*Session B*

- 16.00 Hiroyuki Eto (Yokohama, Japan) *German Influence on English Studies of Japan in its Early Stage*
- 16.30 Ken-Ichi Kadooka (Ryukoku University, Kyoto, Japan) *A Historical Review of the Ancient Japanese Vowel System*
- 17.00 Marek Kosciielecki (Da-Yeh University, Changhua, Taiwan) *The Study of Foreign Languages and The Utilization of Modernizing Knowledge by the Japanese*

17.45 AGM OF THE HENRY SWEET SOCIETY

19.00 CONFERENCE DINNER

**THURSDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER**

*Session A*

- 9.00 Muhammad Jalaal Haashim and Herman Bell (Oxford) *Ideological Motives behind Nubian Writing Systems, Emblems of Shifting Identities over Thirteen Centuries*
- 9.30 Hedwig Gwosdek (Tübingen) *Towards Uniformity in Grammar Teaching*
- 10.00 Christian Puech (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris III) *La question de l'arbitraire du signe et la réception du saussurisme et du structuralisme dans la linguistique francophone et le contexte français*



*Session B*

- 9.00 Carolina Rodríguez-Alcalá (University of Campinas, Brazil) *The Status of Translation in Guarani Jesuit Grammars*
- 9.30 Elke Nowak (Technische Universität Berlin) *The "American Type": On the Troubles of Describing and Understanding Polysynthesis*
- 10.00 Iwona Milewska (Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland) *European Approaches to Sanskrit*

10.30 COFFEE

*Plenary Session*

- 11.00 Joan Leopold (London / Los Angeles) *Ernest Renan (1823-92): From Linguistics and Psychology to Racial Ideology*
- 11.30 Cristina Altman (University of São Paulo, Brazil) *Tupi and Guarani: War and Linguistic Typology in Nineteenth-Century South Brazil*
- 12.00 Joseph Subbiondo (California Institute of Integral Studies, San Francisco) *Musings on the Development of a Philosophical Language: A Study of John Wilkins' Mercury: or the Secret and Swift Messenger*

13.00 LUNCH

**END OF CONFERENCE**

**Victor Klemperer**

***The Language of the Third Reich: LTI – Lingua Tertii Imperii. A Philologist's Notebook.***

Translated by Martin Brady. London and New Brunswick, NJ: The Athlone Press, 2000, 296 pp., £ 45.00.

To judge by recent British school syllabuses for history, a preoccupation with the Third Reich, the paradigmatic evil empire, continues unabated in the English-speaking world. Against this background, it is curious that we have had to wait for so long for an English translation of Victor Klemperer's classic *LTI*, a work which first appeared in 1947.<sup>34</sup> Paradoxically, however, the linguistic evaluation of the Nazi régime's impact on German remains curiously elusive and largely a closed book to the Anglo-Saxon world. This may have something to do with the deplorable decline in the knowledge of German itself over the last thirty years, especially in the United Kingdom. It also may have something to do with the difficulties of properly translating the language of the régime and its organizations. The meanings of the more obvious of its murderous euphemisms, such as *Sonderbehandlung* ("special treatment", i.e. execution) and *Einsatzgruppe* ("operational unit" [for mass murder]) are generally known, but when it comes to terms belonging to the ideology of the régime, we run into serious difficulties. The historian Michael Burleigh translated *Deutschtum* with "Germandom",<sup>35</sup> which is somewhat clumsy; but not entirely devoid of the ideological content inherent in the term. At any rate, it is more appropriate than the insipid "Germanness" of the present translation (p. 79). One must concede that the translator makes valiant efforts, but he is confronted with the contradictions inherent in trying to make a semantically correct translation which incorporates the appropriate ideological content. He does, however, provide us with the German word in such cases. This is just as well, because his translations often lose something of the semantic content and context of such words. An example is the politically loaded word *Volksgemeinschaft*. The translator favours "community of the people" (p. 30) or "national community" (p. 35), but these are far too bloodless and inoffensive, since they necessarily divorce the word from its *völkisch* implications. I would prefer to translate this word as "the collective body of Germandom" and would make no apologies for borrowing Burleigh's term. Then there is the term *völkisch* itself. Brady's "national" (p. 33) just won't do. *Völkisch* is the opposite of *demokratisch* and encapsulates a world of ethnic nationalism within the framework of an authoritarian state. Perhaps it would be better to gloss it rather than to attempt to translate it. Or what of *Gefolgschaft*, the term applied to industrial workforces? This sense of the word *Gefolgschaft* has completely

---

<sup>34</sup> For the present review, I have used the following edition of the German text: V. Klemperer, *LTI. Notizbuch eines Philologen*, 16. Auflage (Reclam Bibliothek Band 278). Leipzig: Reclam, 1996.

