Historiographia Linguistica

H.L.

Volume VIII, no. 1 (1981)

Historiographia Linguistica

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR THE HISTORY OF LINGUISTICS

EDITED BY

E. F. KONRAD KOERNER

Volume VIII

1981

AMSTERDAM / JOHN BENJAMINS B.V.

HISTORIOGRAPHIA LINGUISTICA

International Journal for the History of Linguistics
Revue internationale pour l'histoire de la linguistique
Internationale Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft

AIM AND SCOPE

This periodical is intended to serve the ever growing scholarly interest of linguists, psycholinguists, and philosophers of language of divergent persuasions in the history of linguistic thought.

Central objectives of *HL* are the discussion of the epistemological and methodological foundations of a *historiography* of the discipline and the critical presentation of particular areas or aspects of actual or potential research.

HL is published in 3 issues per year of ca. 450 pages altogether. Each issue contains at least three major articles, one review article and/or a bibliography devoted to a particular topic, and many reviews, review notes and announcements of recent publications in the field.

LC no. 73-88206 – ISS no. 0302 - 5160

Amsteldijk 44 – P O Box 52519 – The Netherlands
1007 HA AMSTERDAM
Telephone: (020) 73 81 56 – Telex 15798

———. 1977. *The Essential Tension.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 1969. "Presuppositions and Relative Grammaticality". *Journal of Philosophical Linguistics* 1.103-116.

McCawley, James D., ed. & introd. 1976a. *Notes From the Linguistic Underground.* New York: Academic Press.

———. 1976b. "¡Madison Avenue sí, Pennsylvania Avenue no!". *The Second LACUS Forum, 1975* ed. by Peter Reich, 17-28. Columbia, S.C.: Hornbeam Press.

Murray, Stephen O. 1980. "Gatekeepers and the 'Chomskian Revolution'". *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 16.73-88.

———. 1981. *Group Formation in Social Science.* Edmonton: Linguistic Research.

Newman, Paul. 1978 Review of Claude Hagège, *La grammaire générative* (Paris, 1976). *Lg* 54.925-29.

Newmeyer, Frederick J., and Joseph Emonds. 1971. "The Linguist in American Society". *Papers from the Seventh Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 285-306. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

* * * * *

The Study of Language in 17th-Century England. By Vivian Salmon. (= *Studies in the History of Linguistics*, 17.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V., 1979. Pp. X, 218.

Reviewed by HERBERT E. BREKLE, *Universität Regensburg*

The book under review is neither a haphazard collection of articles which happened to be written during a certain span of the life-time of a scholar, nor is it just a set of writings somehow related to the topic indicated in the title of the volume.* What we have instead is a carefully arranged selection of contributions to three prominent areas of the study of language in the century which proved to be seminal for many philosophical and linguistic developments. The three sections of the book of approximately equal length are: *Applied Linguistics, Grammatical Theory*, and *Universal Language.* Although the eleven articles which make up the body of the volume deal primarily with linguistic

* [Cf. also R. H. Robins' account of this book in *Times Literary Supplement* (7 March 1980), p.252, entitled "Linguistics avant la lettre". *Ed.*]

issues which were prominent among British scholars, the author is careful in pointing out the many-sided and often quite intricate relationships between the insular and continental protagonists of the main linguistic lines of thought characteristic for the seventeenth century.

With a few exceptions the papers collected here have been published between 1961 and 1976 in journals and in *Festschriften* not readily accessible to historians of the study in language. The book is rounded off by a preface of the author in which she puts her contributions into the perspective of present ongoing research, a list of the publications (1957-1978) by Mrs. Salmon (compiled by E.F.K. Koerner), and an Index of Authors (excluding those who have commented on the primary subject matter). The articles are reprinted in their original format which necessarily gives the book a somewhat uneven typographical appearance (some bibliographical references occur in footnotes on the page concerned, others with bibliographies and notes at the end of an article). The original page numbers are reprinted together with serial pagination throughout the book.

In what follows stress will be laid on the specifically linguistic issues worked out in each of the articles,[1] i.e., I shall not dwell on the many most valuable biographical findings – some of which appear here for the first time – and cultural interconnections outlined in practically each contribution. This is, of course, not meant to underestimate the extra-linguistic aspect of Mrs. Salmon's work, it means rather that I take for granted her convincingly demonstrated competence in digging up hitherto unknown biographical and bibliographical data and using these together with general historical factors in order to create reliable and informative pictures of the life of a grammarian, a teacher of language, or philosopher.

