HENRY SWEET SOCIETY COLLOQUIUM 1997

Abstracts of papers

THE final programme for this year's colloquium contained 18 half hour papers, an hour-long symposium, and the Leslie Seiffert lecture, delivered by the Society's president, which opened the colloquium. The abstracts are given here in the order in which the papers were presented.

Andrew Linn

****

'Habent sua fata libelli'.
On the Importance of a 'History of Books' for a 'History of Ideas'
Werner Hüllen (Essen, werner.huellen@uni-essen.de)

Introito e porta, published in Venice in 1477 by one (otherwise unknown) Adam of Rottweil is the first printed textbook for learning a foreign vernacular, in this case German or Italian (Claes 1977). According to its introduction it was meant to serve people who wanted to learn these languages for trading in the respective countries, without however going to a school. The book consists of a long word-list, almost exclusively nouns and adjectives, in some topical order and verbs together with phrases which are frequently set expressions of conversations.

   Introito e porta, however, is not the first book of its kind, although the first one printed. A manuscript of 1424 called *Liber in volgaro,* written in Venice by one Master George of Nuremberg, is of a very similar type (Pausch 1972). It also presents nouns and adjectives in a topical order, adjectives with the various methods of comparison, verbs with their conjugation paradigms and conversations. Although a direct dependence of *Introito e porta* on the *Liber in volgaro* cannot be proved, it is obvious that Adam of Rottweil must have known the earlier work or some derivative which was extant in the intervening 52 years. This is particularly obvious in the noun and adjective section and in the collection of set phrases for conversations.

   The topical word-lists of both works show a close similarity to word-lists in dictionaries meant to serve the teaching of Latin. There was an obvious tradition at work here which arranged lexemes in a certain order, irrespective of the languages involved. There are differences, but they are only of a gradual kind. This can be shown by the relevant part of the Latin-German textbook written by Johannes Murmellius in 1513 and published in Cologne. This author (Reichling 1880) stresses the 'scientific' categories of word-order, whereas the two later authors are ostensibly more interested in the needs of everyday communication and gear the order of their vocabulary to it. But even so, the 'scientific' skeleton of the topical word-order can be recognised in the background. This can be demonstrated by a comparison between the three word-lists.

Within the next century, *Introito e porta* spread over all the relevant parts of Europe and was translated into all the relevant languages, eventually into as many as eight of them in one edition (Bart 1984). There must have been an estimated 30,000 copies on the market.

The international 'fate' of this book shows the growing need for learning foreign vernaculars arising in the last half of the 15th century. With our historiographical hindsight we can say that this was an almost revolutionary development. It also shows how quickly the new printing trade responded to this need. Moreover, it shows that the cultural unity of Europe, according to common opinion a result of Latin, was not touched by the new method of language learning at all. The growing awareness of vernaculars did not (yet) break Europe down into national linguistic countries.

The analysis of *Introito e porta* and related works is presented as a case study for the interconnection of 'facts' and 'arguments' (ideas) in the historiography of linguistics (Hüllen 1996).

References:

Bart, Alda Rossebastiano (1984): *Antichi vocabulari plurilingui d'uso popolare: la tradizione del 'Solenissimo Vochabulista'*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Claes, Franz (1977): *Bibliographisches Verzeichnis der deutschen Vokabulare und Wörterbücher, gedruckt bis 1600*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Hüllen, Werner (1996): "Schemata der Historiographie. Ein Traktat." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 6.1: 113-125.

Pausch, Oskar (1972): *Das älteste italienisch-deutsche Sprachbuch. Eine Überlieferung aus dem Jahre 1424 nach Georg von Nürnberg*. Wien: Hermann Böhlau. (Veröffentlichung der historischen Kommission der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).

Reichling, Dietrich (1880): *Johannes Murmellius. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Nebst einem ausführlichen Verzeichnis sämmtlicher Schriften und einer Auswahl von Gedichten*. Freiburg. Reprint: [s.l.]: Nienkoop - de Graaf 1963.

****

Dalgerno in Paris -
Jaap Maat (Amsterdam, maat@illc.uva.nl)
David Cram (Oxford, david.cram@jesus.oxford.ac.uk)

This paper report on a recent discovery that in the Bibliothèque Mazarine in Paris there are conserved two manuscripts, each of which is concerned with one of two distinct but closely connected inventions by George Dalgarno: a universal character and an artificial language. The manuscripts are in Latin, and they were written by a visitor who probably came from Paris and who was possibly associated with the Jesuits. For the rest, we have as yet found few clues about the identity of the author, who notes that he was in Oxford in 1657, where 'a certain Scot, George Dalgerno' explained his inventions to him in English. The paper recapitulates the early history of Dalgarno's schem e, explaining why the belief was widespread that a universal writing was desirable and feasible, whereas the creation of a new universal language seemed

far less attractive. Setting out to improve shorthand, Dalgarno soon decided to work simultaneously on a universal character. A little later, he started working on a spoken language. A broadsheet he published in 1657, entitled 'tables of the 'Universal Character', provides a summary of the whole plan.