<sup>35</sup> See M. Burleigh, *Germany turns Eastwards. A Study of Ostforschung in the Third Reich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

disappeared from present-day German, the normal word today being *Belegschaft*. Brady glosses this word as “work-force, entourage, literally: group of followers” (p. 236). Klemperer’s account of the Nazi use of this word (pp. 236-245) is a brilliantly discursive piece of analysis. Klemperer points out that the idea of the *Gefolgschaft* as the basis of labour relations is in direct contradistinction to the contractual idea of labour relations regulated by law. The *Gefolgschaft* is the sworn band of followers bound to their leader by unconditional obedience and loyalty. Its inspiration is of course the *comitatus* of ancient Teutonic society, the band of followers pledged to a lord unto death. Klemperer summarized the concept of the *Gefolgschaft* with characteristic incisiveness, remarking that the word transformed a workforce bound by contractual agreements with management into a body of weapon-bearing vassals forced to keep faith with their aristocratic masters.

The concept of the *Gefolgschaft* belongs to the pseudo-medievalism cultivated by the Nazis. Another area where this sort of influence is felt is that of onomastics, and Klemperer deals with this in a most perceptive chapter with the title “Names” (pp. 74-83). A particular feature of Nazi anthroponymy was the use of names of Germanic origin. As Klemperer points out, the Nazis didn’t invent this, but it was they who transformed it from a fashion into a badge of national identity. These names mostly do not have a continuous history reaching back to the Middle Ages, but are products of a “Romantic revival” from the end of the eighteenth century onwards. Ultimately, this fashion goes back to Klopstock, who revived *Hermann* and *Thusnelda*, to the *Burschenschaften* and to Wagner, who was responsible for the popularity of such names as *Günther* and *Sieglinde*. Klemperer also indicates the exemplary character of the names of some of the Nazi leaders themselves. He particularly cites *Baldur* von Schirach. Curiously, Klemperer fails to mention the Gothomania of the Nazis. This manifested itself in the renaming of *Gdynia* (German *Gdingen*) on the Baltic coast to *Gotenhafen* or in the plans to rename *Simferopol* and *Sebastopol* in the Crimea to *Gotenburg* and *Theoderichshafen*, respectively.<sup>36</sup> This last was connected with another of the projects of the Nazis, namely, that of “regermanizing” the Crimea by settling South Tyrolean peasants there. We also find the occasional use of personal names from Gothic history used as baptismal names in the Third Reich. For example, the name of *Teja*, the last Gothic king of Italy, is not one which would normally be given to children nowadays, but I have noted a Lower Franconian example whose bearer was born in 1942.<sup>37</sup> Generations of German historians starting with Felix Dahn in the nineteenth century were fascinated with the struggle of the Goths against the Byzantines in Italy and it is probably no accident that one of the German defensive lines in Italy in the latter phase of the Second World War was called the ‘Gothic Line’.

<sup>36</sup> H. Wolfram, *Das Reich und die Germanen. Zwischen Antike und Mittelalter*. Berlin: Siedler, 1990: 35.

<sup>37</sup> For other modern German examples of the use of the name *Teja*, see W. Seibicke, *Historisches deutsches Vornamenbuch*. 4 vols. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996–2003 IV: 188.

Klemperer deals with the Nazi predilection for the words *kämpferisch* 'warlike, belligerent' and *heldenhaft* 'valiant, heroic', but it is strange that he fails to link them with the Nazi perception of the Goths and Lombards of the early Middle Ages. Of course, there are other facets of Nazi attitudes to medieval history, such as the negative picture of Charlemagne as the *Sachsenschlächter* ('the slaughterer of the Saxons', alluding to his ruthless conquest of the heathen Saxons), but the Gothic question is one which would merit further investigation.

