English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800
IAN MICHAEL
First published in 1970, this important work is being reissued at a time of growing interest in linguistic historiography. It has always been assumed that English grammar has been merely taken over from Latin grammar. Studying the history of English grammars to 1800, Dr Michael tests this assumption, and shows that the Latinist grammatical tradition is much less unanimous and authoritative than has been supposed. £20.00 net

Universal Languages and Scientific Taxonomy in the Seventeenth Century
MARY SLAUGHTER
In the seventeenth century proposals and schemes for an artificial language intended to replace Latin as the international medium of communication gained currency. Professor Slaughter views the universal language movement in the context of the development of science, and discusses the particular language schemes proposed. "...provides students of the age the means by which to view the language movement from a different vantage within the context of the history and development of science and ideas. This book can be strongly recommended." Seventeenth-Century News £27.50 net

Syntactic Theory in the High Middle Ages
Modistic Models of Sentence Structure
MICHAEL A. COVINGTON
In this study Michael Covington considers the origins and development of the theories of sentence structure formulated by the Modistae, a group of grammarians and logicians who flourished in Paris between about 1270 and 1310. £25.00 net

Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500-1700
The Trends in Vernacular Grammar 1
G. A. PADLEY
This is a companion volume to Dr Padley’s monograph, Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500-1700: the Latin Tradition (CUP 1976). The new volume deals with the early grammar of the five main European languages – English, French, German, Italian and Spanish – and is the first to treat West European vernacular grammatical theory as a whole. ‘This volume and its predecessor will undoubtedly remain the standard treatments of European Renaissance for the foreseeable future.’ The Times Literary Supplement £30.00 net
The Henry Sweet Society was founded in February 1984 with the following aims:

"to promote and encourage the study of the history of all branches of linguistic thought, theoretical and applied, and including non-European traditions"

Membership of the Society is open to all persons engaged in scholarly study or research appropriate to the Society's aims. Associate membership is open to undergraduates, and to graduate students of not more than five years' standing since registration. Applications for membership (which are subject to the approval of the Committee) should be made to the Hon. Treasurer, at the address given above.

It is hoped to include in each newsletter details of new members of the Society, and it would therefore be very helpful if applicants could provide the following information, for inclusion (where appropriate) in the next issue:

(1) Full name and title (Prof./Dr/Mr etc.), degrees and address to which correspondence should be sent

(2) Name of employing institution (if any) and address if different from above

(3) If any of your publications are relevant to the interests of the Society, please give bibliographical details, including forthcoming articles or books

(4) Interests in general (teaching or research) related to the aims of the society.

For details of subscriptions, see back cover.
Henry Sweet Society: Third Annual Colloquium
3 - 6 September 1986

PROGRAMME

Wednesday 3 September
6 p.m. onwards Registration
7.00 Dinner
8.00 Wine party (hosted by the Committee)

Thursday 4 September
10.30 Registration
11.00 Dr V. Law: A new Roman grammar and its implications for the development of grammar in Antiquity.
11.45 Dr P. Mühlenbusch: Towards a History of Papuan linguistics.
1.00 Lunch
2.00 Dr D. Knox: Renaissance ideas on gesture.
2.45 Dr D. Droizhe: Comparatisme et linguistique académique au XVIIe siècle.
3.30 Prof. F. Dolezal: John Wilkins' theory of definition.
4.15 Tea
5.00 - 6.30: Visit to Keble College and HSS library.
7.00 Dinner
8.00 Group meetings (to be arranged)

Friday 5 September
10.15 Mr D. Harley: The history of theory and practice of commerce as competing influences in the early development of shorthand.
11.00 Coffee
11.15 Dr A. Crowley: Language, knowledge, power: 1832-1933.
12.00 Dr N. Smith: Linguistic Ideas of 17th-century Puritans (provisional title).
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1.00 Lunch
2.30 Symposium: Theories of the Origin and Kinship of Languages: A Historical Survey. Arranged by Professor P. Salmon and Dr R. Schreyer.
4.00 Tea
4.15 Continuation of symposium
5.30 A.G.M.
6.30 Dr R. Burchfield: The completion of the OED.
7.00 Dinner
8.00 Group meetings if desired

Saturday 6 September
8.30 Breakfast

Abstracts of the papers will be sent to members who book for the colloquium.

A booking form for the colloquium, to be returned by 25 July 1986, is enclosed with this newsletter. Any member or prospective member requiring an additional form or further information should write to the Hon. Treasurer, Dr John Flood, Institute of Germanic Studies, 29 Russell Square, London WC1 5DP.
The second annual colloquium of the Henry Sweet Society was held at St Peter’s College, Oxford, from 2–5 September 1985. Fifty-four members and seven guests were present.

Abstracts of papers read appear elsewhere in this newsletter, together with a summary of the symposium on medieval grammar, which was arranged by Dr David Thomson and chaired by Professor R.H. Robins. The organization of a symposium devoted to a single theme was greatly appreciated, and it is hoped to arrange other such symposia at future meetings.

Another innovation was the establishment of groups for discussion of, and possible collaborative research in, the history of ideas in individual aspects of our discipline. Eleven groups were proposed and listed on the booking form for the colloquium, and members were invited to express an interest in one or more. In the event, several members expressed their wish to participate in nearly all of the groups; as there was not time enough to arrange group meetings without overlap, it was decided to limit the number of groups meeting at different times to the three most popular which were:

1. Ideas on language kinship and language origin, chaired by Professor Robins.
2. Universal language projects, chaired by Dr Cran.
3. Lexicography, chaired by Dr Seiffert.