The Paris manuscripts contain a faithful Latin translation of the tables printed on this broadsheet, and also of parts of the accompanying text containing explanatory matter. Apart from this, there are some fragments which do not correspond to the broadsheet. For instance, the document dealing with the language exemplifies the method Dalgarno used at an initial stage for forming artificial words. Thus the Paris manuscripts enable us to fill in some of the details of the development of Dalgarno's early scheme. Further, their very existence gives additional evidence how closely knit the network of scholarly contacts regarding universal language was. Finally, the fact that there are two manuscripts, one dealing with a character, the other with a language, illustrates once more the importance of the relationship between spoken and written language for seventeenth century ideas on universal language.

****

Martin Aedler: Germanist, Hebraist or Comparativist?
Fredericka van der Lubbe (Sydney, Fredericka.van.der.lubbe@pgrad.arts.su.edu.au)

Martin Aedler's scarcely recognized niche in linguistic history is as the author of the first German grammar in English, the almost anonymous *High Dutch Minerva* of 1680. Shortly after publishing this, his major piece of work, which brought him practically no recognition but a great deal of distress, he slipped back into almost total obscurity on becoming a casual Hebrew teacher at the University of Cambridge. In spite of his being almost totally unknown in England, he was and is still vaguely remembered among German-speaking scholars as having been a member of the German linguistic society, the 'Deutschgesinnte Genossenschaft'. This paper examines Aedler as a Germanist on the basis of what he published in the *High Dutch Minerva*, as a Hebraist on the basis of letters and other manuscript material by him that has only recently been brought to light by the author of the present paper, and as a comparativist on the basis of what both his published and unpublished writings reveal about him.

****

James Harris's Revision of Hermes
Masataka Miyawaki (Kanagawa, miyamasa@lib.bekkoame.or.jp)

James Harris's *Hermes* is undoubtedly one of the most important works in the history of the study of language in Britain, especially in the annals of those treatises which focus on the universal principles of language. Although there have been various studies of Harris's theory of language, no attempt has been made to collate the several editions of *Hermes*. In this paper I propose to compare the four editions of *Hermes* published during Harris's lifetime (1709-1780) and trace the process of revision. The

relevant editions are: 1st edition (London, 1751), 2nd edition (London, 1765), 3rd edition (London, 1771), and 4th edition (Dublin, 1773). Unfortunately I have been unable to gain access to the Dublin fourth edition and have had to use the London fourth edition (1784) instead.

Revision from the 1st to the 2nd edition.

With regard to the structure of the book, there are two notable differences between the 1st and 2nd editions. To the second edition were added (1) a frontispiece that represents Hermes as the inventor of letters and god of rational discourse and (2) a new section of "Additional Notes". As for the title page, in the first edition the subtitle reads "A Philosophical Inquiry Concerning LANGUAGE AND UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR", though already in the first edition the inner title at the beginning of books I, II, and III has the same subtitle as the title page of the 2nd edition, the words "language and" being omitted. Another difference with regard to the title page is that the 1st edition does not indicate the full name of the author, but only gives his initials "J. H.", while the second edition gives his name fully, "IAMES HARRIS". In the main body of the book, the text is revised in 20 places for the better understanding of the reader (especially the passage on the distinction between the "Requisitive" and "Interrogative" moods on the one hand and the "Indicative" and "Potential" moods on the other [2nd ed., 149-151]), 25 footnotes are revised or enlarged, and 32 new footnotes are added. It has generally been assumed that Harris is an avowed classicist, and that most of the authorities on whom he draws are classical authors (e. g. Arens 1984: 516). According to my count, out of 72 authorities Harris cites in the 1st edition, 60 are from the period before the Renaissance and 12 are from the modern period; to put it as a percentage, 83% v. 17%. Harris adds 30 authorities to the 2nd edition, of whom 23 are from the period before the Renaissance and 7 are from the modern period, i.e. 77% to 23%. So it can be said that, through the revision of the footnotes, Harris does more justice to modern authorities. The 7 modern authors newly added to the 2nd edition are Francis Bacon, the Dutch physician Hermann Boerhaave, Thomas Fuller, the botanist Linnæus (Carl von Linné), Robert Lowth, James Stuart, and Edmund Spenser.

Revision from the 2nd to the 3rd edition.

Compared with the revision from the 2nd to the 3rd edition, the scale of this revision is small. The text is revised in 20 places, but most of the changes are corrections of simple grammatical or stylistic inadequacies and replacements of words or phrases by synonymous ones. As for the footnotes, 7 are revised in minor ways, 1 is enlarged and one new note is added. Harris adds a citation from the Belgian mathematician Andreas Tacquet (3rd ed., 327 [f]), and refers to John Petvin's *Letters concerning Mind* (1750) (172 [o]). Probyn (1991: 149) remarks that "the second edition of *Hermes* does not mention Petvin's book, but a generous acknowledgement was added from Harris's notes in the 1801 and 1841 editions of his *Works* (p. 167)", suggesting that the reference to Petvin was printed for the first time in the collected *Works* of 1801. But it is the 3rd edition that first refers to Petvin's book.