In the chapter "Blurring Boundaries" (pp. 66-71), Klemperer makes several perceptive observations on the semiotics of Nazism. In particular, his observations about the runic abbreviation SS are still worth reading. The runic SS for this organization occurs on type faces and in reference works in the Third Reich. The use of the runes on the collar tabs of the members of the SS, the *Totenkopf* on their caps and the swastika as the symbol of the regime all belong to this nexus of heathen Teutonic and Indo-European pseudo-mythology with which the Nazis wished to surround themselves. These are of course all facets of the malevolent pseudo-antiquarianism which characterized Nazi doctrine. This had roots reaching back into the nineteenth century, but it also reflected a heterogeneous mixture of early-twentieth-century ideas. Klemperer is quite perceptive about the role that Expressionism played in the formation of Nazi vocabulary and illustrates this by a sketch of the history of the use of the words *Aktion* and *Sturm*. The first of these was a key euphemism in the vocabulary of Nazism. The so-called *Kriegseinsatz der Geisteswissenschaften* ("wartime operational activity of the Humanities"), that is, the use of historical and linguistic research as an ideological justification for the "New Order" in Europe, was designated *Aktion Ritterbusch*.<sup>38</sup> The word did not remain confined to lecture rooms and to the activities of historians like Theodor Mayer or archaeologists like Hans Zeiß, but had a role to play in the Nazis' terror and murder apparatus. For example, the arrest of 183 Polish academics at the Jagiellonian University of Cracow in November 1939 and their subsequent deportation to concentration camps was designated *Sonderaktion Krakau*, and in 1942, after the assassination of Heydrich, the extermination of the Jews in Poland was called *Aktion Reinhard* in his memory. In the Third Reich, *Aktion* was a word which was full of murderous intent.

Coupled with the linguistic question is the matter of the behaviour and attitudes of the academic community in the Third Reich. The details of the careers of the more obviously Nazi academics, such as the wartime rector of the University of Munich, the Indo-Europeanist Walther Wüst, *Kurator* of the *Ahnenerbe*, the SS research organization, have been known for a long time, and more recently the careers of historians such as Theodor Schieder, Hermann Heimpel and Percy Ernst Schramm, Celtologists/Germanists such as Johann Leo Weisgerber or archaeologists such as Hans Zeiß and Herbert Jankuhn have been subject to a good deal of scrutiny. Klemperer's own area, that of Romance

---

<sup>38</sup> The *Aktion Ritterbusch* took its name from that of its director, the rector of the University of Kiel, Paul Ritterbusch.

philology, has recently been the subject of a thorough investigation by Frank-Rutger Hausmann.<sup>39</sup> The value of Klemperer's account lies in the fact that it is practically contemporary and catches the atmosphere and intellectual climate of the period. For this reason, but not only for this reason, the translation of *L(ingua) T(ertii) I(mperii)* is to be welcomed. At the beginning of the book, Klemperer includes extracts from his diaries of the period between 21 March 1933 and 14 November 1933 (pp. 29-40). At one juncture, Klemperer refers to the dismissal of the economist Robert Wilbrandt from his chair by the Nazis in the following terms: "Man hat die Affäre des Pazifisten Gumbel ausgegraben, für den er in Marburg eingetreten ist",<sup>40</sup> and Brady duly translates the passage as "Someone had dug up the affair surrounding Gumbel, the pacifist he had stood up for in Marburg" (p. 34). In fact, Klemperer made a mistake here, since Wilbrandt was in Tübingen, not Marburg, prior to receiving his chair in Dresden in 1929. The affair surrounding the pacifist and SPD member Emil Julius Gumbel and the attempts of his national conservative enemies to deprive him of the *venia legendi* on account of pacifist statements was a *cause célèbre* at the University of Heidelberg (not Marburg!) for a large part of the Weimar Republic,<sup>41</sup> and would have merited an explanatory note on the part of the translator. This is a symptomatic shortcoming of the volume reviewed here. Klemperer's text is a historical record and the absence of a critical apparatus with biographical notes is a significant defect of the present translation which should be urgently remedied in any subsequent editions.

As a scholar of Jewish descent, Klemperer was at the receiving end of the repressive apparatus of the régime, but he was an acute observer of language and of the functioning of the régime both in academic and non-academic circles. *LTI* was written soon after the German capitulation, and is a near-contemporary source, which is necessarily impressionistic. As a result, it has an immediate freshness and sharpness of observation which is lacking in much academic writing about the period.

**John Insley, Heidelberg**  
[insley@t-online.de](mailto:insley@t-online.de)

---

<sup>39</sup> F.-R. Hausmann, "Vom Strudel der Ereignisse verschlungen". *Deutsche Romanistik im "Dritten Reich"* (Analecta Romanica 61). Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann Verlag, 2000.

