

Studienkreis ‚Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft‘
Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic ideas

JOINT MEETING
„Sprachlehre und Sprachpflege“

HELSINKI
HELSINGFORS
18–21.7.2007

PROGRAMM/PROGRAMME

DONNERSTAG 19 JULI 2007

0900–0915 Opening: Fred Karlsson
0915–1000 Plenarvortrag: Friederike Spitzl-Dupic

Section 1 – room 673		Sektion 2 – Raum 674
1005–1050	Göran Wolf	Carita Klippi
1055–1140	Barbara Kaltz/ Vincent Balnat	Hiroyuki Eto
1140–1200	Coffee/ tea break	
1200–1245	Stephanos Matthaios	Gijsbert Rutten

1245–1415 Mittagessen

Sektion 1 – Raum 673		Section 2 – room 674
1415–1500	Robert Maltby	Saskia Daalder
1505–1550	Casper C. de Jonge	Dan Olsson
1550–1610	Kaffee/Thee	
1610–1655	Teresa Morgan	Camiel Hamans
1700–1745	Andreas Schmidhauser	Ute Tinteman

FRIDAY 20 JULY 2007

0900–0945 2nd Plenary: Andrew Linn

Section 1 – room 673		Sektion 2 – Raum 674
0950–1035	Saara Haapamäki	Minne De Boer
1040–1125	Tapani Kelomäki	Els Elffers
1125–1145	Kaffee/Thee	
1150–1235	Tinatin Boldvadze	Kjell-Åke Forsgren

1235–1400 Lunch

Sektion 1 – Raum 673		Section 2 – room 674
1400–1445	Nicola McLelland	Frank Vonk
1450–1535	Boris Djubo	Michael Isermann
1535–1555	Coffee/tea	
1600–1645	Louis Kelly	Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers
1650–1735	Karlijn Navest	John Walmsley

1745– Sitzung des SGdS

SONNABEND 21 JULI 2007

Section 1 – room 673		Sektion 2 – Raum 674
0900–0945	Gerda Hassler	
0950–1025	David Cram	Iwona Milewska
1030–1115	Kurt Jankowsky	Nadia Kerečuk
1115–1135		Coffee/ tea break
1135–1220	Jacqueline Leon	Ekaterina Velmezova
1225–1310	Marc Pierce	Serhij Wakulenko
1310–1415		Mittagessen
1415–	Henry Sweet Society Annual General Meeting	
1900–	Conference Dinner	

PRAKTISCHE INFORMATIONEN

EIN INFORMELLES TREFFEN findet am Mittwochabend von 18 bis 20 Uhr im Innenhof des TOPELIA-Gebäudes statt (Adresse: Unioninkatu 38). Sollte es regnen, wird die Veranstaltung in das Institut für klassische Philologie (Adresse: Kluuvikatu 7 Glogatan, 5. Stock) verlegt.

ALLE SEKTIONEN finden in den Räumen 673 und 674 des PORTHANIA-Gebäudes statt (Adresse: Yliopistonkatu 3 Universitetsgatan).

DIE ZEITANGABEN im Programm sind als verbindlich zu betrachten. Die Vortragenden und die Diskussionsleiter(innen) werden gebeten, sich genauestens daran zu halten.

DAS GEMEINSAME ABENDESSEN wird in „Katajanokan Kasino“ stattfinden (Adresse: Laivastokatu 1 Maringatan).

BEI PROBLEMEN wenden Sie sich bitte an die Organisatoren, die während der gesamten Tagung per Handy erreichbar: Aino Kärna +358 500 407487, Anneli Luhtala +358 40 585 6207 und Anders Ahlqvist +358 50 5658 469.

PRACTICAL INFORMATION

THE INFORMAL RECEPTION on Wednesday evening 18 July at 6–8 p.m. will take place in the courtyard of the University's TOPELIA building (address: Unioninkatu 38 Unionsgatan). In case of rain, it will move to the Department of Classical Philology (address: Kluuvikatu 7 Glogatan, 5th floor).

ALL SESSIONS will take place in rooms 673 and 674 of the University's PORTHANIA building (address: Yliopistonkatu 3 Universitetsgatan).

THE TIMES given in the programme are intended to be exact times: speakers and chairmen are requested to adhere rigidly to the timetable.

THE CONFERENCE DINNER will be at *Katajanokan Kasino* (address: Laivastokatu 1 Maringatan).

IN CASE OF NEED, please call one of the organisers, who will be carrying their mobile telephones with them during the conference: Aino Kärna +358 500 407487, Anneli Luhtala +358 40 585 6207 and Anders Ahlqvist +358 50 5658 469.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNGEN/ABSTRACTS

SPRACHKRITIK UND SPRACHPFLEGE IM FRÜHEN 20. JAHRHUNDERT: EINSTELLUNGEN ZU
„FREMDWÖRTERN“ UND „KURZWÖRTERN“

Vincent Balnat & Barbara Kaltz (Marseille)

Die alte Frage nach der Akzeptanz von Fremdwörtern ist im deutschsprachigen Raum gerade im frühen 20. Jahrhundert besonders intensiv diskutiert worden. Der Zusammenhang von Sprachkritik und Sprachpflege in dieser Frage soll ausgehend von Leo Spitzers berühmter „Streitschrift gegen die Sprachreinigung“ (*Fremdwörterhatz und Fremdvölkerhaß*, Wien 1918) und den Schriften seiner Kontrahenten (A. Tesch, G. Landauer u. a.) analysiert werden.

Im selben Zeitraum lösten indessen nicht nur die Fremdwörter, sondern auch die so genannte „Aküsprache“ eine Welle der Entrüstung bei etlichen deutschen Sprachkritikern bzw. Sprachpflegern aus. Die Tendenz, Kurzwörter verstärkt auch in der gesprochenen Sprache zu verwenden, wurde seinerzeit gern auf den zunehmenden Einfluss des Englischen zurückgeführt; die beiden „Problembereiche“ überschneiden sich somit partiell.

Uns geht es darum, die vielfach ideologisch überfrachtete Argumentation der Sprachkritiker bzw. Sprachpfleger bezüglich dieser beiden „Problembereiche“ genauer zu untersuchen und ihre Argumentation in Beziehung zu setzen zum gegenwärtigen Diskurs über Kurzwörter und Fremdwörter im Deutschen: die Parallelen sind, so scheint es uns, nicht zu übersehen.

INTERJECTIONS IN DIFFERENT DESCRIPTIVE PARADIGMS

Minne de Boer (Utrecht/Hengelo)

Interjections are treated differently according to the dominating paradigms of the period. For the seventeenth century they don't refer to anything, they represent sentiments, they are of a spontaneous origin. Descriptions of interjections are marginal in the grammar. The Romantic paradigm introduces the concept of primitiveness: interjections represent a primitive stage of language and therefore are typical for primitive peoples, the lower orders, children and women. In the twentieth century we have several conflicting approaches: the structuralist approach (Karcewski, Tesnière and De Groot), which stresses their formal aspects, generative theories which don't really like interjections, pragmaticists who have a place for interjections in the speech act theory and discourse analysis, and cognitive linguists - among which Wierzbicka and her school - whose foremost interest is in their semantic content.

In this contribution I would like to show how different paradigms stress different aspects of interjections and vice-versa what different treatments of interjections tell us about the paradigms in question. These aspects are discussed according to a model in which I look for the answers on a certain numbers of questions: questions about the nature of interjections and their place in the language system, questions about their phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics, questions about the completeness of the description and their natural place between grammar and dictionary, and questions on the diachrony of interjections. I will be especially interested in paradigm shifts and texts on interjections which show such a shift in action.

FROM THE HISTORY OF OLD GEORGIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE STANDARDIZATION

Tinatin Bolkvadze (Tbilisi)

The paper deals with the main principles of the old Georgian literary language standardization. It will be discussed the problems of a) internal qualities of the Georgian language, b) its functions and c) the attitude of the speaking community to the old Georgian language. The internal qualities of old Georgian are flexible stability that allows the modification equal to cultural changes in the language and intellectualization, as a codified version of the Georgian language into which the holy Scripture and theological literature are translated and in which original works are written, differs from everyday Georgian because the former is very artificial. Gospels and other parts of the Bible translated into Georgian guaranteed a normative stability of the old Georgian language by its constant ecclesiastic use in the church service and in other forms of spiritual life. The native

language is a cognized norm for the old Georgian scholars working not only in the centers of Georgia, but in the cultural centers abroad, they set a standard. Besides that the Georgian obtained the functions of uniting the language community, and the same time, of separated it from the communities speaking different languages; it also had acquired the function of self-protection a long before which is the cause of national pride. This factor, on its part, increases the prestige of the language.

LANGUAGE AND MUSIC AS COGNITIVE SYSTEMS

David Cram (Oxford)

$$\text{MUSIC} = \text{LANGUAGE} - \text{SEMANTICS} + \text{PRAGMATICS}$$

In this paper I attempt to reconstruct substantial areas of controversy in seventeenth-century investigations of the relation between language and music, pointing up parallels with debates within modern cognitive science.

The starting point for most seventeenth-century theoreticians was the idea that music was like language as regards its combinatorial properties, both being component parts of a larger *ars combinatoria* [thus, MUSIC = LANGUAGE]. There were those who then sought to identify the ‘lexical semantics’ of the basic elements of music, which combined to give meaning to the whole [i.e. MUSIC = LANGUAGE + SEMANTICS]. Sceptics, notably Descartes and Leibniz, argued that this avenue of thought was mistaken, since music does not have the same referential semantics as language [i.e. MUSIC = LANGUAGE – SEMANTICS]. But these thinkers nevertheless attributed ‘meaning’ to music structures, of the sort that can be reconstructed in modern linguistic terms as contextual and procedural.