Revision from the 3rd to the 4th edition.

The revision from the 3rd to the 4th edition is still more limited in scale than that from the 2nd to the 3rd. Only a very small number of minor changes are made to the text and footnotes without affecting the contents of the book, and it is doubtful

whether Harris himself is responsible for these changes. The printer may have made many, if not all, of them.

Conclusion.

It is the 2nd edition that underwent the most extensive and important revision. The 3rd edition was revised in a limited way. It is doubtful whether the change made in the 4th edition actually deserves to be called a 'revision''. In view of these findings, I think it is reasonable to conclude that when we study Harris's *Hermes*, we should use the 3rd edition or one of the editions later than the 3rd. However, there are many careless typos in the 3rd edition, most of which are corrected in the 4th. So if we want to avoid encountering many typos, I would recommend that we should base a study of Hermes on the 4th edition or on one of the subsequent editions which are virtually reprints of the 4th.

References:
Arens, Hans 1984. *Aristotle's Theory of Language and its Tradition: Texts from 500 to 1750*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Probyn, Clive T. 1991. *The Social Humanist: The Life and Works of James Harris (1709-1780)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

****

The Foundation of Grammatical Categories in James Beattie's 'The Theory of Language' (1783) in Comparison to Condillac's 'Grammaire' (1775)

Lieve Jooken (Leuven, lieve.jooken@arts.kuleuven.ac.be)

This paper elaborates one topic of a post-doctoral research project which studies the impact of the linguistic concepts of Etienne Bonnot de Condillac in Scotland between 1760 and 1800. James Beattie's 'Theory of Language' formed part of his courses in Moral Philosophy for students at Marischal College, Aberdeen, and Condillac's 'Grammaire' was the first section of his 'Cours d'études' for the instruction of the Prince of Parma. Both works were composed in the 1760s. The paper analyses the concept of general grammar in both works. To Condillac general grammatical categories are not the reflection of a prior categorization of thought. Rather, the uniformity of human constitution determined the creation of specific types of linguistic signs, which were the foundation of general parts of speech. Thought, then, is only analysed through the method of discourse. To Beattie, on the other hand, the universality of grammatical categories is motivated by the similarity of thoughts of men in various ages and nations. Still, Beattie's observation that 'thoughts discover themselves by language' suggests that he may have been aware of the sensationalist tradition established by Condillac.

***

Hervás y Panduro's Position in the History of Anthropological Linguistics
Gerda Haßler (Potsdam, hassler@persius.rz.uni-potsdam.de)

In this paper I argue that it is not justified to classify Hervás y Panduro as a forerunner of nineteenth century linguistics. His intentions in writing a catalogue of the languages of the world were different and so was the result.

After the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain Hervás went to Italy and started working on a large encyclopedia of mankind which was published in Italian under the title of *Idea dell'Universo* from 1778 till 1787. Volume XVII of this encyclopedia is already a catalogue of the known languages of the world, and there are several other linguistic subjects treated by Hervás in this period. Later Hervás published a much more extensive catalogue of the languages of the world in Spanish (*Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas, y numeración, división, y clases de estas, según la diversidad de sus idiomas y dialectos*, 1800-1805, 6 vols.). This work has to be seen in relationship with other anthropological publications by Hervás. His studies on the theory of language are subordinated to the attempt to create a synthesis between religious dogma and the new culture and philosophy which had appeared in the age of Enlightenment. In this context Hervás accepts empiricist methods of cognition. In a treatise on the origin of language which appeared as part of the Italian encyclopedia Hervás had repeated Condillac's hypothesis of two children grown up outside society who would develop language to communicate their needs. It had become clear that this hypothesis could be used to explain human language as created by man out of cries and gestures of a "natural" language. So Hervás had to reconcile this explanation with the biblical report on the creation of language. What helped him to do so was stressing the arbitrary nature of language signs. A work which is still sometimes held to be a precurser of historical-comparative linguistics had been motivated by religious and anthropological convictions and aims.

Hervás discusses four groups of authors who had already compared languages. The first type of author had been looking for universals behind the differences of languages, others had tried to put all languages down to one source or at least to one of the "mother-tongues" of a certain area. According to Hervás the very few treatises written on the history of peoples in the light of their languages are much more useful. But the most beneficial work which has been done in the study of languages is represented by grammars describing their real character. In this context he mentions the material on which his own study relies: the descriptions of foreign languages collected by missionaries. Finally he does not forget the already existing catalogue written by Pallas. Unfortunately Pallas was not really interested in the structure of languages, and this is the reason for Hervás to feel himself completely original.

****

Reasons for the non-Development of Syntactical Theory in the Hellenstic Period
Dirk M. Schenkeveld (Amsterdam)

This paper is meant as a continuation of my paper given at the ICHoLS VII conference (Oxford, September 1996) on 'the figurae grammaticae and solecisms'. There I

15

showed the different attitudes in the practice of three grammarians and rhetoricians towards the occurrences of solecisms in Classical authors. Now I wish to look into the role of a theory of solecism in connection with the well-known fact that a truly developed theory of syntax did not exist in Classical Antiquity.