The first three articles are appropriately assembled under the heading "Applied Linguistics", whereas the fourth article in this section – "Early Seventeenth-Century Punctuation as a Guide to Sentence-Structure" – would in my opinion only secondarily fall under this label. The last-mentioned article (dating back to 1962) gives a careful and detailed examination of the syntactic and semantic functions of punctuation as used by Alexander Gil (1565-1635) in his *Logonomia Anglica* (1619) and by Alexander Top (fl. 1597-1629) in *The Oliue Leafe* (1603) – the latter text was carefully revised by Henoch Clapham (b. ca. 1545). The article as a whole shows convincingly that at least some authors and proofreaders in the early 17th century began to represent "written language in its own right with its own conventions, not necessarily related to spoken language, for indicating grammatical or emotional meaning"

(60). This would suggest that this article is a contribution to historical graphemics.

In contradistinction to this the first three articles in the "Applied Linguistics"-section are of a truly historiographical nature; here Mrs. Salmon discusses with considerable insight into the various tendencies of language-teaching in the first half of the 17th century some methods of teaching Latin to children.

The first two articles – "Problems of Language-Teaching: A Discussion among Hartlib's Friends" (1964) and "Joseph Webbe: Some Seventeenth-century Views on Language-Teaching and the Nature of Meaning" (1961) – center around much the same topics and persons and will therefore be dealt with together. The first article is a detailed study of the biographical and bibliographical background of the main topic. It must be emphasized that the author did an excellent job in highlighting the centripetal function of Samuel Hartlib (c. 1600-1662) who in a way acted as the secretary and *arbiter* of an international group of scholars and teachers (including, e.g., J.A. Comenius); Hartlib's name will re-occur in connection with the articles contained in the third section of the book: "Universal Language". The linguistic matter of the first two articles consists mainly in a detailed description of a controversy between two schoolmasters and grammarians – Joseph Webbe (c. 1570-1633) and William Brookes (H. c. 1630) – about problems of language-teaching. Mrs. Salmon's discussion of this debate shows nicely to what degree she succeeds in reconstructing the issue in modern terms. Webbe's approach is succinctly classified as 'behaviourist', whereas Brookes considered "the learning and speaking of language as a deliberate act of judgment" (8f.). Webbe takes a straightforward empiristic standpoint; according to him children learn a language by being exposed to repeated stimulus-response sequences; in an appropriate social context linguistic competence will be automatically built up. Brookes' key concept is that of "Praecognition', a kind of innate cognitive competence helping the child together with the aid of his memory to produce meaningful and socially appropriate utterances. Webbe in his theory assumed that children learn whole sequences of words – 'clauses' – and should be taught another language in just the same way; however, he ran into difficulties because he was unable to give a consistent definition of which constituents should be called 'clauses' and which not. On the other hand, Brookes adhered to the traditional view "that a clause must have a verb and a noun, and these two he called the 'internall termes of the clause'"(11). It is worth quoting Brookes' idea on the hierarchical syntactic structure of a sentence in full; it does in my opinion show quite clearly that he intended to distinguish between what we would call today the propositional

core of a sentence with some sort of predicate-argument structure and its illocutionary force plus modal constituents:

> ['Internall termes of the clause'] terminate and bound the clause which can extend noe further than their dependants ... they make up the principall matter of the clause as the subject and predicate make up the matter of a logicall axiome. As for the wordes which expresse not the matter of the clause but the affection of the speaker makinge praeparation to the matter as interjections, vocatiue cases and some Aduerbs they belong to a clause as the externall parts of it. (MS Sloane 1466, Fo. 278^{v}, quoted after Salmon, p.11)

Brookes, of course, did not overlook a third syntactic category the 'word of coherence', i.e., conjunctions connecting clauses or sentences.

