

# LEXICON GRAMMATICORUM

Who's Who in the History of World Linguistics

General Editor:

Harro Stammerjohann

Co-Editors:

Sylvain Auroux · Dieter Cherubim · Tullio De Mauro  
Donatella Di Cesare · Eric P. Hamp · Christoph Harbsmeier  
Caroline C. Henriksen · Miklós Kontra · Andrzej M. Lewicki  
Bruno Lewin · Jolanta Mindak · Jan Noordegraaf  
Georges-Jean Pinault · Irène Rosier · Algirdas Sabaliauskas  
Paul Salmon · Ramón Sarmiento · Werner Sasse  
Sorin Stati · Kees Versteegh

English-Language Editor:

James Kerr



Max Niemeyer Verlag  
Tübingen 1996

based on a first-hand knowledge of the langs. studied and detailed investigation of hist. phonol. are the strong points of this grammar which today is still regarded as a reference-book.

(1867): *Outlines of Indian philol.*, Calcutta (repr., 1960). (1872/5/9): *Comp. grammar of the mod. Aryan langs. of India: to wit, Hindi, Panjabi, Sindhi, Gujarati, Marathi, Oriya and Bangali*, I: *On sounds*; II: *The noun and pronoun*; III: *The verb*.

FAIRBANKS, G.H. (1969): "Comp. IA.", in: *Current trends in langs.*, V: *Lings. in South Asia*, The Hague/Paris, 36-45. GRIERSON, G.A. (1902): "J.B.", *JRAS*, 722-5.

Nalini Balbir

**Beattie, James**, b. Oct. 25, 1735, Laurencekirk, Kincardine, Scotland, d. Aug. 18, 1803, Aberdeen, Scotland; poet, essayist and moral philosopher, writer on lang. origins, universal grammar, and ling. theory.

B. studied at Marischal College, Aberdeen, where he was appointed to the Chair of Moral Philos. and Logic in 1760. He was one of the original members of the Aberdeen Philos. Soc., which included, G. → Campbell, T. Reid and other members of the Aberdeen Enlightenment. He was noted for his religious orthodoxy and his violent opposition to Hume's scepticism. He also attacked Lord → Monboddo's view of the affinity of primitive man with the orang-utan. Part of his course of lectures on rhet. was devoted to a treatment of the origin of lang. and universal grammar, material which he incorporated in his *The Theory of Lang.* (1783<sup>4</sup>). In 1797 he publ. *Scotticisms*.

B. is concerned both with correct usage and with more general questions of universal grammar. He is strongly in favor of a standard based on the speech of "the most learned and polite persons in London and the neighbouring Univs. of Oxford and Cambridge". His reference here is to accent, whereas in his *Scotticisms* he sets out to teach his countrymen how to avoid localized usage in their choice of vocabulary and phraseology. B.'s preference for a metropolitan standard and his rejection of local Scottish forms of E. is characteristic of the attitude of most educated Scots and the not always successful attempt to impose north of the border a standard, based on the speech of London.

Unlike most contemporary writers concerned with the origin of speech (E. B. → Condillac and J.-J. → Rousseau in France, A. → Smith and Monboddo in Britain), B. does not accept the evolutionary view of mod. man's descent from a primitive savage, whose extremely simple sign system developed gradually with the advance of civilization into the highly complex langs. of