My main points will be that, when teaching Greek language to boys being native speakers of Greek, the need for a syntax was not felt, the more so when a theory of solecism helped to correct their errors of syntax and the division of work between grammarians and rhetoricians put composition on the side of the latter teachers, who when teaching this subject looked at other aspects than grammatical syntax.

****

Symposium on the History and Nature of Figures and Tropes
James J. Murphy (Davis, Ca., jermurphy@ucdavis.edu), Lynette Hunter (Leeds), Peter Mack (Warwick), Dirk M. Schenkeveld (Amsterdam)

****

English in Denmark in the Period 1678-1800 with special reference to Frideric Bolling, Henrik Gerner, Chresten L. Nyborg, Charles Bertram and Johan Clemens Tode
Hanne Lauridsen (Copenhagen)

In this paper some of the most important works on the English language written in Danish between 1678 and 1800 will be commented on. These works include grammars, works on English pronunciation and a bilingual dictionary. The discussion will concentrate on the following five writers: Frideric Bolling (1640?-1685), Henrik Gerner (1629-1700), Chresten L. Nyborg (1650-?), Charles Bertram (1723-1765), and Johan Clemens Tode (1736-1806).

At the end of the 17th century cultural relations between Denmark and England were sparse, but growing. English was not taught in Danish schools or at the University of Copenhagen, so if a Dane wanted to learn English, he had to find a private teacher or go to England to study the language there.

The first three authors mentioned all published their works in the last quarter of the 17th century. They studied theology and became clergymen, but they also acquired a good knowledge of the English language: Gerner actually studied at Oxford, Nyborg acted for some time as a chaplain to a company of Danish mercenaries in England, and Bolling - after having spent some years in the Far East - was taken prisoner by the English at sea, and was kept by them for several months. They all wrote English grammars for Danes, especially concentrating on pronunciation; Bolling: *Fuldkommen Engelske Grammatica* (1678), Gerner: *Ortographia Danica eller det Danske Sproks Skriffverichtighed: Item en Kort Undervjssning om det Engelske Sprogs Pronunciation* (1679), Nyborg: *Adresse til Det Engelske Sprogs Læssning* (1698). The originality of these first Danish works on the English language is especially conspicuous in the contrastive analyses, especially when Danish and English pronunciation are compared.

Bolling also wrote an alphabetically arranged bilingual dictionary: *Friderici Bollingii Engelske Dictionarium* (1678), the very first English-Danish dictionary to be published. It is a small dictionary based on English-Latin dictionaries, but characterized by the author's common sense and pedagogical insight.

Charles Bertram was an immigrant from England, and must have been bilingual. He was a learned scholar, though not an academic. He left a large library suggesting that he knew many languages. He was for some years a teacher of English at the Naval College of Copenhagen. He wrote two grammars, both in Danish: *Rudimenta Grammaticæ Anglicanæ* (1750), and *Royal English-Danish Grammar* (1753), the second being an enlarged version of the first. These grammars are much more comprehensive than those of Bolling, Gerner and Nyborg, and they show real, scholarly insight into the English and Danish languages.

The last writer to be commented on here is Johan Clemens Tode. He was by profession a doctor, became professor of medicine, and Vice-chancellor of the University of Copenhagen, but he had no experience as a language teacher. He had, however, spent much time in England (studying medicine) and had consulted native speakers of English as well as English grammars when writing his works on the English language. He published five works on English pronunciation from 1787-1789, and a grammar in two volumes in 1790: *Engelsk-Dansk Grammatik*. He praises Bertram's grammars, but as they were out of print, Tode felt confident that <u>his</u> book would be a useful contribution. Apart from his theoretical works on the English language Tode translated most of Tobias Smollett's novels into Danish. These translations were very popular and later translations of Smollett's novels were partly based on Tode's translations.

In my paper I shall discuss in more detail the works mentioned above, whereas my colleague, Inge Kabell, will comment on English in Denmark in the 19th century.

****

English in Denmark in the 19th Century - with Special Reference to the First Two Professors of English at the University of Copenhagen, Thomas Christopher Bruun (1750-1834) and George Stephens (1813-1895)

Inge Kabell (Copenhagen, kabell@engelsk.ku.dk)

While the first part of our double lecture on the teaching of English in Denmark deals with the very first teachers - mainly private teachers - the aim of this second part is to describe the first two university teachers of English in Denmark; together they were active as such through the greater part of the 19th century.

That century was for Denmark a century marked and marred by war; at the beginning, there was a long period (1801-1815) during which the country suffered under incompetent leadership resulting in its siding with Napoleon against Britain, an ill-considered and unhappy decision which had a number of dire consequences: the bombardment of Copenhagen by the British navy, the surrender of the Danish navy to Britain, the bankruptcy of the Danish State, and the loss of Norway to Sweden. So, from being a prosperous neutral country at the turn of the century Denmark ended up as a poor, amputated state with a capital in ruins and no money for an immediate

reconstruction of the many buildings - among them the University - which had been destroyed by bombs and fire.