There are of course vast differences between the larger underpinnings of seventeenth-century and twenty-first-century thinking, and such parallels must be treated with caution. But I have argued elsewhere that viewing seventeenth-century views from a modern perspective is historiographically appropriate (Cram 2006); conversely, a sceptical seventeenth-century perspective can usefully suggest a cognitive view of music (to which I subscribe) which combines the syntactic formalisms developed by Lerdahl and Jackendoff (1983) with the pragmatic insights sketched by Downes (1994). This view can be represented by the formula: MUSIC = LANGUAGE – SEMANTICS + PRAGMATICS.

REFERENCES

- Cram, D. (2006) “Language and music: Theme and Variations in the History of Linguistics.” In J. Noordegraaf et al. (eds) *Amicitia in Academia. Composities voor Els Elffers*. Nodus Publikationen, 1–15.
Downes, W. (1994) “Pragmatics of music and emotion.” *Language Forum* 2: 1–27.
Lerdahl, F. & R. Jackendoff (1983). *A Generative Theory of Tonal Music*. MIT Press.

ANTOINE MEILLET’S CORRESPONDENCE WITH DUTCH LINGUISTS

Saskia Daalder (Amsterdam)

Interesting documents have been published recently concerning Antoine Meillet (1866–1936), foremost French linguist of last century’s first decades (publications by Fryba-Reber, Bergounioux and de Lamberterie, among others). As a complement to those documents, my paper will review some relevant materials from Dutch archival sources. Meillet exchanged letters and postcards at least with the Dutch scholars Nicolaas van Wijk (1880–1941), Jac. van Ginneken (1877–1945) and Jozef Schrijnen (1869–1938). The extant correspondence of Meillet with Schrijnen — some twenty items from the years 1927 to 1935 — gives new insights into Meillet’s activity and opinions in relation to the international organisation of linguistic research. Among the topics of the correspondence are the first International Congress of Linguists and its follow-up, the *Comité international permanent de linguistes* (CIPL), as well as the project of the world’s linguistic atlas, which was taken on by a subcommittee, the *Commission d’enquête linguistique* (CEL). In his letters, Meillet assumes a directing role and offers his frank opinion about many a (non-French) colleague.

REFERENCE

Meillet aujourd'hui rédigé par Gabriel Bergounioux et Charles de Lamberterie *et al.* Leuven et Paris: Peeters, 2006.

DER BEITRAG DER MITGLIEDER DER FRUCHTBRINGENDEN GESELLSCHAFT ZUM VERFASSEN DER GRAMMATIKOGRAPHISCHEN ARBEITEN.

Boris Djubo (St. Petersburg)

Im Vortrag wird die Frage untersucht werden, in welchem Maße die Mitglieder der Fruchtbringen Gesellschaft an der Verfassung der Grammatiken teilgenommen haben.

Es werden unterschiedliche Standpunkte der Gesellschafter zum Problemkreis der Normierung der deutschen Sprache verglichen, um zu zeigen, dass nicht dem berühmten J.G. Schottel, sondern Ch. Gueintz der Verdienst gehört, den Usus der deutschen Sprache zu berücksichtigen und auf diese Weise das Sprachprogramm der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft durch Verfassung von metasprachlichen Schriften wie Grammatiken, die im 17.Jahrhundert einen präskriptiv-anleitenden Charakter hatten, zu verwirklichen.

Es ist praktisch der handschriftliche Entwurf von Gueintz' Grammatik aus dem Jahre 1638 bis heute noch nicht untersucht. Dieser unterscheidet sich aber bedeutend vom gedruckten „Deutscher Sprachlehre Entwurf“ (1641). Die Diskussion der Gesellschaftsmitglieder über diese Handschrift (Fürst Ludwig sandte Abschriften einigen Mitgliedern zum Zwecke der Verbesserung und einer sprachlichen Konsensbildung) sowie die Verbesserungen, die die Handschrift selbst enthält, könnten viel über die sprachwissenschaftliche Arbeit der Fruchtbringer und über ihren konkreten Beitrag zum Verfassen der Grammatiken zeugen.

SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT IN (GEHEIMER) AUßENPOLITISCHER MISSION

Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers (Berlin)

Mein Vortrag wird die politisch motivierte, wissenschaftliche ‚Sprachpflege‘ der auslandsdeutschen Dialekte in der Zwischenkriegszeit behandeln. Die Erforschung des so genannten Auslandsdeutschtums war spätestens am Anfang der dreißiger Jahren zu einem Schwerpunkt der deutschen Sprachforschung geworden. In den interdisziplinär weit gespannten Forschungszusammenhängen zum Auslandsdeutschtum konnte die Sprachwissenschaft nicht nur eine methodologische Schlüsselposition beanspruchen, sondern zugleich Anschluss an aktuelle politische Diskurse gewinnen. Von den meist dialektgeographischen und namenkundlichen Untersuchungen versprach man sich einerseits eine Mobilisierung des Sprach- und Nationalbewusstseins der auslandsdeutschen Minderheiten und andererseits eine Legitimierung der außenpolitischen Interessen Deutschlands. Aus politischen Gründen wurde die Arbeit von ortsansässigen Sprachwissenschaftlern oder Forschungsreisenden in den auslandsdeutschen Gebieten von reichsdeutschen Stellen systematisch mit Fördergeldern unterstützt. Diese Forschungsförderung außerhalb der Reichsgrenzen musste zum großen Teil verdeckt operieren. Ich möchte Ziele und Arbeitsweise dieser geheimen Forschungsförderung einmal an dem Beispiel der Tschechoslowakischen Republik zeigen, in der lange vor der deutschen Okkupation Sprachwissenschaft mit reichsdeutschen Mitteln und in deutscher außenpolitischer Mission betrieben wurde.

INTERJECTIONS AND THE LANGUAGE FUNCTIONS DEBATE

Els Elffers (Amsterdam)

During many centuries, interjections have been attributed three interrelated characteristics:

- 1) interjections express the speaker's emotions.
- 2) interjections are uttered spontaneously.
- 3) interjections are not full-fledged elements of language; they represent a primitive, “natural” proto-language.

Words belonging to other parts of speech were thought to lack these characteristics: they refer to objects or processes in reality, their use is intentional and results from conscious planning by the speaker, and they are part of full-fledged, conventional language systems.

In earlier publications (Elffers 2005 and *to appear*), I argued that (1)–(3) are unjustified. Belief in (1)–(3) can be explained if we take into account general views of language that were latently adhered to throughout the centuries, but became very prominent in the 18th and 19th century:

- a) *all* linguistic utterances represent the speaker's "mental events".
- b) language developed from spontaneous emotional cries.

From the beginning of the 20th century, (a) and (b) were gradually abandoned. However, (1)–(3) were maintained, although Sapir (1921) forcefully opposed to these views. Especially the vindication of (3) explains why interjections hardly received any attention in mainstream structuralistic and generative-linguistic research.

On the other hand, from the end of the 19th century onwards, language psychology expanded explosively, partially in close relationship with the expansion of disciplinary psychology itself.

In this context, language functions (an especially the non-descriptive ones: volitional, expressive, emotive, adhortative etc.) and their classification (e.g. Bühler's trichotomy *Ausdruck* — *Appell* — *Darstellung*) became frequently-discussed themes among psychologically-oriented linguists and philosophers, psychologists and child language researchers (cf. Foolen 2006). This discussion yielded a proliferation of concepts, terms and typologies, which shows the difficulty and stubbornness of the questions at issue.

In my lecture I will survey this language functions debate and try to establish its reflection on ideas about interjections. It seems plausible that, within this psychological-linguistic framework of general attention to non-descriptive functions of language, the old gap between interjections and other parts of speech narrowed or disappeared, but did this really occur?

REFERENCES

- Elffers, Els. 2005. 'Interjections in Dutch grammar'. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 15, 91–105.
- Elffers, Els. (*to appear*). 'Interjections at the margins of language'. In: S. Matthaios & P. Schmitter (eds.) *Linguistische Konzepte – diachron*. Münster.
- Foolen, Ad. 2006. 'Show some emotion. De expressieve functie van taal. In: J. Noordegraaf, F. Vonk & M. van der Wal (eds.) *Amicitia in Academia. Composities voor Els Elffers*. Amsterdam. Münster, 155–162.
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language*. New York.

LANGUAGE STUDY AS NATIONAL LEARNING: MOTOORI NORINAGA'S (1730–1801) UI-YAMA-BUMI (THE FIRST MOUNTAIN CLIMBING)

Hiroyuki Eto (Yokohama)

In 17th-century Japan, foreign studies — kan-gaku (classical Chinese learning) and ran-gaku (Dutch learning) — thrived through rigorous language study, particularly textual interpretation of Chinese and Dutch books. The kan-gaku school exceeded the level of classical scholarship in China at that time, and the ran-gaku scholars learned eagerly from the West various fields such as medicine, chemistry, military science, etc.

Against such an intellectual trend, a fierce nativist reaction – koku-gaku (national learning) movement – gained ground in 18th-century Japan. The koku-gaku scholars devoted themselves to textual and exegetical study of Japanese classical literature based on language study. With a philological and exegetical rigor to examine the original meaning of Japanese classical literature and ancient writings, these scholars insisted on a return to yamato-gokoro (original Japanese ways of thinking) from foreign influence in order to identify and appreciate typical Japanese mentality and morality.