Brookes' opponent, Joseph Webbe, was mainly concerned with the problem of finding out the best method of teaching children Latin. In several places in his works he comes across a related problem: how is translation from one language into another possible. In discussing various aspects of translation (syntax, lexicon, style) he was bound to reflect on semantic questions as well. Mrs. Salmon in her discussion (26-31) characterizes Webbe's semantics as follows: on the one hand, he seems to have endorsed the idea that meaning is a "wordless concept in the mind which can be put into speech and writing in many different ways, each of these varying sets of words retaining the same 'sense'" (27), on the other hand, he has a suspicion – stemming from his wide experience in translating Latin into English and vice versa – that this cannot be always the case. He is aware that, if we translate each Latin word in a sentence by its English equivalent, we do not necessarily arrive at a meaningful English sentence (even if we respect the syntactical rules of the English language). As a consequence of this fact he posits a kind of interlingual semantic level whose constituents are 'characters of sense' which he considers to be "the nearest elements of speech" and which may, in a given language, be expressed by morphologically simple or complex constructions. Webbe compares this procedure with the combining of letters to form just one meaningful element of a language (a word), he thus parallels letters on the morphological level with words on the semantic level, the common denominator of both combinatory processes being the idea that in the first case we arrive at morphologically minimal 'characters' or constituents and in the second case we obtain combinations of 'characters' of the first type meant to represent conceptual units or meanings. Each language is supposed to have its own combinatory rules for both types of processes. It would be a gross misunderstanding to bring Webbe's conception together

with the idea of decomposing lexical units into semantic primes (this was the approach of later grammarians and philosophers, e.g., John Wilkins, 1614-72). Webbe was a practical-minded man with considerable linguistic intuition; for him the idea of a semantic combinatory process was subservient to his aims as a language-teacher.

With her presentation and discussion of the linguistic conceptions and intuitions of several members of the Hartlib-circle – notably Brookes and Webbe – our author has achieved a good deal towards enlightening us on current trends in early 17th century applied linguistics in England and on the continent.

The remaining article of the first section "John Brinsley: 17th-century pioneer in applied linguistics" (1975) gives detailed information about the life and work of a scarcely known English grammarian (1566-c.1630). His main aim was to improve the standard of teaching Latin at English grammar schools. Between 1612 and 1630 he published thirteen books, establishing thereby a kind of curriculum for teachers of Latin. With this he – as a stout Puritan – successfully rivalled the methods propagated by the Jesuits.

The second section of the book – "Grammatical Theory" – consists of two substantial contributions: "Pre-Cartesian Linguistics" (1969), "'Philosophical' Grammar in John Wilkins's '*Essay*'" (1961) plus a short article on the linguistic achievements of the dramatist-grammarian James Shirley (1596-1666), "James Shirley and some problems of 17th-century grammar" (1975).

The first article serves two functions: firstly, it is not just one of the many reviews of Chomsky's 1966 *Cartesian Linguistics*, but a serious, detailed critical piece of scholarly work; secondly, the author considerably extends the scope of Chomsky's "chapter in the history of rationalist thought" insofar as she introduces ideas and achievements of philosophers and grammarians mostly of the second half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th century which have not been taken into consideration by Chomsky. Mrs. Salmon makes clear the important roles played by Sanctius, Ramus, Bacon, Alsted, Campanella, Buonmattei, Caramuel, Wilkins and a few others. The discussion of important grammatical points made by these scholars (who partly influenced the *Grammaire* and *Logique* of Port-Royal) shows that "Cartesian Linguistics" – if such a movement can claim to have had any existence at all – was not the most prominent source for new linguistic insights gained in the course of the 17th century. It is especially shown by Mrs. Salmon that the concept of deep and surface structure – so dear to Chomsky – did not originate with the Port-Royalist thinkers[2], but with philosophers like Thomas Campanella (1568-1639) and Juan Caramuel y Lobkowitz (1606-1682). As will become evident imme-

diately the distinction made by philosophers in the Aristotelian and Stoic tradition between *verbum mentis* and *verbum oris*, or between *sermo interior* and *sermo exterior* cannot be equated with Chomsky's 1965 distinction between syntactic deep structure vs. syntactic surface structure, but is rather a distinction between a conceptual, logico-semantic level of language and a morphosyntactic level of linguistic expressions.