In the middle of the century new political tensions were looming on the horizon with the very intricate problems concerning Schleswig-Holstein and its relations to Denmark and to our southern neighbour; once again the result was war, actually two, in the period 1848-1864, and in the latter Denmark disgracefully suffered defeat and had to surrender a large part of the kingdom to Prussia. As may be expected, these defeats (to Britain and to Prussia) led to feelings of animosity towards the enemies; likewise they gave rise to a growth of patriotism which, regarding literature, language and culture in a broader sense, made poets and scholars begin to seek inspiration in a national past which was more glorious and heroic than the present. At the beginnning, this corresponded very well with the Romantic Movement coming to Denmark by then from abroad, and the period of our past of which we are now so proud and which we have given the name "The Golden Age" actually flourished at a time when the country was as poor as ever - with poets/authors like Hans Christian Andersen, Adam Oehlenschläger and N.F.S.Grundtvig and a scholar like Rasmus Rask. In the university world this interest in the Nordic past continued most of the century and was undoubtedly the main reason why George Stephens actually chose Denmark as his new and second home.

What has been said above provides the background for the lives and activities of T.C. Bruun and George Stephens, the principal themes of my lecture today.

These two men, the first professors of English in Denmark, were not professors in the proper sense of the word, their titles being only honorary ones. One may say that first and foremost they acted as language teachers, and especially Bruun's activities within the subject of English can hardly be termed scholarly, let alone pioneering; he wrote a good, practical grammar of English, and that is all. According to many autobiographies of the time, he seems, however, to have been a popular teacher. As for Stephens, he published one scholarly work, a book in several volumes on the old Runic monuments of Scandinavia, but the system used by him met with severe criticism from his contemporaries, and it was soon totally forgotten. But again as a teacher, he was undoubtedly well liked.

The fact that neither of them can be said to have figured among the outstanding scholars in Denmark in the 19th century does not preclude, however, that both of them were gifted and fascinating personalities who did not seclude themselves from the world around them but partook in the life of the Danish capital - for better or worse!; some people would say that their main importance as the first professors of English was that they prepared the way for Otto Jespersen, our first real professor of this language - and a man who, unlike them, was to reach international renown.

****

A Matter of 'Consequenz': Humboldt on Chinese
John E. Joseph (Edinburgh, john.joseph@ed.ac.uk)

Within a few pages of each other in Humboldt (1836) are found a declaration of the inferiority of Chinese to Sanskrit on the grounds that its structure is animated by a less fruitful principle of mental development, and the statement that it "has a high degree

of excellence, and exerts a powerful, albeit one-sided, influence on the mental faculties... In the first place, there is no contesting the great consistency of its structure... [T]he seeming absence of all grammar in Chinese is precisely what enhances, in the national mind, the acuteness of the ability to recognize the formal linkage of speech". The latter statement has unfortunately failed to find its way into more than one recent discussion of Humboldt's views on Chinese (see e.g. Harris & Taylor 1989, ch. 12; Benson forthcoming), so that a picture of Humboldt as one-sidedly denigrating Chinese appears to be spreading. Admittedly, most of the remarks on Chinese in Humboldt (1836) resemble the first of those mentioned above rather than the second; but the complex, even paradoxical nature of his views (which Humboldt himself acknowledges) should not be glossed over. What he appreciates in Chinese is its consistency (ironically enough given his own seeming inconsistency!) within its structural type. Yet languages inconsistent within their type, such as Modern German and English, sometimes get absorbed back into the historical origination point of their type (in this case, Sanskrit), so that it isn't immediately clear what Chinese is better than. The present paper is an attempt at sorting through Humboldt's views on the basis of not just Humboldt (1836) but others of his works, in particular his long letter to Abel Remusat on the genius of the Chinese language.

****

Keichû and the Native Japanese Linguistic Tradition
Ann Wehmeyer (Gainesville, Fl, wehmeyer@aall.ufl.edu)

A native linguistic tradition arose and flourished in Japan during the Tokugawa period (1603-1868), only to be 'nipped in the bud" (Miller 1967: 311) by the import of Western word and paradigm models in the nineteenth century. The name of this tradition, *kokugaku*, 'nativism", reflects its exclusive preoccupation with the study of native, that is, non-Chinese, texts and language. Yet, the pivotal figure who created the 'scientific" methodology later adopted by this school (Furuta and Tsukishima 1972: 3) was a Buddhist priest of the Shingon school, Keichû (1640-1701). Keichû viewed Japanese poetry as the *dhâranî* (esoteric Buddhist mantras) of Japan (*Wajishôranshô*, 1695: 114), and wrote an extensive commentary (*Man'yô daishôki*, comp. ca. 1687-1690) on Japan's earliest anthology of poetry, the *Man'yôshû* (ca. 759).