Among koku-gaku scholars, Motoori Norinaga's (1730–1801) achievement deserved special attention. Conducting a philologically oriented investigation of ancient Japanese thought and culture, Norinaga re-evaluated the mono-no-aware (sensitivity in literary creation) of the ancient Japanese people for the purpose of explaining the peculiarity and preeminence of yamato-gokoro.

In this paper, I will examine Norinaga's attitude towards his philological and exegetical approach into Japanese classical literature focusing on Ui-yama-bumi (The First Mountain Climbing), his small essay of the aim and method of classical studies as a guide for his young students, and evaluate his philosophy of language study as national leaning with which he protected national identity and manifested the excellence of Japanese culture.

KONZEPTIONEN DER ADVERBKATEGORIE

Kjell-Åke Forsgren (Umeå)

Es werden an Hand von einigen wichtigen Grammatiken und grammatischen Darstellungen des 19. und 20. Jahres Konzeptionen der Adverbkategorie, z.B. bei Adelung, Meiner, Becker, Götzinger, Mager, Sütterlin, Duden, Ries, Glinz, Admoni, Erben u.a. beschrieben und kritisch erörtert. Imtheoretischen Teil stehen Verschiedenheiten, Argumentation undFolgerichtigkeit bei der Wahl von Kriterien und die Problematik derKategorisierungen überhaupt im Blickpunkt. Gegebenenfalls werden auch pädagogisch-didaktische und kognitive Gesichtspunkte angeführt.

SCHWEDISCHE SPRACHLEHREN UND SPRACHPFLEGE - KONTINUITÄT ODER DISKONTINUITÄT?

Saara Haapamäki (Åbo)

Der Vortrag widmet sich der schwedischen Grammatikschreibung vom Ende des 17. bis zum Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts. Ausgangspunkt ist die Frage nach Normierungsansprüchen. Fokussiert werden zentrale, voneinander abweichende grammatische Traditionen sowie für diese repräsentative Sprachlehren. Versucht wird, das Problem der Normierung als einen historischen Prozess mit Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten zu behandeln (vgl. Schmitter 1982). Die Analyse der beigezogenen Sprachlehren vollzieht sich in Anlehnung an diskursanalytisch orientierte gattungstheoretische Überlegungen (vgl. Fairclough 1992, Swales 1995). Im ersten Schritt wird gezeigt, wie die Grammatiker sich mit der Normierung und Sprachpflege auseinandergesetzt und wie sie ihre kommunikativen Ziele definiert haben und wie diese ihrerseits durch den jeweiligen geistes- und wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund (Diskursebene) geprägt sind. Im zweiten Schritt wird die Ausformung der grammatischen Darstellung in den Sprachlehren fokussiert. Dabei wird auf mögliche Differenzen zwischen Zielsetzung und grammatischer Argumentation im Einzelnen eingegangen. Abschließend wird die Frage behandelt, inwiefern es überhaupt möglich und sinnvoll ist, eine von Normierung freie grammatische Beschreibung zu geben bzw. anzustreben.

LITERATUR

Fairclough, Norman (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schmitter, Peter (1982) *Untersuchungen zur Historiographie der Linguistik: Struktur – Methodik – theoretische Fundierung*. Tübingen: Narr.

Swales, John M. (1990) *Genre analysis. English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

THE HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF DUTCH DIPHTHONGIZATION

Camiel Hamans (Brussels/Strasbourg)

As early as 1927 Gesinus G. Kloeke noticed there appears a strange phenomenon in Dutch dialects as far as the diphthongization of OWG *û* and *î* is concerned. In standard Dutch the forms for *house* and *mouse* are *huis* and *muis*, with a diphthong, whereas in regions next to the linguistic centre speakers say *huus* and *muus*, with a monophthong [y]. In the most eastern dialects of the country the corresponding forms are *hoes* and *moes*, with [u]. In some dialects in between people say *huus* and *moes*, but never the other way around.

Kloeke explained this process of diphthongization in the first place by accepting an influence of prestigious immigrant speakers who brought their dialect of Brabant to the provinces of Holland and especially to Amsterdam after the fall of Antwerp. The dialect data of the eastern dialects and of the dialects of the regions in between he explained in terms of expansion from the social and cultural centre of Amsterdam which had a certain prestige and by using the notion of frequency. In this way he became a forerunner of a modern sociolinguistic approach. Although his research has been quoted with approval by Bloomfield in his second edition of *Language* (1933), his theory did not remain unchallenged.

While looking for explanations of the process of diphthongization in the Western part of the Netherlands the philologists Hellinga and Caron pointed to the influence of early modern grammarians and to the influence of the beginning standard language and the propagators of this language, schoolmasters and Bible translators.

Dialectologists as W.A.F. Janssen, Endepols and Dols criticized Kloeke's approach from a more traditional dialectological point of view.

Later on Stroop, Van Reenen, Awedyk and Hamans tried to explain the process of the Dutch diphthongization and the exceptions to the diphthongization rules within current linguistic theories of the second half of the 20th century. Especially Van Reenen who collected data from medieval sources is very successful in explaining exceptions.

Recently a school of young American scholars of Dutch from the University of Wisconsin studied the process of Dutch diphthongization within theories of dialect levelling and koineization, which makes clear how the study of the Dutch diphthongization reflects recent approaches to the study of standardization.

In this paper I shall give an overview of the study of the Dutch diphthongization and I will show how these approaches fit into the mainstream of linguistic research of their days.

THE FUNCTIONAL-COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH TO LANGUAGE: THE GENESIS AND DEMISE OF A PARADIGM

Gerda Haßler (Potsdam)

This paper addresses a language-theoretical paradigm regarding native and foreign-language teaching and learning, a paradigm which was consciously created in a period historians would classify as Contemporary History. The work of Wilhelm Schmidt in the sixties marks its beginning, and its de facto end coincides with the new orientation of East German universities after German reunification. Adherence to this paradigm was mandatory for the linguistics departments of the teachers' colleges of the GDR; each of the dozens of dissertations written in this context had to elaborate on a "functional-communicative aspect" or a "communication process". This often resulted in constructs that were difficult to relate to linguistic reality and even less to foreign language instruction. Curious contradictions arose in the theoretical edifice of the functional-communicative approach to language. The speech act theory was ostensibly refuted, but on the other hand it was used abundantly and without direct reference to define own "communication methods".

Nevertheless, the communicative-functional approach to language tended to harmonize well with communication-based language instruction. Under this paradigm, a number of practical, useful language instruction books with an international orientation were published. The dispute between the functional-communicative approach propagated in Potsdam and the communicative functional approach expounded in Halle can be seen as an oddity. But the reason for this contrast does not merely seem to be due to the influence of the Teachers' College, which tended to be more ideological, and the University, which tended to be more open to international scholarly discourse. The crucial distinguishing factors appear to be language-theoretical differences, which ultimately show up in different ways of treating empirical data.

In a number of characteristics the functional-communicative approach to language is consistent with international trends. The reason why the shift away from it was embraced so readily can be that the paradigm was felt to be forced.

THE RISE OF LINGUISTIC NEOPLATONISM: AGRIPPA VON NETTESHEIM ON LANGUAGE

Michael Isermann (Heidelberg)

One of the widest gaps in the historiographies of Western linguistic ideas is the lack of reference to what has variously been called Renaissance neoplatonism, hermeticism, or occultism. Although it includes men as (in-)famous as Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499), Francesco Giorgi (1460–1549), John Dee (1527–1608), Jacob Boehme (1575–1624), Johannes Reuchlin (1455–1522) or, in the 17th century, Athanasius Kircher (1602–1680) or the younger van Helmont (1614–1698), hardly a representative of the tradition has been given serious scholarly attention by linguistic historiographers. What is the reason for the conspicuous silence surrounding them? Apparently, the rejection of occult authors is based on a widespread conviction the historical roots of which are so deep that it is not in need of justification: what they have to say on language is considered to be either hocus-pocus or, at best, impenetrable and irrational jargon lacking a theoretical backbone.

I believe that in refusing to take off the same ideological blinkers that had already constrained the views of historians of ideas and of science alike, historians of linguistic ideas have missed a lot, and gained nothing. In the first place, they have failed to take into account the possibility that occult ideas on language might be amenable to historiographical description. More importantly, they have suppressed the idea that occult linguistic thought might have played a role in the formation of modern theories of language.

The present paper is a case study of one of the most notorious representatives of the occult tradition, Henry Cornelius of Nettesheim (1486–1535), and his linguistic thought as it is laid down in his famous compendium of magic *De occulta philosophia libri tres* (1531/1533). I will argue that the apparent contradictions and other theoretical inconsistencies in Agrippa's thinking vanish once we allow for the possibility that they can be allocated to two different kinds of language and to two theories of language. It is this double theory of language that I believe provides the theoretical backbone of Renaissance Neoplatonism.

CLASSICAL STUDIES AND THE EMERGENCE OF COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS: WHAT WAS LOST AND WHAT WAS GAINED?

Kurt R. Jankowsky (Washington, DC)

Pioneers of linguistic science in the early 19th century such as Franz Bopp (1791–1867), Jacob Grimm (1785–1863), and August Friedrich Pott (1802–1887) started out as classical scholars, by training as well as by employing methodological tools that owed a great deal to practices developed in the investigation of Classical Latin and Greek.

This is true no less for the majority of linguistic researchers even in the second half of the 19th century. August Schleicher (1821–1868), Wilhelm Scherer (1841–1886), Johannes Schmidt (1843–1901), and—mirabile dictu—all of the Neogrammarians had acquired a thorough grounding in Classical studies, and they made good use of it.

Historiography has widely acknowledged the discoveries and accomplishments of comparative linguistics and of course has not neglected giving ample praise to what Classical scholars have achieved, especially during the 19th century.