Two other groups in which great interest was expressed had to meet simultaneously: they were

1. Phonetics, chaired by Dr MacMahon.
2. Punctuation, chaired by Dr Malcolm Parkes.

Reports of these meetings will appear elsewhere in the newsletter.

At the A.G.M. it was agreed:

1. that the subscription should remain unchanged for 1985–86.
2. that repayment of loans to Founder Members should be offered.
3. that the colloquium in 1986 should be held in the first week of September, so that members from North America who were in England at the time would probably be able to attend the colloquium before the beginning of their own term.

The colloquium ended with an extremely interesting account, by Professor Brian O’Cuivy, of Henry Sweet in Dublin. Vivian Salmon

---

**GESSNER’S MITHRIDATES: NOTES ON WORKING METHODS AND ARGUMENTATION**

K. Gessner’s Mithridates (1555) is the earliest book (in the German world) to collect the available information about the languages of the world, ancient and modern, and to present it in an alphabetical arrangement within the scope of one volume specifically dedicated to this purpose. It provides us thus with a condensed textbook of 16th century linguistic knowledge and concepts, including the history and relationship of languages, which gives it a special interest for the history of linguistic ideas.

Due to its encyclopaedic and compilatory nature Gessner’s working methods and his use of source material deserve special attention. In this talk the articles on (what would be called now) modern Celtic languages will be analysed with a view to elucidating their lay-out, structure and sources. It will be shown that a close reading of these articles can recover more information about their sources and Gessner’s handling of them than hitherto expected. Furthermore two distinct sets of sources (printed vs oral) can be separated, the oral ones being marked by audio.

Gessner does not see these languages as related; he only recognizes a close relationship, even identity, between Welsh and Breton, and Irish and Gaelic. He has a short section on Manx, about which he has no precise information; and he does not mention Cornish.

As one example of the intellectual network through which Gessner obtained his information his version of the Welsh Lord’s Prayer will be discussed. It was given to him by J. Bale and seems to go back ultimately to a translation by W. Salesbury. Thus it would predate the first publication of Salesbury’s translation in 1567.

Another interesting feature of Gessner’s article on Welsh is the etymology of the names Walli and Wallia for which he gives no source, but which is found in Giraldus Cambrensis and Polydorus Vergilius.

The second part of the talk will deal with Gessner’s methodology and line of argument in the article on ‘lingus Gallica’ (which he identifies with ‘Celtica’) and with some related material from his article on the Germanic dialects. Gessner does not posit a relationship between Gallic and the languages discussed in the first part.

The article on Gallic is a landmark in the early interpretations of the pre-history of European languages and their history. The identification of original Gallic with modern German(ic) ultimately proposed here represents a concept which was to influence especially German linguistic thought up to the 18th century. Special attention will be paid to a series of etymologies proposed by Gessner which are the justifications for establishing this relationship. Gessner also develops a methodology for the explanation of names which takes the final element in a compound as the basis of analysis and classification. Here he uses partly material and etymologies already found in Aventin’s Annales Bohiorum, but rearranges them according to his method.

---

Dr. Erich Poppe
Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies
WOLFGANG RATKE (1571-1635) - TOWARDS A HISTORIOGRAPHY

John Waismley
University of Bielefeld

Wolfgang Ratke has two separate histories. To linguists and applied linguists he is best known as a reformer of language-teaching methods. Stern 1983 names Ratke in the company of Ascham, Comenius, Goethe, and Locke, as one of the major European teachers and writers who have something to say on language learning. To educationalists, Ratke is a would-be reformer who propagated revolutionary methods of teaching reading, writing and languages, but who in practical terms failed at every step.

It is hard to find a comparable figure about whom opinion is so divided as it is over Ratke. Had he in fact anything of value to contribute, or was he indeed, as so many claim, a charlatan, a mountebank, a quack, a cheapjack?

As a preliminary to a larger task of undertaking a fresh assessment of Ratke's work, the question arises as to how conflict of judgements could possibly come about. One clue (for the English-speaking world) lies in the fact that the B.L. catalogue lists no more than six works relating to Ratke, none of them actually written by him and only one containing any of his writings. The National Union Catalogue lists five. In other words, we can perhaps partly solve the riddle of how the various critical positions came to be adopted by reconstructing the process of history writing: Where did the various authors obtain their information? Who took which information from whom?

In the picture offered by the currently available literature, thirty-five distinct facts are predicated of Ratke. An analysis of their distribution reveals a cluster of authors presenting roughly similar points of view in the facts they choose to mention and the way in which they assess them. When these authors are considered in terms of generations - the most recent from about 1930-1965, an earlier one of Ratke's work, the question arises as to how these authors obtained their information? Who took which information from whom?

It is hard to find a comparable figure about whom opinion is so divided as it is over Ratke. Had he in fact anything of value to contribute, or was he indeed, as so many claim, a charlatan, a mountebank, a quack, a cheapjack?