antiquity and their mod. descendants. He accepts as literal truth the biblical account of the divine origin of speech, affirming that primitive savages could not possibly have invented so complex a system as human lang. and that "our first parents must have spoken by immediate inspiration". The variety of human tongues is accounted for by the myth of the Tower of Babel. B. hints vaguely at a dual function of lang., that is not only cognitive (words as a sign of thought), but also emotive (words as signs of feeling). Like most of his contemporaries, B. holds that the study of lang., and in particular of universal grammar, is basically a study of the philosophy of mind, since ling. structures are a direct reflection of mental processes. Universal grammar derives its validity from the fact that "the thoughts of men must in all ages have been nearly the same" so that it is probable that "there may be in all human langs. some general points of resemblance, in structure at least, if not in sound". It is "those things that all langs. have in common, or that are necessary to every lang." that are treated in Universal or Philos. Grammar. This insistence on those elements which are 'necessary' to every lang., as opposed to those elements that are mere ornaments or refinements, runs right through his treatment. He rejects the assumption that synthetic langs. like Lat. are superior to the mod. analytical langs., though he does concede that the former are more elegant. One of the features that all langs. have in common is that the vast number of individual items that comprise their word stock can be reduced to a very small number of classes, that is to say the traditional parts of speech. Universal grammar is therefore not the sum total or lowest common denominator of all known langs., but a necessary condition that regulates all human speech. B. is however not always consistent in the application of this principle, and at times he argues for or against the existence of a particular feature in Universal grammar on the basis of its occurrence in a particular lang. His treatment of the parts of speech owes a great deal to J. → Harris, esp. his distinction between substantives and attributives. Basically substs. realize the subject of a proposition, whereas attributives realize the predicate, and hence comprise verbs as well as adjs. B. also distinguishes between "useful" and "necessary" elements in lang. Nouns signify "the thing spoken of": gender and number are said to be their essential attributes, whereas the essential features of verbs are quality + time + assertion. Tenses are said to be either definite or indefinite, complete or incomplete in action; they may be compound ("uniting two or more times in one tense") or simple ("expressive of

one time"). These three binary oppositions all intersect, giving a total of nine tenses. Though B.'s claim that he is "not indebted to former authors" is difficult to maintain, his remarks on universal grammar contain many interesting insights and observations.

(1779): *A list of two hundred scotticisms with remarks*, Aberdeen. (1783): *Dissertations moral and critical*, London/Edinburgh ("The theory of lang." occupies pp. 231-502). (1788): *The theory of lang. in two parts*, London (apart from a few slight alterations identical to the previous item). (1797): *Scotticisms [sic] designed to correct improprieties of speech and writing*, Edinburgh (enl. version of the 1779 pamphlet).—Cf. ALSTON, III, 318-22, 357-8, 855; IX, \*175-6.

BULLEN, A.H. (1885): *DNB*.

Thomas Frank †

**Beauzée, Nicolas**, b. May 9, 1717, Verdun, France, d. Jan 24, 1789, Paris; *grammairien-philosophe*, leading representative of Fr. Genl. Grammar.

There is little biographical information about B., but he was said at the time to have been a 'good man [...] who lived his life surrounded by supines and gerundives, never harming his fellowman'. His traditionalist religious position was set out in his apol. (1747) and in his remarks on the question of the origin of langs., namely his refusal to believe in a human origin and his defense of divine monogeneticism.

For reasons unknown, Denis Diderot asked B. (in collaboration with Douchet, his colleague from the *Ecole Royale Militaire (ERM)*, to take over the writing of arts. for the *Encyclopédie* on grammar after the death of C. C. → Dumarsais (whose last art. was 'grammairien'). It may be that B.'s professorship of grammar at the *ERM* had some bearing on the matter. In his *Grammaire Génl.* (1767) B. developed ideas from the *Encyclopédie*.

B. succeeded C.-P. Duclos (1704-72) as a member of the *Acad. Fr.* His gramm. thought, which was firmly rooted in fixed methodol. principles (establishing categories on the basis of dichotomies, classification of forms under a single category, explanation of counter-examples by using ellipsis, as in F. → Sanctius), continued to make progress in explaining empirical phenomena until his participation in the Panckoucke ed. of the *Encyclopédie Méthodique*, where he ed. (with F.-J. Marmontel), the three vols. dealing with grammar and lit. matters (1782-6). He did not simply reproduce existing arts. but reworked them, adding new elements (including information on the history of langs., Skr., Basque, Lappish, and Quechua).

Fr. also interested him, not simply from the viewpoint of genl. theory but in the area of differential semantics where he continued the analyses carried out by G. → Girard and the Synonymists (1778, 1780). B. was an excellent phonetician, and thought that the role of the vocal cords was to vary the pitch of the voice. He set out the consonantal and vocalic oppositions in the Fr. lang. using minimal pairs. He also transl. several works from Lat.

