

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	ix
<i>List of Tables</i>	x
<i>Preface</i>	xii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xiv
1 Introduction	1
1 Historical sociolinguistics	3
2 Precept and practice	4
3 Comparative standardology	11
4 Outline of the book	14
2 Eighteenth-Century English Grammarians and the Subjunctive Mood	16
1 Introduction	16
2 Systems of moods in the history of English	17
3 Eighteenth-century grammarians' accounts of the subjunctive mood	27
4 The status of the subjunctive in eighteenth-century grammars	52
5 Subjunctive accounts after the eighteenth century	58
6 Conclusion	61
3 The Subjunctive Mood in Eighteenth-Century England: A Corpus Study	62
1 Introduction	62
2 Methodological preliminaries	66
3 The subjunctive mood and its diachronic development	68
4 The inflectional subjunctive and gender variation	79
5 The inflectional subjunctive and genre variation	81
6 Conclusion	85

4 Eighteenth-Century German Grammars and the Subjunctive Mood	87
1 Introduction	87
2 Systems of moods in the history of German	88
3 Grammarians' accounts of the subjunctive mood	92
4 The status of the German subjunctive mood in the eighteenth century	127
5 Subjunctive accounts after the eighteenth century	128
6 Conclusion	131
5 The Subjunctive Mood in Eighteenth-Century Germany and Austria: A Corpus Study	133
1 Introduction	133
2 The subjunctive mood and its diachronic development	135
3 The subjunctive mood in Austrian German	143
4 Conclusion	155
6 Standardisation Processes in England and the German-Speaking Areas	157
1 Introduction	157
2 Selection of norm – the situation in England and Austria	159
3 Codification of form – the situation in England and Austria	173
4 Acceptance by the speech community – the situation in England and Austria	180
5 Elaboration of function – the situation in England and Austria	183
6 Conclusion	186
<i>Notes</i>	188
<i>Bibliography of Works Consulted</i>	197
<i>Index</i>	216

1

Introduction

The rise of a standard language is inextricably connected to value judgements about linguistic variants. During standardisation processes certain linguistic expressions are marked as ‘correct’ and prestigious and subsequently selected as a standard form whereas other linguistic features are labelled as ‘bad’ and corrupt use of language. As Haugen rightly points out, ‘[w]here a norm is to be established, the problem will be as complex as the sociolinguistic structure of the people involved’ (1997, p. 349). It is, after all, the socio-political context that influences the evaluation of the language usage. An established norm, in turn, has many socio-political consequences. This work will be concerned with the establishment of linguistic norms in the history of specific languages and the socio-political contexts in which these norms arose as well as their influence on actual usage. More precisely, this study seeks to trace the development of the subjunctive mood in English and German, with a special focus on the Austrian variety,¹ during part of their standardisation processes, namely the eighteenth century. As grammarians were attempting to shape and codify a prestige variety during this period, the question arises whether and to what extent these normative grammarians influenced the development of the inflectional subjunctive. After all, the subjunctive mood has been claimed to have been on the decline in both English and German in the eighteenth century (*cf.* for English: Strang, 1970, p. 209; Turner, 1980, p. 272; Görlach, 2001, p. 122; for German: von Polenz, 1994, pp. 261–263). The decline in usage relates to the synthetic subjunctive form (see examples 1–4), the functions of which were taken over by periphrastic forms,² modal verbs and the indicative.

- (1) *If he show any Disposition to write me a penitential Letter, you may encourage it; not that I think it of any Consequence to me,*

2 *The Subjunctive in the Age of Prescriptivism*

but because it will ease his Mind and set him at rest. (ARCHER 1766Hume.X3) [present subjunctive]

- (2) I desire to take more serious thought of ys matter, yt *if* it *were* ye will of God some good might be done in it. (ARCHER 1661NEWC.J1) [past subjunctive]

- (3) Den 4ten dieses ist Kundschaftt eingelauffen/ daß der Feind bey Betz eine Schantze *anlege/* und sich bey Temeswar mit der Armee *postire/* auf welche die Käyserl. vigiliren. (GerManC nod_1650–1699) [Subjunctive I]

[On the fourth day of this month news reached us that the enemy *build* an entrenchment near Betz and *post* with the army near Temeswar, to which the Imperial army is vigilant.]

- (4) Darum *wäre* es immer gut, wenn wir die Zeitungen nur öftrer *läsen*. (GerManC nod_1786) [Subjunctive II]

[Therefore *were* it always advisable that we *read* the papers more often.]

Several quantitative studies have already been carried out on the development of the subjunctive mood in English (Kihlbom, 1938/39; Harsh, 1986; Övergaard, 1995; Peters, 1998; Hundt, 1998, forthcoming; Serpoulet, 2001; Moessner, 2002a, 2002b, 2006, 2007; Auer and González-Díaz, 2005; Auer, 2006; Grund and Walker, 2006; Fillbrandt, 2006; Schlüter, forthcoming), but there is still little known about the development in the Late Modern English period (see Övergaard, 1995, p. 89). Even though many linguists have commented on the development of the inflectional subjunctive during that period, there is a lack of empirical data available to support their claims. As regards quantitative studies on the subjunctive in German, Jäger (1971) studied the subjunctive in contemporary German and Engström-Persson (1979) investigated the use of the mood around 1800. While Engström-Persson's study is based on a self-compiled multi-genre corpus, her data do not focus on geographical differences in use of the subjunctive. Guchmann and Semenuk (1981), on the other hand, did investigate the development of the subjunctive in a range of literary genres as well as different geographical areas in the period 1470–1730 in Germany. Their investigation does, however, stop at the point when standardisation processes were initiated in the southern areas and in particular in the Habsburg Empire.³ Behaghel (1924), who provides a historical account of German syntax, dedicates a chapter to the subjunctive mood, but this does not contain any statistical records of the development of the subjunctive. All in all, as studies on the subjunctive in English and German have not yet extensively

explored the development of the mood in the eighteenth century, this is what this book aims to supply.

The remaining parts of this chapter shall be concerned with the methodological framework employed in this work. Through the discussion of particular methodological approaches, namely historical sociolinguistics (Section 1), precept and practice (Section 2) and comparative standardology (Section 3), the organisation of this book will be established and elucidated.