As a preliminary to a larger task of undertaking a fresh assessment of Ratke's work, the question arises as to how conflict of judgements could possibly come about. One clue (for the English-speaking world) lies in the fact that the B.L. catalogue lists no more than six works relating to Ratke, none of them actually written by him and only one containing any of his writings. The National Union Catalogue lists five. In other words, we can perhaps partly solve the riddle of how the various critical positions came to be adopted by reconstructing the process of history writing: Where did the various authors obtain their information? Who took which information from whom?

In the picture offered by the currently available literature, thirty-five distinct facts are predicated of Ratke. An analysis of their distribution reveals a cluster of authors presenting roughly similar points of view in the facts they choose to mention and the way in which they assess them. When these authors are considered in terms of generations - the most recent from about 1930-1965, an earlier one from 1900-1930 (including Adamson 1905), and a yet earlier one pre-1900, it becomes strikingly clear how the paths along which information was transmitted converged as one moves backwards through time. Central to the reception and transmission of Ratke's work in the English-speaking world appear to be Quick (1908) and Barnard (1878). Adamson gives, as his sources, in addition to Quick, the German authors Israel (1908), Krause (1872) and Paulsen.

The question is, what sources did Quick and Barnard draw on? Quick is refreshingly frank. In his Preface he writes: "The authority I have recourse to most frequently is Raumer ... to Raumer I am indebted for a great deal... I have written about Ratke..." (Quick 1904:11). Barnard's German Teachers and Educators has a more complicated history. It appeared as the second volume of an Educational Biography initiated in 1859. This second volume, however, turns out to be nothing other than (in the words of the B.L.C.) "the entire contents of the first two volumes of Prof. Karl von Raumer's History of Pedagogy". Adamson sees himself in this constellation as a corrector of misapprehensions as regards Ratke. His main, if not only source of information in this respect is Krause (1872), who thus becomes a key figure in our understanding of Ratke. Krause stands out as the publisher of 142 original documents from the archives in Kbhcn - published, as he says himself, to modify the excessively positive assessments of Ratke presented by Nieneyer, von Raumer and others.

First, opinion varies as to just how favourable the treatment of Ratke by Nieneyer, von Raumer and others really was. Hohendorf, for instance, describes Nieneyer's presentation as "very one-sided. The material published characterises Ratke as an obstinate and unco-operative mystery-monger" (Hohendorf 1957:10). Krause, that is, was trying to correct a picture which was not as one-sidedly positive as he would have us believe. Second, Krause seems to have had other motives in publishing his material. In his Preface he writes more as though his main purpose was to rehabilitate Prf. Ludwig in the eyes of the world, for his imprisonment of Ratke in Warmsdorf castle. His documentation, Krause claims, "solves the riddle of the apparent harshness towards the Didacticus, and now the slight blemish which has attached to his name... will be removed" (Krause 1872:ix). When one bears in mind that Krause was curator of the ducal collections in Kbhcn - that is, successor to the archivist who on Ludwig's orders first sealed the Ratichian documents - a degree of special pleading cannot be ruled out.

Krause's monograph closes with the words, "...at 62 Ratichius had still not achieved any notable success with his teaching method... after 22 years of barking up the wrong educational tree, he finds himself on the same barren spot as at the outset" (op. cit. 182 fn). Nothing could be further from the truth. Krause's own exclusive reliance on too limited evidence left him - like those he criticised - unaware of the extent, breadth and originality of Ratke's work during the remaining fifteen years of his life. It is only through such publications as those by Ising, Hohendorf and Hofman, during the last thirty years, that many of them have been made widely accessible for the first time.

References

HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS VS. THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTICS

Thomas Frank
University of Naples

Before exploring the relationship between historical linguistics and the history of linguistics some sort of definition of the field covered by these two complementary disciplines is called for. Historical linguistics can be defined as the thread that connects chronologically successive, but discrete synchronic states of the language, the discipline that traces how state A of a language becomes state B. The fact that this progresses by means of more abrupt change than gradual, but that the present is a dimensionless point in time, nevertheless does not prevent us from tracing the progression from past into the future along a line consisting of an infinite number of ‘presents’.

Historical linguistics, after a period of unmerited neglect, has made a comeback in recent years, although it might still be salutary to remind ourselves that many of the founders of ‘modern’ synchronic linguistics had an intense interest in the diachronic dimension of language. On the one hand transformationists are interested in rule addition and rule subtraction processes capable of explaining the transmutation of state A of a language into state B, or more precisely to explain how Grammar A relates to Grammar B. Rather than thinking of speakers of Grammar A ‘turning into’ speakers of Grammar B (which would appear to be the fictitious model of language change of the older generation of historical linguists) they find it more appropriate to think of the two grammars continuing side by side, so that each generation of speakers, as it were, recreates or ‘reanalyses’ the grammar of the language. On the other hand, sociolinguistics has alerted us once again to the dynamics of language, in many cases not studying language as it has changed, but observing language as it is changing. The synchronic states into which the language seems to itself to evolve seem to be entities which we all recognise as the grand abstractions they are, such as Middle English or Classical Latin, or clearly localized and circumscribed forms, such as American Black English Vernacular, are all theoretical constructs of the linguist: they represent his attempt to come to terms with, to impose some sort of order on the infinite variety of ‘language in use’, to find the language underlying the observed and observable parole.