<sup>40</sup> Klemperer, *LTI*: 49.

<sup>41</sup> For the Gumbel affair, see D. Hakelberg, "Deutsche Vorgeschichte als Geschichtswissenschaft – Der Heidelberger Extraordinarius Ernst Wahle im Kontext seiner Zeit", in H. Steuer (ed.), *Eine hervorragend nationale Wissenschaft Deutsche Prähistoriker zwischen 1900 und 1945* (Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde Bd. 29). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002: 199-310, at 226-228.

## Publications Received

(to 1st May 2004)

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 Richard Steadman-Jones  
Dept of English Language & Linguistics  
University of Sheffield  
Sheffield S10 2TN

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

VAN DRIEL, Lo (ed.)

*'Ik Ben Voor Hoera! Om De Uitspraak.'* *De lexicografische correspondentie tussen Matthias de Vries en J.H. van Dale.*

Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek: VU; Múnster: Nodus (Cahiers voor Taalkunde), 2004. 140 pp. ISBN • 90-72365-78-X; ISBN • 3-89323-527-2.

### ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

NOORDEGRAAF, Jan

"De Afrikaanse connectie van Taco H. de Beer: I. Nicolaas Mansvelt en zijn 'Proeve van een Hollandsch Idioticon' (1882)", *Trefwoord*, (March 2004), 13 pp.

NOORDEGRAAF, Jan

"Lambert ten Kate en de steen der wijzen", *Nieuwsbrief voor afgestudeerden van de opleiding Nederlands van de Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam* 25 (2004), 48-55.



## Ankündigung — Call for papers.

### **Rekonstruktion, Interpretation und Rezeption linguistischer Analysen und Konzepte**

#### **XVII. Internationales Kolloquium des SGdS**

veranstaltet vom

Studienkreis 'Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft' (SGdS)

in Zusammenarbeit mit der 'Faculty of Letters'  
und dem 'Department of Classical Studies and Philosophy'  
(Prof. Dr. Ioannis Taifacos, Dekan; Prof. Dr. Anna Panayotou-  
Triantaphyllopoulou und Dr. Stephanos Matthaïos, wiss. Mitarbeiter)  
der 'University of Cyprus'

**Nicosia (Cyprus), 11. – 13.02.2005**

Während die vorangegangene SGdS-Tagung von ihrem Schwerpunkt her gesehen einem speziellen Themenkreis gewidmet war, ist das Thema des XVII. Internationalen Kolloquiums des SGdS wieder so weit gefasst, dass es für alle sprachwissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Studien offen ist. Auch Beiträge zur Antiken Grammatikographie sind selbstverständlich willkommen. Zudem ist eine Nachbesprechung bzw. Weiterführung des Workshops "Die Kategorie 'Adverb' in der europäischen Grammatikographie" geplant, der auf dem XVI. Internationalen Kolloquium des SGdS stattgefunden hat.

Von den angegebenen 3 Tagen sind der 11. und 12. Februar für die wissenschaftliche Arbeit vorgesehen, während für den 13. Februar, einem Sonntag, eine Exkursion zu einigen ausgewählten Monumenten der griechischen Antike auf dem Plan steht. Um den Teilnehmerkreis so beschränkt zu halten, dass das Kolloquium durchgehend als Plenarveranstaltung durchgeführt werden kann, können maximal 16 Vorträge angenommen werden. Es empfiehlt sich daher, sich *möglichst bald* unter Angabe des Themas und mit

einem **Abstract** von ca. einer halben Seite bei den Organisatoren anzumelden. Letzter Termin für die Anmeldung ist der **31. August 2004**.

Vortrags- und Diskussionssprachen sind Deutsch, Englisch und Französisch. Eine Teilnahmegebühr wird angesichts der anfallenden Reisekosten nicht erhoben (ein Flug mit Eurocypria von Berlin, Düsseldorf, Hamburg oder Hannover nach Nicosia kostet derzeit etwa 210 Euro). Nähere Informationen zu Anreise und Unterkunft werden den Teilnehmern nach der Anmeldung mitgeteilt.