1 Historical sociolinguistics

The beginning of the research field known as ‘Socio-historical Linguistics’ or ‘Historical Sociolinguistics’ is marked with the publication of Suzanne Romaine’s *Socio-Historical Linguistics* (1982), in which she applied sociolinguistic techniques to the study of historical data. While Romaine’s study of relativizers in Middle Scots (1450–1700) revealed that stylistic stratification played an important role in language maintenance and shift, the scope of historical sociolinguistics has since then been extended ‘to comprise a wide range of issues including social and regional embedding in linguistic change’ (Nevalainen, 2006, p. 558). Any kind of sociolinguistic research, be it synchronic or diachronic, requires an analysis of linguistic data in connection with contextual information such as genre, gender and region. The flourishing of representative electronic corpora since the 1980s (in the field of English) provided linguists with a range of corpora – that is diachronic, synchronic, single-genre, multi-genre, written, spoken, as well as geographically and socio-linguistically stratified – to investigate language variation and change (see McEnery and Wilson, 2001). For my study of the use and development of the subjunctive in English and German in the eighteenth century I will use electronic corpora that should ideally contain samples from different genres and regions and should be socio-linguistically stratified. As Milroy (1998) rightly comments, ‘All changes diffuse socially, and it is therefore argued that we need to take into account social factors in addition to intra-linguistic factors in order to come closer to explanations’ (Milroy, 1998, p. 41). Existing corpora can unfortunately not cater for all the requirements of socio-historical research; nevertheless, some of the needed variables are contained in diachronic corpora after all. The English usage part of my research will be based on *A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers* (ARCHER), a 1.7 million-word corpus, which consists of examples from British and American English ranging from 1650 to 1990.⁴ The corpus

contains a variety of texts from different genres, which are journals, letters, drama, fiction, news, sermons, scientific prose, medical prose and legal opinions (see Biber, Finegan, Atkinson *et al.*, 1994 for more information). This study will be restricted to the British English variety only. The make-up of the corpus allows me to investigate the diachronic development of the subjunctive mood as well as the distribution of the form with respect to genre and gender. On the German side it is a lot more difficult to find a representative historical corpus that can be used for my research. Only in 2006 a pilot project of a German historical corpus (GerManC) has commenced at the University of Manchester, which in the long run aims to parallel ARCHER in English.⁵ After the completion of the first stage of the project (in April 2007), the corpus contains 100,000 words of one genre, namely newspapers, covering the time span 1650–1800 in five varieties of German: North German, West Central German, East Central German, West Upper German (including Switzerland), and East Upper German (including Austria). I will first investigate this single-genre corpus with respect to the use and development of the German subjunctive and will then analyse a second multi-genre corpus (sermons, journals and reports and newspapers), which I compiled for the Austrian German (East Upper German) language variety. Due to the differences in make-up of the corpora, the German study will not be able to focus on the gender variable.

2 Precept and practice

Standardisation processes took place in England and Germany at approximately the same time, namely the sixteenth to the eighteenth century (see Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion of the standardisation processes). In both countries grammarians and language theoreticians were heavily involved in shaping and codifying the desired prestige varieties (*cf.* for English: Leonard, 1929; Milroy and Milroy, 1991; Bayley, 1992; Finegan, 1992, 1998; Baugh and Cable, 1993; Stein and Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds), 1994; Blake, 1996; McIntosh, 1998; Bex and Watts, 1999; Wright (ed.), 2000; Görlach, 2001; Crowley, 2003; for German: Althaus *et al.*, 1980; von Polenz, 1994; Gardt *et al.*, 1995; Besch *et al.*, 2000; for Austrian German: Wiesinger, 1983, 1995, 1997). Even though the 'age of prescriptivism' (*cf.* for English: Dossena, 2003, p. 389; 2007, p. 13; Mugglestone, 2007, pp. 10–13; for German: von Polenz, 1994) has been well documented in both languages, it has not yet been satisfactorily resolved whether normative grammarians or prescriptivists

actually changed usage. After all, the publication of grammars, dictionaries and prescriptive manuals only indicates the strong interest in the standardisation of the language. Studies in English historical linguistics that deal with the question of prescriptivism and its influence on actual language usage can be divided into two types of studies, namely (1) those that investigate the influence of language authorities, which could have emerged from grammar books or via specific people, on individuals and their idiolects⁶ (see Tieken-Boon van Ostade, 1987, 1991, 1994, 2006; Susan Fitzmaurice, 2000, 2003 [formerly Wright, 1994]; Percy, 1996; Auer and Tieken-Boon van Ostade, 2007; Sairio, 2008) and (2) those that focus on the prescriptivists' effects on language usage on a larger scale and for this purpose employ electronic corpora (cf. Auer and González-Díaz, 2005; Auer, 2006; Yáñez-Bouza, 2006, 2007).⁷ Note that the latter kinds of studies (on a macro level) have only recently started.

In German historical linguistics opinions on whether prescriptivists had any influence on actual language usage have been divided. Claims that prescriptivists' rules had an effect on language usage have been made in several linguistic histories of German, but the lack of empirical evidence suggests that these claims are mere suppositions (see Bergmann, 1982, pp. 270–272). Bergmann⁸ (1982) and Schmidt-Wilpert (1985), who discussed the problem extensively, argue that the matter is not yet resolved. Schmidt-Wilpert claims that not enough is known about the effect of prescriptivism on language usage, which can be put down to the fact that linguists have focussed on other research areas such as language change and continuity (see Schmidt-Wilpert, 1985, p. 1557). The lack of research on the effect of prescriptivism may also be explained as follows: German researchers were primarily interested in investigating the influence of different language-external factors such as political and cultural factors. The contribution of grammarians was regarded as less important (see *ibid.*, p. 1557). It must be pointed out that the study of Early New High German grammars and other theoretical works on language has nevertheless been a popular field of research. The study of linguistic ideas and philosophy of language as portrayed in meta-linguistic works was considered to be of great interest. However, the normative effect of prescriptions on actual language usage is an aspect that has largely been neglected (Bergmann, 1982, p. 277; Konopka, 1996, p. 42). Von Polenz (1994, p. 168) subscribes to this view and maintains that the actual effect of grammarians and teachers of orthography on language usage has not been sufficiently clarified.