One might, however, have to look again at what was lost in the transition from Classical studies to comparative linguistics and ask the question as to whether, and if yes, to what extent, comparative linguistics would have gained significant advantages, if those two approaches to language study had established a more fruitful cooperation than they actually did.

Equally important is, conversely, to consider in what way Classical studies would have benefitted, if the practitioners of those two approaches would have been more willing to institute a truly functional give-and-take relationship.

This paper will investigate those questions and try to come up with a variety of revealing answers.

PROTAGORAS AND THE PREHISTORY OF GRAMMAR

Casper C. de Jonge (Leiden)

For many historians of linguistics, Protagoras is the starting point of the history of grammar in the western world. On the basis of ancient testimonies by Aristotle (Diels-Kranz 262,12–13) and Diogenes Laertius (Diels-Kranz 254,13–14), modern scholars attribute to Protagoras the distinction of 'grammatical categories' (e.g. Robins 1997: 32). He would have been the first to distinguish three 'grammatical genders' and four 'modes of discourse' (prayer, question, answer and order), which would correspond to the moods optative, subjunctive, indicative and imperative. Steinthal (1890: 136) credits Protagoras with the 'Entdeckung der ersten grammatischen Tatsache'. Thus, Protagoras is often presented as a proto-grammarian, who dealt with 'linguistic analysis' (Ildefonse 1997: 12).

In this paper I will argue that the modern tendency to regard Protagoras as an early grammarian obscures the real purpose of his statements. In their wish to trace the origins of grammar, historians of linguistics do not do justice to the historical meaning of Protagoras' ideas. It has already been noticed that linguistic analysis was not Protagoras' aim (Fehling 1965). His objections to the

opening of Homer's *Iliad*, where the poet used an order instead of a prayer and treated the word *mênis* as a feminine rather than a masculine word, did not serve the purpose of grammatical analysis, nor were they part of an exercise in poetical criticism (as Fehling argues). I suggest that, by questioning the correctness of linguistic use in the very first line of Homer, the poet whose authority was indisputable in ancient Greece, Protagoras intended to demonstrate that people's knowledge depended on dubious authority, which could be criticised and refuted.

This interpretation implies that both the distinction between genders and the one between different types of discourse were only a 'by-product' of Protagoras' real interests (see also Sluiter 1990: 8). Both distinctions seem to have been interpreted in grammatical terms by later commentators. Thus, it should be observed that Protagoras distinguished between 'males', 'females', and 'instruments' (*arrhena kai thêlea kai skeuê*) rather than between masculine, feminine and neuter words. Further, it appears that the four 'basic forms of speech' (*puthmenes logôn*) were only in later periods connected with the verbal moods. Already in antiquity, then, Protagoras was interpreted from the perspective of grammatical theory. Modern historians of linguistics have followed this practice, but if we remove the blinkers of our discipline, we will observe that neither grammar nor criticism of Homer was Protagoras' primary purpose. Instead of presenting the relevant fragments on genders and types of discourse as a prehistory of grammar or philology, this paper will interpret these testimonies in the context of Protagoras' relativistic programme. The fact that even the very first words of the *Iliad* could be the object of discussion may have been his ultimate demonstration of relativism.

TOWARDS A LINGUISTICS OF *PAROLE*

L.G. Kelly (Cambridge)

Saussure defined *langue* as a system of expression proper to a community, and *parole* as its use by individuals. Some of his followers set about examining regularities in *parole* through the problems of translation.

They were not the first. The chapter on translation in volume 5 of *Principles de littérature* (1753) by the rhetorician, Charles Batteux, compares the word-orders of French and Latin, and concludes that the "natural order" is not governed by logic, but by priorities of expression: sentences proceed from a *début*, which is not necessarily the grammatical subject, to their *but* (goal). This word-order translators must reproduce, because it vehicles the order of "thought". Because authors choose their grammar as an instrument of word-order, translators must choose theirs likewise, even if their grammatical structures bear no resemblance to the author's. Henri Weil's *De l'ordre des mots* (1844) is the first theoretical treatment of this issue: *début* and *but* become *notion initiale* and *but*, which he describes in pragmatic terms. Later von der Gabelentz called them "psychological subject and predicate." Both see grammar as subordinate to discourse.

Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye renamed Weil's pragmatic units, *thème* and *propos*, and examined the repercussions of Saussure's distinctions between *signification* and *valeur*, and between *signe arbitraire* and *signe motivé*. Their goal was analysing idiosyncracies, such as the French preference for static representation and the German for dynamic, the differing usage of parts of speech, and the stylistic preferences peculiar to each language. The poet, Yves Bonnefoy, discusses these issues in his *Postface to Hamlet* (1962).

Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais (1958) by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet analyses three levels of usage: lexicon (words and their behaviour in each language; grammatical structures and how each language uses them; and "message", the discourse shapes and linkages which correspond functionally in each language. The result is a coherent contrastive linguistics of *parole* which has been further developed, and has prompted a translation of *Stylistique comparée* into English in 1995.

THE MYTH OF THE NEOGRAMMARIAN SCHOOL IN THE STUDY OF THE FINNISH LANGUAGE

Tapani Kelomäki (Helsinki)

The most customary presumption in the field of the study of Finnish language is the presumption of the neogrammarian school prevailing from the end of the 1900th century to the 1960s.

This period is equivalent to the scope of professor E.N. Setälä who has been the most powerful individual in the field of all times. In fact, the neogrammarian period has been determined as the period of Setälä, or as “the long shadow of a big man”.

In my paper it will be shown that

1. The presumption of the school lies on a futile ground: hardly anybody regarded himself as a neogrammarian, hardly anybody has been regarded as neogrammarian by his contemporaries or historians. Moreover, the scholars were not properly familiar with the ideas of the neogrammarian linguistics. Only Herman Paul and his ideas were known, but superficially. Furthermore, the scholars of Finnish language (and Finno-ugrian languages) did not even believe in strict sound-laws.
2. In fact the alleged period of neogrammarian linguistics were more like dialectology, although the dialectologists (i.e. Schuchardt or Guilleron) were hardly ever referred to.
3. In that period there was a remarkable amount of competing approaches that challenged the “neogrammarian mainstream”. But those who challenged the mainstream jeopardized their career.
4. The illusion of the neogrammarian nature of the main stream linguistics has preserved in the course of time because it has been regenerated in an uncritical and routine scientific discourse. It is also due to the lack of the metatheoretical and historical discourse on the fundamental questions: scholars have said the same as their predecessors. This can be easily seen in obituaries, anniversaries, reviews, general works e.t.c.
5. Predominantly the study of Finnish language was sound historical, but the neogrammarian nature of the study was a myth which was socially constructed in the scientific discourses. This construction has been used as norm of research, which the challengers frequently had to realize.

SYNTAX IN THE 19TH CENTURY: O.O. POTEBNIA (1835–1891)

Nadia Kerecuk (London)

This paper aims at addressing a myth in the history of ideas in linguistics: the argument that the 19th century did not produce any relevant work on syntax. This argument has clouded histories for a long time.

Potebnia's¹ theory of language offers a refutation of such an argument. The place and role of syntax is clearly defined in his works particularly in his 1874 *Iz Zapysok po russkoi grammatyke I – II*² (henceforth IZPRG), revised 1888. However, his works on syntax cannot be divorced from his theory and philosophy of language, which constitute a coherent epistemological system.

In the first volume of IZPRG, Potebnia establishes the parameters and axioms for his syntactic theory. A comprehensive critical analysis of the ideas on syntax and its relation to phonetics, morphology, etymology, semantics, grammar, rhetoric, logic, philology and linguistics reveals a new approach. He provides a state-of-the-art appraisal as the chapter headings suggest: Grammatical forms; Etymological (= Semantic) and syntactic forms; Grammar and logic; Members of a sentence and parts of speech.

Potebnia describes the difference between a logical proposition and a grammatical sentence (psychological sentence) taking into account what his contemporary linguists put forward (both Western and Eastern European, e.g. Steinthal, Buslaiev). Additionally, many concepts that Potebnia applies to his theory indicate an interesting development of the ideas found in speculative grammars.

The second volume — *The constituent members of a sentence and its commutations* — contains a very comprehensive description of the constituents of the Indo-European sentence in synchronic

¹ for a bibliography see Kerecuk, N. (2006) *Potebnja, Aleksander (1835–91)* in (ed. Brown, K.) 2006 *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed. Elsevier: Oxford.

² The word ‘russkoi’ was mistranslated as Russian by many — as I have demonstrated since 1990, this should be expressed as ‘East Slavonic’ as in the 19th century Russians used ‘Great Russian’ to describe their language, ‘Little Russian’ was used for Ukrainian and ‘White Russian’ for Belarussian. Despite the modest title, the work encompasses the Indo-European sentence.

and diachronic terms. Indeed, the examples Potebnia uses to illustrate transform this work into an encyclopaedia of the development of the sentence. It is fitting that Jagič refers to IZPRG as *Thesaurus Syntacticus* (19th c). Potebnia's influence is markedly widespread both in the Eastern Europe and the West albeit in various guises.

L'ESPACE LINGUISTIQUE VECU

Carita Klippi (Tampere)

La carte est une représentation iconique approximative de la situation géographique réelle, mais les représentations de l'espace contribuent à orienter son organisation. Nous nous proposons d'étudier par l'intermédiaire de la géographie linguistique française de la fin du 19^e et du début du 20^e siècles, d'une part, comment la langue reflète la représentation de l'espace, et d'autre part, comment la langue vit le mouvement des locuteurs dans l'espace.