Among others Mrs. Salmon quotes and discusses Caramuel's *Grammatica audax* (1654);[3] this work of the Spanish theologian, philosopher and grammarian certainly deserves closer scrutiny. In connection with Sanctius' theory of ellipsis or subaudition our author points out that prior to the Port-Royal *Grammaire* there existed a well-developed theory of how attributive constructions and relative clauses function. Caramuel even shows quite clearly his awareness of problems connected with the tense-logic of propositions (what he has to say on this topic is more than vaguely reminiscent of Bach's famous 1968 article). In order to make this fully understood I shall quote from Caramuel's original text just one relevant passage which at the same time throws more light on Mrs. Salmon's rather concise interpretation on p.81. Under the heading *De temporum ampliatione et Praecisione* (which is a section of a larger chapter *De Modi Significandi*) | Caramuel sets out to describe so-called timeless propositions; in the course of his deliberations he also touches upon problems of tense-logic connected with various *Aktionsarten* of verbs. His arguments run as follows:

> [. . .] quae sint tempora in his propositionibus. *Motus incipit, Motus desinit: Petrus demolitur domum, Navem Ambrosius fabricatur.* Et respondeo esse duas sententias de compositione continui. Si illud dicatur componi ex indivisibilibus, dabitur primum et ultimum mutatum esse; et cessabit quaestio: si ex partibus semper dividuis, Haec positio, *Motus incipit* aequipollebit huic, *Nunc non est motus, sed immediatè pòst erit:* et haec *Motus desinit,* huic, *Nunc non est motus, sed immediatè antè fuit* [. . .] *Petrus demolitur domum* aequivalebit huic *Petrus demolitur id, quod nunc est, vel ante fuit domus;* et haec, *Ambrosius fabricatur navim* [sic], huic, *Fabricatur id quod jam est, vel erit navis.* Nam domus diruta non est domus, et navis incepta non est navis. (1654: §XXVIII, p.13)

This hint at the analytical achievements of Caramuel – who incidentally may be regarded as a continuator of the scholastic tradition – together with many others discussed by Mrs. Salmon should make it obvious that the 17th century has much more to offer to historiographers of linguistics and present-day linguists than could be guessed from current work in this domain.

"'Philosophical' Grammar in John Wilkins's 'Essay'" is one of the major articles in this collection; it is especially relevant for linguists who want to find out more about the theory underlying the grammatical framework inherent in Wilkins' famous *Essay towards a real character, and a philosophical language* (1668). The article pursues two aims: "first, to explain that theory, and secondly, to suggest the sources on which Wilkins drew" (198). I hasten to add that Mrs. Salmon succeeded admirably in both respects.

As to the sources unearthed for Wilkins' *Essay* our author ably shows that Wilkins heavily relied on Caramuel's logical and grammatical work (Wilkins did quote Caramuel, together with (Pseudo)Scotus and Camapanella).[4] It is quite impossible to give even a short summary of the wealth of material and arguments presented in this article. After a very detailed investigation into the various sources of the *Essay*, Mrs. Salmon sets out to inquire about "The relationship between language, thought and reality" (106-110); she makes clear that Wilkins' position relies very much on scholastic models which still survived in the curriculum of the English universities and which were transmitted through the works of Campanella and Caramuel.

The following sections of the article, "The properties of existents" (110-112) and "The linguistic correlation of the properties of existents" (112-18) touch upon the core problems with which Wilkins saw himself confronted with when he tried to work out his system of 'real characters'. What we find there has much in common with present-day topics in the domain of linguistic semantics. Wilkins' struggles go into the direction of setting up a number of suitable categories like *ens* "concreteness", *essense* "abstraction" and *existence* "action" (112); he distinguishes between *integrals* ("full words") and *particles* ("empty words") and subdivides the first type of words into 'absolute and 'relational' predicates. Mrs. Salmon elucidates Wilkins' system further by explaining the details in the lexical-semantic domain presenting in addition Wilkins' ideas on the interrelationships between "Syntax, logic and rhetoric" (119-23). Inspite of its shortness the article on "James Shirley and some problems of 17th century Grammar" is very informative as to the state of the art around the middle of the century. "Shirley's grammars illustrate the change from the more formal approach to grammar of the earlier 17th century to the later semasiological approach ..." (87). Mrs. Salmon draws a neat picture of the various conflicting methods of grammatical classification exemplified in the grammars of Lilly, Hewes, Butler and Jonson; at the same time she shows clearly the internal developments in Shirley's own grammars between 1649 and 1656. In the later sections of the article our author gives an illuminating sketch of the

development of the grammatical terms *subject* and *predicate*. Although this terminology had already been introduced by the Dutch grammarian Vossius in 1635, Shirley and other grammarians still adhere to the traditional medieval terms *suppositum* and *appositum*. This terminology is gradually supplanted by the modern terms only during the 18th century.