More recently, a useful method of evaluating influence through the comparison between prescription and actual usage has been applied in

the field of German standardisation by Konopka (1996), Takada (1998) and Langer (2001). What these studies have in common is that they are based on two corpora, which are individually evaluated and then compared. One corpus, which I shall call 'precept corpus', consists of a collection of meta-linguistic comments on the investigated grammatical feature, and the second corpus, which I shall label 'usage corpus', represents language practice. Marek Konopka, for instance, in his work *Strittige Erscheinungen der deutschen Syntax im 18. Jahrhundert* (1996), discusses German syntactic rules such as subordinate clauses and *zu* + infinitive, which were developed in the eighteenth century. The great interest of grammarians and other theoreticians of language, which is reflected in the large number of grammars, raises the question of whether grammars had an effect on actual syntactic usage. Konopka thus aimed to investigate the development of language usage and language norms in the eighteenth century (see Konopka, 1996, p. 1). He only discusses 'controversial' syntactic features, which means syntactic formations on which the grammarians disagree as reflected by their proposed rules. As pointed out above, the study is based on a precept corpus, which consists of 17 works (1722–1775) by 14 grammarians or theoreticians from six geographical areas, and a usage corpus that contains 37 sources (1724–1775) covering three text types (philosophical texts, texts on language, literary reviews) as well as regional variation. Konopka analyses and discusses both corpora individually, then matches and compares the results. The outcome reveals that grammarians can be divided into two groups. The first group of grammarians used an adequate grammatical terminology, which means a set of syntactic rules; they 'described' actual language use and subsequently theorised grammatical constructions that were in fact part of the language. The second group, who Konopka calls old-fashioned, lacked an adequate terminology and posited artificial constructions that were not found in the actual language use at the time (*cf.* Konopka, 1996, pp. 232–235; Langer, 2001, p. 5). The analysis of the usage corpus showed variation in the different syntactic areas that was determined by pragmatic factors (see Konopka, 1996, p. 223). The comparison between language norms and actual usage revealed a geographical and temporal parallelism, which, according to Konopka, indicates that prescription influenced actual language usage. This result was particularly obvious in the data of a certain region, namely Upper German. Konopka also showed that the works by the language authority Gottsched were most influential, whereas he claims that the works of other grammarians predicted usage that occurred after the research period, which ends in 1775.

Hiroyuki Takada's *Grammatik und Sprachwirklichkeit von 1640–1700. Zur Rolle deutscher Grammatiker im schriftsprachlichen Ausgleichsprozeß* (1998) investigates the emergence and distribution of nationally printed norms for literary and educated usage. As the main focus of the study is grammatical correction in the practice of printing, Takada selects between 2 and 8 editions of each text, which differ in publishing date and printing location. The religious texts selected are for example different editions of Luther's Bible. As opposed to Konopka, Takada does not only aim to find out if grammarians' recommendations were adopted by contemporary writers, but also whether printers at different locations adhered to the norms (see Takada, 1998, pp. 16–19). The general outcome of the study shows that meta-linguistic comments on language by theorists and actual language usage largely agree in the second half of the seventeenth century. Furthermore, the grammarians exerted influence on local and national language usage. Takada also noticed that the degree of influence by grammarians was not the same in all linguistic areas, but that the success was greater with orthography and morphology (see Takada, 1998, pp. 296–299).

The final German study of this kind to be discussed is Nils Langer's *Linguistic Purism in Action. How Auxiliary *tun* Was Stigmatized in Early New High German* (2001), which seeks 'to explore to what extent the influence of prescriptive grammarians on the formation of standard German can be traced and verified by a close comparison of language use and metalinguistic comments in the ENHG [1350–1750] period' (Langer, 2001, p. 4). The study is concerned with the morpho-syntactic construction auxiliary *tun*, which is stigmatised in present-day written German and associated with low social status and colloquial speech. Langer argues that if a construction has frequently been used before language theorists comment, but following their objection to the construction starts to disappear, we can reasonably claim that the grammarians' efforts to influence language development have been effective. Unlike Konopka and Takada, Langer investigates the usage corpus first to 'establish patterns of the distribution of *tun* with regard to region, time and text type' (*ibid.*, p. 9). Then the precept corpus is analysed with respect to the promotion or stigmatisation of the language feature. The usage corpus reveals that the auxiliary *tun*-construction occurred in approximately 50% of the texts and that the construction was evenly distributed with regard to region, time and text type. These results suggest that 'the ungrammaticality of *tun* in standard German was not due to an independently occurring, general decrease of the use of the construction' (*ibid.*, p. 220). Instead, the precept corpus reveals that the

*Language usage 1 – Meta-linguistic comments by grammarians
(descriptive & prescriptive) – Effectiveness – Language usage 2*

(based on Konopka, 1996, p. 47)

Figure 1.1 A model of precept and practice

construction became stigmatised in clearly discernible stages: ‘the feature is slowly but progressively stigmatized as bad poetry (1640–1680), bad written German (1680–1740), and bad German (after 1740) in the form of metalinguistic comments’ (*ibid.*, p. 10). Langer thus successfully showed that the stigmatisation of *tun* was strongly influenced by comments of prescriptive grammarians.

All these studies are in principle based on the stages of Konopka’s model, which depicts the method of approach (Figure 1.1).

Konopka claims that the elements depicted in the model are intergradable and then suggests that ‘[w]ill man die Bedeutung der Grammatik für den Sprachgebrauch richtig einschätzen, müssen zunächst die beiden unmittelbar greifbaren Bereiche untersucht werden, und zwar die sprachreflexiven Aussagen und der Sprachgebrauch’ (Konopka, 1996, p. 47). In his advice to compare both directly available domains, namely the meta-linguistic comments and actual language usage, Konopka does not differentiate between language usage 1 and language usage 2 as proposed in the model. In fact, his precept corpus, which covers the time span 1722–1775, and the usage corpus, which covers 1724–1775, almost perfectly overlap. Both Takada and Langer apply Konopka’s model by comparing the precept element and the usage element (as a whole).

My interpretation of Konopka’s model differs from Konopka’s application of it. The first step in the method is to chart the actual language use before the codification stage, in other words, before grammarians prescribed a certain usage. The second part of the model refers to the study of language norms as represented in opinions and meta-linguistic comments made by grammarians about the investigated feature (the precept corpus). It is not always obvious if a grammarian’s account is based on actual language usage or if it is prescriptive, and this would certainly influence or rather hinder the evaluation of effectiveness. The last part refers to usage after grammarians exercised their prescriptive powers. A close comparison between language usage 1, language usage 2 and meta-linguistic comments by grammarians should ideally show if

prescriptivists had an influence on the development of the selected linguistic feature. One might even want to include a third element of language usage that covers the time span during which selected grammarians commented on the selected linguistic feature. This enables the researcher to possibly detect the point in the progression when the prescriptions start to be effective. The usage corpus may therefore be continuous and start before the precept corpus and finish after the precept corpus. A subdivision of the usage corpus may be as follows: Language usage 1 before the precept corpus starts, language usage 2 parallels the precept corpus, and language usage 3 covers some time after the precept corpus.