Selon A.-L. Terracher³ (1914 : I) le terme de géographie linguistique désigne une telle diversité de travaux « d'ordre et d'esprit » qu'il serait plutôt approprié de systématiser sous des expressions nouvelles les études effectuées dans le cadre de la dialectologie gallo-romane. Il propose de rediviser les travaux existants comme suit : 1) la cartographie linguistique qui dresse des cartes, d'une part, des limites de dialectes (la méthode représentée par Ascoli), et d'autre part, des caractères linguistiques (la méthode de Meyer) ; 2) la géologie linguistique qui établit des cartes de mots en vue d'en examiner la stratigraphie historique (la méthode de J. Gilliéron) ; 3) la géographie linguistique qui constitue une « explication de la répartition topographique des faits du langage » au moyen des facteurs ethnographiques, géographiques et historiques (la méthode de Terracher même) (ibid. pp. I–XIV).

La répartition des travaux empiriques est révélatrice de la façon dont l'homme possède l'espace. Si Terracher ne fait pas entièrement justice à ses collègues, on peut toutefois adopter sa méthode de la géographie linguistique lorsque l'on s'intéresse au rapport entre l'homme et l'espace — comment l'homme s'y meut, comment il l'articule. L'expression linguistique peut être l'un des seuls indices par le biais desquels on arrive à remonter le cours du temps. Ainsi, les noms, et surtout les toponymes, franchissent-ils les barrières temporelles, et non seulement ils retracent l'histoire du peuplement, mais aussi traduisent les imaginaires de l'espace habité. La corporalité de l'homme dans l'espace engendre du discontinu ou du continu linguistique. Les limites des langues, des dialectes et des parlers ne sont pas arbitraires, mais vécues. La discontinuité est une manifestation d'une corporalité sédentaire, d'un *esprit de clocher*, pour utiliser le terme saussurien, modifiable selon l'échelle qui va d'un village jusqu'à l'Etat, voire au-delà. Cet esprit de clocher constitue un effet de barrière linguistique qui est propre à réduire à néant les échanges et les contacts avec l'extérieur. L'espace devient ainsi un support identitaire. En revanche, la représentation topographique de la diffusion des phénomènes linguistiques à partir d'une aire d'attraction est une traduction du mouvement continu de la corporalité de l'homme à travers l'espace. L'espace organisateur des identités devient un espace de contacts par la *force d'intercourse*, pour reprendre le terme saussurien, laquelle engendre des discontinuités nuancées sans qu'il y ait un espace fini à l'égard de tous les phénomènes linguistiques.

CONTEXT, TEXT, CORPUS AND USE IN BRITISH APPLIED LINGUISTICS IN THE 1960S

Jacqueline Léon (Paris)

Within their strong empirical tradition, British linguists have always been concerned with applied linguistics, most notably with language teaching. In my paper, I propose to deal with the notions of use, context, text and corpus as they were addressed by the Neo-Firthians when they tackled computer-methods in the 1960s in order to make corpus-based grammars and dictionaries for language teaching. While Firth, within his contextual theory of meaning, considering 'the meaning of words lies in their use', mainly addressed use as the study of collocations in whole texts, leaving

³ Terracher, A.-L. (1914) : *Les aires morphologiques dans les parlers populaires du Nord-Ouest de l'Angoumois (1800–1900)*. Paris : Honoré Champion.

aside his former interest in the relation between the use of sounds and social attitudes, two approaches can be observed among his followers. John Sinclair remained very close to Firth's views. His central concern was lexical meaning by collocation with particular emphasis on the study of very long texts ; language should be studied as whole texts, not as isolated sentences or text fragments. Context was restricted to text and did not involve social practices. Sinclair has used the term corpus only since the 1990s when starting his collocation dictionary for language teaching. He pointed out that 'a corpus made up of whole documents is open to a wider range of linguistic studies than a collection of short samples'. Randolph Quirk, on the other hand, focusing his enquiries more on grammar than lexical meaning, had a multifarious approach of use based on the study of variation which means taking into account grammatical norms, attested written and spoken language, as well as the systematic study of the discrepancy between speakers' intuition and their real use. Consequently, when starting his *Survey of English Usage* in 1959, he used experimental methods as well as the construction of a sampled corpus ; his explicit aim was to make grammars, both prescriptive and descriptive, for English teaching as a foreign language. In my paper, I will examine both approaches, their inheritance from British empirical linguistics and lexicography, and see how they led to different views of corpus linguistics, currently called 'corpus-based' and 'corpus-driven' methods.

THE UNPUBLISHED PAPERS OF JOHAN AUGUST LUNDELL (1851–1940)

Andrew Linn (Sheffield)

The Swedish linguist, Johan August Lundell (1851-1940) is best remembered for his internationally renowned phonetic alphabet for the notation of Swedish dialects (but also used, for example, in the transcription of Chinese dialects), and for his practical and theoretical dialect work, much of it presented in the journal, *Nyare bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmålen och svenskt folkliif*. From 1882 he held a post in Phonetics at Uppsala University, where he had been a student, as far as I know the first post anywhere formally dedicated to Phonetics. In 1890 he was appointed the first Professor of Slavic languages at Uppsala. He was self-taught in this field and his output here was very limited. He was very active in debates concerning the reform of Swedish spelling, and his reform activities also spanned educational reform in Sweden and attempts to reform the way in which modern languages were taught. Along with Otto Jespersen and the Norwegian August Western, he was a founder of Quousque Tandem, 'The Scandinavian Society for Improved Language Teaching'. In short, he was active in all the new areas of linguistic and educational interest embraced by the other, more widely known and understood Scandinavian and British reformers of the time, such as Jespersen, Johan Storm and Henry Sweet.

In 2007 I will be spending a month working with Lundell's unpublished papers in the Manuscript Department of the University Library in Uppsala. The materials are not catalogued, and I do not know yet what I will find. My paper will therefore be a report of my findings and a presentation of the Lundell archive and what it can contribute to our understanding of the state of language research in northern Europe around the turn of the 20th century.

MULTIPLE DISCOURSES IN SCHOTTELIUS' AUSFUHRRLICHE ARBEIT DER TEUTSCHEN HAUPTSPRACHE (1663)

Nicola McLelland (Nottingham)

Schottelius' *Ausführliche Arbeit* is the most significant contribution to the study of the German language in the seventeenth century, and is strikingly different from the equivalent landmarks in English grammar (Wallis) or French grammar (the Port Royal grammar) published around the same time. This paper will explore one of the reasons why Schottelius' work is so different: its author is participating in multiple discourses at once. At least four discourses can be identified: the internal discourse of the language society of which Schottelius was an active member (the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft), the wider Gattungsreihe of German grammars, the "pansemiotic" world-view dominant in Baroque Germany, which attributes multiple meanings to signs in the world, and, finally, the discourse of the international scholarly community reflecting on questions such as the origin of language and the relative status of languages. The paper will illustrate how these four

discourses affect what Schottelius has to say and why, and how their relative importance shifts over the three editions of the Schottelius grammar (1641, 1651, culminating in the massive 1663 volume).

VARRO ON THE ORIGINS OF LANGUAGE, ETYMOLOGY AND CORRECT LINGUISTIC USAGE

Robert Maltby (Leeds)

The aim the paper will be to discuss Varro's theories on etymology and the origins of language as set out mainly in his *De Lingua Latina* and to compare his views with those of his Greek predecessors, Plato (*Cratylus*), Chrysippus and the Stoic tradition, and, in particular, with those of his near contemporary Lucretius and the Epicurean tradition. In particular the Roman tradition, as represented by Varro, will be shown to be much more practical and less philosophical than that of the Greeks, emphasising the role of etymology in semantics and correct usage. Varro's main contribution to the debate, the contrast between *impositio uoluntaria* and *declinatio naturalis* will be analysed in detail. I will be drawing some conclusions on the originality and modernity of Varro's approach, particularly as regards the use of etymology as a guide to correct usage in Latin, comparing his views on linguistic correctness with the more traditionally prescriptive ideas of Cicero and Quintilian. Whereas Cicero and Quintilian both emphasise the role of the "best speakers" in deciding questions of linguistic correctness, Varro is willing to accept the modern view that ultimately linguistic correctness has to depend on the habits *consuetudo* of the whole body of speakers (the *populus*). The paper will end with an evaluation of the influence of Varro's ideas on the subsequent Latin grammatical tradition, the role of etymology in Roman grammatical teaching and its relation to *barbarismos* and correct usage.

SPRACHLEHRE UND SPRACHPFLEGE IM SPIEGEL DER ANTIATTIZISTISCHEN BEWEGUNG IM BEREICH DER ANTIKEN GRIECHISCHEN LEXIKOGRAPHIE

Stephanos Matthaios (Thessaloniki)

Im Rahmen der griechischen Sprachgeschichte, aber auch im allgemeinen Kontext der historischen Sprachwissenschaft stellt der Attizismus eins der repräsentativsten Beispiele von Sprachlehre, besonders von Sprachpflege dar. Zunächst als Stilrichtung gegen den sogenannten Asianismus verstanden, vertrat die attizistische Bewegung im Bereich der Rhetorik und literarischen Prosa die Nachahmung des schlichten Stils der attischen Redner aus der griechischen Klassik. In der Form eines sprachlichen Programms weist sie jedoch eine nachhaltige Wirkung auf und umspannt die Geschichte des Griechischen seit der Herauskristallisierung einer gemeinsamen Sprache in hellenistischer Zeit bis in die Gegenwart hinein mit dem bekannten Phänomen der Diglossia. Als sprachliches Programm also postulierte der Attizismus in der Zeit seiner Hochblüte (vom ausgehenden 1. bis zum 3. Jh. n.Chr.) und während des gesamten byzantinischen Zeitalters, zuweilen sehr vehement, die Beibehaltung der attischen Sprachform im Bereich der Grammatik und des Lexikons, zugleich ignorierte sie die natürliche Entwicklung der griechischen Sprache und betrachtete sie als Verfall gegenüber der klassischen Norm, die als musterhaft und mit allen Mitteln zu bewahren galt. Im Sinne des Attizismus arbeiteten auch die antiken Lexikographen. Ein großer Teil der damaligen Lexikographie hatte sich zum Ziel gesetzt, einerseits die zugelassenen Ausdrücke aus den Werken der Musterautoren zu sammeln, andererseits Anweisungen zum korrekten Gebrauch des attischen Dialekts zu geben.