Anmeldung (ggf. mit Abstract) und Anfragen richte man bitte an eine der beiden folgenden Adressen:

Dr. Stephanos Matthaïos  
Dept. of Classics and Philosophy  
University of Cyprus  
P.O. Box 20537  
CY-1678 Nicosia, Cyprus

Prof. Dr. Peter Schmitter  
Dept. of German Education  
Hankuk University of Foreign  
Studies  
Imun-Dong 270,  
Dongdaemun-Gu  
Seoul, 130-791  
KOREA (South)

e-mail:  
matthaïo@ucy.ac.cy

e-mail:  
schmipe@uni-muenster.de



## **NAAHoLS at LSA**

### **Call for papers.**

The 2005 NAAHoLS meeting will again be held in conjunction with the Linguistic Society of America, the American Dialect Society, the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas, and the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics.

The meeting will take place at the Hyatt Regency in San Francisco, California between 6-9 January, 2005. Further details about the meeting will be provided in the next newsletter (to be distributed Summer 2004).

As in the past, we invite papers relating to any aspect of the history of the language sciences. All presenters must be members of the association (contact the NAAHoLS Treasurer for details). Papers will be 20 minutes, with 10 minutes for discussion. Abstracts may be submitted as hard copies or as file attachments (MS Word only). The length of the abstract should not exceed 500 words – a shorter (200 word) abstract will also be requested for the meeting handbook. The deadline for abstracts is 1 September 2004.

Abstracts should be sent to: David Boe, Department of English, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, MI 49855; (906) 227-2677; [dboe@nmu.edu](mailto:dboe@nmu.edu)

**Tenth International Conference on the History of the  
Language Sciences (ICHoLS X)**

**Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, 1-5 September 2005**

**Call for papers.**

Papers on all aspects of the history of the language sciences are invited. Please submit abstracts of no more than 300 words to the conference organizer (address provided below).

The organizers are willing to entertain proposals for a full panel on a particular topic. Those proposing such a panel must provide full abstracts for each paper.

We particularly encourage participation by scholars of non-Western linguistic traditions.

**Deadline for abstracts: 1 October 2004**

Contact

Douglas Kibbee  
Department of French  
University of Illinois  
707 Mathews Avenue  
Urbana, IL 61801  
USA  
dkibbee@uiuc.edu



## Conference Announcement

### First East Asian Colloquium on the History of Linguistics

**Hong Kong (People's Republic of China), 28 – 30 October 2005**

The *Studienkreis Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft (SGdS)* in conjunction with the *Department of English* and the *Programme in Language Communication* at the University of Hong Kong will be holding a colloquium at the University of Hong Kong from October 28 to 30, 2005. The conference languages will be English and German, and papers are invited on all aspects of the history of linguistics. Topics relating to the study of East Asian languages and the history of linguistics in East Asia are particularly welcome.

Participants who would like to present a paper (which should be no more than 40 minutes in length) are kindly requested to submit title and abstract via e-mail to one of the conference organizers mentioned below. The deadline for abstracts is February 1, 2005.

#### Organizing committee:

Dr Christopher Hutton  
Dr Hans-Georg Wolf  
Department of English  
The University of Hong Kong  
Pokfulam Road  
Hong Kong SAR  
People's Republic of China

e-mail:  
chutton@hkucc.hku.hk  
hanswolf@hkucc.hku.hk

Professor Dr Peter Schmitter  
Department of German  
Education  
Hankuk University of Foreign  
Studies  
Imun-Dong 270,  
Dongdaemun-Gu  
Seoul,  
130-791 KOREA (South)  
e-mail:  
schmipe@uni-muenster.de

## **The Vivien Law Prize in the History of Linguistic Ideas**

In memory of Dr Vivien Law (1954-2002), and thanks to her generosity, a prize has been established by the Henry Sweet Society for an essay on any topic within the history of linguistics.

The competition is open to scholars under the age of 35 and to all currently registered students, provided they are not members of the executive committee. The essay should not have been previously published.

The prize consists of £100 and publication of the essay in the *Henry Sweet Society Bulletin*. Others of the essays submitted may also be published where appropriate, and the prize will not be awarded if none of the submitted essays is deemed to be worthy of publication. The prize-winner is also entitled to one year's free membership of the Society.

The prize will be awarded by the executive committee on the recommendation of a prize committee drawn from its members. The committee will be looking for a striking and original approach to the history of linguistics, either in the choice of topic or in the way it is treated.