The history of linguistics, on the other hand, represents an account of how these various ways of looking at language, of expounding the phenomenon linguists, relate to one another and develop at times by a gradual process of evolution, at others by means of more abrupt changes. One way of writing the history of linguistics is by tracing the elective affinities (history, philosophy, psychology, etc.) of the disciplines of linguists: a very direct relationship with the history of linguistics and is in a very real sense determined by it. In brief, the history of a science is part of itself and of the way it operates.

One obvious connection between these two sister disciplines can be found in the study of pedagogic grammars, dictionaries and similar works. This sort of book clearly does not tell us anything new about the state of the language during the period in question. Obviously we do not need grammars like those of Ward or Lowth in order to write a Dictionary of Samuel Johnson to tell us anything new about the English language during the 18th century. Some useful information, usually of a descriptive nature, can for example be gleaned from pronunciation, e.g. Walker’s pronouncing dictionary, and my own study of Italian 18th century grammars of the English language has thrown some (rather oblique) light on certain features of 18th century phonology (HL X 1/2. 25-61(1981)). But the main use these grammars can be put to is to investigate people’s attitude to their language, the models of language schoolmasters and others concerned with imposing or keeping up standards had in mind. Grammars are frequently good indicators of linguistic innovations and taboos. The two are closely connected, since an innovation that has not yet found general acceptance is often stigmatized as ugly, illogical, offensive or plainly wrong by the self-appointed preservers of linguistic purity. 18th century grammars frequently set out to ‘correct mistakes’ – Lowth in the Preface to his Grammar says that quoting mistakes is as good a way of teaching correct forms as giving examples of good usage. Clearly not all the grammars cited by authors like Lowth were correct, but many of them can surely add to our knowledge of what the language was really like in a given period, as well as providing us with an insight into why certain forms were prescribed. The English of the 18th century is surely not only the ‘official’ language that Lowth and others cite, for there must have been as wide a variety of non-standard uses, both regionally and socially determined, as at any other period of the history of the language, that used the standard language took no cognizance of and works on the models of and indeed tried to conform to. It would be unwise to underestimate the influence of the pedagogues:

Historical linguistics, in its earlier phases certainly, is concerned with ‘discovering new facts’, i.e. new forms, their distribution in time and place, their relative frequency etc., but at no time have linguists been content with merely a vast quantity of facts, for their concern has always been with imposing some order on these facts and with finding an explanation for them. Facts are the raw material of history, and if we do not want to consider ourselves disciplines as chronicles, then we cannot do without theory, for without theory no explanation is possible, only a set of unrelated data. A change in the kind of theory we operate with, will produce not different facts, but different explanations and future words, will determine the kind of history we write, the way we formulate our ‘sound law’, or process of syntactic change or semantic evolution. One very basic consideration therefore is the following: the history of linguistics determines the kind of historical linguistics we do, the kind of explanation we offer. Historical linguists may have little direct interest in the history of linguistics, or theory for that matter, but their work has a very direct relationship with the history of linguistics and is in a very real sense determined by it. In brief, the history of a science is part of itself and of the way it operates.
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a very language-conscious society and the study of attitudes to the language we speak is therefore a vital and legitimate part of historical as well as synchronic linguistics. Modern sociolinguistics has reintroduced the notion of change into linguistic studies, and change is what historical linguistics is about, whether it be within the span of five years or five centuries.

The relationship between works of a more theoretical nature and the 'facts of language' is less direct and clear-cut. Much of 17th and 18th century theory is concerned with relating the laws of language to the laws of thought. Works like the Grammar of Port-Royal or Wilkins's Essay can only exist in so far as they are founded on principles and categories that transcend the entirely arbitrary naming processes of natural languages or the mere rules of 'instituted' grammar. Eighteenth century linguistic theory in England is more concerned with grammar than with the naming process. For Harris, as well as his successors in England and Scotland, grammar is a branch of philosophy or perhaps psychology, and though George Campbell in his influential Philosophy of Rhetoric rejects any theory of universal grammar, this is merely because he is using the term in a deliberately restrictive sense. (Cfr. T. Frank, "Linguistic Theory and the Doctrine of Usage in George Campbell's 'The Philosophy of Rhetoric"" Lingua et Stile XX/2, 199-216 (1985)). The theoretical foundations of many of the ordinary pedagogic grammars are these more speculative works: e.g. Lowth specifically states that his grammar is based on the ideas of Harris. Practically all the writers on language pay lip service to the Horatian dictum on usage, but in practice more attention is given to 'correct' or 'polite' than to current usage. A theory of language based on universalist principles was unable to handle the facts of language change as well as language variety. Change is usually condemned as corruption and variety is at variance with the concept of a rational grammar, which, precisely because it is based on reason and logic legitimizes certain forms and consigns to the limbo of solecism, barbarism and corruption all others. The study of dialect, in so far as it exists, is seen as the recovery of old, quaint, forgotten, but essentially fossilized forms of speech rather than a dynamic factor inseparable from a living language.

These attitudes affected the way people used English, and they were filtered down via dictionaries, school grammars and handbooks of correct usage to a public which was taught to look upon 'politeness' as one of the distinguishing marks of civilization. Some sort of feedback on the way people actually used language was therefore not only natural but inevitable. I believe the recovery of the submerged, condemned, ostracized forms I have mentioned is one of our tasks as historical linguists, not because they have some sort of antiquarian interest, but because there is a continuity between them and the language of today.