Keichû drew from his knowledge of Sanskrit studies in Japan (*Shittan*) to analyze the structure of the sounds of Japanese, and he attempted to represent a universal classification of sounds, for which he has been accused of naiveté (Mabuchi 1993: 52). I will argue that Keichû's discussion of sounds, based as it is on place and manner of articulation, represents an attempt at an etic view of language, something which is missing in subsequent scholars of the tradition. An additional point which sets Keichû apart from those who followed is that he was well aware that one arrangement of the Japanese syllabary was based on the order of the Sanskrit alphabet, while subsequent scholars such as Kamo no Mabuchi rejected this origin and attributed the order to divine ancestors (Toyoda 1980: 187).

Keichû's view of language has been termed "esoteric" (Seeley 1991: 118). Keichû stands alone, however, in his attempt to analyze the relation between sound or written representation of sound and spirituality in a universal sense. While he acknowledged that the Japanese people had from antiquity viewed the spoken word as having magical properties (*kotodama*), he, unlike those who followed, did not view this as a unique feature of language to be found only in the Japanese language. I will argue that in the work of Keichû, one can find the beginnings of an etic analysis of language, while in the tradition as it developed after Keichû, the focus and methods of analysis were strictly emic in nature.

References:
Furuta Tôsaku and Tsukishima Hiroshi. 1972. *Kokugogaku shi*. Tokyo: Tôkyô Daigaku
         shuppan kai. Hisamatu Sen'ichi, ed. 1973. *Keichû zenshû*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
Mabuchi Kazuo. 1993. *Gojûon zu no hanashi*. Tokyo: Taishûkan shoten.
Miller, Roy Andrew. 1967. *The Japanese Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Seeley, Christopher. 1991. *A History of Writing in Japan*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
Toyoda Kunio. 1980. *Nihonzin no kotodama shisô*. Tokyo: Kôdansha.

****

South American Missionaries and the Description of the General Languages
Cristina Altman (São Paulo, altman@usp.br)

Unlike Anglo Saxon America, Latin America was colonized under the system of *padroado* ['patronage'] which, in practice, divided the non-Christian world of the time between the Spanish and the Portuguese Catholic kingdoms, provided that they promoted the evangelization of the 'discovered' territories. The colonizing and catechizing enterprise would not be successful, however, without a parallel linguistic policy. As a matter of fact, the linguistic panorama of Portuguese and Spanish America was quite complex, and in the course of three centuries Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, and, in particular, Jesuits came to South America to accomplish the double-sided function of missionary work: catechism and general education in reading and writing.

Although we do not know the exact number of the spoken languages at the time, we probably don't exaggerate if we consider the presence of hundreds of tribal languages and dialects side-by-side with several major contact and trade languages of variable degrees of geographical diffusion and prestige, like *Araucano* (Chile), *Aymara* (Bolivia and Peru), *Quechua* (from Chile as far as Equator), *Tupi* (Brazilian coast), and *Guarani* (Paraguay), to mention only some of those spoken in the territory which corresponds today to South America. While the former, the local languages, were absolutely secondary to the interests of the colonial powers, religious or terrestrial, and condemned for this reason to extinction rather sooner than later, these other languages were often chosen by both the Administration and the Church as supra-regional and supra-tribal means of communication, and hence were those preferably 'reduced to rules' and the subject of dictionary work by the missionaries. In most instances, before publishing their grammars and glossaries, the missionaries had

lived for many years amongst the natives. As a result, it seems reasonable to suggest that, in the task of describing the indigenous languages, the missionaries not only applied their formal linguistic knowledge of Latin grammar, but also the intuition they had developed in the use of these languages. They may well have found different descriptive solutions when facing data from languages typologically different from their own.

This paper examines this hypothesis by comparing the grammars written by three contemporary Jesuits, who described different South American languages: Joseph de Anchieta (1534-1597) in *his Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais usada na costa do Brasil* of 1595, Antonio Ludovico Bertonio (1555-1628), in his *Arte Breve dela Lengva Aymara, para introduction del arte grande de la misma lengua* of 1603, and Diego de Torres Rubio (1547-1638), with his *Arte de la lengua Quichua*, of 1619.

****

Language and Dialect in the History of Linguistics: a Case-Study of the Politics of Anglo-Norman
Douglas A. Kibbee (Urbana, Illinois, dkibbee@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu)

The designation of dialects of French has been a matter of some controversy since the first attempts to distinguish among the varieties of Old French. From the beginning the concern in France was primarily with living dialects and their perceived threat to the unity of the French state, even though there were occasional words of praise for dialect, as in the poets of the Pléaide and Montaigne. In discussions of dialects of Old French Anglo-Norman, a very productive dialect (in terms of literary texts) was consistently omitted in continental studies. In Great Britain this dialect, or its off-shoot Law French, was ignored or criticized, either because of its divergence from the Parisian standard or because of the effects it had had on English, as waves of Anglo-Saxon pride periodically swept through 16th and 17th century England. It was only in the 19th century that the dialectal issue became a focal point of linguistic debate. Bergounioux has done an admirable job tracing the mythology of *francien*, a mythology meant to perpetuate a centralizing vision of French, and primarily opposed to schools of thought that accounted for independent development of regional varieties of French, especially in the southern France. In this paper I revisit the development of scientific study of dialectal variation in 19th century France, and its relationship to the development of historical/comparative grammar. From this it becomes clear that the leading scholars in this field deserve neither the scorn nor the label 'neogrammarian' that William Rothwell has recently attached to them. From this exercise, it is clear that the historiography of linguistics must be pursued in a frame of mind that offers the maximally sympathetic reading to our forebears. Only then can we distinguish real differences, and real progress.