Similar kinds of studies to the ones discussed earlier have also been carried out in English historical linguistics, as for example Facchinetti (2000), Gustafsson (2002a, 2002b) and González-Díaz (2003). Facchinetti (2000), for instance, studied the modal verb *shall* in the nineteenth century. She analyses modal usage in 188 newspaper articles (*The Times*, *The Sunday Times*) dealing with the Irish Question in the nineteenth century and also discusses socially biased remarks made by grammarians in the previous centuries. The reason for the choice of the Irish question is that grammarians have 'trespassed the limits of social discrimination so as to brand some *shall*- or *will*-clauses as typically Scottish, Irish, or American' (Facchinetti, 2000, p. 115). Even though the selected articles are in English newspapers, Facchinetti argues that they include copies of reports and commentaries that were originally published in Irish newspapers (*ibid.*, p. 116). The language represented in the newspaper corpus therefore contains English as used in Ireland as well as England in the nineteenth century. Facchinetti's study claims that the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century prescriptions were largely complied with in the nineteenth century; that is, the semantic discrimination between *will* and *shall* as suggested by grammarians has been noticed: *shall* with first person subjects favours future values, while with second and third person subjects deontic contexts are more common (see *ibid.*, p. 130).

Gustafsson (2002a) studied variation in the use of preterite and past participle forms during a period of prescriptive codification.⁹ Gustafsson compiled a corpus of public and private writing, whose usage she compared to the precepts found in contemporaneous grammars, rhetoric books and dictionaries. Her data revealed a tendency towards standardisation in public writing, which is shown in the spelling of *-ed* forms of regular verbs. This is however not substantiated in the use of irregular verb forms. The data of the private writing showed that the varied spelling of forms of regular verbs recedes in moderation as opposed to

the use of irregular verb forms, the recession of which is prominent. The overall results show that standardisation is not a monolithic process, but it comprises diverse and distinct standardisation processes (see Gustafsson, 2002a, p. 283). This diversity is also reflected in the contrasts between the evidence of usage and precept.

González-Díaz (2003) investigated the diachronic development of double periphrastic comparatives. She compares a number of 'usage' corpora to comments made by grammarians in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries about the grammatical feature. She finds that the form started to disappear from the written domain in the last decade of the sixteenth century and not during the age of prescriptivism as proposed in standard literature. Due to the initial loss of prestige of the form, which was followed by positive stigmatisation, double periphrastic forms became restricted to non-standard registers. The prescriptive tendencies of the eighteenth century fostered the social stigmatisation of the forms. The new interest in language variation and non-standard forms from the nineteenth century onwards resulted in double forms being less stigmatised, although still considered non-standard.

A critical appraisal of the English studies from the point of view of Konopka's model [my interpretation] shows that Facchinetti's work has flaws in that her study lacks the element language usage 1. The absence of this element prevents the researcher from finding out whether the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century rules are in fact prescriptive. Moreover, it is not possible to monitor the exact influence of the grammarians' rules. Another difficulty is the choice of usage corpus as it is not representative of Irish English. Gustafsson appears to apply Konopka's model according to his interpretation in her 2002a study and my interpretation in her 2002b study; and so does González-Díaz (2003).

From the discussion of studies which have compared language prescription and language practice, it may be concluded that the method applied appears to be useful for testing whether prescriptive grammars were effective. The essential idea is thus to trace the development of linguistic thought as well as actual language usage (on a large scale) and then compare the outcome. The German scholars suggest that studies of this kind should be carried out with a wide range of linguistic features in order to support or oppose the claim that prescriptivists changed language usage overall. If a language theorist propagates a certain grammatical property and its usage increases in some geographical areas or text types in subsequent decades, the likelihood that the change is due to the prescriptive influence is rather high. Furthermore, if a

grammatical feature is stigmatised by grammarians and its actual usage subsequently strongly decreases to the verge of dying out, there is a good chance that the prescription was effective. It would seem important that a time gap lies between prescription and usage. After all, the lack of a temporal shift might suggest that actual language usage affected prescriptivism rather than vice versa.¹⁰ Konopka's (1996) claim that the works of other grammarians predicted usage that occurred after the research period can therefore possibly be interpreted as effective prescriptivism. The development should also be viewed over a longer period as certain stigmatised features might have disappeared from the standard written language but still occur in colloquial language. The possibility that the features are used in written language again is given. The effect of prescriptivism must then be regarded as limited and merely a trend in the diachronic development of a grammatical feature (cf. Elspaß, 2005; González-Díaz, 2003). Moreover, if a declining grammatical feature is stigmatised by grammarians and its actual usage subsequently strongly decreases to the verge of dying out, it is more difficult to tell whether prescriptivism played a role in its demise; for example, in the case with double negative, the existing trend could at best have been reinforced by prescription, which would probably not be noticeable. In this case, prescriptivism has to be seen as a facilitating rather than a triggering factor of language change.

Being aware of these limitations, why should the method be applied in a study of the inflectional subjunctive in English and German? If, as suggested by previous research, the subjunctive form was on the decline, an effective prescriptive advocacy of the form should result in a reversal of its development, which shows that prescriptivists might have influenced the development of the mood.

3 Comparative standardology

As Jespersen notes, '[t]he greatest and most important phenomenon of the evolution of language in historic times has been the springing up of the great national common languages – Greek, French, English, German, *etc.* – the “standard” languages which drive out, or are on the way to drive out, the local dialects' (Jespersen, 1925, p. 45). For some time standardisation has been associated with a kind of sociolinguistic change, more precisely a linguistic process of variation reduction, and investigations were sometimes carried out on a comparative basis¹¹, as for example in Scaglione's *The Emergence of National Languages* (1984)