Während es der Forschung bislang gelungen ist, die attizistische Bewegung in ihrer Vielfalt und Wirkung zu analysieren, doch ist die Frage von Gegenreaktionen auf deren Forderungen wenig beachtet worden. Auf Grundlage der attizistischen Postulate im jeweiligen sprachlichen und kulturellen Kontext, in dem er präsent war, sollen in diesem Beitrag aus dem Zusammenhang der kaiserzeitlichen und byzantinischen Lexikographie Formen leisen oder lauten 'Protestes' gegen den Attizismus untersucht werden, zugleich in ihrer Tragweite und Resonanz ausgewertet werden.

HELENA WILLMAN-GRABOWSKA — PORTRAIT OF A LINGUIST AND AN INDOLOGIST

Iwona Milewska (Kraków)

My paper will focus on Helena Willman-Grabowska (1870–1957) a Polish indologist, a linguist and a translator. She studied in Warsaw, Bern, Lausanne and Paris and was a pupil of J.N. Baudouin de Courtenay (Kraków), A. Meillet, S. Levi, A. Foucher and L. Finot (Paris).

Between 1920–1927 she gave lectures on Sanskrit and Pali grammar at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes in Paris then starting from 1927 to 1948 was appointed head of Sanskrit and Indian Philology Department at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Poland. Her “official” work at the Jagiellonian University lasted only till 1948 because at this very year the Sanskrit Department was formally dissolved by the authorities. These were the dark times of Stalinism and a professor educated in the “rotten West” was not treated by the authority as an authority any longer. Nevertheless she continued her meetings with students till her death in 1957.

While in Kraków she delivered lectures on Vedic, Sanskrit, Avestan, Persian, Pali, Dravidian, Tibetan and Sogdian grammar. Simultaneously she taught the history of Indian literature and philosophy and was reading and interpreting classical Indian texts with her students. She left a group of splendid followers who were continuing the tradition of Indian and linguistic studies in Kraków (T. Pobożniak, J. Łączak), in Lublin (F. Tokarz) and abroad (L. Sternbach) and a bunch of written works, both in Polish and French. Her works may be classified into six main groups. Namely linguistic e.g. *Les composés nominaux dans le Śatapatha-Brahmana* (her PhD thesis); comparative e.g. *Le chien dans le Rigveda et l’Avesta*; philosophical e.g. *L’idée de l’atman du Rigveda aux Brahmana*; historical e.g. *Idea państwa w Indiach starożytnych* (The idea of state in ancient India); entries in dictionaries e.g. in *Mythologie Asiatique Illustrée*, in *Słownik form literackich* (Dictionary of Literary Forms); translations from Sanskrit and Russian into Polish e.g. *Vetālapācaviūśatikā* (25 stories of the Vampire). Since 1927 she participated in different linguistic and orientalist congresses and conferences e.g. 1928 Oxford, 1929 Prague and Lund, 1935 Rome, 1939 Copenhagen and Brussels. Between 1936 and 1937 she made a trip to India and Ceylon. There she gave lectures on Buddhism in Calcutta and organized the Society of Friends of Poland in Bombay.

Her whole life may stand as an example of the results of intermingling of two spheres: university career and political circumstances in the turn of XIXth and XXth centuries.

THE MORALITY OF GRAMMAR

Teresa Morgan (Oxford)

This paper will explore the connection between Greek grammar and morality, in Graeco-Roman education, scholarship and popular culture. I shall discuss the declension of *gnomai* and *chreiai* of wise men and the declinability of Greek proverbs, and I shall investigate why it was thought appropriate for Greek and Roman schoolchildren to receive the bulk of their ethical education from the *grammatikos*. I shall link my findings with the world of grammatical scholarship, and investigate the connection between right and wrong language and right and wrong behaviour and ethos.

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR: ASH AND DEVIS AND “THE LANGUAGE OF GENTLEMEN”

Karlijn Navest (Leiden)

The ambitions of middle-class parents for the education of their sons and daughters created a market for grammars in eighteenth-century Britain (Beal 2004:105). In his *Grammatical institutes: or grammar, adapted to the genius of the English tongue*, John Ash (1724–1779) noted that

THE Importance of an *English Education* is now pretty well understood; and ’tis generally acknowledged, that not only for Ladies, but for young Gentlemen design’d merely for Trade, an intimate Acquaintance with the Proprieties, and Beauties of the English Tongue, wou’d be a very desirable, and necessary Attainment (1760: iii).

Although Ash had originally written his grammar for his five-year-old daughter, he decided to print the grammar “for the Use of his Friends who were concerned in the Education of Children” (1766: Advertisement). One of these friends was John Collett Ryland, headmaster of a dissenting academy in Northampton, who in 1766 and 1768 reissued Ash’s work as “The easiest introduction to Dr. Lowth’s English grammar”. All editions after 1768 carry the title *Grammatical institutes: or, an easy introduction to Dr. Lowth’s English grammar*. Ash’s grammar must have appealed to Ellin Devis, who offered her grammar as an introduction to Robert Lowth’s *Short introduction to English grammar* (1762). Devis’s *Accidence; or first rudiments of English grammar* (1775) “was the first grammar of modern English explicitly written ‘by a lady’ and specifically written for a female audience” (Percy 2003:45). Although Devis’s grammar contains one footnote in which she indicates her debt to Ash, Percy states that “[i]n pursuit of ‘Perspicuity and Simplicity’”, Devis appears to have relied more on Ash’s grammar than this single footnote to him suggests (2003:55). Ash and Devis both wrote their grammars “for those who were deemed not to need a classical education” (Beal 2004:104). In this paper I will analyse the ways in which these two grammarians tried to teach their audiences “the language of gentlemen” (Leonard 1929:169), i.e. “the kind of upper class educated English used in ‘polite’ London circles” (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2000:883).

REFERENCES

- Ash, John (1760). *Grammatical institutes: or grammar, adapted to the genius of the English tongue*. Worcester: R. Lewis.
- Beal, Joan C. (2004). *English in modern times*. London: Arnold.
- Devis, Ellin (1775). *The accidence; or first rudiments of English grammar. Designed for the use of young ladies*. London: sold by J. Beecroft and Thomas Cadell.
- Leonard, S[terling] A[nndrus] (1929). The doctrine of correctness in English usage, 1700–1800. Madison: University of Wisconsin (Repr., New York: Russell & Russell, 1962).
- Percy, Carol (2003). “The art of grammar in the age of sensibility: *The accidence [...] for [...] young ladies* (1775)”. In: Dossena, Marina and Charles Jones (eds.) *Insights into late modern English*, Series: Linguistic insights: studies in language and communication. Bern: Peter Lang, 45–82.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid (2000). “Normative studies in England”. In: Auroux, Sylvain et al. (eds.) *History of the language sciences/Geschichte der sprachwissenschaften/Histoire des sciences du langage*. Vol. 1. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 876–887.

DER GRAMMATIKER UND PÄDAGOGE MAX WILHELM GÖTZINGER (1799–1856) – EIN VORWEGNEHMENDER GRAMMATIKER

Dan Olsson (Umeå)

Im Jahre 1824 erschien Max Wilhelm Götzingers (1799–1856) erste Grammatik *Die Anfangsgründe der deutschen Rechtschreibung und Satzzeichnung in Regeln und Aufgaben*. Es war eine Schulgrammatik, die sehr grossen Erfolg hatte und deshalb auch mehrmals aufgelegt wurde. Später erschienen von diesem Professor für deutsche Sprache und Literatur in Schaffhausen, der ursprünglich Theologe war, immer wieder neue Lesebücher und Grammatiken, die sowohl pädagogischen als auch wissenschaftlichen Zwecken dienten und mit neuen Auflagen bis ins 20. Jh. hinein erschienen. Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts gerieten er und seine Grammatiken aus unterschiedlichen Gründen in Vergessenheit. Einige Aspekte seines grammatischen Systems, vor allem seine verbozentrische Theorie, die Ähnlichkeiten mit der heutigen Valenztheorie aufweist, wurden dann in den 80er Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts von den sprachwissenschaftlichen Historiographen Clemens Knobloch und Kjell-Åke Forsgren wieder aktualisiert und diskutiert. Auch die dialektologische Arbeit Götzingers, die bisher wenig beachtet wurde, ist von grossem Interesse, da er sich viel mit der Einteilung und Charakterisierung der zeitgenössischen deutschen Mundarten beschäftigt. Er sollte, laut der einzigen Götzingerbiographie von Johannes Meyer, sogar der erste sein, der die Mundarten grupperte. In diesem Vortrag geht es in erster Linie darum, Götzingers ziemlich schwer zugängliche Biographie und einige seiner Theorien kurz darzustellen. Er behauptete sie nicht selten in Polemik gegen zeitgenössische Sprachwissenschaftler. Götzinger war also ein selbständiger und bisher zu wenig beachteter Grammatiker, dessen Ideen im höchsten Grade heute noch diskutabel sind.