****

Cornish Lexicography from the 9th Century AD to the Present Day
Jon Mills (Luton, jon.mills@luton.ac.uk)

A variety of reference sources provide information about the Cornish lexicon over a period of approximately a thousand years. Glosses in the margins of Latin manuscripts give Cornish equivalents for items in the text. Glossaries provide lists of items with their equivalents. The notes and essays of philologists explore an assortment of data concerning lexical items. Published and unpublished dictionaries give more comprehensive accounts of the Cornish lexicon. Cornish lexicography has passed through three phases. During the first phase, which includes the early glosses and the *Vocabularium Cornicum*, the target language is Latin and the dictionary user's first language Cornish. The second phase begins in the mid 17th century vocabulary and is purely descriptive. In other words the lexicographer is simply recording data about the Cornish lexicon. Meaning is dealt with by providing English translation equivalents. This overlaps with the third phase, in which reconstruction is attempted by the lexicographer. Lhuyd (1707) is the first to fill in gaps in the lexicon by borrowing from Welsh. He is followed by Borlase (1754) and Nance (1938, 1952, 1955). In the 20th century, several attempts have been made to standardise spellings to meet the demands of Cornish language revivalists.

****

Problèmes d'interprétation lexicologique des anciens vocabulaires multilingues
Adel Sidarus (Évora, asidarus@mail.telepac.pt)

L'exploitation des anciens vocabulaires ou glossaires multilingues pour la connaissance du lexique des langues respectives s'avère une entreprise délicate, exigeant une approche méthodologique spécifique et complexe.

Partant de l'expérience d'une récente recherche menée sur les vocabulaires gréco-copto-arabes médiévaux, connus sous le nom de 'scalae', on tentera de dresser le tableau des questions théoriques et pratiques que pose une pareille entreprise et les solutions adoptées: état des langues en jeu, dialectique comparatiste, structure et nomenclature des textes, terminologies spécialisées et champs sémantiques, sédimentation de matériel ancien, traditions locales de lexicographie.

****

"Valency Theory" in German Grammars of the 18th and 19th Century
Kjell-Åke Forsgren (Skövde, Forsgren@isp.his.se)

It is rather well known that the German philosophical grammar of Johann Werner Meiner (1782) contains features and ideas tantamount to those of modern valency theory as it was initiated by Lucien Tesnière. Less well known, however, is the fact that 'valency grammars', which were apparently independent of Meiner, were published all through the 19th century. In fact, these grammars were opposed to the more traditional school of rationalist grammar in the line of Port Royal and Karl Ferdinand Becker, stressing the communicative rather than the logical and cognitive side of language. This paper gives a brief survey of German 'valency grammar', and

considers, in addition to Meiner, (1723-1789), Max Wilhelm Götzinger (1759-1856), Johann August Lehmann (1802-1883) and Franz Kern (1830-1894). It also raises the question, whether there might be a(n) (in)direct connection to modern valency theory of today.

****

From Psychological Linguistics to Psycholinguistics
Els Elffers (Amsterdam, Els.Elffers@let.uva.nl)

Two trends can be observed in the first decades of the 20th century: the change from psychological linguistics to autonomous linguistics and the rise of new psychological research of processes of language production and comprehension. I investigate the hypothesis that these developments are related. The decline of psychological linguistics puts an end to the identification of the meaning of sentences and concrete processes of representation and association in the minds of its speakers and listeners. Linguistic meaning was now reconstructed in a more abstract way, so that the processes of language use had to be accounted for in an area outside linguistics. Incorporation of this research into psychology seems plausible, which would explain the rise of new psycholinguistic research into this subject.

However, the hypothesis is only partially confirmed. Two of three new psychological approaches to speech production and comprehension that rejected the old psychology of representation and association, did not take over the study of linguistic processes in the predicted way. They maintained, each in its own way, the unity of linguistics and psychology of language.

One approach elaborates the act-psychological view of language use, initiated by, for example, Marty and Bühler. Scholars like Mead and Révész develop a proto-pragmatic view of language along these lines, which, however, contributes to linguistics rather than to psycholinguistics, conceived as the study of concrete processes of language use. The new insights are answers to 'what'-questions rather than to 'how'-questions.

The second approach, the behavioristic one, in fact continues the unity of linguistic entities and processes (Bühler's 'Sprachgebilde" and 'Sprachhandlungen"), but reconstructs it in a way different from the representationist one. According to, for example, De Laguna and Kantor, the meaning of an utterance retains its process character, be it that the processes thought relevant are of a physical and observable type now, they are no longer the unobservable occurrences in the inner cinema of the mind.