and Haas's *Standard Languages: Spoken and Written* (1982). These studies, even though they provide case studies from different languages, cannot be considered properly comparative since each case study is approached from a different angle. It is therefore difficult to establish similarities and differences across histories of standardisation. In order to provide the systematic comparison that earlier studies have been lacking, in this work the standardisation accounts of English and German will be based on Haugen's four-step model. Haugen (1966, 1972, 1997) suggests four stages of language development, the features of which are crucial in the process leading from 'dialect' to 'language'. These four stages are (1) selection of norm, (2) codification of form, (3) elaboration of function and (4) acceptance by the speech community. Haugen's standardisation concept has become somewhat of a 'standard' model for describing standardisation processes, which is substantiated by the fact that it has only recently been applied for comparative purposes in Deumert and Vandenbussche (2003). The book consists of 16 standardisation histories of what the editors term 'mature' Germanic languages (Afrikaans, Danish, Dutch, English, German, Icelandic, Norwegian, Swedish), languages whose standardisation is in progress (Germanic pidgin and creole languages), languages with partial and ongoing standardisations (Frisian, Scots, Luxemburgish, Yiddish, Faroese) and it also includes an example of absent standardisation (the Middle Low German *lingua franca*) (Deumert and Vandenbussche, 2003, p. 2). The contributors were asked to organise their articles based on Haugen's four-step model. This certainly raises the question whether the model fits every language, and if so, whether the standardisation processes go through the stages as listed? Deumert and Vandenbussche responded to the first question as follows: 'Haugen's model has the advantage that it is broad as well as detailed enough to function as the frame of reference for the description of highly varied standardization histories' (*ibid.*, p. 4). To consider the second question, if standardisation processes went through the stages as listed by Haugen (1966, 1997), predictions of a development of a language would largely be possible. However, as research into the standardisation process of languages has shown, languages do not develop in the same way. Willemyns (2003, pp. 93–126), who contributed the chapter on Dutch, divided the standardisation process into selection and codification on the one hand and elaboration and implementation¹² on the other hand. This differs from the account of English by Nevalainen (2003, pp. 127–156), who subdivided the process into selection and acceptance versus codification and elaboration.¹³ In the case of Pacific Pidgins and Creoles, Mühlhäusler

(2003, pp. 355–382) deviated from the standard model and headed his account with status planning and corpus planning. From these examples we are able to observe that the four listed aspects seem to be applicable to all standard varieties or ‘mature’ Germanic languages. The only stage that is fairly fixed is the selection of a norm at the beginning of the process; the following stages are prone to overlap. The model shows that languages that have already developed into a standard will go through the four stages at some point. Other standardisation histories, those of partial and ongoing standardisations, will pass through selected stages only. This suggests that the four-stage model is best employed with hindsight.¹⁴

Why should Haugen’s four-step concept of standardisation serve as a model for the portrayal and comparison of the standardisation process in English and the German-speaking countries in this study? Firstly, the Haugen model is considered a standard frame of reference for standardisation processes. Secondly, different varieties of German, such as Austrian,¹⁵ were not treated in Deumert and Vandenbussche’s (2003) volume. Moreover, Deumert and Vandenbussche argue that Haugen’s model is ‘an appropriate frame of reference for the strong comparative orientation of this volume’ (Deumert and Vandenbussche, 2003, p. 4), but there is no concluding chapter in which comparisons are applied to the model in different languages. The only indication of a comparative approach, apart from the application of Haugen’s model, can be found in the introductory section, which contains a brief overview linking the languages with different topics such as medieval Chancery and literary standards, nineteenth-century national standards, different sizes of speech communities, matrilectal speech communities and communities with a great number of L2 speakers, mature, partial and incipient standard languages and, finally, colonial and post-colonial standardisation processes. My study will be particularly concerned with the situation in the eighteenth century. Nevalainen’s (2003) account of English, on the other hand, discusses the development of English from Old English to the present day and is also concerned with the expansion of English outside the British Isles, which does not allow her to go into much detail. My study, however, will be particularly concerned with the situation in the eighteenth century. In this account, topics like Chancery and literary standards as well as other themes like the role of religion and education are discussed in detail and compared in both languages (see Chapter 6). After all, my aim is to find out about differences in the standardisation processes that might account for the decline of the inflectional subjunctive in English and German and possible influences

on it by eighteenth-century grammarians. Following the investigation of the subjunctive in English and German in precept and practice corpora (Chapters 2–5), in Chapter 6 I will take a step back and put the development of the inflectional subjunctive into the larger picture of language standardisation in England and the German-speaking areas.

4 Outline of the book

As the introduction has already shown, the issue that will be addressed in the following chapters is the question of effectiveness of normative eighteenth-century grammarians on actual language usage with respect to the inflectional subjunctive mood at the time. This investigation does not only focus on one particular language but is an exercise in comparative standardology, which means that I will discuss the development of the subjunctive in English and German, both in the grammars and grammar books and actual usage, as well as the different socio-political contexts in which these developments occurred.

The discussion on the methodology of this study (Sections 1–3) pointed out that a precept and a usage corpus will be closely compared in order to find out whether eighteenth-century grammarians had any effect on the development of the subjunctive. Chapters 2 (English subjunctive) and 4 (German subjunctive), which are concerned with the treatment of the subjunctive in eighteenth-century grammars (precept corpus), are organised in parallel. First, the systems of moods in selected grammars will be investigated. Then, accounts of the subjunctive in these grammars will be discussed with respect to morphology, syntax and semantics. Finally, the status of the subjunctive as implied by examples provided and/or explicit statements made will be discussed. The findings will be summarised and hypotheses will be made with regard to actual subjunctive usage in the eighteenth century.

Chapters 3 and 5 will be concerned with actual usage and the development of the subjunctive. Chapter 3 investigates the English subjunctive with respect to the hypotheses made in Chapter 2. The corpus study (based on ARCHER) will trace the development of the inflectional subjunctive from 1650 to 1990. I will investigate the occurrence of the mood in different genres as well as the distribution of the inflectional subjunctive according to gender. Moreover, I will be concerned with the role that conjunctions and verbs might have played in the alleged demise of the subjunctive. Chapter 5 takes up the hypotheses made in Chapter 4 to investigate actual subjunctive usage in the German-speaking areas of the Holy Roman Empire during the period

1650–1800. A corpus study, which is based on the newspaper genre in GerManC, will shed some light on the development of the inflectional subjunctive in five regions, which correspond to the following German varieties: North German, West Central German, East Central German, West Upper German (including Switzerland) and East Upper German (including Austria). I will then discuss the fate of the inflectional subjunctive in the Austrian German variety in greater detail. To this end, more text genres will be analysed and the importance and influence of printing in eighteenth-century Austrian German will be taken into account.

Chapter 6 focuses on the standardisation processes in England and the German-speaking areas, which provide an essential background for the understanding of the status of eighteenth-century grammarians in both countries. To be able to carry out a structured comparison of the situations in these countries, I adopt Haugen's concept of standardisation as a framework for discussion. The processes and stages of standardisation in the respective languages will be discussed separately and the similarities and differences will subsequently be compared. Since language standardisation is associated with the linguistic process of variation reduction, this chapter will also shed some light on language variation in English and German in the eighteenth century. This in turn concerns the situation and the development of the subjunctive mood in both languages.