GERMANIC LINGUISTICS AND THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA: 1924 AND 2007

Marc Pierce (Austin, TX)

When the Linguistic Society of America was founded in 1924, Germanic linguistics held a particularly strong position within the Society. Several of the “Signers of the Call” were Germanic linguists, including such major figures as Leonard Bloomfield and Hermann Collitz. Moreover, a number of teachers at the first Linguistic Institute, held in the summer of 1929 at Yale, were Germanic linguists, and several courses on Germanic topics were offered there, including Gothic and comparative Germanic philology, Old Norse, and the history of German.

The current situation is markedly different. There are no courses dedicated to Germanic linguistics scheduled for the 2007 Linguistic Institute, to be held at Stanford. A similar situation prevails at the upcoming 2007 Annual Meeting of the Society, where there are no scheduled sessions devoted to Germanic topics, and only a handful of Germanic papers scattered throughout the various sessions.

In this paper, I shall first provide the necessary historical background and then discuss some possible reasons for the change in the status of Germanic linguistics, including the following. First, Germanic linguistics is being increasingly marginalized within its traditional stronghold in Germanic departments, resulting in an ever more dismal job market, and thus discouraging younger scholars from entering the field. Third, an increasing interest in the study of other languages has drawn scholars away from Germanic topics. Finally, a decrease in historical awareness has led linguists in America away from their intellectual ancestors, many of whom were Germanic linguists.

REMARK AND REMEMBER: CULTIVATING DUTCH IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE

Gijsbert Rutten (Nijmegen)

In many language areas, there was a time when a literary elite was engaged in cultivating the language. Men of letters wrote on language, linguistics, rhetoric, and literary theory, and tried to raise the vernacular to the level of ancient Latin and Greek. Sometimes these efforts at *Sprachpflege* or *Spracharbeit* were institutionalized, as in the German *Sprachgesellschaften* and the *Académie française*, sometimes they were not. In the Netherlands, especially the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are characterized by such cultivating activities by men of letters. At first, they were not united in a society, but individuals working on similar language projects. Later on, in the second half of the eighteenth century, societies were founded in order to work in unison on the cultivation of Dutch.

Of course, these men of letters did not just write for their own sake. Sometimes, however, it seems that historians forget to ask who this *Sprachpflege* was practiced for. Who, according to the men of letters, should read their books? Who ought to care about the cultivation of language? How did the *Sprachpflege*-texts function in early modern society? In short, who was supposed to learn from what the men of letters wrote? With regard to the Dutch situation, it appears that *Sprachpflege* was executed especially for the benefit of upper class young men with literary ambitions. In the Latin schools they were taught Latin and Greek, but outside the regular educational system, another circuit of language teaching, that is of *Sprachlehre*, was established in which these young men were exposed to *Sprachpflege*-texts in order to advance Dutch literature. In this way, *Sprachpflege* and *Sprachlehre* are two sides of the same coin.

THE NOTION OF SUBSTANCE IN APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS

Andreas Schmidhauser (Geneva)

According to Apollonius Dyscolus, the great Greek grammarian from the second century AD, we use pronouns to signify a substance (*ousia*). But what is a substance? Scholars generally claim that Apollonius intended to speak of an Aristotelian substance. Yet as it stands this statement cannot even be evaluated, for Aristotle used the term *ousia* in various ways. Moreover, I shall argue that even on the most favourable interpretation, the claim cannot be correct. One of the main reasons for rejecting it is that Apollonius' dictum that pronouns signify a substance is paralleled by his affirmation that nouns signify a quality — or more precisely: that proper nouns signify a peculiar

quality (*idia poiotes*), and that appellative nouns signify a common quality (*koine poiotes*). However, the two phrases *idia poiotes* and *koine poiotes* make sense only in a theory such as the Stoic one. This suggests that if possible one should understand *ousia* in the Stoic fashion as well. Now as a matter of fact, this does seem possible: there is a Stoic use of *ousia* that could be put to use in Apollonius' theory. I will show that further facts prove this interpretation to be correct. Accordingly, the notion of substance Apollonius is making use of in his theory of language is the Stoic notion.

„REDENDE KÜNSTE“⁴ UND SPRACHPFLEGE IM 17. UND 18. JAHRHUNDERT IM DEUTSCHEN SPRACHRAUM (ARBEITSTITEL)

Friederike Spitzl-Dupic (Clermont-Ferrand)

Mein Ausgangspunkt ist der Terminus *Kunst* in seiner Anwendung auf sprachliche Erzeugnisse zwischen Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts und Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts in deutschsprachigen Texten sein. *Kunst* ist dabei in dem Sinn zu verstehen, in dem dieser Begriff bis ins letzte Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts verwendet wird, nämlich in einer technisch ausgerichteten Lesart: so ist z.B. Grammatik *Sprachkunst* und Fachtermini sind *Kunstwörter*.⁵

Dieses Verständnis von Kunst führt dazu, dass „redende Künste“ als ein weitgehend — ja oft völlig — rational beherrschbares Vorgehen aufgefasst werden. Dessen vorzügliches Mittel ist nun Sprachpflege im weitesten Sinne, die Aspekte wie „Sprachreinigkeit“ für das Deutsche, Wortbildung per „Analogie“, präzise Synonymenscheidung etc. beinhaltet.

Mein Interesse richtet sich genauer auf Schriften, in denen derart auf Sprachpflege beruhende „redende Künste“ als unerlässliches Mittel zur intellektuellen und moralischen Erziehung einzelner Individuen, bestimmter gesellschaftlicher Gruppen oder auch ganzer Völker und Nationen dargestellt werden: neben Grammatik und Kunstwörtern sind in diesem Kontext u.a. „Auslegekunst“, „Redekunst“, „Dichtkunst“, „Critische Dichtkunst“, „Redende Künste“ und „logische Zeichenkunst“ zu nennen, wobei allerdings letztere hier nur sehr beschränkt behandelt werden soll.

Die Untersuchung der Argumentation, die Philosophen, Kunstkritiker und Linguisten verwenden, um unterschiedlichen „Sprachkünsten“ eine erzieherische Rolle zuzuschreiben, stützt sich auf Texte von u.a. G.W. Leibniz, Chr. Wolff, J. Chr. Gottsched, J.H. Lambert und J.G. Sulzer.

AUSWAHLBIBLIOGRAPHIE

LAMBERT, Johann Heinrich 1764. *Neues Organon oder Gedanken über die Erforschung und Bezeichnung des Wahren und dessen Unterscheidung vom Irrtum und Schein*, Leipzig: Johann Wendler [Repr., unter Mitarbeit von Peter Heyl, hrsg., bearbeitet und mit einem Anhang versehen von Günter Schenk, 3 Bde., Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1990].

LEIBNIZ, Gottfried Wilhelm 1682/83. „Ermahnung an die Teutsche, ihren verstand und sprache beßer zu üben, samt beygefügeten vorschlag einer Teutsch=gesinten gesellschaft“

(http://www.fh-augsburg.de/~harsch/germanica/Chronologie/17Jh/Leibniz/lei_erma.html).

LEIBNIZ, Gottfried Wilhelm vers 1697. „Unvorgreifliche Gedancken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der Teutschen Sprache“, (première édition imprimée 1716) <http://staff-www.uni-marburg.de/~gloning/lbnz-ug.htm> (consulté le 02.08.2004)

GOTTSCHEDE, Johann Christoph und »sehr vermehrten« Auflage 1751⁴ (zuerst 1730), Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst [...] [Reprint der d. 4., verm. Aufl., Leipzig: Breitkopf, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft].

SULZER, Johann George (sic). 1771. 1774. *Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste. In einzeln, nach alphabetischer Ordnung der Kunstwörter auf einander folgenden, Artikeln abgehandelt*, Leipzig: M. G. Weidmanns Erben und Reich [Reprint. Berlin: Digitale Bibliothek 2002] (Digitale Bibliothek 67).

WOLFF, Christian 1733². Ausführliche Nachricht von seinen eigenen Schrifften, die er in deutscher Sprache von den verschiedenen Theilen der Welt=Weißheit heraus gegeben: auf Verlangen ans Licht gestellet, Franckfurt am Mayn : Andreä und Hort. [zuerst 1726, Repr., hrsg. und mit einer Einl. von Hans Werner Arndt, Hildesheim / New York: Olms (Chr. Wolff, Gesammelte Werke, hrsg und bearbeitet von J. Ecole, J.E. Hofmann, M. Thomann, H.W. Arndt. I. Abt., Deutsche Schriften, Bd.9)].

⁴ Sulzer 1771, Bd. 2: 1184

⁵ Ab Mitte des Jahrhunderts weicht dieser Kunstbegriff dem auch heute gebräuchlichen, d.i. *Kunst* wird zum nicht normierten Ausdruck menschlicher Kreativität.

„ÄHNLICHKEITEN UND UNTERSCHIEDE ZWISCHEN DER DEUTSCHEN UND ENGLISCHEN SPRACHE“. ZU
KARL PHILIPP MORITZ' *ENGLISCHER SPRACHLEHRE FÜR DIE DEUTSCHEN*
Ute Tintemann (Berlin)

Obwohl Karl Philipp Moritz' *Englische Sprachlehre für die Deutschen* zwischen ihrem Erscheinungsjahr 1784 und 1805 fünf Auflagen erreichte und somit zu den populärsten Werken dieses Autors zählt, ist sie bis heute von der Forschung kaum berücksichtigt worden.