It is only the third approach of non-behavioristic research of speech production and comprehension, partially 'armchair" and partially empirical, conducted by, for example, Stählin and Delacroix, which exemplifies the predicted trend of new psycholinguistic research of processes of language use, based upon a recognition of the distinction between linguistic entities and processes and a corresponding division of labour between linguistics and psycholinguistics.

****

Le Traitement de la Quantification d'Ajdukiewicz à Montague

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

The Fregean analysis of the sentence in mathematical terms - that is in terms of "function" and "argument" (1891) - was taken up again by the first categorial grammars (Ajdukiewicz 1935; Bar-Hillel 1953; Lambek 1958 and 1961) in order to formalize their constitutive distinction between "basic category" and "functor category". Frege had opened up the possibility of adequately representing quantification in *Die Begriffsschrift* (1879) and this in turn led to the first outline of a categorial syntax, since Ajdukiewicz defined a third category (called "operator") in order to account for universal and existential quantifiers.

Defined with the help of a proper symbolism able to represent the scope of quantifiers, Ajdukiewicz's new category was, however, curiously ignored by Bar-Hillel and Lambek since neither the bidirectional grammar nor the associative syntactic calculus contains a treatment of quantification. We have to wait for Montague's paper "The Proper Treatment of Quantification in Ordinary English" (1973) in order for this aspect to be again taken into consideration.

This presentation will first attempt to understand why Bar-Hillel's and Lambek's categorial syntaxes (which appear themselves as improvements of Ajdukiewicz's algebraic formalism and arithmetic treatment) never proposed another analysis of quantification - a topic which is well-known for its difficulty. We will then propose a comparative study of Ajdukiewicz's and Montague's treatment of quantification. In particular, we will evaluate the originality as well as the theoretical contribution of both unidirectional syntax and Montague's universal grammar - with respect to Bar-Hillel's and Lambek's theories.

****

The Unity of the Chomskyan Research Programme
Pius ten Hacken (Basel, tenhacken@ubaclu.unibas.ch)

In this paper I will show that Chomskyan linguistics is conceptually and historically a unity in a non-trivial sense, contrasting it to other generative and non-generative approaches to the theory of grammar.

In the discussion of the question whether the emergence of Chomskyan linguistics should be considered to be a scientific revolution, an argument which is often used against the revolution hypothesis or at least to relativize the importance of the Chomskyan revolution is that the history of Chomskyan linguistics itself is marked by a number of breaks that, though smaller, are not essentially different in character. Thus Kaldewaij (1986) concludes that it would be fairly arbitrary to call only the break due to Chomsky's earliest works a revolution, Matthews (1993) accepts the Chomskyan revolution but stresses the contrast between the first and second Chomskyan schools, and Murray (1994) calls Chomsky a "serial revolutionary".

The underlying idea of a hierarchy of scientific revolutions seems to be supported by Kuhn's (1970) explanation of the concept of disciplinary matrix. For Kuhn, there is a hierarchy of matrices with increasing degrees of specification and decreasing size of the groups of researchers sharing them, which ranges from the

entire field of natural science to groups of around 100 people. Transposed to the area of linguistics, at some low level of the hierarchy we may find groups assuming different definitions of government within GB-theory; somewhat higher (in the 1970s) groups with or without the assumption that movement leaves traces; still higher the conflict between GB-theory and LFG and perhaps at the highest level linguists concerned with theory of grammar as opposed to sociolinguistics.

The problem with such a view of a hierarchy is that it obscures the borderline between theoretical and metatheoretical discussion. In the former, the issue is which theory offers the best prospect of explaining a given set of data against a given background. In the latter, the role of the theory itself is called into question. In metatheoretical discussions, rational arguments play only a limited role, because differing belief sets lead one side to deny the validity or relevance of the other side's arguments. After Kuhn (1970) this problem is often referred to as incommensurability effects. I will introduce the concept of the research programme as a basis for explaining incommensurability. It incorporates the set of assumptions that define the role a theory should fulfil and provide a background for explanation. I will show that the difference between Chomsky's (1965) model and the model assumed in newer works such as Chomsky (1986) is a difference between theories within the same research programme. On the other hand, LFG as outlined by Bresnan & Kaplan (1982) constitutes a separate research programme.

References:

Bresnan, Joan & Kaplan, Ronald M. (1982), 'Introduction: Grammars as Mental Representations of Language', in Bresnan (ed.), *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, MIT Press, Cambridge (Mass.), xvi-lii.

Chomsky, Noam (1965), *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge (Mass.).

Chomsky, Noam (1986), *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*, Praeger, Westport (Conn.).

Kaldewaij, Jelle (1986), *Structuralisme en transformationeel-generatieve grammatica*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Second Edition, Enlarged*, Chicago University Press, Chicago (orig. 1962).

Matthews, Peter H. (1993), *Grammatical Theory in the United States from Bloomfield to Chomsky*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Murray, Stephen O. (1994), *Theory Groups and the Study of Language in North America: A Social History*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.