It might perhaps be possible to stretch the Chomskyan dichotomy of competence and performance so that the former corresponds to the history of linguistics and the latter to historical linguistics. Although this is a sort of metaphor, if we look on the concept of competence as an explanatory theory, the theory that makes sense of a series of seemingly disjointed phenomena, then maybe the parallel between speakers' ability to use language and the way this ability
AN INTRODUCTION TO ARABIC LINGUISTIC STUDIES

K.I.H. Semaan
State University of New York
Binghamton

The Arabs' interest in the study of their language began much earlier than the coming of Islam, the commonly held idea that it was Blessed 'Ali b. Abi Talib's fear for the threatened correctness of the Islamic Scripture that prompted him to look into the "speech of the Arabs", which insight became the point de départ of Arabic linguistic studies, nahw, is not tenable. In our opinion, the first Arab attempt at understanding their speech goes as far back as the first Egyptian dynasty, c. the third millennium B.C., by the Arabs of the Sinai desert. Those Arabs worked the salt mines for their Egyptian masters and it is perhaps as pupils of the ancient Egyptians and in imitation of their linguistic work that they uncovered linguistic truths and carried them on to the point of devising an analysis of their speech and creating a writing system thereof. The reference here is to inscriptions unearthed at Serabit el-Khadim in Sinai which were analysed by a number of scholars, among them W.F. Albright (ASOR for April 1948). That these inscriptions were written by the Arabs of Sinai is confirmed by the similarities of figures found on Egyptian monuments depicting those workers and those found on Assyrian monuments calling them arabi.

The next stage in the history of Arabic is to be found in the inscriptional remains of South Arabia where the first highly developed urban Arab civilisation flourished. These inscriptions date from about 900 B.C. They reveal a superbly advanced system of linguistic analysis where, on the phonetic level, for example, six sibilants are isolated, namely, /~/, /z/, /~/, /~/ - what Wolf Leslau calls /s1/, /s2/, and /s3/ (Lexique Socotri, Paris 1938) - /g/, /z/, and /g/... From the South, linguistic learning travelled to the North and North East where these same South Arabs had established commercial settlements. From their Southern kin, North Arabsians learned about language and language analysis. There, we find inscriptions dating from the fourth century B.C. written in a system of twenty-eight signs closely resembling those of the South Arabian system of writing. A short time later, the Nabataeans show up on the stage of history; they spoke a dialect of Arabic but used Aramaic, the lingua franca of the region at that time, for their written documents. From that modified script the writing system of Arabic developed. This was the very script that was employed by the pagan merchants of Mecca prior to the coming of Islam; it evolved into the Arabic system which we know and use today. Needless to say, the accuracy of this system reveals a high degree of scientific knowledge of linguistic analysis.

It was the coming of Islam, however, that provided the stimuli which culminated in the production of the first normative grammar of Arabic, Kitab Sibawaihi, rightly considered the masterpiece of Arabic linguistic writing and wrongly thought of as the first linguistic effort in Arabic.

SYMPOSIUM ON MEDIAEVAL GRAMMAR

On the second day of the 1985 Colloquium, a Symposium was held on Mediaeval Grammar. This had been planned in advance and speakers had been invited. The Symposium was coordinated by Dr D. Thomson and the Chair was taken by Professor R.H. Robins.

We were most fortunate in having three speakers, each experts in their own field, presenting the subject from different and complementary viewpoints. Dr Gibson brought to our attention, what is too often neglected, the work of grammarians in the first half of the Middle Ages, and the different paths by which first Donatus and then Priscian entered the mainstream of the study and teaching of grammar. Professor Bursill-Hall set out the vast array of material on mediaeval grammar still extant in the libraries, universities and religious foundations of Europe and the progress made in the subject during the Middle Ages. Dr Rosier concentrated her paper on a masterly presentation of the central doctrines of scholastic theoretical grammar, which because of its highly idiosyncratic technical terminology is rather impenetrable to the unguided general linguist.

As a result of the Symposium many of those attending, who were not specialists in any aspect of mediaeval scholarship, were enabled to understand the interest and importance of mediaeval grammar in the history of our subject, and were given the inspiration and the means to pursue this subject further. The hope was expressed that similar Symposia, planned to present specialist knowledge to non-specialists, should be a part of some future meetings of the Society.

R.H. Robins

Reports from Group Meetings

History of Phonetics

Two meetings were held of the History of Phonetics Discussion Group. Those taking part were: A. Berghenau, F. Berghenau, Y. Frank, N. Kurban, M. MacMahan, J. Mughan, G. Pointon, K. Semaan and M. Silverstein. Michael MacMahon acted as co-ordinator.

It was agreed that an initial objective must be to alert colleagues around the world who are interested in the history of phonetics to the existence of the group, and to invite them to get in touch. A note will be placed, if possible, in various journals, and announcements will be made at meetings of linguistics and phonetics societies.

The idea of collaborative research met with approval. Two suggestions were discussed. One was to identify important items from the history of phonetics which deserve to be reprinted - a volume of readings with critical commentaries would be an obvious approach. The other was to begin thinking about the feasibility of producing in due course a bibliography of primary and secondary source-materials for the history of phonetics.