Inhalt und Konzeption dieses Lehrwerks möchte ich in meinem Vortrag ausführlich vorstellen. Moritz wählte für die Darstellung der englischen Sprache eine kontrastive Herangehensweise. Diese diente ihm einerseits dazu, den Lernstoff auf einen deutschsprachigen Lerner zuzuschneiden und beispielsweise einen Schwerpunkt auf den Erwerb der Aussprache zu legen. Andererseits ging es ihm auch darum, bei dem Leser eine kognitive Durchdringung des Lernstoffs zu erreichen, wie ich unter Rekurs auf Moritz' Sprachauffassung ebenfalls zeigen möchte.

TO STUDY RUSSIAN BY MEANS OF THE "NEW THEORY OF LANGUAGE" ? A LITTLE KNOWN PAGE
FROM THE HISTORY OF SOVIET PEDAGOGICS
Ekaterina Velmezova (Lausanne)

"The Soviet schools must be the best in the world. And we must teach best of all".
(Petrova 1937, p. 2)

In the 1930s, a group of Soviet pedagogues (E.N. Petrova, N.P. Andreev, O.A. Modenskaja, O.V. Vejspal, etc.) insisted on the necessity to introduce the linguistic theories elaborated by N.Ja. Marr (1864–1934) into the teaching of Russian at secondary schools. Marr highly appreciated all these attempts to "reconcile" linguistic theory and practical needs and mentioned them in his works. As a result, a number of particular pedagogical methods were worked out, which will be analyzed in the paper. As we shall show, the transference of purely theoretical ideas into pedagogics resulted in a considerable simplification of the initial Marrist doctrines. At the same time, such transference helps us to reveal the very essence of Marr's theories which is not so evident in the academic account of his works. That is why, analysis of the "New Theory of Language" in the light of the history of Soviet pedagogics makes possible to develop a new approach to the study of Marrism.

On the other hand, Soviet pedagogues did not approve all Marr's theses. For instance, in 1930s–1940s interjections were interpreted differently in the Soviet theoretical linguistics and in the school-books of Russian. In our paper, we shall present a detailed analysis of such divergence of opinions trying to explain its reasons.

REFERENCE

Petrova E.N. 1937. "Rabota nad slovom", in *Russkij jazyk v škole*. 1937, № 2, pp. 2-15. [How to Work with Words]

WHAT LINGUISTICS COULD LEARN FROM PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY. MAUTHNER'S CHAPTERS
ON PSYCHOLOGY

Frank Vonk (Arnhem)

Like human behaviour language use has some hidden aspects which can be unravelled by using psychological and sociological methodological techniques. Now psychology and sociology have in common that these sciences transcend empirical findings. By looking at and analyzing conceptualizations of psychic and social reality, where reality means a possible object of these conceptualizations, psychologists and sociologists try to make accessible entities like "mind", "memory", "attention" or "mass", "society" and "human beings". These notions are part of the psychological and sociological discourse creating as it were their own reality. Linguistics, the study of its psychological and sociological dimension, has something in common with the ways psychology and sociology describe, analyze and explain linguistic entities like "nouns", "verbs", "meaning" or "discourse".

How could linguistics profit methodologically from sociological or psychological ways of thinking and research? How can we find out about the "hidden" in linguistic discourse and can we use scientific methodologies to reveal this dimension of language? It is the scientific interest

sociologists and psychologists have, which accounts for the specific results in unearthing the assumptions which underlie language research. Like psychology and sociology linguistics seems to be of a general interest which makes it the object not only of linguistic research but also of sciences studying human behaviour.

One of the historically pre-postmodern, not modern, thinkers trying to link linguistic studies and psychology and/or sociology was Fritz Mauthner (1847–1923) who stated that language is not an appropriate means to get access to what we call the inner world of human beings. Language, according to Mauthner, is fundamentally materialistic and sensualistic. The world as such, however, is not accessible by using our senses but a construction. Meaning that language pretends to make the outer world accessible to us but by being sensualistic in fact is not able to represent it but accidentally. Language assumes the senses and they neither look inside nor represent adequately outside. In the 1st volume of his *Beiträge zu einer Kritik der Sprache*, Mauthner devotes over 400 pages to this problematic relation between language, psychology and what he considers his own contribution to the language sciences: a critique of language. What sociology and psychology contribute to this critique is elaborated in this contribution.

SPRACHKLASSIFIKATIONEN IN DEN UKRAINISCHEN HANDSCHRIFTLICHEN LOGIKKURSEN VOM ENDE DES 17. - ERSTEN DRITTEL DES 18. JAHRHUNDERTS

Serhij Wakulenko (Charkiw)

Unter den orthodoxen Ländern zeichnet sich die Ukraine dadurch aus, dass sie eine eigene Tradition der auf Lateinisch getriebenen Schulphilosophie hat. Ihre Anfänge gehen auf das Jahr 1632 zurück, als der Metropolit Petro Mohyla ein Kollegium in Kiew stiftete, in dem auf Lateinisch unterrichtet wurde.

Zwar hat diese Tradition kaum beachtenswerte gedruckte Werke auf dem Gebiet der Philosophie hinterlassen, doch haben mehrere Dutzende von handschriftlichen Kursen unsere Zeit erreicht, was eine gute Einsicht in den Ideenkreis ihrer Autoren ermöglicht.

Die Scholastische Logik beschäftigte sich bekanntlich mit einer Reihe Fragen, die heute den Gegenstand der sprachwissenschaftlichen Semantik ausmachen, darunter mit dem theoretischen Problem der Willkürlichkeit/ Naturgemäßheit des sprachlichen Zeichens. Während dieses Problem in der scholastischen Logik überwiegend im Sinne der ersten Alternative behandelt wurde, entstand daraus ein Widerspruch mit dem theologischen Dogma des göttlichen Ursprunges der allerersten menschlichen Sprache(n).

Eine Lösung dafür wurde auf dem Wege der Unterscheidung zwischen von Gott eingeflößten Grundsprachen und von den Menschen verdorbenen abgeleiteten Sprachen gesucht. Die Lehre von den Grundsprachen (exemplifiziert durch das Hebräische, das Lateinische, das Griechische, das Slawische, das Germanische, das Tatarische und das Abyssinische) und den von ihnen entstandenen Sprachfamilien hatten die ukrainischen Autoren aus den Pentateuch-Kommentaren von dem flämischen Jesuiten Cornelis Cornelissen Van Den Steen genommen, doch bereicherten sie sie mit bedeutenden Ergänzungen im Bereich des germanischen und insbesondere des slawischen Sprachzweiges.

Das erste Werk, in dem diese theologische Argumentation innerhalb der Logik verwendet und weitergeführt wird, ist Stefan Javors'kyjs "Agonium Philosophicum" (1691); ihm folgen Innokentij Popovs'kyjs "Universa Philosophia" (1699), Josyf Turobojs'kyjs "Organum Aristotelis" (1702), Ilarion Jarozevyč'kyjs "Cursus Philosophicus" (1704), Amvrosij Dubnevskyj "Philosophia Peripathetica" (1727) u. a. Eine Untersuchung ihrer Thesen gewährt einen tieferen Einblick in den damaligen Kenntnisstand in Bezug auf die Sprachverwandtschaft.

LILY'S THEORY OF SIGNS

John Walmsley (Bielefeld)

Lily's theory of signs is generally understood to mean "that English expresses by means of prepositions what Latin does by casual endings" (Vorlat 1975: 154). This theory played an important part - indeed a highly elaborated role - in grammatical investigation in England from Lily's time up to at least the eighteenth century. The question is, what exactly did

Lily's theory of signs say, both in its earlier and in its later manifestations, and why did Lily need to develop his theory in the first place? On the one hand, it has been claimed that Lily's theory of signs helped "the analytic character of English gradually [to become a] a recognized fact" (Poldauf 1948: 47). Against this, Padley argued that Lily's signs "were as much a pedagogical device as a means of linguistic description . . . They [the signs - J.W.] constitute no proof that Lily was to any notable extent aware of the analytical character of English as opposed to Latin" (Padley 1985: 67), so that the growing appreciation of the analytic aspects of English was nothing more than an accidental by-product of the theory.

This paper will go into these questions in some detail. At the same time, the topic offers an instructive case study in the historiography of linguistics.

REFERENCES

- Michael, I. (1970). *English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Padley, G.A. (1985). *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500–1700. Trends in Vernacular Grammar I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Poldauf, I. (1948). *On the History of Some Problems of English Grammar before 1800*. Prague: Akladem Filozofické Fakulty University Karlovy.
- Vorlat, E. (1985). *The Development of English Grammatical Theory 1586–1737*. Louvain: Leuven University Press.

DOES PRESCRIPTIVISM COINCIDE WITH *SPRACHPFLEGE* IN ENGLISH GRAMMARS OF THE 17TH AND 18TH CENTURIES?

Göran Wolf (*Dresden*)

Grammar undeniably is *Sprachlehre*. With regards to English, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw the publication of a large number of works devoted to grammar. Almost all of them were intended for use in (grammar) schools. A good share of them are said to be prescriptive, because they gave rather authoritative comments of what was regarded as good or bad English. Whether strictly prescriptive or not, all of these grammars, to some extent, were part of the process of codification and therefore contributed to the development of the standard variety of English. However, all of this does not necessarily mean that seventeenth- and eighteenth-century grammars have to have a share in *Sprachpflege*. Examining a selection of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century grammars, my paper would like to outline how the grammars of that time applied the 'lore of language' and expanded its reach, which of the selected grammars were devoted to *Sprachpflege*, and, if they show tendencies of purism, which kind of purism did they adopt. Particular attention will also be paid to metalinguistic comments and extralinguistic factors which might have emphasised and confirmed the prescriptivism and purism of the grammar books in the long run.