According to B., if describing specific areas of grammar is an art, Genl. Grammar is a science, since it has to state necessary and universal truths. Like Descartes, B. thought that this was possible if the principles were derived from the unchanging structure of the human mind, whose laws are related to those of logic. Nevertheless, grammar has its own, particular theoretical concepts relating, for example, to parts of speech. Therefore, a definition had to be found which would account for all elements of all langs. and also be linked to the structure of human thought. B. consulted many works of grammar in order to arrive at a principle of empirical adequacy. He adopted a system of strict classification, where clusters could vary from lang. to lang., at lower levels. Genl. Grammar is only concerned with categories corresponding to clusters which occur sufficiently high up in the system to be universal. The kinds of necessity expressed by grammar relate therefore to class and not to species.

For B., syntax (the study of the relations between the constituent elements of utterances) took on major importance. He introd. the notion of complement and analyzed the way determination functions (restriction of the extension of the concepts signified by words); this led him to bring together qualifiers (which he called 'physical adjs.') and determiners (which he called 'metaphysical adjs.') under the heading of adjs. In his theory of tenses, he takes as his starting point not just the actual moment of utterance but a point to which the event being considered is linked, before the whole is related to the moment of utterance. Although he was one of the most famous of the grammarians and his work was influential for a long time, particularly among Fr. grammarians, this theory did not find favor with his successors and would have required a radical revision of nomenclature.

For B., sci. explanation in ling. matters consisted of placing phenomena related to morphol. marking (the details varied between langs. but were based on word-order, agreement and subject/object distinction) within genl. semantic categories (identity of content, determination). The history of langs. (where the contingent events of people's lives find expression)

in Copenhagen, 1953–69 its director, 1964–73 prof. of Dan. lang. at the Univ. of Copenhagen.

B.'s sci. works lie within the fields of Dan. dialectology, history of the Dan. lang. and Dan. onomatology. His studies both in dialectol. and the history of the lang. are inspired by L. → Hjelmslev's particularly Dan. variety of F. → de Saussure's structuralism. As an onomatologist, B. was more concerned with interpretations of individual place-names than with genl. problems.

B.'s principal works are his thesis on the sound system of the now extinct Dan. dial. of Fjølde, once spoken south of the present Dan.-G. border (1944), a 2 vols. dict. of the dial. of Fjølde (1974, with Marie B.), a grammar of the lang. of the Scanic Law (1966), and a grammar of the lang. of the Zealand Laws (1967).

(1944): *Fjøldemålets lydssystem*, København. (1966): *Grammatik over Skånske Lov*, København. (1967): *Grammatik over De sjællandske Love*, København. (1973): *Ling. papers*, Copenhagen (selection of studies on Dan. ling. research, bilingualism in Slesvig, the evaluation of dial. recordings, and ODan., with biblio., 191–5). With M. BJERRUM (1974): *Ordbog over Fjøldemålet*, København.

SØRENSEN, J.K. (1986): "A.B.", in: *Oversigt over Det Kongelige Danske Videnskaberne Selskabs Virksomhed 1984–5*, København, 172–83 (with biblio., 182–3).

John Kousgård Sørensen

**Blair, Hugh**, b. Apr. 7, 1718, Edinburgh, Scotland, d. Dec. 27, 1800, ib.; writer on rhetoric and ling. theory, well-known divine and leading member of the Edinburgh lit. establishment, and as such on friendly terms with D. Hume, A. → Smith, A. Ferguson, among others.

Educated at Edinburgh High School and subsequently Edinburgh Univ., B. graduated in 1739 and was ordained minister of the Church of Scotland in 1742. One of the leading "moderates" of the Church of Scotland, he was appointed Minister of St. Giles in 1758 and first Regius Prof. of Rhet. and Belles Lettres at the Univ. of Edinburgh in 1762. His *Lectures on Rhet. and Belles Lettres* (1783), based on his courses at Edinburgh, was an extremely popular work, long in use as a textbook and transl. into Fr., It., Sp., G. and Du. The strictly ling. parts are contained in Lectures VI–IX, but there are references to lang. also in his subsequent treatment of more specifically rhet. interest.