Index

- Académie Française, 175
 Accademia della Crusca, 175
 Addison, Joseph, 53, 57, 77, 175, 188
 Adelung, Johann Christoph, 89, 91–2,
 116–23, 125–7, 131, 153, 178–9
Adventurer, 77
 adverbial clauses, English: 39, 51, 61,
 65–6, 69–70, 74–6, 78–9, 84–6,
 138, 190
 concession (English), 65, 74–6
 conditional, English, 62, 65, 74–5,
 190; German, 133, 144–5, 154
 purpose (English), 74–6
 temporal (English), 74–5
 Akenside, Dr, 53
 Albertus, Laurentius, 89, 192
 American (English), 3, 9, 63
 Anonymous (English grammar
 published in 1736), 20, 24, 49
 Anonymous (English grammar
 published in 1781), 22, 50
 Anonymous (German grammar
 published in 1794), 89, 123, 125
 Antesperg, Johann Balthasar von, 90,
 92, 97–103, 105, 108, 125–8,
 131–2, 152, 155, 171, 176,
 189, 195
*A Representative Corpus of Historical
 English Registers* (ARCHER), xiv,
 2–4, 14, 67–9, 79, 81, 84–6, 188
 Armstrong, Dr, 53
 Arnauld, Antoine, 30
 Ascham, Roger, 53
 Ash, John, 21–2, 26, 50
Atlas zur deutschen Alltagssprache
 (AdA), 193
 Austen, Jane, 67, 78–9
 auxiliaries, 29–30, 32, 34–5, 37–8, 41,
 48, 51–2, 61, 66–9, 86, 94–5, 103,
 105, 126, 132, 188, 190–1
 see also modal auxiliaries; modal
 verb/s
- Barker, Isaac, 19, 49, 52
 Bayly, Anselm, 20, 21, 26, 49–50, 53,
 55–6
 Becker, Moritz Alois, 128
 Bible, 53, 83
 editions (German), 113
 Geneva, 191
 King James, 63–4, 83
 Luther's, 7, 93
 translations (English), 57, 63, 161,
 185, 190
 translations (German), 88, 93, 164
 Bicknell, Alexander, 23, 50, 55
 Bob, Franz Joseph, 91–2, 110–12,
 126–7, 131, 153, 170, 178
 Bolingbroke, Lord, 53
 book reviews, 76, 79
 Bourn, Samuel, 77
 Brightland, John, 19, 27–30, 33, 41,
 47, 49, 51, 53
 Brittain, Lewis, 22, 50, 55, 58, 61, 71,
 84, 86
 Brome, Mr., 53
 Buchanan, James, 20–1, 24–5, 27,
 41–4, 48–50, 52, 55–6
 Bullen, Henry St. John, 23, 51
 Bullokar, William, 17
 Burn, John, 21, 50
 Butler, Charles, 17–18
- Campbell, George, 22, 50
 Carter, John, 21, 24, 50
 Catholic, 98, 114, 125, 168–9,
 181, 185
 Caxton, William, 159, 161
 Chadwyck Healey Eighteenth-century
 Poetry Corpus, 84
 Chancery
 language, 88, 163–6
 Medieval, 13
 royal, 173
 Saxon, 165
 Standard, 159–60, 183–5

- Charles VI (Charles III of Spain), 168, 195
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, 159, 161, 173
- Clajus, Johannes, 89, 192
- Clarke, John, 46
- Coar, Thomas, 23, 50
- Cobbett, William, 58, 176
- colloquial language, 11, 62
- comparative standardology, vii, 3, 11, 14, 158, 186
- complaint tradition, 172, 175, 180
- compulsory schooling in Austria, 143–4, 178–9, 181, 183–4
- conjunctions, *see* subjunctive
- Coote, Charles, 22, 50
- corpus/corpora
- characteristics of a modern corpus, 62
 - practice, 14
 - precept, 6–9, 14, 86, 137, 143, 157–8, 183, 186
 - usage, 6–10, 14, 128, 135, 143, 152, 158
- Corpus of Early English Correspondence Sampler* (CEECS), xiv, 64
- conjunctive (mood), 19, 24, 26, 42, 44–5, 54–5, 59–60, 118, 120–2
- Cornwall, John of, 183, 185
- Counter-Reformation, 147, 168
- Coverdale, Myles, 191
- Cowley, Abraham, 53
- Croat, 194
- Czech, 194
- Critical Review*, 76–7
- Defoe, Daniel, 175, 195
- determinate (mood), 20
- Deutsche Gesellschaft Leipzig* (DGL), 97, 101
- Deutsche Gesellschaft* (Vienna), 177–9
- Devis, Ellin, 22, 28, 45, 50, 56, 75, 79, 190
- dialects (middle English), 63, 159–60, 163
- dialect/s (German, Austrian), 97, 106, 128–9, 131, 145, 149–51, 153, 177
- dialect poetry, 143, 149, 151, 153, 183
 - metropolitan and aristocratic, 167
 - rural, 167–8
 - Viennese, 167–8
- diglossia, 162, 187, 193–4
- Dilworth, Thomas, 20, 26, 44, 49, 52
- Dionysius Thrax, 17
- Donatus, 89
- double periphrastic comparatives, 10
- Dryden, John, 53, 57, 63, 175, 195
- dubitative (mood), 19, 26
- Dutch, 12
- Dyche, Thomas, 20, 49
- Earle, John, 60
- East Upper German, x, 4, 15, 98, 135, 137, 140, 142, 164–8
- Education Act, 1st, 195
- Edwards, M.C., 23, 26, 28, 46, 51
- Eighteenth Century Collections Online* (ECCO), xii, 18, 88
- Elphinston, James, 21, 50
- Enlightenment, 28, 88, 168–9, 177, 184, 195
- Entick, John, 19, 49, 52
- Eves, Mrs., 23, 28, 47, 51
- Farquhar, George, 53
- Farro, Daniel, 20, 24, 49
- Felbiger, Johann Ignaz, 91–2, 113–16, 126, 131, 153, 178, 192
- Fell, John, 22, 50, 52
- Fenn, Eleanor, 23, 28, 46–7, 51, 55, 79
- Fenning, Daniel, 21, 24, 50
- Fisher, Ann, 20, 24, 28, 45, 49
- Fleming, Caleb, 21, 25, 50
- Fogg, Peter W., 23, 50, 55
- Foster, Alexander, 58–9
- Foster, Margaret E., 58–9
- French, 11, 53, 134, 160–2, 168, 183, 185, 193–4
- Gardiner, Jane, 23, 28, 46, 51
- Gerlach, Friedrich Wilhelm, 90, 92, 108–9, 126, 131, 153, 176–7
- Germanic (languages), 12–13, 177
- Gerlach, Friedrich Wilhelm, 90, 92, 108–9, 126, 131, 153, 176–7
- GerManC: A Historical Corpus of German (1650–1800)*, x, xii, 2, 4, 15, 135, 137–8, 143, 158, 188