M. MacMahan
Orthography and Punctuation

The keynote for the orthography discussion group came from the floor, in the form of the question "What is an orthography?". With its carry-overs from an indefinite article, it was intended to get us beyond the normal comfortable assumptions that we tend to make at least for languages whose alphabetic symbolism projects a more or less (usually less) comfortable match between letters in a sequence on the written side, and 'letter-size' segments in sequence on the spoken side. When such a view is taken, orthography looks, in principle and in the abstract, like the skilled (or maybe artful) application of a coded set of symbols to the representation of a sound pattern which, one before the language in question got committed to writing, had a regular (if not regulated), customary (if not codified) and systematic (if not systematized) existence in the mouths and on the lips of speakers of the language. What might alternatively be the case is that, as an orthography is developed and its shape argued over by the literate community, the interest in a close rendering of a sound pattern (itself no easy task) might co-exist (in what will be in its turn no easy relationship) with another purpose, namely giving a satisfactory shape to the units into which you perceived your language as being divided, and through that shaping of the units also projecting a satisfactory image for the language as a whole.

It is not just that the array of letters with their various loops and curves and uprights (both ascending and descending) had aesthetic qualities in their own right: they also lent themselves to conveying a sense of both a pleasing and a proper presentation as well as representation of the language and its units.

Thus units could be marked off by the use of spacing (once it was understood that 'word-sized' units were the ones to which your analysis was committed), and you had also to move towards a decision as to which complexes of these could be joined (as compounds) and which should be written apart (as phrases); or you could distribute letters that had historically evolved from one another, or had come to be seen in relation to one another (y/u, or i/j/y) not solely according to phonetic values associated with them, but also according to doctrines about the proper marking of word initial or, as the case may be, word final or syllable final position;

or, as a variant on this last point, you could do as Luther's Wittenberg printer Georg Rhaw did, and spell the first person pronoun ich with an initial i- because you classed it with major parts of speech like nouns (in which you placed an i- to stand even for the phonetic value [j], as in far, fingen or jünger), whereas in second and third personal pronoun forms like ihm, ihm or ihr you set j- to stand for a vowel, as you did in the articulatory parts of speech like the preposition jn;

or you could find a use for accents or for letter sequences like th or rh, because these contributed to the image of a vernacular as having the qualities of a classical language like Greek; you could even go looking to a role for a sequence like jh because of its sacred associations with historic or classical ways of writing the proper names Jesus (as jhesus, abbreviated jhs, accusative jhm etc.) and Jerusalem;

and in general you looked to find devices that projected satisfying images marking the shape of words (e.g., clusters characteristically appearing in final position);

while often, if there was a particular interest at stake, it was that of helping faithful readers distinguish the true German Bible by alerting them (as did Christoph Walther, working in the Wittenberg printing house of Georg Lufft) to there being distinct codes of orthographic practice.

The Chairman apologises (though not too profusely) for the prominence of examples from German, even before the discussion moves to hear that even the relative clarity of German orthographical practice has been achieved through much labour and relection on complex issues. Even the rationality of spelling nouns with capital letters - such a comforting support to foreign learners finding their way round German clause structures, and such an enhancement of the almost mythic image presented by German abstract nouns like Weltanschauung or Verfremdung when they attain to wider currency - might bear some consideration; but that is perhaps rather a question of punctuation, would thus have belonged in the domain of another discussion group, represents therefore a change of subject, and must be put off to another occasion.

L. Seiffert

Universal Language

The meeting of the discussion group on Universal Language, chaired by David Cram, was attended by twenty-seven members - an indication of the multifaceted interest of the topic.

A question raised at the outset was whether the topic of universal language might perhaps have been receiving disproportionate attention, in light of the number of treatments, both scholarly and popularising, that had recently appeared. It was felt however that recent research had approached the topic from useful new perspectives, and that there were aspects of the topic remaining to be explored.

The group then considered, in a Baconian spirit, what were the desiderata of learning with respect to universal language studies. Editions of inaccessible texts and investigations of individual thinkers were obvious further developments, but discussion centred on the importance of seeing the universal language movement in the broader intellectual and social context. Attention was drawn to the interest of universal language schemes for scholars concerned with religious language, the reform of prose style and language in education, as well as in more immediately related areas such as shorthand, orthography and punctuation.

As a step towards coordinating research efforts, it was hoped to produce a register of recent and forthcoming publications, and of research in progress, before the next meeting of the group.
SYMPOSIUM ON: ENGLISH GRAMMAR - ENGLISH GRAMMARS
Freie Universität, Berlin, July 8-11, 1985

A Symposium on English Grammar and English Grammars was held at the Freie Universität, Berlin, from July 8th to 11th, 1985. The planning and organization were undertaken by Prof. Gerhard Leitner, Head of the Institut für Englische Philologie, and all of us who attended the Symposium are greatly indebted for the stimulation and interest provided by the academic content of the meetings and for the care he took to ensure that we had an enjoyable stay in the city. In particular we look back on a delightful cruise on the Havel River from Tennenau one evening.

About thirty people took an active part in the Symposium, including some students of the Freie Universität, and a number of others attended some of the meetings. Though the total of active participants was restricted in order that everyone could offer a paper, nine countries outside West Berlin were represented: Holland, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and the U.S.A.