The closing date for submissions is **30 September 2004**. Entries may be written in English, French or German, and should follow the style conventions used in the *Henry Sweet Society Bulletin*. They should not exceed 8000 words, including references, footnotes, tables, appendices, etc. Four hard copies of the essay, and one in electronic form, should be sent to the chairman of the executive committee (Dr David Cram, Jesus College, Oxford OX1 3DW), by the closing date. The committee's decision will be final.

## Book announcement

**Hanne Lauridsen & Inge Kabell, Copenhagen (eds.)**

*Otto Jespersen (1860-1943) and Felix Franke (1860-1886).  
Historien om en brevveksling.*

A long time ago a good colleague and friend of ours, dr. phil. Arne Juul, drew our attention to the fact that the Royal Library, Copenhagen is in possession of a unique correspondence between Otto Jespersen, Denmark's best-known English scholar so far, and Felix Franke, a German phonetician. These two men got to know each other when they were in their twenties and still undergraduates, studying (each in their own country) foreign languages especially from a linguistic point of view. They actually never met, for various practical reasons, but corresponded intensely with each other for a couple of years (1884-86). Both were exceptionally gifted and if Felix Franke had not contracted tuberculosis and died of it before he reached the age of thirty, he would undoubtedly, like his friend Otto Jespersen, have had a brilliant academic career. Their primary mutual interest was phonetics, a discipline that was just beginning to gain ground in those days.

The letters show that, although they are still so very young, they are already well read and they keep on recommending recent scholarly literature to each other in – and on – several languages of which they mastered quite a number.

When we first read their extensive correspondence, we soon realized that what Arne Juul had suggested was indeed a good idea, namely to edit these letters and publish the greater part of them with our own notes. It was quite a stroke of luck, we felt, that hardly anybody had drawn on them since they were handed over to the library at Otto Jespersen's death in 1943.

In our quotations and comments we have focussed on points such as the working of their academic minds as they test their ideas on each other; the prominent role they (more or less directly) play in the rise of the new discipline of phonetics; and the development of their friendship from the first formal steps to the intimate and touching final letters when both realize that Franke is very soon going to die.

The letters are reproduced in the languages in which they were written; both correspondents use their own languages – Danish and German respectively; each understands the other's native language, to be sure, but does not master it to perfection. As two languages were thus already involved, we thought that to include a third (i.e. to translate it all into English) was not a good idea, although, of course, we do realize that many potential readers may regret this decision.

The title of our work (159 pages) is: "Otto Jespersen (1860-1943) and Felix Franke (1860-1886). Historien om en brevveksling." As something new it is only to be found on the net and can be downloaded in the following way:

www.kb.dk:

Om biblioteket

Publikationer fra KB. Forskning og formidling

Fund og forskning

Fund og forskning Online

Artikler. (<http://www.kb.dk/kb/publikationer/fundogforskning/online/artikler/>)

**Hanne Lauridsen, cand. Phil. and Inge Kabell Ph.D., Copenhagen, Denmark.**

## **Paying your subscription**

### *Paying your subscription by PayPal*

Members outside the UK have often had trouble paying their subscriptions in the past because of ruinous bank charges. You can now avoid bank charges by paying your Henry Sweet Society subscription by PayPal (in effect, by email).

If you have not used PayPal before, you might like to look at their website <http://www.paypal.com>. It costs nothing to register, and is quite straightforward to use, though it takes a few minutes to get started. All you need is an email address and a credit card or debit card.

#### *How to make your payment using PayPal.*

Please follow the instructions at the PayPal website, <http://www.paypal.com>, to send your subscription of £15 to [nicola.mclelland@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:nicola.mclelland@nottingham.ac.uk)

Points to remember:

- Make sure that in the “Notes” section of your message, you state clearly that the payment is a subscription for the Henry Sweet Society, for which year, and include your full name and full contact details.
- Under “Payment type”, select “Service”. (NB If you select “Quasi-Cash”, your bank may charge interest, as if it were a cash withdrawal on your credit card).
- If you get a message that says “Cookies are disabled”, this usually means that your computer’s security level is set too high to allow PayPal to store a cookie (a small text file) on your computer. To change the security level, go to the Tools menu in Internet Explorer, and select Internet Options, then Privacy. Under Privacy, slide the bar all the way down to “Accept all cookies”. After you have made your payment, you will probably want to move the bar back again to a higher level of security.

#### *Is it safe?*

PayPay received some bad press a couple of years ago, but seems to be working much better now that it is owned by e-Bay. However, you use the service at your own risk.

I will acknowledge receipt of your payment by email, so that you know it has reached me safely.