- Gildon, Charles, 19, 27–30, 33, 41, 47, 49, 51, 53
- Gill, Alexander, 17–18
- Glover, Dr, 53
- Gottsched, Johann Christoph, 6, 90, 92, 97–8, 101–6, 110, 125–7, 131–2, 152, 154–5, 169, 172, 176–9, 181, 189
- grammar/s
- Early Modern English, 18
 - Early New High German, 5, 7
 - elementary, 28
 - influx, 71
 - normative, 16
 - prescriptive, 10, 86, 151, 175
 - traditional English, 36
- grammarian/s
- Austrian, 87, 97, 106, 131–2, 135, 151–2, 155, 176
 - descriptive, 41
 - dissenters (English), 27
 - female (English), 27–8, 45, 47–8, 56, 79, 81
 - German, 88, 127, 131, 135, 150, 180
 - 'most influential', 6, 27, 33
 - normative, 1, 4, 16
 - provincial, 27, 41
 - radical, 27, 41, 177
 - working-class, 27
- grammar-writing, 27–8, 88–9, 92
- empirical and scientific approach, 28
- Greaves, Paul, 17–18
- Greek, 11, 17, 38, 93, 98, 113, 162
- Greenwood, James, 19, 24, 27–8, 31–3, 47, 49, 53
- Habsburg Empire, 2, 110, 147–8, 151, 165–6, 169, 182, 186, 188, 194
- Harrison, Ralph, 22, 50
- Haugen's four-step concept of standardisation, 12–13, 15, 158–9, 186, 189, 195
- Helmsdörfer, Adolf, 129–30, 135, 153, 192
- Henry V, 160–1, 194
- Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* (HC), xiv, 63–4, 192
- Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots* (SC), xiv, 63–4
- historical sociolinguistics, vii, 3
- see also socio-historical linguistics/research
- Hoffmann, Leopold Alois, 178, 193
- Holy Roman Empire (of the German Nation), 14, 182, 186, 188
- Hornsey, John, 23, 50
- Humanism, 17, 161
- Hume, Alexander, 2, 17
- Hungarian, 194
- Hunter, Thomas, 77
- hypercorrection, 16
- imperative (mood), 17, 19–20, 22, 24–6, 29–34, 38–9, 46, 89–90, 92, 191
- implementation (of norm), 12, 189
- indicative (mood), ix, 17, 19–20, 22, 24–6, 29, 33–5, 37–41, 43–8, 51–2, 54–61, 64, 66–70, 72–8, 82, 84–6, 89–90, 92, 95–7, 99–101, 115, 118–24, 126–7, 129–30, 133–4, 136, 148, 150, 153, 154, 190–2
- infinitive (mood), 6, 17, 19–20, 22–6, 33–4, 38, 41, 46, 89–90, 92, 99, 105, 109
- interrogative (mood), 19, 25, 33
- Irish (English), 9–10
- Irealis* (subjunctive), 48
- Italian, 168, 194–5
- Jesuit Order, 113, 143, 168, 177, 184–5
- dissolution of, 113, 1845
- Johnson, Samuel, 20, 26, 42, 44, 46, 49, 54–6, 61, 79, 84, 86, 163, 174–6, 184, 195
- Jonson, Ben, 17–18
- Joseph II, 114, 167, 178, 184
- Kirkby, John, 20, 26, 49
- Klemm, Christian Gottlob, 177
- Konopka's model/method/approach, 8, 10–11, 68–9, 143, 157
- Kromayer, Johannes, 89, 93
- Lancelot, Claude, 30
- Lane, A., 19, 49

- language
 literary, 62, 102, 158–9, 161–2,
 174–5, 184, 194–5
 national, 7, 184–6
 of education and science, 129, 184
 of law, parliament and the ruler's
 Court, 184–5
 of media, 184
 reform (Austrian), 88, 143–4, 146–7,
 149, 151, 154, 169, 172, 176–7,
 179
 of religion, 158, 184–5
 universal, 28
- Latin
 categories, 17–18, 96
 Classical, 161
 grammar, 17–18, 33, 52, 89, 190
 grammatical framework, 25
 Latin-based rules of correctness, 16
 lexical borrowing from, 162, 186
 models, 47, 89, 186
 patterns, 17, 25
 system of moods, 17, 99
 terminology, 29
 Vulgar, 161
- Linacre, Thomas, 17–18, 94
 Lindemayr, Maurus, 149–51, 181, 185
 Lindemayr, Peter Gottlieb, 149–50
lingua franca, 12, 182, 184–6
 Loughton, William, 19, 24, 49
 Lowth, Robert, 21, 26–7, 33–6, 38, 46,
 48, 50, 53, 57–8, 61, 75–6, 176,
 189–90, 192
 Luther, Martin, 7, 88, 93, 164–6, 181
 Lynch, Patrick, 23, 51
- Maittaire, Michael, 19, 25–6, 49,
 52–3, 191
Mannheimer Corpus, 236
 Maria Theresia (Empress), 88, 114,
 143, 146, 166, 168–9,
 172, 176–8, 182, 195
 Marriott, Charles, 22, 24, 50
 Martin, Benjamin, 20, 26, 49
 Maximilian I., 88, 166, 194
 Metcalfe, Lister, 21, 50, 57, 76
 Middle English, xiv, 63,
 159, 190
 Middle High German, 136
- Milton, John, 53, 57, 60, 195
 modal auxiliaries, 29–30, 32, 34–5, 37,
 41, 51–2, 61, 67–9, 86, 94–5, 103,
 105, 126, 132, 188, 190–1
see also auxiliaries; modal verb/s
 modal verb/s, 1, 9, 35, 44, 51–2,
 66, 103, 126, 133, 138–44, 151,
 191–2
see also auxiliaries; modal auxiliaries
 model of precept and practice, 8,
 10–11, 68–9, 143, 157; *see also*
 Konopka's model/method/
 approach
 Montagu, M., 77
Monthly Review, 76
 moods
 denial of, 26
 inventory of, 18
 system of; English, 18, 24–5, 28, 40,
 43, 61, 92; German, 89, 94, 96;
 Latin, *see* Latin
 Murray, Lindley, 23, 26–7, 33, 36–8,
 48, 50, 58, 76, 176, 190
 myths, 174
- national literature, 168, 173, 184
 New Testament, 60, 64, 83
 Newton, John, 18
 Nicholson, James, 23, 50
 normative, *see* grammarian/s;
 grammar/s
- obligative (mood), 20, 38
 Old Testament, 60, 64, 83, 185
 Ölinger, Albert, 89
 Opitz, Martin, 164, 194
 optative (mood), 17–22, 26, 30, 89,
 92, 94–6, 99, 102–4, 127
 orthographical handbook (German),
 113
- Pacific Pidgins and Creoles, 12
 Pape, Daniel, 22, 50
 Pardon, William, 20, 49
 participles (as a mood), 20–2, 26, 33,
 28, 90, 192
 Pickbourn, James, 22, 24, 27, 38, 40–1,
 48, 50, 52–3
 Pinero, Arthur, 63