The theme of the Symposium was an examination of the development and current situation of published grammars in English in relation to the teaching of the language, more especially in West Germany. A number of German teachers of English were present, and a lively discussion of the principles and practice of foreign language teaching took place on one of the evenings. The first day was devoted in the main to a historical survey of English language teaching in various European countries and in the U.S.A. Thereafter the principles, resources, and problems of the present day were examined in depth from different perspectives and viewpoints. There was a display of current books, including the newly published Comprehensive Grammar of English, and Professor Greenbaum's talk on its planning and production attracted the largest audience of the Symposium.

The distinction between pedagogic grammar and theoretical grammar was emphasized throughout, and, while different theories were discussed, this was always in the context of the needs of teachers, school children, and university students. Among the participants were some students in training as teachers of English, and their comments and reports on their problems were of particular interest. No one theory predominated, but papers written specifically from a generative point of view. There was a display of current books, including the newly published Comprehensive Grammar of English, and Professor Greenbaum's talk on its planning and production attracted the largest audience of the Symposium.

The presence of Dr Burchfield, Editor of the Oxford English Dictionaries, ensured that lexicography held a prominent place in our discussions. But the general feeling was that at least as far as foreign language teaching was concerned a sharp distinction between lexicology and grammar could be a hindrance to the work and that it should not be overdrawn. We learned that in addition to language teaching and language practice students of foreign languages should be specifically taught how to make proper use of dictionaries and reference grammars. Even today with the amount of published material available it seems that the needs of many students, especially at school level, for readily accessible reference grammars, small enough to be economically priced, clear, and well indexed, were still not being met in full.

Discussions with and between German teachers of English revealed a fairly prominent divergence of views on the priority to be accorded to the encouragement and confidence in using a foreign language, even with grammatical and lexical errors and faulty pronunciation, and the imposition of strict standards of performance from the start. Clearly both are essential, but their relative weighting is a matter for judgment. Listening to the German teachers of English made clear how prominent a place the active use of the foreign language today and showed the dedication and enthusiasm of the teachers in their work.

The Proceedings of the Symposium will be published by Niemeyer of Tübingen, it is hoped next year. Members of the Henry Sweet Society may be particularly interested in the historically oriented papers, covering aspects of the progress of English language teaching from the Renaissance to the present day. A number of the papers dealt with grammatical and lexical errors and faulty pronunciation, and the expectations of the language teaching profession.

A.C. GIMSON 1917 - 1985

Gimson was very much the inheritor of the tradition of Henry Sweet and Daniel Jones. Like them he occupied himself with both contemporary and earlier forms of English, like them he worked on the phonological analysis of a number of other languages, and like them he believed that theory should go hand in hand with practical phonetic skills. His two major legacies are his Introduction to the Pronunciation of English, first published in 1962, which quickly superseded Jones' Outline of English Phonetics as the standard description of present-day English pronunciation, and the English Pronouncing Dictionary, with which he first assisted the author, Daniel Jones, and subsequently took over as sole editor, producing a totally revised 13th edition. Although the EPD was a continuous preoccupation until the time of his death in 1985, he was consulted on pronunciation matters by virtually all the editors of dictionaries in this country, and it is due to his efforts that there is now a standard transcription for pronunciation in these works. He was, until he died, a member of the consultative panel concerned with the computerized version of the great Oxford English Dictionary.

Gimson took over the headship of the Phonetics Department at University College London in 1971, and his immediate task was to carry through the amalgamation of the then separate departments of Phonetics and Linguistics, bringing into being a most powerful all-round entity. His management of the department over the following twelve years saw a flowering of research publications and an expansion of traditional teaching commitments, notably, in the latter case, the establishment of a first degree in Speech Sciences, on which he worked hard and long to bring together the various disparate elements. His commitment to this project stemmed largely from his long connection with the College of Speech Therapists; he was for many years chairman of their examinations board and a valued advisor to the College and to the...
various schools of speech therapy throughout the country. His contribution in this respect is to be acknowledged by the College’s setting up of a fund to support an A.C. Gimson memorial lecture.

In 1950 Gimson became secretary and treasurer of the International Phonetic Association and editor of its journal *Le Maître Phonétique*. He immediately set about underpinning its somewhat shaky financial and editorial foundations, and throughout his long tenure of these offices the journal made a satisfactory profit and regular quarterly appearances. An achievement which gave him particular satisfaction was to persuade the Council of the Association to change from the traditional phonetic transcription of *Le Maître Phonétique* to the normal orthography of what is now the *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*, with consequent wider accessibility.

Perhaps his greatest influence in the field of phonetics was a personal one. Many professors of phonetics and English throughout the world were his students, with whom he kept in regular touch. He travelled widely and tirelessly to promote his subject and must have known everyone who was anyone in the field. The respect and affection in which he was held is reflected in the number of his compères who have mourned his death and clamoured for the establishment of some suitable memorial to him.

J. D. O’Connor

A.C. GIMSON MEMORIAL FUND APPEAL

Friends, students and colleagues around the world will be grieved by the death of Professor A.C. Gimson. The Department of Phonetics and Linguistics, University College London, desires to honour Professor Gimson’s memory by the establishment of a Memorial Fund. It is hoped to fund a Scholarship or Fellowship in his name to enable an overseas scholar to come and study in the department. The precise form and duration of any such award will depend on the amount of money raised.