Though B. does not claim absolute originality, he affirms that the author "consulted his own ideas and reflections: and a great part of what will be found in these lectures is entirely his own". Nevertheless he cites most contemporary writers on lang. both E. (e.g. A. Smith and J. → Harris, to whom his treatment of grammar

is greatly indebted) and Fr. (e.g. E.B. de → Condillac, C. de → Bosses and N. → Beauzée) as well as Renaissance sources like F. → Sanctius. Though Lord → Monboddo is not specifically mentioned among his sources, B.'s indebtedness to him is obvious at several points, and the same can be said of the work of G. → Campbell.

Like many of his contemporaries B. is concerned with the question of lang. origins and with the nature of primitive speech. While accepting the essentially arbitrary nature of lang. in its present stage, he thinks that in its early phases there must have been some onomatopoeic element and that paraling. features such as gesture and intonation played a larger part in the early history of lang. than they do now. Whereas at one point he doubts whether lang. can be considered a human invention and must therefore be attributed to some direct divine intervention, somewhat contradictorily in most of his treatment he accepts the common 18th-c. view of the descent of mod. civilization, and therefore lang., from early primitive societies, and he talks somewhat glibly of the lang. of savages. Like J.-J. Rousseau and Monboddo he is caught up in the dilemma of whether lang. existed before society or *vice versa*, but he merely enunciates the subject without attempting to find a satisfactory answer. His treatment of the first origins of speech is in terms of stimulus and response. Following the theory of Monboddo, who in turn bases himself on A. Smith, B. affirms that "among several savage tribes" the first words must have consisted of whole propositions (his examples are "the lion is coming", "the river is swelling") rather than the names of objects (nouns). It was only at a later stage that substs. were separated from their attributes. Primitive lang. must have had a very limited vocabulary, but have been rich in figures of speech, for all abstract expressions are said to have their origin in concrete nouns and are thus in a sense metaphors. B. moves from these purely ling. considerations to styl. observations on the highly figurative lang. of early poetry—it should be remembered that he was a strenuous defender of the authenticity of the *Ossian* poems. He is also concerned with natural vs. artificial word order: the mod. langs. observe a more log. word order, whereas the ancient langs. "in one view" have a more natural order, in so far as the central argument or focus of the proposition, which is not necessarily the gramm. subject, is placed first, though his use of Gr. and Lat. as examples of this primitive word order is hardly convincing.

Though somewhat surprisingly B. claims that few writers have written "with philos. accuracy" on genl. grammar and fewer still have applied

these principles to E., he relies very heavily on Harris both in his division of words into parts of speech, which he affirms are the same in all langs., and his definition of their basic functions, which are treated in logico-philos. rather than structural terms. Some parts of speech were invented earlier than others: in this context "earlier" almost certainly means he considers they are more essential. Both gender and case are said to be basic distinctions; as regards the latter, he holds that the case system, though more "artificial" than the use of prepositions, is the older of the two; his treatment on this point owes a good deal to A. Smith. His claim that the essence of the verb is "affirmation", i.e. predication, is very much in line with mainstream gramm. theory. B.'s treatment of grammar, while hardly original, adequately fulfills its original purpose as a genl. introd. to the subject within the wider context of a course on rhetoric.

(1965): *Lectures on rhet. and belles lettres*, H.F. Harding ed., Carbondale, IL (London, 1783, 2 vols.).

FRANK, T. (1990): "H.B.'s theory of the origin and basic functions of lang.", in: S. Adamson et al., eds., *Papers from the 5th intern. conference on E. hist. lings.* (Cambridge, 6–9 April 1987), Amsterdam, 165–87.

Thomas Frank †

**Blanco y Sánchez, Rufino**, b. Nov. 16, 1861, Montiel, Guadalajara, Spain, murdered Oct. 2, 1936, Madrid; Sp. educator and lang. teacher.

B. studied at the *Escuela Normal Central* of Madrid, from which he obtained his doctorate in *Filosofía y Letras*. He collaborated with various ministers for Public Works and Education—such as the Marquess of Pidal or La Cierva—in their plans for a reform of teaching. As a teacher at the *Escuela Modelo Municipal* of Madrid, he carried out anthropometric research. B. worked for several professional and political newspapers and was the ed. of *El Magisterio español* and Madrid's political daily *El Universo*. He wrote or ed. numerous educational works which won him great acclaim. At the beg. of the Civil War, he was murdered in Madrid.