- polite
 British society, 27, 41, 71, 180, 186
 language, 45, 56, 79, 86, 157, 173,
 180, 186–7
 speakers and writers, 56, 58, 61
 politeness marker, 56–7, 60, 79, 186
 Poole, Joshua, 17
 Pope, Alexander, 40, 53, 60, 175
 Popowitsch, Johann Siegmund
 Valentin, 90–2, 105–8, 111, 126,
 131–2, 152–4, 177
 Port-Royal Grammar, 30, 33, 47, 53,
 189
 Postlethwaite, Richard, 23, 50
 potential (mood), 17–26, 30, 32, 34,
 36–8, 46, 48, 51–2, 71, 86, 89, 92,
 94–5, 102–3, 126–7, 191
 prescription/s, 5, 6, 9–11, 81, 155,
 189, 192
 prescriptivism
 effect of, 5, 11
 ideology of, 174, *see also* myths
 influence of, 65
 Priestley, Joseph, 20, 24, 27, 41–2, 47,
 50, 55, 176
 printing, 7, 15, 143, 146–8, 159, 161,
 166, 177
 proof-reader/s, 116, 147,
 154, 177
 typesetters, 147, 154, 177
 Prior, Matthew, 53
 Protestant, 98, 116, 125, 147, 149,
 168–9, 172, 181, 185
 Puttenham, George, 163, 167–8
- Queen Anne, 173
 Queen Elizabeth, 175
- Raine, Matthew, 21, 50, 52
 Rationalism, 28
 Reformation, 17, 164, 168, 184–5
 Renaissance, 17, 88, 162, 195
 responsive (mood), 19, 25
 Rhodes, Benjamin, 23, 50, 52
 Rieger, Joseph Anton, 177
- Salmon, Nicholar, 23, 51
 Sandys, George, 53
 Scheyb, Franz Christoph von, 176
 Schottel, Justus Georg, 89, 92–7
 Scottish (English), 9
 Scots, 12, 63–4, 189
 Middle Scots, 3
 Seally, John, 22–50
 Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley-Cooper,
 3rd Earl of, 53
 Shakespeare, William, 53, 60, 63, 173,
 190, 195
shall/will, 9
 Shaw, John, 22, 26, 50, 52
 Sheridan, Thomas, 19, 49, 52
 Smetham, Thomas, 21, 50
 social climbers, 61, 71, 79, 86
 social shibboleth, 56, 61, 78–9, 157
 socio-historical linguistics/research, 3
 Sonnenfels, Joseph von, 177–8
 Soria, Paul Grafes Amor von, 153, 172
 Spanish, 168, 194
Spectator, 77
 standard
 English, 160, 172, 175
 German, 101, 165, 166, 181, 186
 literary, 13, 125, 160, 162,
 164, 180
 national, 13, 173, 186
 standard language, 1, 11–13, 105, 148,
 158, 160, 166, 173, 180–1, 184,
 186, 189
 subjunctive (English)
 in adverbial clauses, 66, 70, 74–5
 descriptions by grammarians,
 27–60; decline of the, 54–8;
 exemplification (summary),
 53–4
 diachronic development, 68–85;
 gender variation, 79–81; genre
 variation, 81–5; role of
 conjunctions, 71–6; role of
 verbs (*to be*, lexical verbs), 76
 functions of, 1, 30, 41, 61, 66–8,
 70–1, 86, 191–2
 mandative, 39, 48, 64, 191
 past subjunctive, ix, xi, 2, 46, 51,
 61, 79–81
 present subjunctive, 2, 62, 77, 81, 86

- subjunctive (German)
 descriptions by grammarians,
 92–131
 diachronic development, 135–55;
 development in Austrian
 German, 143–55
 functions of, 87, 133
 past subjunctive, 87, 100–1, 103,
 129, 133–6, 145, 148–55, 171,
 187, 192–3; regional (synthetic),
 100–1, 145–6, 148–50, 152–5
 present subjunctive, 87, 96, 121
 subjunctive I, 2, 87, 135, 138–44,
 148
 subjunctive II, 2, 87, 133, 135,
 138–45, 148, 150–1, 155–6, 187
 würde-periphrasis, ix, 125, 133–5,
 137, 141–5, 150–1, 153–6, 187,
 192
 Story, Joshua, 22, 26, 50, 192
 Swift, Jonathan, 53, 174–5, 195

Tatler, 77
 Taylor, Mrs., 23, 28, 45–6, 50
 Tennyson, Alfred Lord, 63
 Trattner, Johann Thomas (von), 177
 Turner, Daniel, 20, 49
 Turner, William, 19, 49, 52
 Tyndale, William, 64, 83, 185, 191

 Ussher, George Neville, 22, 50

 varieties of German, 4, 13, 88, 134–6,
 138–9, 142, 147, 155
 Austrian German, viii, xi–xii, 4, 15,
 143–4, 153, 157, 186, 188, 195;
 see also East Upper German
 Austro-Bavarian, xi, 142, 147–9,
 187, 194
 Cologne variety, 164
 East Central German, x, 4, 15, 135,
 137, 139, 142, 164–5, 169
 East Upper German, x, 4, 15, 98,
 135, 137, 140, 142, 164–8
 Meißnisch, 164
 North German, x, 4, 15, 130, 135,
 137, 139, 142, 148, 169, 172,
 177, 180, 187, 193
 West Central German, x, 4, 15, 130,
 135, 137, 139, 142, 148, 169,
 172, 177, 180, 187, 193
 West Upper German, xi, 4, 15, 135,
 137–8, 141–2, 164
 Viennese Academy, 97

 Wallis, John, 18, 28–30
 Ward, William, 21, 26, 50,
 53, 56
 Weitenauer, Ignaz, 91–2, 113, 126,
 131, 153
 Wharton, Jeremiah, 17–18
 White, James, 20, 26–7, 33, 38–40,
 48, 50, 52–3, 55–6, 58, 61, 79,
 191–2
 Wilkins, John, 28
 Williams, David, 77
 Wilson, Rev. J., 23, 50
 Wright, G., of Sunderland, 23, 50

 Young, E., 77

Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht,
 133–5, 141, 144, 192