Donations and enquiries relating to this appeal should be addressed to:

Professor N.V. Smith,
Department of Phonetics and Linguistics,
University College London,
Gower Street,
London WC1 6BT.

May 1986

LINGUISTIC ABSTRACTS

Professor David Crystal, editor of *Linguistic Abstracts*, is willing to include in the journal abstracts of items on the history of linguistics. He would be pleased to hear from anyone interested in writing a survey on linguistic historiography, and also from those who would care to offer abstracts on an ad hoc basis, derived from journals which are not already in the core list of *Linguistic Abstracts*. He asks members of the Society to contact him before writing abstracts, to check that no one else has already produced an abstract. Contact address: P.O. Box 5, Holyhead, Gwynedd, LL65 1RG, Tel. 0407 2764.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE LINGUISTIQUE / LINGUISTIC BIBLIOGRAPHIE

The editor of B.L., Drs Mark Janse, would be interested to hear from members of the Society who would be prepared to contribute bibliographical information about relevant publications in the history of linguistics, in the first instance for 1984. He would also be glad to hear from members who could offer assistance in other areas of linguistics, as well as from all members who have published books or articles on any linguistic topic in 1984 and 1985. Contact address: Bibliographie Linguistique, Prins Willem-Alexanderhof 5, 2595 BE The Hague, Holland.

G.A. Padley, the third volume of whose *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe* is currently in press, has been appointed to a personal chair at University College Dublin.

The HSS congratulates Dr Jane Roberts, Kings College London, on the receipt of a Leverhulme award for her work on the Historical Thesaurus of English.
QUERY

THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC FUTUROLOGY

References are sought to linguists or other writers in the past who have attempted to foretell developments in the English language. Replies to: Katie Wales, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Department of English, Egham Hill, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX.

MEETINGS

THE LINGUISTICS OF WRITING
University of Strathclyde, 4-6 July 1986. Details from Nigel Fabb, English Studies, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow G1 1XH.

CONFERENCE ON ANALOGY
University of Aberdeen, 4-6 August 1986, under the auspices of the Traditional Cosmology Society. Details from Dr Rosalind Shaw, Department of Religious Studies, Aberdeen University, Aberdeen AB9 2UB.

EURALEX
Second International Conference, Zürich, 9-14 September 1986. Details from PD Mary Smell-Hornby, Dekanat der Philosophischen Fakultät 1, Universität Zürich, Ramistrasse 71, CH-8006 Zürich, Switzerland.

ICHoLS IV

SHEL
Héritage des grammariens latins de l’antiquité aux Lumières: Histoire des Théories. 2-4 September 1987, Chantilly, near Paris. Details from Irène Rosier, Dept. de Recherche Linguistique, Université Paris 7, 2 Place Jussieu, 75251 Paris Cedex 05.

COLLOQUE MEILLET
4-10 September 1987. Details from Sylvain Auroux, Histoire des Théories Linguistiques, Dept. de Recherche Linguistique, Université Paris 7, 2 Place Jussieu, 75251 Paris Cedex 05.

NEW MEMBERS

Dr Dionisius Agius
Elm House, Upper Poppleton, York YO2 6DL. (Arabic and Maltese linguistics.)

Miss Catherine Hart,
Trinity College, Oxford.

Mr Darrell Hincliffe,
50 Queens Drive, Glasgow G42 8DD. (16th-century theories of language, with special reference to the English orthoepy debate.)

Drs Mark Janse,
Linguistic Bibliography, Prins Willem-Alexanderhof 5, 2595 BE The Hague, The Netherlands. (Greek linguistics; comparative Indo-European and Semitic linguistics.)

Mr Bernd Kortman,
Seminar für englische Philologie, Universität Hannover, Im Moore 21, 3000 Hannover 1, West Germany.

Miss Helen Mosby,
12 Adelaide Street, Oxford OX2 6EN.

Dr M.B. Parkes,
Keble College, Oxford OX1 3PG. (The history of punctuation.)

Professor Neil v. Smith,
Department of Phonetics and Linguistics, University College, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT. (Linguistic theory.)

Professor H.C. Wolfart,
Linguistics Program, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2.

CHANGES OF ADDRESS

Professor Linda Dowling,
McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, Dept. of English and Comparative Literature, 248-9 McMicken Hall (ML 69), Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0069, U.S.A.

Professor J. Wollock,
Dept of Psychiatry, New York Hospital, Cornell Medical Center, 525 East 68th Street, New York, NY 10021, U.S.A.
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

I. PERIODICALS, NEWSLETTERS AND PROCEEDINGS


II. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS


III. ARTICLES


Bursill-Hall, G.L. (1977) "Teaching grammars of the Middle Ages: notes on the manuscript tradition" Historiographia Linguistica 4, 1-29.


Bursill-Hall, G.L. (1979) "Johannes de Garlandia: additional manuscript material" Historiographia Linguistica 6, 77-86.

Frank, T. (1985) "Linguistic theory and the doctrine of usage in George Campbell's 'Philosophy of Rhetoric'" Lingua e Stile 20, 199-216.


The Hon. Sec. would like to thank most warmly all those members (and some non-members) who have submitted publications, some of which arrived too late for inclusion in this list. She also apologises for omissions, which will be rectified in the next newsletter.