B. was equally prolific as a grammarian, writing textbooks for all levels of teaching, particularly for State primary and secondary schools, which were reed. many times. The theories expounded in them, which are closely in line with the doctrines of the *Real Academia Española*—tradition and prescriptivism—are accompanied by practical exercises (identification of gramm. units, morphol. and syntactic analysis, composition, etc.) in accordance with the level of public demand.

B.'s importance within the history of Sp. lings. lies more in his pedagogical innovations and practical aspects of grammar teaching than in his theoretical contributions.

(1896): *Tratado elemental de lengua castellana o española*, Madrid. (1912): *Teoría de la enseñanza*, Madrid. (1929): *Fundamentos de lengua castellana*, Madrid.

CALERO VAQUERA, M.L. (1986): *Historia de la gramática española (1847–1920)*. De A. Bello a R. Lenz, Madrid.

María Luisa Calero Vaquera

**Blasius Pelacani of Parma** (Lat. Blasius de Pelacanis de Parma), b. ca. 1347, Parma, Italy, d. Apr. 23, 1416, ib.; terminist logician.; master of logic, philos. and astrology.

B. was one of the best-known masters in the northern It. univs. at the end of the 14th c. who taught in Pavia, 1374–8 and 1389–1407; in Bologna, 1379–82; and in Padova, 1384–8 and 1408–1411. He was active in a number of fields, as witnessed by his works on physics, astronomy, mathematics, optics and statics, and has left an important contr. to logic in his Questions on → Peter of Spain's *Tractatus* (ca. 1379–82). There he proves to be a follower of the new terminist logic taught by → William of Ockham and the E. logicians of the Merton school, with its emphasis on the formal aspects of sci. lang. and on a referential approach to the problem of meaning.

(1952): "Quaestiones de Caelo. Quaestiones de Sphaera. Tractatus de ponderibus", in: E. Moody/M. Claggett, eds., *The Med. sci. of weights*, Madison, WI, 238–78. (1974): "Quaestiones de Generatione et corruptione. Quaestiones Meteororum. Quaestiones de Anima", G. Federici Vescovini ed., in: *Le 'Quaestiones de anima' di Biagio Pelacani da Parma*, Firenze, 55–168.—For the uned. *Quaestiones Physicorum. Quaestiones de proportionibus. De latitudine formarum. Super Theorica Planetarum*, see complete list of mss. and early printed eds. in: G. Federici Vescovini, *Astrologia e scienza. La crisi dell'aristotelismo sul cadere del Trecento e B.P. da P.*, Firenze, 1979, 411–51. (Uned.): *Quaestiones dialecticae. Quaestiones perspicuae*.

FEDERICI VESCOVINI, G. (1976): "Le questioni dialettiche di B.P. da P. sopra i trattati di logica di Pietro Ispano", *Medioevo* 2, 253–87.

Andrea Tabarroni

**Bloch, Bernard**, b. June 18, 1907, New York City, USA, d. Nov. 26, 1965, New Haven, CT, USA; leading Am. structuralist-descriptivist theoretician, and pioneer in the application of structuralist-ling. principles to mod.-lang. pedagogy.



mar. After his first arrest for anti-religious rationalism and commerce with the devil, C. wandered from one monastery to another—Naples, Rome, Florence, Bologna. He met Galileo and they remained close friends for life. Although persecuted by the Holy Office, C. managed to avoid the destiny of his friends F. Pucci and G. → Bruno in 1594. Charged with political conspiracy in 1597, C. escaped death once again, this time by pleading insanity and accepting a life sentence in prison. There he composed his principal works.

C.'s sensism and materialism posited in man a coordinating bodily Center which draws together and structures the flux of sensorial data (1925 [1604]:115–6, 150). The Center operates using the principal defect of man's mental machinery, i.e. the tendency to form patterns of analogy which permit objects to survive in the brain, even though absent. This tendency, "imagination", produces activity which is articulated and "discorsiva" ("discursive", "expressive"), i.e. lang. C.'s link between imagination and lang. foreshadows G.B. → Vico.