The third section of the book, "Universal Language", comprises four articles all concerning projects for creating a 'universal language' intended to promote "the international dissemination of scientific knowledge" (130). (It should be added that other motives and interests, e.g., commercial and theological ones, were at work, too.)[5] The first article "Language-planning in seventeenth-century England; its context and aims" (1966) presents in great detail not only a coherent view of the insular factors and achievements, but considers also the international network of scholarly cooperation in this domain. Our author discusses competently the roles played by Comenius, Cyprian Kinner (H. 1650), and others in the group of scholars around Samuel Hartlib; she convincingly relativizes the influence Comenius' writings may have had on the projects of English language-planners, especially Dalgarno and Wilkins. She establishes connections between French and English scholars; of course, Marin Mersenne (1588-1648) is duly mentioned (both his correspondence with Descartes and his *Harmonie universelle* [1629, published 1636]).[6] She also mentions another, practically unknown French scholar, Meric Casaubon (1599-1671)*, who in his book *De verborum usu* (London 1647) is rather sceptical as to the value of purely philological speculations when it comes to establishing objectively the meanings of words and sentences.[7]

After having carefully weighed various channels of putative influence on the work of the English language-planners, Mrs Salmon arrives at the conclusion that it was mainly the general 'climate of opinion' – including a relatively close international exchange of ideas – which helped Wilkins and others to bring about their various schemes of a universal language.

The fourth article in this section, "John Wilkins' *Essay* (1668) Critics and continuators" (1974), supplements nicely the other two articles on Wilkins contained in the book. Mrs. Salmon discusses what happened to Wilkins' monumental work (which the author was unable to finish) during the decades after his death (1672). Although the Royal Society had practically commissioned the *Essay*, there were conflicting opinions about its scientific value and about

* [See now the article by John F. Eros, "A 17th-Century Demonstration of Language Relationship" Meric Casaubon on English and Greek", *HL* 3.1-15 (1976). *Ed.*]

the question whether the projects should be continued at all. A number of distinguished scholars and other learned men (among them we find Holder, Wallis, Ray, Boyle, Wren, Ward; Paschall and Lodwick) tried to revise and develop further Wilkins' system. Mrs. Salmon explains why these attempts were bound to fail: "... their goal was, if not a near-impossibility, completely impracticable. They had three objects in mind; the classification of reality, its symbolisation by iconic characters, and the construction of a 'universal' grammar." (201) Inspite of this seemingly unsatisfactory outcome our author is able to show that Wilkins' *Essay* exerted considerable influence on grammarians and lexicographers well into the 19th century.

The remaining two articles in the third section lend additional colour and depth to the picture representing the intricate relationships between those who contributed to projects of universal language and the various cross-influences between their works. One article investigates in great detail "The Evolution of Dalgarno's 'Ars signorum'" (1966), the other article – "Cave Beck: A seventeenth-century Ipswich schoolmaster and his 'Universal Character'" (1976) – shows that the interest in the topic was quite widespread. Although Beck (1623-c.1706) pursued more practical aims with his 'Universal Character', it nevertheless attracted the attention of several members of the Royal Society. Besides a clear and concise description of Beck's system, Mrs. Salmon gives most interesting insights into the social system of the time. She does not overrate the importance of Beck but would like him to be "remembered as the creator of the first complete 'Universal Character' [published 1657 in English and French] to be printed, not only in Britain but, in all likelihood, in the whole of Europe" (190).

To sum up: this collection of articles represents a notable achievement in the historiography of linguistics, it is well balanced between the internal and external aspects of the object and it provides the community of linguistic historiographers with an invaluable cornerstone for a full-scale history of the study of language in 17th-century England, a history which remains to be written.

Reviewer's address:

Herbert E. Brekle
Lehrstuhl für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Universität Regensburg
D-8400 REGENSBURG
Federal Republic of Germany

NOTES

1) For a possible justification of this preference cf. I. Lakatos (1971:1, E), where he defends the thesis that internal aspects and criteria in the history of science are primary, and external evidence is secondary, because the relevance of external aspects is defined in the light of the internal, theoretical historical framework of a scientific discipline.

2) Cf. also Robin Lakoff's review article of Brekle 1966 in *Language* 45.343-64 which appeared in the same year as the article under discussion here – 1969.

3) A reprint of plus introductory and commentatory matter on this work by Juan Caramuel y Lobkowitz is scheduled to appear in the series *Grammatica universalis.*

4) On p.110 there are two small misprints as to the date of publication of Campanella's *opera*; instead of "1654" read "1954". Otherwise this date is given correctly; first edition 1638.

5) Cf. especially Mrs. Salmon's book on Francis Lodwyck (1972).

6) There may very well exist a connection between Mersenne's *Harmonie universelle* and Kepler's *Harmonices mundi* (published 1619); the ideas underlying both works converge on the applicability of the structural properties of music to other domains – the old Pythagorean topos!

7) Casaubon recommended that in case of semantic disputes one should ask for advice from persons competent in the respective field, especially if "ex unius ambiguae aut obscurioris voculae variâ interpretatione multorum hominum millium salus pendeat" (quoted after Salmon, p.146). I cannot but feel reminded of such 'practical semanticists' as Whorf and Korzybski who made very similar proposals.

REFERENCES

Brekle, Herbert E., ed. 1966. *Grammaire générale et raisonnée, ou La Grammaire de Port-Royal.* Edition critique présentée par Herbert E. Brekle. 2 vol. Tome I: Nouvelle impression en facsimilé de la troisième édition de 1676. Tome II: Variantes et annotations. (= *Grammatica universalis*, 1.) Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog).

Caramuel Lobkowitz, Juan. 1654. *Praecursor logicus complectens grammaticam audacem cujus partes sunt tres: methodica, metrica, critica... - Herculis logici labores tres, videlicet: I. Nil-negans, II. Non-omnis, III. Contigens, inventi ... industria Caramuelis, sive Praecursoris logici pars altera.* Francofurti: sumptibus J. G. Schönvvetteri. (To be reprinted in the series *Grammatica universalis*, 20.)

Casaubon, Meric. 1647. *De verborum usu, et accuratae eorum cognitionis utilitate, diatriba.* Londini: typis M. Flesher, sumptibus R. Mynne ...

Kepler, Johann. 1619. *Harmonices mvndi libri V. qvorvm primus geometricvs, de figuram regularium, . . . , secundus architectonicvs, seu ex geometria figvrata, . . . , tertius propriè harmonicvs, de proportionum harmonicarum ortu ex figuris, . . . , quartus metaphysicvs, psychologicvs & astrologicvs, . . . , quintus astronomicvs & metaphysicvs . . .* Lincii Austriae [= Linz a.d. Donau]: sumptibus G. Tampachii. (Repr., Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1968; Bologna: Forni editore, 1969.)

Lakatos, Imre. 1971. "History of Science and its Rational Reconstructions". *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, Volume VIII.91-136, and: "Replies to Critics", (= *PSA 1970 in memory of Rudolf Carnap: Proceedings of the 1970 Biennial Meeting Philosophy of Science Association*) ed. by Roger C. Buck and Robert S. Cohen, 174-82. Dordrecht (Holland): D. Reidel.

Lakoff, Robin. 1969. [Review of] Brekle, Herbert E., ed. 1966. *Grammaire générale et raisonnée, ou La Grammaire de Port-Royal.: Language* 45.343-64.

Mersenne, Marin. 1636-37. *Harmonie vniverselle, contenant la théorie et la pratiqve de la mvsique, où il est traité de la nature des sons & movvemens, des consonances, des dissonances, des genres, des modes, de la composition, de la voix, des chants & des toutes sortes d'instrumens harmoniques.* Paris: S. Cramoisy. (Repr., with an Introduction by François Lesure, Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1963, 3 vols.)

Salmon, Vivian. 1972. *The Works of Francis Lodwick: A study of his writings in the intellectual context of the seventeenth century.* London: Longmans.

* * * * *

A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language. By George Y. Shevelov. Published for the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies by Carl Winter Universitätsverlag. (= *Historical Phonology of the Slavic Languages*, IV: *Ukrainian.*) Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1979. 809 pp. Paperbound, DM 460.–

Reviewed by J. B. RUDNYCKYJ, *Montreal*

The primary value and scholarly importance of this massive reference work is the fact that it was compiled and published in English. So far there were several works in this field written in Ukrainian, Russian, Polish and German, but none in English (cf. References). The author enumerates these studies on