Imagination is ling. activity in the double sense of analogical energy and articulatory procedure. 'Discourse is rendering one similarity with another; thus there are as many utterances and syllogisms in the world [...] as there are kinds of similitudes' (1925 [1604]:11; cf. also 65, 102, 104, 145). Just as imagination rises from a defect in man's mental machinery, which requires the mind, unable to act on things, to act on images, so does lang. rise from a structural imperfection in man. Being neither angelic nor divine, man—a material, physical, animal—must articulate the knowable by expressing himself. This is so "even though speaking is a slow and contorted way of rendering meaning, compared to the way bodiless entities render meaning, like the angels and the demons who communicate concepts to each other immediately, thousands in the time it takes us to represent one" (1925 [1604]:67). Lang. is a continuous articulatory activity which develops between two opposite poles. On the one hand is the tendency toward generalization, which produces shared understanding but also a 'particularistic' failure (a lack of conformity with empirical reality which contains only 'singularities'). On the other hand is the tendency toward specificity, which generates discourse characterized by greater perspicuity but less comprehensibility (1925 [1604]:II, ch. 11). 'We humans, closed in our shells, must cause air to vibrate in order to transmit concepts, and we must establish conventions with our recipients so that they know that a particular vibration means one thing and another vibration means another' (1925 [1604]:

67); indeed, 'if a person does not know the lang. used, which varies from country to country according to the latitude and the peoples who have migrated there, just as clothing and other customs vary, he can only understand what the voice naturally communicates, as when laughing or crying' (ib.). These difficulties, inherent in discourse, make the 'political' work of the grammarian indispensable: "*grammatica est ars instrumentalis politicae humanae [...]. Grammatica ergo naturalis est hominis quatenus politicus est, artificialis insuper quatenus voces et orationes usum considerat*" (1967 [1638]:434).

(1949): *La Città del Sole*, L. Firpo ed., Torino (1602). (1925): *Del senso delle cose e della magia*, A. Bruers ed., Bari (1604). (1954): *Philosophia rationalis partes quinque, videlicet: Grammatica, Dialectica, Rhetorica, Poetica, Historiographia*, L. Firpo ed., Milano (1638). (1967): *Metaphysicarum rerum iuxta propria dogmata partes tres*, G. di Napoli ed., Bologna (1638).

PAGLIARO, A. (1930): *Sommario di linguistica arioeuropea*, Roma, 35–6 (Palermo, 1993). PENNISI, A. (1986): "Calcolo" vs. "Ingenium" in G.B. Vico: per una filosofia politica della lingua", *Bollettino del centro di studi vichiani* 16, 345–65 (repr. in: N.N., *Prospettive di storia della linguistica*, Roma, 1988, 191–213).

Antonino Pennisi

**Campbell, George**, b. Dec. 25, 1719, Aberdeen, Scotland, d. Apr. 6, 1796, ib.; churchman and philosopher.

C. studied at Marischal College, Aberdeen, was ordained minister in the Church of Scotland in 1748 and appointed Principal of Marischal College in 1759, of which he was appointed Prof. of Divinity in 1771. He was one of the founding members of the Aberdeen Philos. Society. *The Philos. of Rhet.*, originally delivered as a series of lectures to the Soc., constitutes the author's principal contr. to the sci. of lang. For many years C.'s *Rhet.* was a widely used textbook on both sides of the Atlantic, and there are numerous reprs. and adaptations of it right until the early 20th c.

C.'s genl. position is close to Reid's common sense philos., and he sees his work essentially as part of the philos. of mind, although he assigns a much more limited role to grammar than many of his contemporaries. Since C.'s main object of study is rhet., he is as much concerned with the illocutionary function of lang. as with its strictly cognitive value, which was the main concern of the majority of his contemporaries. He is very much aware of the dual function of lang., which is "indeed the grand art of communication, not of ideas only, but of sentiments, passions, dispositions, and purposes". It is through rhet. that we use lang., not merely to know things, but

to do things, though he insists that rhet. is not morally neutral, not "the art of deception", but based on reason. In the parts of the work concerned specifically with lang. he accords a strictly subordinate position to grammar, which he sees as purely instrumental, devoid of cognitive value. In fact he contemptuously dismisses any form of general grammar, perhaps wilfully misinterpreting the principles on which it is based, since he sees it as nothing more than the lowest common denominator of known existing grammars. Grammar is always local and particular, the necessary, but not sufficient, condition for good writing: a strict adherence to its rules will ensure clarity of expression and unambiguity (purity), but it is rhet. that teaches us how to use lang. effectively. Talking of the orator and the grammarian, he affirms that the "highest aim of the former is the lowest aim of the latter" and, echoing a remark by C. → Buffier as quoted by C.C. → Dumarsais, he affirms that "where grammar ends eloquence begins". In another part of the work C. attributes to rhet. those universal qualities which other linguists see as being an essential prerogative of a rational grammar.

C. roundly declares that grammar is not a normative sci. but is essentially inductive, a methodical digest of such forms as actually exist in any particular lang., and that it is genl. use, rather than any abstract laws of grammar, that legitimize these forms. But this liberal notion of use is immediately qualified so as to limit it to "reputable", "national" and "present use". As to the first of these criteria, it is the best authors, or in the case of pronunciation, the highest ranks in soc. that determine what is "reputable", whereas "national" comprises those forms which, though they may be used only by a minority of the population, are not peculiar to any one region. As regards "present use", C. tries to steer a middle course between extreme ling. conservatism and an uncritical acceptance of the latest innovations or ling. fashions. All three criteria demonstrate the essentially sensible and moderate character of the author. However, he recognizes that even these three limiting factors do not always provide unequivocal answers to what forms are to be admitted and what forms are to be discarded. In order to resolve doubtful cases he sets up five canons (unambiguity, analogy, phonetic harmony, simplicity and conformity to ancient usage). A further four canons determine which forms, though generally judged to be "good", may nevertheless be eliminated from the lang. because they are too harsh in sound, or at variance with the known etymol. of the word, or obsolete, or ungramm. As can be seen some of these criteria are mutually

contradictory. Purity of lang., which is the essential prerequisite of true eloquence, is achieved through the avoidance of "barbarisms" (of which he lists three types), "solecisms" and "improprieties", categories that are minutely analyzed in C.'s treatment, which contains a wealth of examples both from recent and contemporary authors and grammarians like R. → Lowth and J. → Priestley. The leading idea that inspires C.'s remarks on lang. is the class. ideal of *perspicuitas*. Figures of speech, like metaphors, are acceptable provided they are used to illuminate meaning rather than create it, for when the signifier rather than the signified is the central criterion for the choice of lang., its basic function is nullified and the result instead of clarity is obscurity. (1963): *The philos. of rhet.*, ed. with an Introd. by L.F. Bitzer, Carbondale, IL (1776, 2 vols., London).

BRYAN, W.F. (1926): "A late 18th-c. purist", *Studies in Philol.* 23, 358–70. FRANK, T. (1985): "Ling. theory and the doctrine of usage in G.C.'s *Philos. of rhet.*", *LeSt* 20, 199–216.

Thomas Frank †

**Campe, Joachim Heinrich**, b. June 29, 1746, Deensen, near Holzminden, Germany, d. Oct. 22, 1818, Brunswick, Germany; lexicographer and educator.

After studying theol. from 1765 onwards at Helmstedt and Halle, C. was private tutor (amongst others to A. and W.v. → Humboldt), preacher and educator (among other places at Dessau and Hamburg), from 1786 onwards schools inspector at Brunswick, founded a bookshop for schoolbooks as well as a publishing house, taken over in 1799 by his son-in-law J.F. Vieweg.

C.'s influential writings for schools served to bring the Enlightenment to the classroom. He also produced works for children and adolescents (e.g., adapting Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*), travel books, and also writings on ling. purism and diets. His work on lang. began 1790 with publs. on the purity of lang., which he subsumed under the concept of 'ling. enrichment'. In a prize-winning essay of 1794 he summed up his writings pertaining to this topic. 1795–7, he proposed, among other projects, analyzing lit. works in respect of their foreign ("ausländische") and alien ling. usage ("nicht analoger Sprachgebrauch"), including studies on Goethe, Herder, and Voss. Goethe and Schiller defended themselves against this pedantry in their *Xenien*. Originally also asked to produce a genl. suppl. to J.C. → Adelung's dict., C., 1801, combined his theoretical and practical works on the 'purification and enrichment' of